

Philosophy as Creativity

Natalia Anatolievna Tereschenko*

Department of Social Philosophy, Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia

Abstract: The main aim of the study is to analyze the phenomenon of creativity, which has traditionally been the subject of philosophical investigation. Moreover, the phenomenon of philosophy itself as a creative process often remained in the shadow of general problems. By tacit agreement the creative nature of philosophy was recognized as obvious, and therefore, as a subject of philosophizing, it was often simply left out of the picture. However, again and again, the thesis about the "death of philosophy" makes the question of its creative nature more than relevant. If the creative potential of philosophy has been exhausted, perhaps it is really dying as a special form of thought in culture. If creativity in philosophy is possible, then its cultural prospects become more optimistic, or cultural elimination of philosophy is associated not only (or not so much) with its creative capacity. Creativity became the object of theorization in the Renaissance and Modernity, when man was initially thought of as its subject. Therefore, the very understanding of creativity bears the mark of Modern thinking. However, the "post-" situation forces us to return to the analysis of the problem and consider it in terms of the impossibility of the new. The problem can and should also be considered on the material of Russian philosophical thought, whose status has always been ambiguous, primarily for Russian philosophy itself. Today, the position of Russian philosophy is becoming even more problematic due to the problematization of philosophy as a particular discourse that claims to be universal, on the one hand, and the specifics of Russian theoretical thought labeled as "responsive", its empathicity – on the other.

Keywords: Creativity, The New, Progress, "Death of Philosophy", Russian Philosophy.

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of creativity has been in the sphere of close philosophical attention at least since the Renaissance, which gave rise to the first theories of artistic creativity. They shifted the focus of interest from the problems of creation to the analysis of activities (of an artist) to create the new. In other words, philosophy viewed creativity as a certain algorithm that allowed to create the very ability to create. At the same time, philosophy was considered a metaform that could describe the phenomenon in a metalanguage (Loi, Viganò, & van der Plas 2020).

METHODS

The methodological approach used in the article is one of the versions of Derrida's deconstruction undertaken in the space of the creative problem and in the space of philosophy, as it is implied in Derrida's idea that deconstruction needs nothing, even a theorist. He writes: "Deconstruction takes place; it is an event that does not await the deliberation, consciousness, or organization of subject, or even of modernity" (Derrida, & Bennington, 1993). As "taking place", it unites all possible reflected approaches to the phenomenon, inverting and "outverting" them. Therefore, in the analysis of the phenomenon (creativity) in the horizon

of deconstruction, we will encounter structuralist, historical, genealogical, and phenomenological intuitions. That is relevant as a deconstruction event must be described preferably without any violence perpetrated by the theoretical matrix.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

So, it seems interesting to reverse creativity issues in philosophy and consider philosophy itself as creativity. The intention is not new, it seems that when speaking of creativity philosophy has always spoken on its own behalf, but, obviously, that is not really necessary to clarify and specify.

The question of philosophy as creativity implies a tightly packed complex of questions. It is the question of what philosophy as creativity or creativity in philosophy is. What optics of creativity investigation prevails in philosophical space today? How does this question sound in the accompaniment of voices talking about the present or impending death of philosophy? They are possibly the three formulations of the same question, because if philosophy is dying, then, probably, its creative potential has been exhausted. If creativity is possible in philosophy, then its chances of life increase. The ability to create becomes a specific theoretical passport that makes the presence of philosophy in the horizon of culture legitimate. And, finally, how do all these questions enlighten the nature of Russian philosophy today?

We understand that talks about creativity in philosophy imply a whole huge layer of texts, a whole

*Address correspondence to this author at the Department of Social Philosophy, Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia;
E-mail: t.personality21@mail.ru, nataliaanatolievna.t@mail.ru

palette of theoretical approaches. However, a small amount of the article does not allow lengthy judgments. Therefore, some claims may look straightforward and vulnerable. Firstly, we accept it as a fact (and not as truth) that philosophy today develops its theoretical activity in the paradigm of Modern thinking with its recognition (or without it – from the point of theory it makes no difference) of the concrete historical nature of the latter. And it means that philosophy regardless of the formulations of the question still continues, in the words of J. Ortega-y-Gasset, to take bows to science. Given this formulation of the question, creativity in philosophy will be considered by analogy with creativity (the possibility of creativity) in science. Moreover, philosophical quality is nullified by the ongoing scientization of philosophy, which makes its presence in the theoretical space redundant. This is the path which Dimkov, (2019). calls one of the versions of the death of philosophy (transformation into science), and A. Badiou (1992) calls it suturing of philosophy. As a matter of fact, the counter-question arises: is it well-reasoned to talk about the *differencia specifica* of a phenomenon (any, including philosophy) and the discovery of specifically essential characteristics from the standpoint of contemporary theory. But it is a slightly different case, let us leave it aside.

In the work “Introduction to Non-Classical Philosophy” Dimkov, (2019). offers another way to verify philosophical theory, which might allow us to talk about its viability and see how philosophy can (cannot) be thought of as creativity. She writes that the life or death of philosophy is diagnosed by answering two questions: is there any progress in philosophy and is it capable of generating something new (Wood *et al.*, 1988), although it seems that they are one and the same question. Besides, that is surely a modern and, as a result, scientific approach. Surprisingly, speaking of historicity and, consequently, of the historical bounds of the very concept of “progress”, we still want to discover it in philosophy.

The philosophy of science problematizes the concept of scientific progress, albeit in a negative form, offering various fallibilistic concepts, though science and the philosophy of science are certainly not twins. Art parted with the idea of progress at the beginning of the 20th century. The thesis “Everything transient is merely a semblance” (V. Nezval) can be used without quotation marks, since a whole galaxy of poets, writers, critics, philosophers can claim authorship. And the passions of philosophy are largely connected with the fact that science and a number of areas of art (let us

leave aside the question of correspondence of the phenomenon to the concept) are already overcoming this approach to creativity, although they do not propose a different one. As for philosophy, it is still at the point of criticism.

Thus, Postmodern irony in relation to the phenomenon of the new resonated in the intention of criticism of philosophy, aggravated by the reproach that the latter, as a particular discourse, hardly has the right to claim the status of the universal. The problematization of the concept of “progress” in philosophy has also led to doubts about the possibility of the new as such but in this case the question of progress and novelty in philosophy becomes merely strange or it requires revision of the concepts themselves.

It is quite obvious that the Modern principle of the new cannot be the basis for understanding creativity today if the phenomenon of the new is problematic. One of the indicators of that is the spread of the vague idea of innovation that reflects possible variation and combinatorics rather than the new as the created and the other. In this case, a new understanding of the new and creativity “closes up” (or, on the contrary, discloses) with the understanding of creativity as creation (out of nothing, by the power of one’s own will), namely, with manifestation as a kind of groundlessness. But, nonetheless, it doesn’t solve the problem.

When discussing the new, we’d like to refer to the position of Dimkov who points to a contradictory feature of the new as the result of creativity in the perception of Modernity: “The new in modernism ... (is) the result of certain requirements, an intended strategy that dominates the culture of Modernity. Thus, the creation of the new is not an expression of human freedom as it is often considered” (Dimkov, 2019; Veale & Cardoso, 2019).

This is a very important point, for in this case the new as fallen into the horizon of coercion and unfreedom casts doubt on the very consideration of creation of the new as the criterion of creative activity. Creativity and freedom have always been considered inextricable - even if we take the principle beyond the limits of modern scientist strategy. Further, according to B. Groys, “the premise that the desire for the new is the desire for truth” hides behind the principle of the search for the new Dimkov, (2019). However, truth in modernism is also regarded as an ontological

prerequisite which is not a fact of theorist's creation, creativity, but is a discovery, which means it is not related to the act of creativity either.

So, an attempt to discover the creative potential of philosophy in its ability (or inability) to create something new and demonstrate a progressive trend in the development of thought is dubious. It is no coincidence that Heidegger will say that sometimes it is much braver not to be afraid of turning one's eyes and mind back to the old rather than to say something new. "For this reason essential thinkers always say the Same. But that does not mean the identical. Of course they say it only to one who undertakes to meditate on them. Whenever thinking, in historical recollection, attends the destiny of being, it has already bound itself to what is fitting for it, in accordance with its destiny. To flee into the identical is not dangerous. To venture into discordance in order to say the Same is the danger" (Veale, & Cardoso 2019).

Thus, we must either revise the principles of understanding creativity in philosophy, or recognize that philosophy has exhausted its creative potential, and talks about its death are no longer a provoking gesture.

Understanding philosophy, let us take two positions into consideration. They were expressed by J. Deleuze and F. Guattari in the work "What is Philosophy?" and A. Badiou (1992) in the "Manifesto of Philosophy". Both texts are extremely popular and shared in philosophy today, which presupposes their universality and nonrandomness in relation to philosophy. Let us primarily note that we will somewhat straighten and coarsen the positions of the authors as if bringing them to their logical end, which will reveal their core on the verge of absurdity. The first one considers philosophy from within philosophy itself and sees the essence of the latter in concept creation; concepts are purely authorial and in fact prove to be personal autographs (Heidegger 2000). Asserting that Greek philosophy is a product of agon, the authors define it as a rivalry of contenders. And then philosophy requires not only bravery to claim, but also the ability to judge the validation of claims. It turns out that the validation presented to a rival and friend, is a concept.

So, a thought that doesn't give rise to an original authorial concept is not philosophical in itself. However, philosophy, being a personal discourse, is in an ambiguous position: a personal discourse becomes vulnerable, situational and optional, which in a sense

devalues the concept. Deleuze and Guattari would say that the philosopher constantly renounces his concepts, he erases them from his discourse. Perhaps that is why Deleuze would look for other forms of legitimate universality outside philosophy, particularly in literature (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994). Literature, in turn, will claim its right to universality by discovering a meta-literary foundation which Paul de Man defines as literariness: "The linguistics of semiology and of literature apparently have something in common that only their shared perspective can detect and that pertains distinctively to them. The definition of this something, often referred to as literariness, has become the object of literary theory" (Deleuze 1998). Art will become the area of search for what philosophy denies - universal coordinates. For example, for Deleuze "The cinema still forms part of art and part of thought, in the irreplaceable, autonomous forms which these directions were able to invent and get screened in spite of everything (De Man 1989).

Badiou's position is different. The idea of the four foundations of philosophy implies a view on philosophy as a form of existence of the thought in the world; the thought that unites different modes of human existence (Deleuze 1997). "These conditions are: the matheme, the poem, political invention and love' – he writes. The poem, the mathema, politeia, and a love create a vector for the power of thought that pervades the world. It probably occurs in crisis situations, but it does not require the creation of a certain original concept for its expression, the author's form of which demonstrates the character's ambitions. Cultures can do without philosophy, and there are many of such cultures. Let's assume that in a way such organisms are even healthier than the cultures that gave rise to philosophy. But the very birth of philosophy shows that this organism needs to pull together the four conditions (or may find the ability to intertwine them). We can assume that the birth of such a strange phenomenon is reasoned by an internal split, the loss of syncretic unity. And then philosophy becomes a form of healing, therapy. The "Philosophy Arch", as Badiou says, can connect the present day with any point in time-space, and make the thought of any era relevant. If it is so, the essence of philosophy will lie in discovery of a certain in-the-worldness of man who can pull together meanings, forces and actions rather than in creation of the new. Concerning this case M.K. Mamardashvili said that the thought/culture is possible, "If I ...". However, this I (ego) makes sense exclusively in the logic of transcending the boundaries of individuality, of

reaching the universal, which is so severely disparaged by contemporary philosophy. Apparently, it is the case of the discovery of a certain quality that goes beyond a strictly organized discourse, which, by analogy with de Mans literariness, can be called philosophicity. Then philosophy as crystallization of the world's philosophicity is the necessity to understand the world / man in the logic of personal out-of-timeliness and out-of-spaceness; in the ability to respond.

In this regard, the phenomenon of Russian philosophy sparks interest, though its originality has repeatedly been called into question. On the one hand, as early as the 19th century, Russian philosophy was reproached for the extreme ease of accepting and assimilating alien ideas, which Dostoevsky called universal responsiveness of the Russian soul, and Herzen named as the most humane side of the Russian character. As for the creation of concepts, in this respect the 19th-century Russian philosophy could certainly be exemplifying, but, as Kim, (2020). wrote, having left the domestic soil, it deceased in the West for it did not find its congenial reader (Badiou 1992; Kim, 2020). It means that creation of the concept is not a panacea. And philosophy can die even if it creates them. At the same time, the twentieth century showed that Russian (and Soviet) philosophy introduced major philosophers to the world, and, by all means, they influenced the world's philosophical thought. And they can hardly be placed in the line of thinkers who invent concepts. M. Bakhtin, M. Mamardashvili, Yu. Lotman, E. Ilyenkov... the list can be expanded. All of them worked with a fairly traditional conceptual philosophical apparatus but managed to transcend the limits of the scientific modern paradigm and suggest serious philosophical solutions to most complicated problems. Our task does not involve a detailed consideration of the problem field of these theorists' research. We just state a well-known fact that is difficult to dispute.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, philosophy seems to be a space of creativity when and if it is capable of detecting and naming the problem that affects various modes of human existence and requires decisions entailing changes in all areas of his life. From this point of view, it can be assumed that nowadays philosophy is most frequently unfolded in the paradigm of "suffering" philosophy: a thought requires action. But then, as Matzeyna believes, philosophy dies as it is removed from the field of reflection to the field of practical action. Is there any reason to claim that philosophy moves towards its death while it practices

itself as creativity? I believe, there is. First, as we know, philosophy has already died a number of times, which hasn't prevented it from revival - each time with the reappearance of the four conditions. Second, it is possible if we discover a meta-philosophical space of philosophicity that will draw one or another form of philosophizing to its utmost. Third, globalization processes suggest that philosophical experience can be learnt by cultures which have not given birth to their own philosophical experience. And each time this experience will be adopted in various manners.

SUMMARY

However, it seems that in the horizon of the philosophicity search it is specifically domestic culture that can offer us hope that life will not leave the body of philosophy. After all, the experience of congenial thinking, responsiveness can become the basis for pulling meanings together in thinking activity. Russian religious philosophy has probably died in exile. However, the 20th century gave rise to some other Russian philosophy. It is secularized but not ultimately identified. It's sensitive to various fluctuations of philosophical thought, but it hasn't lost the property of strict theoreticity. What could cause the death of Russian philosophy? It could be the neglect of these achievements of the 20th century and the desire to become entirely European. Thus, the question of philosophy as creativity and the life or impending death of philosophy remains open to anyone who dares enter its space not only with historical intentions. The answer is not predetermined.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

- Badiou, A. 1992. *Manifesto for Philosophy* / translated, edited and with an Introduction Norman Madarasz, State University of New York Press, Albany.
- De Man, P. 1997. *the Resistance to Theory* // Foreword by Wlad Godzich, *Theory and History of Literature*, Volume 33, p.3-20.
- Deleuze, G. 1997. *Cinema I. The movement-image* / translated by Hugh Tomloson and Barbara Habberjam, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis. – Moscow: Ad Marginem Press, 1997.
- Deleuze, G. 1998. *Critical and Clinical* / translator by Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco, Verso, London, New York.
- Deleuze, G., Guattari, F. 1994. *What is Philosophy?* / translated by Graham Burchell and Hugh Tomloson, Verso, London, New York.

- Derrida, J., & Bennington, G. (1993). *Jacques Derrida* (p. 3). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dimkov, P. R. (2019). An Excursion into Philosophy and Psychology of Creativity. *Knowledge International Journal*, 30(5), 1313-1317.
- Kim, H. (2020). Creativity and wellbeing in music education-philosophy, policy and practice in the context of contemporary Scottish primary education (Doctoral dissertation, University of Glasgow).
- Loi, M., Viganò, E., & van der Plas, L. (2020). The societal and ethical relevance of computational creativity. arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.11973.
- Veale, T., & Cardoso, F. A. (Eds.). (2019). *Computational creativity: The philosophy and engineering of autonomously creative systems*. Springer.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-43610-4>

Received on 05-11-2020

Accepted on 11-12-2020

Published on 29-12-2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2020.09.288>

© 2020 Natalia Anatolievna Tereschenko; Licensee Lifescience Global.

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.