

Creativity Reflections

NERIJUS STASIULIS

Department of Philosophy and Cultural Studies, Faculty of Creative Industries, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, 26 Pylimo/1 Trakų Street, 00132 Vilnius, Lithuania
Email: nerijus.stasiulis@vilniustech.lt

The article overviews and introduces the current issue of *Filosofija. Sociologija*. The topics include history of scientific and political thought, identity, (post-)truth, visibility and medialisation, imagination, creativity and fashion, etc. Issues in ethics and education are also discussed. The paper shows one way of uniting these disparate topics into a coherent whole.

Keywords: creativity, education, fashion, post-truth, visibility

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this introductory article is to provide a unitary overview of multiple and unrelated articles. Is there such a thing as unrelated multiplicity which is not united in any way? Is war only the ‘father’ (origin) of all in the sense that the being of the world is at bottom strife and disagreement, or also the ‘king’ of all – meaning it governs the multiplicity and renders unity to it? Is Being ‘merely’ a wound or also a ‘healing’? Merely tears or also laughter? Merely stress or also relaxation? Merely a breathing in or also a breathing out? Obviously, both.

Thus, unsurprisingly, many articles can also be found to tacitly be ‘subordinated’ to an ‘underlying’ system. This system is precisely that of one and many. The following outline will generally follow this scheme.

OVERVIEW

The first instance of one and many is the well-known dictum that all multiple Western philosophy is but footnotes to Plato.* Or is it? Plato’s philosophy is very much linked to his own time and political involvement which, obviously, make it different from very differing subsequent epochs and places. Xue’s article could be interpreted as revolving around this axis. Plato’s ancient political philosophy is paradoxically juxtaposed with modern political science. The author provides a review of how Plato’s political philosophy is ‘assessed’ in modern political science. He discusses constitutionalist, behaviourist, rational choice theorist and Marxist as well as Fascist ideas related to political views found in Plato. He summarises that all these discourses can be claimed to have their roots in Plato, even though the realities they deal with are from a different epoch.

* Whitehead (1978: 39).

Another problem obviously formulated in ancient Greece is that of identity. Identity, or sameness, is opposed to change, or flux. The principle is ever the same while things sometimes exist and sometimes not. This structure was preserved in later times but for the Greeks the difference (and unity) between sameness and multiplicity did not involve a disembodiment characteristic of later 'spiritual' interpretations. Mockutė-Cicėnė and Žilinskaitė-Vytė's article understands – without reflecting on the oxymoron-like fashion of this understanding – identity as changable and liquid. But the article is about the phenomenon of fashion. It is emphasised that fashion is related to national or regional identities. This relation shows, for them, how important fashion is as a social phenomenon. It reflects the phenomenon of identity as such. Thus it could be seen as an instance of trying to relate the 'disembodied' concept of identity to the very embodied phenomenon of fashion. The authors illustrate their case by describing Italian, French, British, American (USA) and Japanese different fashions. To substantiate a link between rational thinking and fashion, they reference Stuhr (2014) who boasts of adding a lot or at least some visual content to his rational presentations.

Vėželis discusses the problem of the relation between art and truth in his article. He reviews how a painting by a famous artist was interpreted by different philosophers and how these different interpretations show that truth is understood in multiple ways. To add to the turmoil, a historian (Shapiro 1994), based on his empiricist investigation, can outright reject a 'metaphysical' interpretation as 'false'. Single truth in multiple ways? Are these ways at war? Or is there a single clearing? Or both?

Stezhko's article can also be seen as touching upon the issue of disembodiedness of the so-called 'rationality'. The article discusses how linguistics can be affected positively by a transformation of its modern methodology via postmodern principles. Postmodernism's attention to emotional intelligence allows one to explain not 'rationally' but 'visually'. Thus the complex claims can be effectively communicated at the common-sense level. But if rationality and visuality are still opposed, is not the opposition itself the issue?

Similarly, Mruszczyk also puts emphasis on imagination and creativity. But, according to her, in such a world of flux the question of human identity becomes relevant. The author asserts that the answer to this question can be found in the creative act. She draws on Tymieniecka's phenomenology of life and human creative condition (e. g.: Tymieniecka 2004). The latter considered the cognitive-constitutive act to be secondary to the creative act found in the creative imagination of man.

Another instance of duality of one and many is the pole of 'privacy and autonomy' against 'technological control by panoptical government'. This issue is exemplified by Kovalenko, Meliakova, Kalnytskyi and Nesterenko. They also employ the theme of 'scientific knowledge' against 'social-humanitarian' knowledge. According to the authors, who investigate panoptical and postpanoptical models of social control, the digital media are one of the key elements of the digital control system. They acknowledge the pragmatics of security which the system provides but lament the loss of privacy and erosion of individual autonomy. As a solution, they point to a human centred model which combines social-humanitarian knowledge with natural-scientific knowledge.

Alvaro offers an attack on moral relativism. To be more precise, he attacks ethical subjectivism. His article replies to Park's previous article (2022). Park argued that moral subjectivism is not self-defeating. According to Alvaro, ethical subjectivism compares moral judgments to those of taste. He thinks that this is pernicious because it can justify

anything. He also provides a series of formalised arguments to show how ethical subjectivism is also incoherent and undefendable. It applies to all forms of ethical subjectivism. This position can be seen as one of the many different close or distant echoes of ancient Greek 'rationalism'.

An article by Asakavičiūtė, Valantinaitė and Sederevičiūtė-Pačiauskienė also employs the distinction between critical thinking and sophistry. They delineate the difference between the authentic discussion and the inauthentic one. The aim is to implement authentic dialogue in the process of study. The needs of the market and broad horizons of young people are seen as complementary. The outline of the method of training students to become independent and critical as well as socially responsible is discussed.

Honcharenko seeks to describe the negative effects of post-truth culture to university and university education. She speaks of a historical context of a conflict between university and post-truth. It goes back to the ancient Greek distinction between speaking the truth and sophistry. So, post-truth is not just something current. She also links the sophistic attitude with a 'utilitarian approach' which reorients university from a scientific institution to the changing needs and attitudes of the market.

Tuomas seems to move towards the pole of war without peace or calm. His article is about 'entropology' of Bataille. Topics of temporalisation, destruction, decay or extinction are prominent. It is also related to the negative side of capitalist economy which is seen as 'wasting the planet'. Entropology is opposed to anthropology in that it decentralises the human being and situates it in bigger processes. The relation of humanity with the environment is seen as self-destructive.

Bytniewski discusses how destruction and war are seen via lenses of cameras and the visual media. He suggests that our morality is imperfect because it is adapted only to face-to-face relations and that we may be in need of tele-ethics to be prepared to respond to human suffering absent from direct relationships. But being a moral subject presupposes that oneself and others as well as reality itself are real. Yet, the world of images is a world of fiction. The paper was incited by Sontag's *Regarding the Pain of Others* (2004).

Slipkauskaitė's article is about history or historiography of science. Another variant of the dilemma – how is the one truth discovered by science related to historical multiplicities in science? She aims to describe the role of inter-theory relations in reconstructing the development of science. Maier's work is provided as an example of such a 'reductivist' reconstruction of relations between successive theories: 'Maier tracks key principles used by the old theory that also had appeared in the new one. That is why her approach to history of science is a reductive one.' A diachronic reductivist account is said to avoid the criticism valid for synchronic reductivist reconstruction.

CONCLUSIONS

Can a two be a one? If something is split, it is not a unity. It is impossible to find unity where duality is presupposed. On the other hand, unity does not exclude multiplicity. Rather, it is the way unity is. Multiple, but indivisible.

Science must not be disembodied. But it does not mean that it is something purely spiritual which should then be dressed in a body. Rather, the truth must – and can only – reveal itself in bodily fashion. The truth revealed in the bodily fashion is another name for the unity expressed in multiplicity. It is the multiplicity which wounds and the unity which heals. The two are inseparable, like tragedy and comedy.

References

1. Maier, A. 1938. 'The Achievements of Late Scholastic Natural Philosophy', in *On the Threshold of Exact Science: Selected Writings of Anneliese Maier on Late Medieval Natural Philosophy*, ed. E. Peters. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 143–173.
2. Park, S. 2022. 'Moral Subjectivism vs. Moral Objectivism', *Filosofija. Sociologija* 3(33): 269–276.
3. Schapiro, M. 1994. 'The Still Life as a Personal Object – A Note of Heidegger and van Gogh', in *Theory and Philosophy of Art: Style, Artist, and Society*. George Braziller, 135–142.
4. Sontag, S. 2004. *Regarding the Pain of Others*. New York: Picador Press.
5. Stuhr, J. J. 2006. 'Only Going So Fast: Philosophies as Fashions', *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 20(3): 147–164.
6. Tymieniecka, A.-T. 2004. 'The Theme: The Triumph of Imagination in the Critique of Reason', in *Imaginatō Creatrix. The Pivotal Force of the Genesis/Ontopoiesis of Human Life and Reality*, *Analecta Husserliana* 83, ed. A.-T. Tymieniecka. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, XI–XVIII.
7. Whitehead, A. N. 1978 (1929). *Process and Reality*. New York: The Free Press.

NERIJUS STASIULIS

Kūrybiškumo refleksijos

Santrauka

Straipsnyje apžvelgiamas ir pristatomas naujas žurnalo „Filosofija. Sociologija“ numeris. Jame aptariamos mokslinės ir politinės minties istorijos, tapatybės, (post)tiesos, vizualumo ir medializacijos, vaizduotės, kūrybiškumo, mados ir kitos temos. Taip pat aptarstomi etikos ir švietimo klausimai. Straipsnyje parodomas vienas iš būdų sujungti šias skirtingas temas į nuoseklią visumą.

Raktažodžiai: mada, kūrybiškumas, posttiesa, švietimas, vizualumas