

Social environment of creativity

PRANAS BALTRĖNAS, EDITA BALTRĖNAITĖ

Institute of Environmental Protection, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Saulėtekio Ave. 11, LT-10223 Vilnius, Lithuania
E-mail: pranas.baltrenas@vgtu.lt; edita.baltrenaite@vgtu.lt

TOMAS KAČERAUSKAS

Department of Philosophy and Communication, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Saulėtekio Ave. 11, LT-10223 Vilnius, Lithuania
E-mail: tomas.kacerauskas@vgtu.lt

The article deals with the issues of creative society's environment. The theses have been developed as follows. 1. Creative venture enters unknown environment concerning consuming. 2. Outstanding society is hardly recognized in consuming environment, which has been forced to change. 3. Creative society is outstanding as much as by arising in consuming environment does not regard consuming logic and blocks communicative channels of the consumers. 4. A creative worker is rich not by having a lot of things to be consumed but by satisfying things for realization of his (her) creative aspirations. 5. The concept of happiness is a mobility factor of both an individual and the society. 6. Happiness is to be created together with beneficial for it social environment, the creator of which is both an individual and the society. 7. Average-ness does not mean inauthenticity, on the contrary, it is an environment of outstandingness nurturance while the creative phenomena canalize this environment into the identity whole. 8. Creation and creative life art is prophylaxis of moderation and ipso facto happiness. 9. Technology is a factor of new social environment. 10. Consumer society wastes natural and social environment by orienting to as bigger as possible comfort and, as a result, causes total discomfort. 11. Quality of ecosphere as well as being affected by environmental pollution becomes an important challenge for the creative society.

Key words: creative society, social environment, the factors of happiness, consuming culture

INTRODUCTION

The attitude towards the innovations witnesses environment of creative society. On the one hand, creative society is innovative being oriented to development of economy. On the other hand, it is venturesome in order to start new things and to show an example for other societies that accept creative venture by consuming it. The advanced society differs from trailing one not because of the fact that the first one creates oftener and the latter one buys both creative products and creative technologies but because of the fact that the first one creates oftener not intending to sell; it can allow for itself this venture. Nevertheless, venture, i. e. a brave but

reckless breakthrough (that is to be connected not as much with braveness as with madness) into a new life “region” forms often new social environment, ipso facto social order for new things although creative venture oversteps consuming by ignoring and parodying it. *Creative venture enters into unknown “region” and unexplored environment concerning consuming.*

In Lithuania, the creativity has been investigated by V. Aglinskas (2014), T. Bajarkevičius (2014), J. Barevičiūtė (2014), J. Černevičiūtė with R. Strazdas (2014a, 2014b), A. Juzefovič (2013, 2015), J. Lavrinec (2014), T. Mitkus (2013), P. P. Skorupa (2014), E. Štuopytė (2013), I. M. Valivonytė (2013), and others¹.

First of all, we shall analyse creative venture in the society (*Outstandingness as creative venture*), later we shall compare welfare environment with happiness society (*Welfare environment and happiness society*), as well as show the social structure of creativity (*Social structure of creativity*), finally we shall present the problems of environment from the point of view of social engineering (*Clean environment creates a challenge for the creative society*).

OUTSTANDINGNESS AS CREATIVE VENTURE

Outstandingness signifies a new social “territory”. An inquiry of demand concerning outstandingness would be useless because of the fact that creative venture orients towards a new hermeneutic “region” instead of the formed consuming environment. Only advanced creative society, that is commonly also rich, has a demand for creative venture impossible to consume. Only such kind of society can allow for itself such luxury as creative venture. Usually, not so rich (in all senses including creative one) societies restrict to other amusements including mass ones and free available, cheap and “glossy” (kitsches) by imitating luxury. If society cannot allow for itself luxury of creative venture, i. e. art for not consuming it is necessary to imitate the art with luxury spangles. The more expensive they are the bigger imitation power they have in the circle of “exclusive customers”.

The creative society is outstanding compared with the consuming society although they are inseparable from each other. Like an outstanding individual is hardly recognized in his (her) environment, *the outstanding society is hardly recognized in consuming environment, which has been forced to change*. Outstandingness means both hermeneutic as well communicative disturbance, with the help of which consuming environment has been disturbed and recreation of this environment is possible. *The creative society is outstanding by arising in its environment that has been forced to be changed together with the individuals within it* instead of arising in a certain (creative) class. *Creative society is outstanding as much as by arising in consuming environment does not regard consuming logic and blocks communicative channels of the consumers*. Creative society transfers them into glossy snowfields of highlands where they lack air and have twinkles in their eyes. That is why the creative society being “distracted” and nonchalant concerning consuming is so desirable in the consuming environment that seeks to consume itself purposefully.

In this sense, consuming society is a purposeful and rational social environment unlike irrational creative society. Although it seems that the main purpose is happiness by consuming, happiness stays namely unreached, more exactly, “consumed” together with things, environment and life that are consumed. The question arises whether the rich individuals are happy. By appealing to both antique thinkers (Aristotle, Seneca) and to contemporary sociological inquiries, it could be stated that a middle way has been required. It means that the necessary life needs (including home) should be satisfied, after this a rest

¹ T. Kačerauskas 2013, 2014a; 2014b.

should leave in order to have freedom to choose what to consume for the rest money – kitsch or expensive art. If an individual can allow for himself (herself) a part of them to spend for the needs of others, i. e. to invest in social environment, it is plausible that he (she) is a lucky beggar. On the contrary, large incomes remove ability to be happy. It should be connected not as much with additional troubles concerning investments as with increased seductions of consumption including “consumption” of life. Violation of this rule of a middle way means also violation of identity’s balance; intensive consumption while submitting to call of advertising or fashion means also “consumption” of identity, i. e. amalgamation of the individual identity’s “region” with the “region” of his (her) environment. Although an individual could be always seen in the “screen”, namely because of this he (she) amalgamates with mediated environment. In this sense, he (she) is only in the media that create him (her). His (her) outstandingness is null and void here; being consumed by his (her) environment he (she) is unable to change it.

WELFARE ENVIRONMENT AND HAPPINESS SOCIETY

What is the relationship between happiness and wealth? As mentioned, creative society is also rich usually although it is oriented towards creation instead of wealth. Similarly, a creative worker can be rich being happy. However, wealth is ignored by an outstanding creative worker, who seeks both to create his (her) works and to recreate the environment; as a result, wealth is not the whole to be consumed. In other words, *a creative worker is rich not by having a lot of things to be consumed but by satisfying things for realization of his (her) creative aspirations*. If so, we face a different concept of wealth in the creative society compared with the consuming society. Similarly, we face a different concept of the way towards happiness while happiness is to be created instead of “consumed”.

Nevertheless, a question arises whether content of happiness (instead of way to reach it) is to be created. If we answer in a negative way, we presuppose happiness as an unchangeable value to be reached despite changes of social environment. It would be certain Platonism: happiness as an eternal idea that loses touch with human reality, primary reality that forms behaviour of both an individual and the society. In this case, it would be actual Aristotelian (1924) criticism towards the Platonic idea, i. e. it is not clear how to explain a happy society with otherworldly idea of happiness and how to harmonize the concept of unchangeable happiness with the concepts of mobile society and a moving individual within it. Beside this, content of unchangeable happiness contradicts to variety of the theorists of happiness: Aristotle, Plato, Epicures, and Seneca – all of them have different understanding of happiness.

If we answer to the mentioned question positively, we presuppose relativism in the sphere of values; happiness is what has been reached by a certain individual and certain society. It would lead inevitably both to the collisions between the individuals, as well between an individual and the society (his or her social environment). Nevertheless, it is also necessary to search for a middle way in this case (answering positively or negatively). On the one hand, all mentioned (and not mentioned) theorists of happiness agree in principle that 1) it is a long-term pleasure, 2) it is to be connected with wise and 3) moral activity. These all should be supplemented by 4) creative activity that follows from the investigated subject. Nevertheless, this supplement allows developing the conception formed by the mentioned thinkers; it transfuses every part of the conception instead of destroying this conception. As a result, long-term pleasure has been created by wise coexistence in a social environment to be created. It could be said even more, i. e. *the concept of happiness is mobility’s factor of both an*

individual and the society while the activity has been directed in order to reach happiness. So happiness is a category of a wise, moral and creative society. *The very happiness is to be created together with beneficial for it social environment, the creator of which is both an individual and the society.* Wisdom as a reflexive project of life in social environment is inseparable from creativity that is social inevitably. As a result, social environment creates us and we create it.

The difficulties of happy society's social investigations are connected not only with a certain variety of happiness content. Often, the scholars are in desperation because of discrepancy between an index of social welfare (quantitative statistical index of gross national product) and happiness index (in qualitative inquiries). The investigations of happiness are characteristic not only in stressing the contradictions between welfare environment and happy society but also in showing that quantitative and qualitative indexes are hardly harmonious despite their interconnections. Quantitative indexes presuppose averageness of social environment, qualitative ones are outstandingness of an individual in social environment. Nevertheless, outstandingness is possible only concerning averageness and the latter uniforms the different outstandingness. Beside this, outstandingness is not such if it has not been recognized in average environment. Acknowledgement means here both acceptance and refusing. The latter reaction of averageness also forms average environment that focuses into a certain social whole by distancing from the exceptional phenomena; this whole is in no way amorphous. Being such, i. e. not having identity, social environment would be indifferent towards outstanding phenomena. That is why *averageness does not mean inauthenticity, on the contrary, it is an environment of outstandingness nurturance while the creative phenomena canalize this environment into the identity whole.*

On the other hand, welfare society being a consuming community is rather unhappy than happy not because of certain errors in sociological methodology or questionnaires but because of the fact that a property (accumulated or consumed) is not an ingredient of happiness, at least according to the mentioned theorists. A question arises whether happy society is a community of ascetics, paupers and homeless people. According to Plato (1992), at least the ruling class (the rulers and the guardians that correspond to our officers) must be penniless while home should be provided by the society. However, Plato speaks about moderation instead of ascetic. The attitudes of Plato (1980) concerning private property are not so strong in the dialogue *The Laws* while Aristotle distances from his teacher's "socialism" at all.

Appealing to Aristotle (2011), the content of happiness could be supplemented by one additional ingredient, i. e. 5) satisfaction of most necessary life needs. In other words, a hungry, needy and homeless individual could not be happy. Sure, it is a necessary but not sufficient condition of happiness. In our context, it means both minimum and moderation of consuming; we should consume things instead of the situation that they consume us. Similarly, we should not allow to be consumed by environment that could not cover outstanding creative workers. In other words, *creation and creative life art is prophylaxis of moderation ipso facto happiness.* A creative worker consumes the environment but not the environment consumes a creative worker, although here certain moderation (limits) are also necessary that we connect with creative ecology. Consumption of environment means three things. First, a creative worker has the impulses for his (her) creation from his (her) environment. Second, this environment engages him (her) for creativity (social order). Third, he (she) changes his (her) environment while creating. Excessive consuming of environment (even exceptionally for the sake of creativity) ipso facto wastes creative sources.

SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF CREATIVITY

R. Florida (2012) speaks about the social structure of creativity. It covers the aspects as follows: 1) new creative systems in the sphere of technologies and business; 2) new more effective models of commodities producing; 3) general social, cultural and geographic conditions. In all these three aspects, we can speak about social environment. When speaking about the new systems of creativity in the sphere of technologies and business, a question arises where these new systems of creativity emerge and who initiates them. In the sphere of business, we face, first of all, a private initiative that always has difficulties moving through bureaucratic obstacles. We can remember here A. Šliogeris, according to whom a businessman is Don Quixote. Being wise (otherwise he (she) would not be a successful businessman), he (she) understands very well that welfare does not give any happiness. Despite this, he (she) is seeking for the second, third or tenth million in a heroic way, often ignoring the attitudes of consumption.

While developing a certain creative policy or no one, the politicians create good or bad conditions for these systems of creativity. However, every system loses its creative potential after it becomes formal. It is a certain illustration of the Second Thermodynamic Law: a closed system detunes and collapses finally. Subordination of creativity to politics is disastrous for creativity while politics circulates in a closed circle of the media. The most creative system is in an incubatory period when it has no formality yet, when it forces to re-form its environment while being outstanding towards the latter when it demands attention and financing. However, the creative system loses its creativity after it gets one and another. *Creativity forces a consumed system to be open*. For example, the technologies need the innovations, without renewing, the technologies rust up; they must develop continually, move forwards, be dynamic. They lose drive, possibility to compete, finally to survive. Nevertheless, namely social environment stimulates development of the technologies, the newest of which force to renew and develop social environment. In this sense, *technology is a factor of new social environment*. The technologies “move” being consumed; however, namely they consume the individuals (but not the individuals consume them) in a consuming (“welfare”) society. Nevertheless, the creative individuals can turn the dominant technologies into a scrap-iron if they suggest newer technologies necessary for development of social environment.

It seems that we appeal to the industrial society while speaking about newer, more effective models of commodities producing and service. Nevertheless, post-industrial environment does not cancel need of consuming commodities to be produced. The paradoxical forms of producing arise here: serial producing needs less and less human handwork; on the contrary, the crafts recapture exceptional handwork that is as more expensive as it has been replaced in production of consumer commodities including food, wear, and housewares in order to be satisfied with the fifth condition of happiness. On the other hand, the commodities need newer and more effective models of delivering, forming of demand and increasing of consumption in general, even by using traditional models of producing. Different marketing means including advertising have been used for this. Beside this, traditional methods used for many years could arise as very new and unexpected.

The general social, cultural and geographic conditions mean cultivated and creative sufficiently social environment with demand of art and creation. Beside this, certain geographic conditions are necessary for development of creativity. Not by accident, the first civilizations (Egyptian, Greek, and Roman) had arisen in the Mediterranean region with mild, warm climate. Nevertheless, there are contradictory theories in this respect. According to one of them, favourable geographic conditions are very important for the development of culture that is

to be connected with certain physical comfort (one of happiness conditions). However, the society orients towards creative horizon while being not satisfied only with its vital needs. The question arises why certain societies do not satisfy themselves with elementary vital needs while other societies in warm countries stay “primitive”. The theory of challenge and response attributed to A. Toynbee (1979) tries to solve this problem. According to it, the severe geographical conditions provoke creative power of a society, force it to make a lodgement at any price, search for certain inner resources by answering to natural (or other) challenges. For example, United Kingdom has arisen not having sufficient resources, as a result, it has been forced to orient towards colonies and to invest into intellectual resources. Another example is Scandinavia: the severe conditions and spare natural resources force these societies to search for other (creative) resources.

The paradox is as follows: *consumer society wastes natural and social environment by orienting to as bigger as possible comfort and, as a result, causes total discomfort*. In other words, if we make the fifth condition of happiness absolute (making it sufficient), it removes from the very happiness: the catastrophes, tornados and storms are natural revenge for the consumers. Similarly, social environment revenges, too: the wars, hunger and diseases could be evaluated as a revenge of consuming social environment. Nevertheless, consuming society and creative society are not identical and increasing of consumption does cause not necessary bigger consumption of environment; industrial society is more aggressive towards natural environment. It is characteristic not necessary for creative society that faces other ecological challenges.

R. Florida (2012) speaks about increase of expanses for investigations, about the interconnections between high technologies, new forms of capital and creative environment. It could be added here: all this also presupposes bigger consumption with all consequences. Beside this, financing of certain activity has been accompanied by bigger bureaucracy and decline of creativity, as mentioned. Additionally, financing of creation often hides financial reinforcement of a certain (creative) class or its sub-class (creative managers) by using its influence: power and the many are inseparable in political environment.

CLEAN ENVIRONMENT CREATES A CHALLENGE FOR THE CREATIVE SOCIETY

In the current world scientists and politicians announce the definition of “the crisis of global ecology” (Lietuvninkas 2012). There are more discussions rather than proactive actions towards a problem solving. Moreover, there are many people writing and talking about extinction now, and about *solastalgia*, the so-called psychic or existential distress caused by environmental change (Bates 2010). On the other hand, the human management of the Earth ecosystem seems impossible because the ecosystem as a system including its composition and functions is understood by humankind only in a broad outline. The consciousness of the major part of humankind remains purely consuming and based on mistaken perception about absolute resources of the Earth and a trifling effect of human activities on the ecosystem quality. In his novel *Brave New World* an English writer Aldous Huxley (1932) has commented that “we live on a finite planet and yet we scatter life-giving minerals to the oceans and the winds as if they were infinite”. We still have enough phosphorus (P), however, nitrogen and carbon cycles are already unbalanced and threatening the humankind. Together with such macroelements as oxygen (O), hydrogen (H), calcium (Ca), potassium (K), silicon, they form the major part of the biological biosphere production accounted for 230 billion tonnes annually. Microelements, including toxic heavy metals such as lead (Pb),

cadmium (Cd), contribute to the amounts of thousands and million tonnes in the biological biosphere production, however, due to their unique characteristics they are actively and more intensively exploited. The ratio between metal emissions from natural and technogenic sources stands at 1:3 for V and Ni, 1:5 for Zn and As, 1:8 for Cu and Cd, and even 1:15 for Pb, i. e. technogenic emissions of heavy metals predominate (Lietuvninkas 2012; Mancinelli et al. 2015).

Use of fossil fuel (oil, gas, coal) causes emissions of carbon dioxide as well as releases heavy metals (Markert et al. 2012; Pundytė et al. 2011). The extent of technogenic impact overpasses regional borders and becomes global. Contamination of ecosphere caused by anthropogenic activity distorts the geochemical status of the ecosphere. Let us give an example. AB ORLEN Lietuva enterprise situated in northwest Lithuania is the only oil refinery in the Baltic States (Baltrėnas et al. 2011). Constructed in 1980, it annually refines about 15 million tons of crude oil (about 315,000 barrels a day), and is referred to the group of big oil refineries (for comparison the world largest oil refinery operated by Exxon Mobil corporation refines 5,800,000 barrels per day). The volatile organic contaminants as well as heavy metals (for instance, Ni, Cr, V) are typomorphic for the emissions from the oil refining process. Being emitted to the air and transported with a flow of air, these elements accumulated in the deposit media such as soil and plants. Heavy metals as long-term contaminants accumulated in the environment exhibit a long-term negative effect on the ecosphere.

Integrated evaluation of aerogenic pollution by air-transported heavy metals using the main deposit media allows us to state that the territory affected by the oil refinery is referred to the type of territories of low or medium pollution level. It means that the air pollution threatens natural functions of the ecosphere. In other words, the inequality between the anthropogenic load and natural process of ecosphere's self-cleaning exists and the balance is already disturbed. Putting together the position of a human being as a consumer of biological products on the top of the ecological pyramid and the biomagnification principle in ecology, the increased pollution of deposit media by heavy metals that are persistent and not biodegradable is extremely harmful for humans. In the long-term perspective a long-time operation of the oil refinery causes emissions of dangerous substances into the air, which is a pollutant's transporting medium and therefore influence the surroundings and the conditions of human living (Baltrėnaitė et al. 2014).

Quality of the ecosphere as a continuum integrating biosphere, technosphere and socio-sphere as well as being affected by environmental pollution becomes an important challenge for the creative society (Markert 2014). The only forefront-type creative society rather than the consumer society which is limited by rationality and pragmatism would be able to understand the issue. Development of this type of society is the mission of the university. The university is where an imaginative personality which is public-spirited, accountable to society and nation, able to think independently can be developed.

CONCLUSIONS

Beside this, the system of creativity stimulation changes the rules of games in a social environment when old social environment nears to the limit of its augmentation. We can remember T. Kuhn's scientific revolutions while the new scientific theories change the old ones that are no more able to cover and "consume" the phenomena arisen newly. The latters could seem new and "unconsumed" by old theories only because of the fact that social environment changes and every phenomenon emerges in this already different perspective. As a result, creative

approach is a necessary response both to the emerged phenomena and to environment changing because of them. In other words, creativity allows orienting to consuming strategies that would block consuming of social environment and the individuals within it.

Received 10 January 2015

Accepted 2 March 2015

References

1. Aglinskas, V. 2014. "Caught in the Waiting Game: Community, Creativity and Everyday Life in Šnipiškės", *Santalka: filosofija, komunikacija* 22(1): 77–86.
2. Aristotle. 1924. *Metaphysics*, ed. W. D. Ross. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
3. Aristotle. 2011. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
4. Bajarkevičius, T. 2014. „Garso meno praktikos miesto erdvėse“ [Sound Art Practices in City Spaces], *Santalka: filosofija, komunikacija* 22(1): 69–76.
5. Baltrėnaitė, E.; Baltrėnas, P.; Lietuvninkas, A.; Šerevičienė, V.; Zuokaitė, E. 2014. "Integrated Evaluation of Aerogenic Pollution by Air-transported Heavy Metals (Pb, Cd, Ni, Zn, Mn and Cu) in the Analysis of the Main Deposit Media", *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 21(1): 299–313.
6. Baltrėnas, P.; Baltrėnaitė, E.; Šerevičienė, V.; Pereira, P. 2011. "Atmospheric BTEX Concentrations in the Vicinity of the Crude Refinery of the Baltic Region", *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 182: 115–127.
7. Barevičiūtė, J. 2014. „Pagrindiniai kūrybiškumo ir kūrybingumo aspektai šiuolaikiniuose humanitariniuose bei socialiniuose moksluose“ [The Aspects of Creativity and Creativeness in Contemporary Humanities and Social Sciences], *Filosofija. Sociologija* 25(1): 19–28.
8. Bates, A. 2010. *The Biochar Solution: Carbon Farming and Climate Change*. Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers.
9. Černevičiūtė, J.; Strazdas, R. 2014a. „Kūrybingumo sampratų raida: nuo genijaus į kūrybines sistemas“ [Creativity Understandings, Evolution: from Genius to Creative Systems], *Santalka: filosofija, komunikacija* 22(2): 113–125.
10. Černevičiūtė, J.; Strazdas, R. 2014b. „Meno inkubatorių vaidmuo, plėtojant sistemų inovacijas“ [The Arts Incubators, Influence on the Development of System Innovations], *Santalka: filosofija, komunikacija* 22(2): 126–136.
11. Florida, R. 2012. *The Rise of Creative Class*. New York: Basic Books.
12. Huxley, A. 1932. *Brave New World*. London: Chatto & Windus.
13. Juzefovič, A. 2013. "Creative Interactions Between Word and Image in Modern Visual Culture", *Limes: Borderland Studies* 6(2): 121–131.
14. Juzefovič, A. 2015. "Creativity and Aesthetic Applied to Ecological Education", *Creativity Studies* 8(1): 12–24.
15. Kačerauskas, T. 2013. "University as the Environment of Academic Creation", *Synthesis Philosophica* 28(1–2): 119–129.
16. Kačerauskas, T. 2014. „Kūrybos visuomenės terminai ir sampratos“ [The Terms and Concepts of Creative Society], *Logos* 78: 6–18.
17. Kačerauskas, T. 2014. „Kūrybos visuomenė: tyrimo metodai ir problemos“ [Creative Society: Research Methods and Problems], *Logos* 80: 6–15.
18. Lavrinc, J. 2014. "Community Art Initiatives as a Form of Participatory Research: the Case of Street Mosaic Workshop", *Creativity Studies* 7(1): 52–65.
19. Lietuvninkas, A. 2012. *Aplinkos geochemija*. Vilnius: Technika.
20. Mancinelli, E.; Baltrėnaitė, E.; Baltrėnas, P.; Paliulis, D.; Passerini, G.; Almas, A. R. 2015. "Trace Metal Concentration and Speciation in Storm Water Runoff on Impervious Surfaces", *Journal of Environmental Engineering and Landscape Management* 23: 15–27.
21. Markert, B.; Baltrėnaitė, E.; Chudzińska, E.; De Marco, S.; Diatta, J.; Ghaffari, Z.; Gorelova, S.; Marcovecchio, J.; Tabors, G.; Wang, M.; Yousef, N.; Fraenzle, S.; Wuenschmann, S. 2014. "Multilingual Education of Students on a Global Scale and Perspective – International Networking on the Example of Bioindication and Biomonitoring (B & B Technologies)", *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 21(8): 5450–5456.
22. Markert, B.; Wuenschmann, S.; Baltrėnaitė, E. 2012. „Aplinkos stebėjimo naujovės. Bioindikatoriai

- ir biomonitoriai: apibrėžtys, strategijos ir taikymas“ [Innovative Observation of the Environment: Bioindicators and Biomonitorers: Definitions, Strategies and Applications], *Journal of Environmental Engineering and Landscape Management* 20(3): 221–239.
23. Mītkus, T. 2013. „Komiksai Lietuvoje: nepanaudotas kultūrinis ir edukacinis įrankis“ [Lithuanian Comics: Unused Cultural and Educations Instrument], *Santalka: filosofija, komunikacija* 21(1): 21–34.
24. Plato. 1980. *The Laws*. New York: Basic Books.
25. Plato. 1992. *The Republic*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
26. Pundytė, N.; Baltrėnaitė, E.; Pereira, P.; Paliulis, D. 2011. „Variation of Metal Uptake by *Pinus sylvestris*“, *Journal of Environmental Engineering and Landscape Management* 19(1): 34–43.
27. Reimeris, R. 2012. „Kūrybinių centrų identitetas: strateginio valdymo ir komunikaciniai aspektai“, *Santalka: filosofija, komunikacija* 20(1): 61–69.
28. Skorupa, P. 2014. „Shocking Contents in Social and Commercial Advertising“, *Creativity Studies* 7(2): 69–81.
29. Štuopytė, E. 2013. „Unesco kūrybinių miestų tinklų poveikis miesto tapatumui“ [The Influence of the UNESCO Creative Cities Network on City's Identity], *Santalka: filosofija, komunikacija* 21(2): 98–109.
30. Toynbee, A. J. 1979. *A Study of History*. New York: Weathervane Books.
31. Valivonytė, I. M. 2013. „Plagiarizmas reklamoje: kūrybinio mąstymo trūkumas ar perpildytos rinkos pasekmė?“ [Plagiarism in Advertising: Lack of the Creative Thinking or Result of Saturated Market?], *Santalka: filosofija, komunikacija* 21(2): 128–139.

PRANAS BALTRĖNAS, EDITA BALTRĖNAITĖ, TOMAS KAČERAUSKAS

Kūrybos socialinė aplinka

Santrauka

Straipsnyje gvildenami kūrybos visuomeninės aplinkos klausimai. Plėtojamos šios tezės: 1. Kūrybinė avantiūra žengia į nežinomą regioną ir neištirtą vartojimo prasme aplinką. 2. Iškilį visuomenė nepripažįstama vartojimo aplinkoje, kurią ji verčia keistis. 3. Kūrybos visuomenė yra iškilį tiek, kiek iškildama vartojimo aplinkoje nepaiso vartojimo logikos ir užtveria vartotojų komunikacinius kanalus. 4. Turtingas ne tas kūrybininkas, kuris daug turi, kad suvartotų, bet tas, kuriam užtenka savo kūrybiniams siekiams įgyvendinti. 5. Laimės samprata, kokia ji bebūtų, yra tiek individo, tiek visuomenės judumo veiksnys. 6. Laimė yra sukurtina drauge su jai palankia socialine aplinka: jos kūrėjas yra tiek individas, tiek visuomenė. 7. Vidutinumas nereiškia neautentiškumo, priešingai, tai – iškilumo puoselėjimo aplinka, kurią į tapatumo vienetą ir visumą sutelkia tam tikri iškilūs fenomenai. 8. Kūryba ir kūrybingas gyvenimo būdas – saiko, laimės drauge, profilaktika. 9. Technologijos yra socialinės aplinkos iškilumo veiksnys. 10. Vartotojų visuomenė, orientuodamasi į kuo didesnę komfortą, alina gamtinę ir socialinę aplinką ir taip sukelia visišką diskomfortą. 11. Ekosfera, veikiama aplinkos taršos, tampa svarbiu iššūkiu kūrybos visuomenei.

Raktažodžiai: kūrybos visuomenė, socialinė aplinka, laimės veiksniai, vartojimo kultūra