Your Money or Your Philosophy: Dollars, Decisions, and the Search for Meaning

Timothy Jussaume

Honors College, West Chester University of Pennsylvania

Author Note

I have no known conflict of interest to disclose. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Timothy Jussaume, Honors College, West Chester University, 700 S High St., West Chester, PA 19383. Email: tjussaume@wcupa.edu.

Abstract

Personal finance literature often presents itself as a pragmatic genre, offering strategies for saving, investing, and planning for retirement. Beneath this practical surface, however, lies a set of implicit philosophical commitments about virtue, consumption, autonomy, and the meaning of a life well lived. This article argues that personal finance should be read as a philosophical genre, one in which questions of ethics, responsibility, and human flourishing are embedded in everyday advice about money. Drawing on classical sources such as Aristotle, Epictetus, Seneca, and Kant, alongside modern voices including Suze Orman, Dave Ramsey, Robert Kiyosaki, the FIRE movement, The Minimalists, Bill Perkins, and Alicia Munnell, I trace three central narratives: money as a vehicle for virtue, money as a critique of consumption, and money as a pathway to autonomy through time. By examining financial advice through a philosophical lens, this article highlights that money is never neutral. Even its most technical strategies encode moral visions that shape how individuals and societies pursue meaning, responsibility, and freedom.

Keywords: personal finance, philosophy of money, Stoicism, financial independence, retirement

Your Money or Your Philosophy: Dollars, Decisions, and the Search for Meaning

At first glance, money and philosophy appear to stand in opposition. In nearly every introductory course on Western philosophy, students encounter the paradigm of the "philosopher" in the image of Socrates: barefoot, poor, and engaged in unpaid conversation in the Athenian agora as his primary "occupation." In Plato's *Apology*, when asked to assess his own penalty for his supposed crimes against the city, Socrates willingly offers the little money he has, stating that the loss of money "would not hurt me" (Plato, ca. 399 B.C.E./2000, 38a). He suggests a mere single mina, leaving it to his friends to raise a more substantial (but still relatively modest) sum of 30 minae on his behalf. This moment captures the enduring stereotype of the philosopher (lampooned to great effect by the Greek playwright Aristophanes in *The Clouds)* as a figure devoted to transcendent truths, unconcerned with the practical realities of commerce or material security. Imagine the absurdity of Socrates offering investment advice or financial planning services!

Yet this apparent opposition between philosophy and money is misleading. While there are indeed many historical examples of philosophers suspicious of wealth (e.g., Diogenes, Kant, Thoreau, Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche, to name just a few), it would be a mistake to separate the philosophical from the financial. The decisions we make each day regarding money—when and how we spend, save, donate, or invest—are determinations of value, which are invariably grounded (whether acknowledged or not) in philosophical questions about life's purpose, our moral obligations to others, and our relationship to work. (Consider the oft-repeated claim that "budgets are moral documents.") To explore this connection, I turn to the genre of personal finance, which I define here as content written for a general audience and offering actionable steps for managing an individual's finances. Though it presents itself as practical guidance, personal finance is saturated with philosophical content, much of it implicit and operating just beneath the surface. From philosophy, it inherits questions of ethics, virtue, and human flourishing, as well as Stoic and existentialist perspectives on autonomy, discipline, freedom, and mortality. Examining personal finance through this lens reveals that financial advice is never philosophically neutral; it encodes moral visions that shape how we understand ourselves, our responsibilities, and our place in the world.

To illustrate this claim, the article will dive into the world of personal finance literature to survey a broad selection of texts, including classic texts such as Vicki Robin and Joseph Dominguez's *Your Money or Your Life* (2008), Suze Orman's *The 9 Steps to Financial Freedom* (1997), and Dave Ramsey's *The Total Money Makeover* (2003). More recent contributions will also be considered, such as the "Financial Independence, Retire Early" (FIRE) movement represented by writers such as Pete Adeney, known through his blog as "Mr. Money Mustache"; Brandon Ganch, known through his blog as "The Mad Fientist" (The word "fientist" is a play on financial independence, "FI", and scientist.); Bill Perkins's *Die with Zero* (2020); and the minimalist philosophy popularized by "The Minimalists," Joshua Fields Millburn and Ryan Nicodemus. Each example articulates a distinct vision of meaning, whether through the search for self-actualization, the quest for autonomy, critiques of consumption, or the pursuit of security.

The central thesis of this article is that money, as discussed in personal finance, functions not only as a medium of exchange but also as a reflection of our deepest philosophical commitments. In this sense, the ways we use money are inseparable from questions of metaphysics and ethics: how we understand the nature of reality and how we believe we ought to act within it. When personal finance literature is read as philosophical text, it reveals the claims that quietly shape how individuals and societies earn, spend, donate, and save. My aim is not to offer definitive answers to the philosophical questions embedded in this genre, but rather to highlight the claims already operating, often implicitly, within some of its most influential works.[1]

The majority of the article proceeds by analyzing three central narratives of meaning that appear widely in the personal finance genre: (1) personal finance as a call to ethical living; (2) personal finance as itself a critique of unreflective consumption; and (3) personal finance as a means for the pursuit of autonomy. By way of conclusion, I gather these themes together to highlight a few of the primary philosophical fault lines that emerge within the personal finance genre. My hope is that reading the genre of personal finance through a philosophical lens not only offers the potential to reshape how we think about the role of money in our lives but also offers new, and perhaps more easily accessible, approaches to perennial philosophical questions regarding a life well lived.

Personal Finance and Morality

A central narrative in personal finance literature is the idea that money, when properly ordered, is not an end in itself but a means to cultivate virtue and support human flourishing. This perspective has deep philosophical roots. Aristotle (ca. 350 B.C.E./1944), in Book 1 of the *Politics* (1256a–1258b), distinguishes between a “natural” form of economic activity, which serves the household (*oikos*) and aims at sufficiency, and an “unnatural” form, which treats

---

[1] Although it is beyond the scope of this article, it is important to note that what remains unasked in much of the personal finance genre is whether there are alternatives to the idea of money itself. In many ways, a critical starting point for nearly every personal finance text is the apparent inevitability of money as a dominant feature of life in human community. Radical alternatives to money remain for the most part unconsidered. Instead, the approach tends toward understanding the “rules of the game,” so as to achieve the best outcomes, rather than attempting to radically rethink the game itself.

money as an end in itself. The very term economy derives from *oikonomia*—the management of the household—underscoring its original association with sustaining life and ordering resources toward flourishing rather than unbounded accumulation. Aristotle condemns usury as the quintessential corruption of this order, money producing money, which he describes as “most contrary to nature” (Aristotle, ca. 350 BCE/1944, 1258b). For Aristotle, the economy belongs to the sphere of the household and community, where its purpose is to sustain life and enable the cultivation of excellence (*aretē*). Economic life is meaningful when it remains tethered to these ends; it becomes destructive when wealth getting overwhelms virtue and turns accumulation into the goal.

This conviction that money is inextricably bound to a vision of a life well lived extends beyond Aristotle’s virtue ethics. Other moral theories also frame financial life as a site where deeper principles are tested. In utilitarian thought, for example, money is valued as a tool for maximizing well-being for the greatest number of people. The contemporary “effective altruism” movement reflects this logic, urging individuals to make as much money as possible so they can direct resources toward causes that create the greatest overall benefit (Centre for Effective Altruism, n.d.). The utilitarian call to maximize positive consequences is taken to its logical conclusion: The ultra-wealthy, on this view, have a greater moral obligation than others to maximize their earnings in order to maximize their impact.[2]

A Kantian deontological perspective offers a sharp contrast. Instead of emphasizing consequences, this framework highlights our obligation to follow universal norms such as truth

---

[2] Yet, it has also been controversial in application. Sam Bankman-Fried, the disgraced founder of the collapsed cryptocurrency exchange, FTX, cited effective altruism as the motivating philosophy for his financial empire, raising questions about whether utilitarian reasoning can be stretched to justify reckless or harmful actions.

telling, honoring promises, elevating the interests of the universal over the individual, and never treating people simply as means to other ends. Here, the moral significance of money is located in duties such as keeping promises, repaying debts, and respecting the autonomy of others through fair financial dealings. Money becomes a site where obligations are clearly quantified. To fall into debt without repayment, for instance, is not merely imprudent but a failure of duty itself.

What is striking is that modern personal finance writers, though rarely explicit about moral philosophy, echo many of these same ethical emphases. Suze Orman, one of the most recognizable voices in the field since the late 1990s, frames financial responsibility not only as an expression of dignity and self-respect, but also of courage. In *The 9 Steps to Financial Freedom* Orman (1997) writes:

> We are all powerless as children, and money looms so powerfully. As we grow up we claim our power in one way after another, taking on jobs, families, commitments, responsibilities. Yet we don't grow up to claim our financial power until we look money directly in the eye, face our fears, and claim that power back. (pp. 18–19)

For Orman, financial freedom requires confronting fear, developing courage, and reclaiming control over one's life. To be in charge of one's finances is to mature into full adulthood. This emphasis on courage and maturation aligns with the Aristotelian model of virtue: realizing our potential and cultivating character through the steady practice of facing challenges well. Saving, investing, and protecting resources are not simply technical steps but moral acts of empowerment that actualize one's flourishing.

Yet, Orman's call to courage is set against a worldview of uncertainty and perpetual financial risk. Her work stands in sharp contrast to recent trends in personal finance around "early retirement," which will be discussed later in this article. She claims individuals must save far more than they might expect in order to ensure security. For a representative example, consider Episode #153 from Pant's (2018) *Afford Anything* podcast, where Orman warned at various points in the conversation:

> Two million dollars is nothing. It's nothing. It's pennies in today's world to tell you the truth. . . . Let's say you need help. Remember, I took care of my mother and it cost me $30,000 a month. So, you're talking about very possibly $300,000, $400,000 a year. . . . I am telling you don't be naïve. Don't test fate. You should work as long as you possibly can. (Pant, 2018)

She adds that once taxes, inflation, market downturns, and unexpected emergencies are included, $2 million may no longer stretch as far as one would hope. Beneath this warning is a metaphysical-ethical vision, namely, financial disaster is always a looming threat, and true responsibility means preparing for the worst. But this raises questions: Is $300,000–$400,000 in annual eldercare costs a realistic consideration for the average person? Should children bear such costs for their parents? How should we balance risk against the opportunity cost of years spent in pursuit of financial security? Orman's account pushes us to think not only about money but about responsibility, duty, and intergenerational obligations, and to do so with a recognition that the financial dangers of miscalculation are great.

In *The Total Money Makeover*, Dave Ramsey (2003) advances a similar narrative of discipline and responsibility. His insistence on living debt-free, saving methodically, and practicing strict self-control reflects a moral vision in which money managed well is evidence of virtue, while debt signals a failure of responsibility. The famous introduction to his radio program captures this ethos in a single phrase: "Debt is dumb, cash is king, and the paid off home mortgage has replaced the BMW as the status symbol of choice."[3] Ramsey's insistence on repaying debt, accompanied by his advice to subsist on "rice and beans" while paying it down, resonates with Kantian ethics, where honoring one's obligations is central to moral duty. For Ramsey, rejecting debt and embracing financial restraint is not merely a strategic choice but a moral one.

Robert Kiyosaki's *Rich Dad, Poor Dad* (1997) also contributes to this moralizing framework, emphasizing financial education and entrepreneurial initiative while contrasting the choices of two archetypal figures. The "poor dad," who spends freely and remains trapped in financial insecurity, is set against the "rich dad," who invests, takes risks, and builds lasting wealth. Wealth, in Kiyosaki's account, is not accidental but the result of disciplined habits and cultivated prudence. While the "poor dad" seeks the appearance of wealth (e.g., the visible trapping of material success), the "rich dad" aims for the actual attainment of wealth, even if it is unrecognizable to the neighbors (e.g., no new car in the driveway).

Despite stylistic and practical differences, Kiyosaki, Orman, Ramsey, Aristotle, Kant, and the utilitarian logic of effective altruism all converge on the same claim (i.e., money requires us to exercise responsibility, perseverance, and restraint). Together, these classic voices present a shared vision that money is not valuable in isolation but in its capacity to sustain households, nurture personal growth, and provide the conditions for flourishing. In a world of potential financial peril, managing one's money well becomes not merely prudent but virtuous.

This narrative, however, stands in contrast to newer movements in personal finance such as FIRE and minimalist philosophies, which question whether virtue lies in disciplined

[3] Ramsey popularized this phrase on his radio program. Similar subjects are discussed in his 2003 book, *The Total Money Makeover: A Proven Plan for Financial Fitness*.

accumulation or in freeing oneself from the demands of work and financial obligation. The next section turns to these challenges, exploring how personal finance literature also gives voice to a robust critique of consumption.

Rethinking Consumption: Spending Wisely

If the first narrative casts money as a vehicle for virtue, the second narrative challenges the equation of meaning with consumption. Personal finance literature frequently critiques this consumerist ethos in which wealth is measured by what one owns—the home, the car, the wardrobe, the vacations. It proposes instead that deliberately reducing spending provides a more meaningful alternative.

This theme finds philosophical precedent in Stoicism, particularly in Epictetus, who insisted that genuine freedom does not come from wealth or possessions but from governing one's judgments and desires. In the *Enchiridion*, he distinguishes what is within our control (our beliefs, impulses, and choices) from what is not (status, reputation, health, or wealth) (Epictetus, ca. 125/1995, §1). To hinge happiness on goods subject to fortune is to forfeit autonomy; the Stoic program loosens that dependence by cultivating self-mastery and measured desire. Stoicism thus provides a powerful foundation for anti-consumption movements, rejecting the promise that happiness can be bought and elevating autonomy, clarity, and inner strength instead (Epictetus, ca. 125/1995, §1).

The FIRE movement exemplifies this ethos in the contemporary landscape. Popularized by bloggers such as Mr. Money Mustache, the Mad Fientist, and authors like J. L. Collins, FIRE advocates urge readers to escape consumerist culture through aggressive saving, minimalist spending, and disciplined investing. At its core, Collins's *The Simple Path to Wealth* (2016) distills the FIRE message into a straightforward formula: Save 50% or more of what you earn, invest in low-cost index funds that track the market, and keep expenses lean. Mr. Money Mustache's *The Shockingly Simple Math Behind Early Retirement* (2012) demonstrates in spreadsheet form how a high savings rate dramatically reduces the number of years one must work, framing early retirement as a nearly mechanical outcome of disciplined frugality. The Mad Fientist blog (Mad Fientist, n.d.) takes the analysis further, unpacking technical strategies such as tax-efficient withdrawal plans, geographic arbitrage, and health insurance hacks, offering a toolbox of methods for those seeking to accelerate independence.

Yet, beneath these technical details lies a shared philosophical conviction that consumption is not neutral. To buy more is to need more, which in turn requires more labor, more dependence on employers, and more years sacrificed to the paycheck. Consumption binds individuals to the very systems they might prefer to escape. The FIRE solution, by contrast, is to live radically below one's means in order to buy back life's most precious resource: time. To contribute to your retirement accounts is to purchase your freedom. Freedom is measured not by what one owns but by how little one needs. In this way, FIRE can be read as a reversal of the Protestant work ethic famously described by Max Weber (1905/2002): Whereas the ethic of capitalism treats accumulation and consumption as signals of discipline and spiritual seriousness, FIRE treats restraint and early withdrawal from labor as the truest signs of prudence and autonomy.

The Minimalists (Millburn & Nicodemus, n.d.) bring a complementary cultural voice to this rejection of consumption. Their philosophy emphasizes decluttering not only physical possessions but also mental and emotional space, presenting minimalism as a pathway to intentional living. Like FIRE advocates, they argue that possessions often enslave rather than liberate, and that freedom comes from detachment, clarity, and purpose rather than accumulation.

Some of their recommendations include arranging a "packing party" in which individuals pack all of their possessions in boxes as though they were moving. Over the next several weeks, any items that are still in boxes are clearly not required for daily life and can be donated or discarded. The claim is that such a process liberates one from the grip that possessions hold on our sense of value. The "packing party" provides firsthand evidence that we need far less than we thought. On a deeper level, their message is less about possessions or financial spreadsheets than it is about existential clarity: Consumption should not define who we are.

And yet, not all anti-consumption literature recommends abstinence. Bill Perkins's *Die with Zero* (2020) makes a counterintuitive case that meaning comes not from indefinite saving, but from purposeful spending, with the goal of spending one's money before death, including giving early inheritances to heirs. While he acknowledges the impracticality of literally reducing one's net worth to zero, the idea of dying the same day as the bank account empties is established as an aspirational ideal. Perkins urges readers to divide their lives into "time buckets," consciously allocating resources to experiences at ages when they can be most fully enjoyed. A mountain trek at 30 is not the same as at 70, and memories created earlier in life can compound in value as they are recalled and shared over decades. His advice challenges the traditional retirement model, which postpones life's pleasures in favor of later security, by suggesting that such deferral often leads to missed opportunities and unused wealth. Perkins's framework resonates with Aristotle's understanding of flourishing as the actualization of potential in the right time and circumstance: To wait too long is to miss the moment when certain goods can be actualized. It also echoes Stoic and existentialist insights that life's finitude demands urgency, not procrastination. Whereas FIRE emphasizes restraint and independence through radical frugality, Perkins emphasizes purposeful consumption, urging readers to see money as a tool to enhance the quality of time rather than simply to extend it. In his account, the real tragedy is not overspending but underliving: leaving unspent wealth while leaving life unlived. Perkins is not a minimalist, but rather a kind of "maximalist" committed to getting the most out of life's experiences.

There is clearly a different emphasis in Perkins's perspective than what we saw earlier from Suze Orman, for whom the ever-present threat of financial ruin drives decision-making. For Orman, the tragedy is to be caught unprepared for life's inevitable twists and turns. It would be foolhardy to attempt to "die with zero" since one risks being "alive with zero." While it is well beyond the scope of this article to decide between the two, we can see that multiple philosophical questions are at stake: Which is the greater danger, taking too many risks or taking too few? Do we have a responsibility to pass on generational wealth to our heirs? How should we understand self-actualization across an entire lifespan? If Orman highlights the Aristotelian call to courage and self-discipline, Perkins highlights the equally Aristotelian call to realize one's potential in recognition of the natural trajectory of a lifespan.

Read together and despite their differences, these approaches articulate an anti-consumption narrative that is less about rejecting material goods outright than about reframing their role in human life. From Epictetus to FIRE bloggers, The Minimalists, and Perkins, the common conviction is that unchecked consumption distorts our priorities and undermines our freedom. Meaning, they insist, is not found in possessions but in the wise use of time, the cultivation of self-discipline, and the pursuit of intentional living. Yet this anti-consumption ethos also sets the stage for a deeper question, one that will carry us into the next section: If money should not be spent on possessions, then how should it be used? The answer, increasingly, is framed in terms of autonomy and time.

Autonomy and Time

If the rejection of consumption highlights the opportunity costs of unchecked spending, the third narrative goes further, situating money within the deeper horizon of time itself. This perspective insists that financial decisions are never only about dollars, but about life's most finite resource, time.

The Ancient Roman Stoic philosopher Seneca's *On the Shortness of Life* (ca. 49/2016) crystallizes this idea. He argues that life is short only for those who fail to use their time wisely, admonishing readers to treat time itself as their most valuable possession (Seneca, ca. 49/2016, 1.1–2.2). In this framing, the danger is not merely overspending but misusing the years allotted to us, chasing wealth or status while neglecting the pursuits that bring genuine fulfillment. To squander time is the ultimate form of poverty, one that no fortune can remedy.

A similar thread runs through modern existential philosophy. The work of German philosopher Martin Heidegger highlights that human beings are defined by finitude. We are creatures whose lives are bounded by death, and it is only by acknowledging this limit that authentic existence becomes possible (Heidegger, 1927/2010, p. 367). Freedom, in his existential sense, is not endless possibility but the sober recognition that every choice consumes irretrievable time. Financial decisions thus carry existential weight: How we budget, save, or spend reflects not only economic prudence but also how we understand and respond to our own mortality. To live authentically is to take responsibility for one's time, rather than allowing it to be consumed by the dictates of social conventions, consumer culture, or workplace obligations.

This emphasis on time resonates powerfully in personal finance literature. Robin and Dominguez's *Your Money or Your Life* (2008) reframes money as "life energy," measured in the hours exchanged to earn it. By forcing readers to track every expenditure in terms of time, they expose the hidden costs of both work and consumption. The goal is not simply financial independence, but alignment (i.e., ensuring that the use of money matches the life one truly wishes to live). Like Seneca and Heidegger, Robin and Dominguez remind us that the essence of financial choice lies in how it structures our finite existence.

Bill Perkins's *Die with Zero* (2020) pushes the time-centered perspective to its radical conclusion. If money is only valuable in relation to lived experience, then hoarding it for an indefinite future makes little sense. This is why the image of the "time bucket" discussed earlier is so powerful. The emphasis here is not on rejecting consumption but on synchronizing financial choices with the decidedly temporal rhythms of human finitude. For Perkins, running out of time poses a far greater risk than running out of money, since there are many ways to replace spent money but there is no way to recover lost time. His framework echoes Aristotle's insight that flourishing involves actualizing potential at the right moment and Heidegger's insistence that mortality gives urgency to authentic choice.

The FIRE movement also frames money through the horizon of time, though in a markedly different register. Instead of advocating purposeful spending, FIRE promotes radical saving and frugality in order to "buy back" decades of life otherwise lost to wage labor. The goal is to achieve financial independence as early as possible so that time can be directed toward pursuits chosen freely rather than dictated by employers. Here, retirement is not simply the end of work but the recovery of one's temporal autonomy. In this sense, FIRE and *Die with Zero* share a conviction that time, not money, is the ultimate currency of a meaningful life—yet they diverge sharply on method. Where Perkins counsels the bold use of money to seize fleeting opportunities, FIRE counsels restraint and delay in order to secure a longer horizon of freedom.

Economics scholar Alicia Munnell, by contrast, represents a strikingly different voice. As Director of the Center for Retirement Research at Boston College, she has long argued that working longer (specifically, two to four years longer than traditional retirement age) is the most practical way to address the retirement income challenge (Munnell & Sass, 2009). Her focus is largely technical and macroeconomic: declining pensions, insufficient 401(k) savings, and pressures on Social Security (Munnell, 2022). From this perspective, retirement is not an existential question but a systemic problem requiring adjustment, with "working longer" offered as the solution. In a 2024 interview with *The New York Times*, however, she acknowledged the tension, namely, while continuing to argue that later retirement is the best way to secure stability, she admitted that many workers aspire to retire earlier, revealing the gap between technical prescriptions and lived desires (Lowrey, 2024). Her approach underscores the irony of treating time, a precious and finite resource, as a policy variable, rather than a dimension of meaning. Her own personal story (told in the 2024 *New York Times* interview) of working until the age of 82 highlights the implications of adopting this practice. Clearly, there is not a right or a wrong answer, but rather we are faced with questions regarding the continued role of work in our lives. Most fundamentally, how do we want to spend our time?

Taken together, these voices converge on the recognition that autonomy is inseparable from time. To be financially autonomous is not merely to possess wealth but to control one's hours, to reclaim life from the dictates of debt, consumerism, or endless labor. Whether framed in Stoic, existentialist, or pragmatic terms, the central lesson is the same: Money matters most when it serves time, and time matters most when we remember it cannot be replenished. This insight prepares the ground for a broader synthesis: If personal finance literature encodes moral visions of virtue, responsible consumption, and autonomy, what do we learn when we step back and consider them together? And what are the implications for those who outsource their financial choices to advisers or systems, delegating the very decisions that shape the narrative of their lives?

Philosophical Fault Lines

Examining personal finance literature through the lens of philosophy reveals that it is far more than a collection of pragmatic tips about budgeting, investing, or retirement planning. It is, at its core, a discourse about meaning. The three narratives surveyed here—money as a vehicle for virtue, the rejection of consumerist consumption, and autonomy in relation to time—demonstrate that personal finance texts embed philosophical visions that stretch across traditions as diverse as Aristotle's virtue ethics, Epictetus's Stoicism, Kant's deontology, and Heidegger's existentialism. Each framework asks its readers to make financial choices that are also choices about what kind of life is worth living.

At the same time, these narratives are not always harmonious. Orman's insistence on financial discipline, Ramsey's debt-free ethos, and Kiyosaki's prudential entrepreneurship cast money as a proving ground for responsibility and character. FIRE and The Minimalists, by contrast, suggest that too much responsibility to money is itself a kind of slavery, and that meaning comes from loosening its grip on our lives. Perkins, in *Die with Zero*, adds yet another complication. Perhaps, the goal is not merely discipline or restraint but the active pursuit of experiences before it is too late. And Munnell, speaking from the perspective of macroeconomics, shifts the discussion to the structural level, urging workers to "work longer" as a practical response to demographic and financial pressures, an argument that makes sense on paper but often collides with human longing for rest, autonomy, and freedom. What counts as prudence in one account looks like folly in another.

The philosophical fault lines here are clear. Is courage expressed in taking risks to seize the fullness of life (Perkins), or in refusing the risks that debt and overspending impose (Orman)? Is freedom found in radical frugality and early exit from labor (FIRE), or in ensuring financial security through persistence in work (Munnell)? Should money be used to build security for heirs, or to ensure that no life energy is left unspent?

These are not merely technical disagreements but reflections of deep philosophical divides—between responsibility and risk-taking, duty and freedom, self-discipline and self-actualization. They also reflect direct narratives about the nature of the human world. A world fraught with risk at every turn demands a very different response than a world full of adventure that rewards bold risk-taking. Likewise, how we think about the relationship between human flourishing and participation in labor markets will have an enormous impact on how we regard the employer's bargain to provide wages in exchange for time.

What unites these perspectives, however, is their insistence that money is never neutral. To spend, save, or invest is to embody a set of values—responsibility and courage in Orman, discipline in Ramsey, prudence in Kiyosaki, frugality in FIRE, intentionality in The Minimalists, alignment in Robin and Dominguez, maximizing experiences in Perkins, or systemic pragmatism in Munnell. Even financial practices that appear purely technical, such as scaffolding a Roth ladder, tax-loss harvesting, or meeting required minimum distributions, rest on assumptions about what one is optimizing for: security, independence, consumption, or legacy. The very language of "managing" money implies a worldview in which money is something to be controlled, stewarded, or disciplined, as opposed to, for instance, an energy to be spent or a trust to be given away.

The fact that many people hire professionals to manage their money adds an extra complication worth considering. When individuals delegate their finances to advisers (and increasingly, AI-driven robo-advisors), they are not escaping philosophical questions but rather adopting answers secondhand. An adviser may assume that security and accumulation are paramount; a budgeting app may implicitly frame money as something to be “managed” rather than lived with. To outsource is therefore not a neutral convenience but a transfer of moral agency: a decision to allow someone else’s ethical framework to govern the use of one’s time, labor, and resources. The paradox is striking. By outsourcing to “save time,” individuals may surrender the very autonomy that FIRE, Perkins, or Robin and Dominguez treat as the essence of freedom. By outsourcing to “reduce risk,” they may absorb Orman’s caution or Munnell’s pragmatism without consciously choosing those values. Even efforts to depersonalize money—to treat it as numbers on a spreadsheet—carry hidden philosophies that shape the trajectory of a life. Outsourcing, in this sense, does not remove the burden of financial choice; it only obscures the fact that a choice has already been made.

What becomes clear, then, is that money cannot be reduced to a technical problem even though technical challenges abound. The deeper stakes are philosophical: How do we wish to use our time? What kind of risks are we willing to take? Where do we locate the boundary between responsibility to others and responsibility to ourselves? Personal finance literature forces these questions to the surface, whether by advocating discipline, decluttering, maximal experiences, or extended labor. Its true value may lie not in the particular strategies it prescribes but in the way it invites us to confront, again and again, a key philosophical question: How should one live?

Conclusion

On its surface, personal finance literature offers advice about debt reduction, saving strategies, and retirement planning. But just beneath the surface lies a deeper layer, namely, a set of moral visions about what money means and how it should shape a life. Whether framed in terms of cultivating virtue, rejecting consumption, or reclaiming autonomy through time, the texts of this genre ask readers to wrestle with the same fundamental question: How should one live?

To read financial advice as philosophy is not to impose theory where none exists, but to recognize that every budget, investment plan, or retirement strategy encodes assumptions about what constitutes a successful human life. The temptation to treat money as purely technical blinds us to this fact. At stake in personal finance is not simply the optimization of accounts or the avoidance of mistakes, but the orientation of one's finite time and energy toward what is taken to matter most.

The three narratives explored here—virtue, thoughtful consumption, and autonomy—are not exhaustive, but they demonstrate the extent to which financial choices are also ethical and existential choices. What Orman calls courage, FIRE calls independence, and Perkins calls living fully are all attempts to answer the same question from different vantage points. Even when these visions conflict, they share an insistence that money is fraught moral terrain.

This suggests a broader lesson. Money, in its most technical form, can be delegated to advisers, algorithms, or policy. But its role as a carrier of meaning cannot be outsourced. To abdicate the philosophical dimension of money is to let others dictate the story of our lives, whether through consumer culture, employer expectations, or financial institutions. To recognize the philosophical content of personal finance is, by contrast, to reclaim responsibility for shaping one's narrative amidst the inescapable reality that human life is economic.

Money, then, is more than a medium of exchange. It is a narrative device through which individuals express their values, fears, and aspirations. To spend, save, or invest is to tell a story about what we believe life is for. And it is only when we acknowledge this narrative power that personal finance becomes not merely a guide to prosperity but an invitation to reflect on meaning itself.

References

Aristotle. (1944). *Politics* (H. Rackham, Trans.). In *Aristotle in 23 volumes* (Vol. 21). Harvard University Press. (Original work published ca. 350 B.C.E.)

Centre for Effective Altruism. (n.d.). *Effective altruism*. https://www.effectivealtruism.org

Collins, J. L. (2016). *The simple path to wealth: Your road map to financial independence and a rich, free life.* CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

Epictetus. (1995). *Enchiridion* (N. White, Trans). Hackett Publishing Company. (Original work published ca. 125)

Heidegger, M. (2010). *Being and time* (J. Stambaugh, Trans.; D. J. Schmidt, Ed.). State University of New York Press. (Original work published 1927)

Kiyosaki, R. T. (1997). *Rich dad, poor dad: What the rich teach their kids about money that the poor and middle class do not!* TechPress.

Lowrey, A. (2024, December 27). Alicia Munnell wants you to work longer. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2024/12/27/business/retirement-alicia-munnell-boston-college.html

Mad Fientist. (n.d.). *Mad fientist*. https://www.madfientist.com/

Millburn, J. F., & Nicodemus, R. (n.d.). *The minimalists.* https://www.theminimalists.com/

Mr. Money Mustache. (2012, January 13). *The shockingly simple math behind early retirement.* Mr. Money Mustache. https://www.mrmoneymustache.com/2012/01/13/the-shockingly-simple-math-behind-early-retirement/

Munnell, A. H. (2022, July). *How to think about recent trends in the average retirement age?* (Working Paper No. 22–11). Center for Retirement Research at Boston College. https://crr.bc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/IB_22-11.pdf

Munnell, A. H., & Sass, S. A. (2009). *Working longer: The solution to the retirement income challenge.* Brookings Institution Press.

Orman, S. (1997). *The 9 steps to financial freedom: Practical and spiritual steps so you can stop worrying.* Crown Publishers.

Pant, P. (Host). (2018, October 1). Why I hate the FIRE movement, says Suze Orman (No. 153) [Audio podcast episode]. In *Afford Anything*. https://affordanything.com/153-hate-fire-movement-suze-orman/

Perkins, B. (2020). *Die with zero: Getting all you can from your money and your life.* Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Plato. (2000). *Apology* (G. M. A. Grube, Trans.). In S. M. Cohen, P. C. Curd, & C. D. C. Reeve (Eds.), *Readings in ancient Greek philosophy: From Thales to Aristotle* (2nd ed., pp. 112–130). Hackett Publishing Company. (Original work published ca. 399 B.C.E.)

Ramsey, D. (2003). *The total money makeover: A proven plan for financial fitness.* Thomas Nelson.

Robin, V., & Dominguez, J. (2008). *Your money or your life: 9 steps to transforming your relationship with money and achieving financial independence.* Penguin.

Seneca, L. A. (2016). *On the shortness of life: Adapted for the contemporary reader by James Harris* (J. Harris, Trans.). CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform. (Original work published ca. 49)

Weber, M. (2002). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (S. Kalberg, Trans.). Blackwell. (Original work published 1905)