



Studies / Études

Professional paper UDC 1:159.954(045)

doi: [10.21464/sp32208](https://doi.org/10.21464/sp32208)

Received: May 30, 2016

Sead Alić

Petrovogorska 16a, HR-10000 Zagreb
sead.alic@centar-fm.org

Appropriating the Licence to Creativity

Abstract

Creativity is always associated with free human activity – with beauty, art, human inventions. Most of the time it is something acceptable and good. But what happens in a time of global manipulation? Does the new time develop new types and forms of creativity? What will an analyses of global mass media manipulation performance reveal? The goal of the paper is to show a dark side of creativity in mass media. Mass media reduce the possibility of creative action in the media whilst they develop manipulative forms of creativity. These forms ought to be detected, explained, and commented.

Keywords

god, religion, manipulation, policy, media, dark side of creativity

1.

The danger of instrumentalization by ‘nomenclatures’ once again looms over the ideas of the Enlightenment, over philosophy and its solutions, art and beauty, and even creativity itself. Corporations and policies have their ‘philosophy’; art is stuck to capitalism’s drip; beauty become means of sales promotion... But the strangest changes hit creation, which has ended up in the dimension of sadistic torment since its theological origins. Regardless of whether it is to do with the new forms of prisoner torture, new ways of exploiting the poor, new ‘creative’ forms of economic, banking, media, and political scams – creativity is increasingly used in ways incompatible with the philosophical (aesthetic) and theological visions of this phenomenon.

What is at work here is the appropriation of creativity for the forms of theories and practices that are inconsistent with the original significance of creation. To that extent, it is important to reflect on the forms of this aberration, and try to pinpoint the origin which made such a thing possible.

One of the questions that can vividly illustrate finding a possible origin is the one raised by Joachim Remak in *The Nazi Years: A Documentary History*: How much did Spencer’s theory of evolution, which argues that superior organisms have greater chances of survival, create space for thought which will deviate into the single-mindedness of the twentieth century, i.e. to what extent

did his comparison of the natural and social organism (substantially influenced by Darwin's theory of evolution) suggest solutions necessarily leading to the shaping of such theories of social organisation that will lead to fascism and Nazism? The aforementioned book takes the analysis all the way to Spencer and Darwin,¹ i.e. the pseudo-biological mirroring of natural laws onto society. The roots of everything, including totalitarianism, might or, perhaps even should, be looked for in the sort of human activity that we would prefer to see as pure and untouchable.

Scientific discoveries can sometimes reverberate in their eras, and appear to be a self-evident solution to centuries of wandering. However, later research will often show that the apparent rising of the sun in the east each morning has dimensions that are not obvious. As with the sun, so is with creativity. Again and again, it is necessary to examine whether something somewhere was left ill-considered, overlooked, forgotten.

In his writing on whether truth is stronger than either wine, king or woman,² Thomas Aquinas (with all due respect to wine, king and woman) attributes the greatest strength to truth. According to Aquinas, wine will change the physical mood; the promise of bodily pleasure will bear lust; and we can only be incited to war by the king. However, truth remains "the most excellent, the highest and most powerful value".³

Contemporary experience warns: there is no ideologue who will not give truth these same attributes ("the most excellent, the highest and most powerful value"), but what if man was to create something more powerful than truth? What if it is true that he has shaped powerful and convincing images of illusion that fill his life with desire, constantly affect his body, and what if he even allows this illusion of truth to lead him to war? And what sort of creation is it if the final result is – giving up the truth? Thomas Aquinas of our time should be asked what if truth has become just a notion for which we have merely 'bought' a licence for the newly created virtual world of mass-media illusion, spectacle, seduction, and manipulation.

God speaks through truth, Augustine wrote, not forgetting to add that it cannot be heard with body, but only with mind.⁴ The role of mediator between God and man is the mind, as that which is most excellent in man, which can 'hear' God, who does not speak in a voice; to feel God, who does not let on that he is near; to see God, who cannot be seen. However, there is another mediator between God and man, who works in a similar way. It is, notes Augustine – "the man Christ Jesus".⁵ God, who, according to the Old Testament, created the world, appears as the father of Jesus Christ in the New Testament. Simultaneously, what used to refer to the God of the Old Testament now also refers to Jesus Christ. At the same time, however, it is said that Christ is "the reflection of the glory of God and the impression of God's being", "image of the invisible God and the firstborn of all creatures".⁶

When it comes to understanding the philosophical and theological approach and their relationship, this is one of the most important points in the history of thought. The man Jesus Christ, as a mediator between man and God, takes the place of Mind. Man, who wants to rid himself of illusions, and understand the world in which he exists, becomes the person who follows the philosophical or theological frame of mind. The third mediator was engendered by time. New technologies,⁷ possibilities of multiplication, simultaneity of publication, ubiquity of messages, and persuasiveness of 'secular sermons' have brought us to the point where both Augustine and Thomas Aquinas must recognise the power of that which is not excellent – the beauty, persuasiveness

and influence of the mass-media illusion of creation.⁸ We live in an age of bare spectacle⁹ in which whatever creates an atmosphere of yearning, excitement, and hierarchies (anything suitable for the most diverse forms of political manipulation) is desirable. In this sense, we live in a time when many will, at the very least, give themselves a time to think when asked to choose the most powerful thing, in the fashion of Aquinas. Instead of Truth as internal wealth, information has become the measure of (external) material wealth, often used for immoral purposes in our modern times (since morality creates no profit for corporations dealing with the media).¹⁰ Worlds are created, quick to come into being and just as quick to disappear, whose main goal is to keep the focus on their own surface, or, to borrow Augustine, keep people “blessed because [it is] deceived”.¹¹

The faltering of critical philosophical thought has made bolder the proliferation of world views that do not seek to legitimise themselves through philosophy or political, aesthetic, and ethical dimensions built on philosophical foundations. Banality has become the cheapest material of mass-media intervention. Multiplication of opinion without critical valorisation has created mass-media sophists, ready to shape their thought at any moment in order to fit their clients’ needs and their financial capacity.

1

Joachim Remak (ed.), *The Nazi Years: A Documentary History*, Waveland Press Inc., Long Grove 1990.

2

Toma Akvinski [Thomas Aquinas], *Izabrano djelo [Selected Works]*, Globus, Zagreb 1981, p. 370.

3

Ibid.

4

Augustine adds: “For He speaks to that part of man which is better than all else that is in him, and than which God Himself alone is better.” See: Saint Augustine, *The City of God*, translated by Marcus Dods, Hendrickson Publishers, Peabody 2009, p. 311.

5

“And that in this faith it might advance the more confidently towards the truth, the truth itself, God, God’s Son, assuming humanity without destroying His divinity, established and founded this faith, that there might be a way for man to man’s God through a God-man. For this is the Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus. For it is as man that He is the Mediator and the Way.” See: *ibid.*

6

Michael Glazier, Monika K. Hellwig (eds.), *Suvremena katolička enciklopedija [The Modern Catholic Encyclopedia]*, translated by Živan Filipi et al., Laus, Split 1998, p. 919.

7

In *Information and Communication*, Claude Hagège notes one of the reasons behind hu-

man reluctance: “... advanced technology, although based on human invention, develops faster than the modes of thinking and types of habits of human societies.” See: Claude Hagège, “Informacija i komunikacija” [“Information and Communication”], translated by Ana Prpić, *Europski glasnik* 17 (2015), pp. 559–571, p. 559.

8

This persuasiveness was addressed in an interesting way in a Tony Schwartz book with an indicative title: *Media: The Second God*, Anchor Books, New York 1983.

9

It should be noted that, for Guy Debord, spectacle was a “material reconstruction of the religious illusion”. See: Guy Debord, *Society of the Spectacle*, translated by Ken Knabb, Hologoblin Press, Canberra 2002, p. 9. For him, then, the mass-media illusion stands for the spectacle’s shedding of the religious attire, required by religious followers in order to use spectacle for their own interests.

10

In addition to his films, famous director Michael Moore exposes the US government administration in his books. The chapter “House of the Whopper in his Dude, Where’s My Country?” is particularly interesting for the ways of transmitting lies from politics to media, and media’s repetition of lies. Michael Moore, *Bum, Bush, bu*, translated by Darko Brdarić, Izvori, Zagreb 2004, pp. 5–97.

11

St. Augustine, *The City of God*, p. 313.

That which is common to whatever is different has been recognised (in ancient Greece) as an idea in which the subject only participates in its ideal form.¹² The ‘One’ towards which human abstraction rose triumphed over polytheism, and it guided man towards seeking the universal being who had created everything, including man, risen to the abstraction of One. Life in the divine truth, God’s city, a life lived to the glory of the creator, it was slowly opposed by a life that celebrated creation, the truth of the human mind, i.e. the human city in its secular attire. What is true in all of this, and what is an illusion? Did God create the world in which man creates his own worlds, or did man, due to his pragmatic needs, create a supernatural creature through which to create order and harmony in the world? Does a believer attempting to live God as the only truth and criterion alive in the real world? Or is his world virtual in a sense, since it is dominated by ‘stars’ created by the human need for answers to the questions that the human species has not yet been able to answer?

The theological view of the world is relatively rounded: God created the world from nothing. It was created in order for the creation to trust and love God and not what was created. Created out of love, the world is ‘a manifestation of God’s power’. However, to love the world, even as a manifestation of God’s power, or any single symbol of God’s power, is a sin according to St. Paul.

“God does not dwell in temples built with hands.” (Acts 17:24)

Indeed, for St Paul, the fundamental sin consists in reversing the relationship between the Creator and creature, in the religious worship of the creation instead of the Creator (Romans 1:25). Thus, he constantly emphasizes the divine origin of creatures.¹³

When Feuerbach, eighteen centuries later (in the preface to the second edition of *The Essence of Christianity*), speaks of an age “which prefers the sign to the thing signified, the copy to the original, representation to reality, the appearance to the essence”,¹⁴ he suggests that the replacement of reality with an illusion has come about precisely because of neglect towards senses as instruments of the self-knowledge of the absolute, due to an inequality of the head and the heart. In other words, that which was created and nurtured by human thought, of which the heart took no part, has been deemed supernatural. However, wisdom took part. During the world’s creation, wisdom was there like a skilled artist:

“It took pleasure in space before experiencing pleasure in the company of men. Similarly, the Book of Wisdom sees wisdom as a craftsman of the universe.”¹⁵

Although even Philolaus (320 BC) and Aristarchus (280 BC) had advocated for the heliocentric system in which the Earth orbits the Sun, it took Copernicus, as well as the Church’s reaction, for such thought to reach the general public. But while Copernicus pushed the issues of the heliocentric system opposed to the geocentric, Kepler introduced his own, somewhat mystical, search for the harmony of the world, into his contemplation of the world’s system, seeking the connection between structures that appear in both the material and the spiritual worlds.

It is especially important to point out the significance of Kepler’s search today, when particular interests are portrayed as the interests arising from the need to create something new, as results of this creation. In combining music and geometry in his exploration of the universe, Kepler awoke anew the pre-Aristotle search for harmony between man and the cosmos.¹⁶ In pondering music beyond its apparent dimensions, looking at geometric regularities beyond their significance for mathematics, comparing the regularities and

repetition of the ideal worlds of music and geometry with the planets' orbits and the laws of their movements, Kepler sought after spiritual and scientific support for human behaviour.

2.

When it comes to creativity,¹⁷ one of the oldest questions is whether we actually create or if creation is merely discovering something that already exists (depending on our answer, we will be classified as arrogant and obstinate, unable to see the beauty and design of the already existing, or as conservatives not conscious of the significance of creation for the creation of man).

Is Eros the god of the individual or the genus? Does he inspire individual human pursuits of beauty, love, and spirit, or does he use some strange ruse in order to lure individual power into melding with an idea that actually belongs to the genus? Do we only paint what we have a predisposition for or do we make rules for ourselves and the canvas? Do we create through behaviour, in the Aristotelian fashion? Is the hypnotic power of the television screen the multiplied play of peacock feathers? Is *mimesis* our starting point?

We have discovered the rules of geometry, mathematics, astronomy, music, physics, chemistry... We have realised that we are part of an order defined by movement and advancement. We are stopped in our tracks before Mendeleev's system as if before a miracle of organisation of what we see as matter. At the same time, we perceive beauty, such as the beauty of works of art, as beauty where we do not recognise order akin to Mendeleev's. We are fascinated by mathematical relations in music. But whoever is truly open to music leaves behind the recognition and deciphering of mathematical relations in an activity meant for enjoyment, experience, quivering...¹⁸

The creative act is possible as an act of freedom, the kind of activity that is not determined by any external order/value system, but only the mental voli-

12

The context of these deliberations was put forth in the text *The Medium of Language* and published in Sead Alić's *Masmediji: zatvor bez zidova* [*Mass Media: Prison without Walls*], Centar za filozofiju medija, Zagreb 2011.

13

M. Glazier, M. K. Hellwig, *Suvremena katolička enciklopedija* [*The Modern Catholic Encyclopedia*], p. 919.

14

In: G. Debord, *Society of the Spectacle*, p. 7.

15

M. Glazier, M. K. Hellwig, *Suvremena katolička enciklopedija* [*The Modern Catholic Encyclopedia*], p. 919.

16

Johannes Kepler, *Harmonies of the World*, translated by Charles Glenn Wallis, Independent Publishing Platform 2014.

17

In *The Philosophy of Creativity: New Essays*, editors Elliot Samuel Paul and Scott Barry Kaufman highlight the basic coordinates of

creativity as such in the introductory chapter. By linking creativity with the person, process/activity or product, they add that it always has to do with something new, but also valuable. Especially since, as stated by Immanuel Kant, something new can also be nonsensical. According to Kant, artistic genius creates not only that which is new, but also that which is exemplary. See: Elliot Samuel Paul, Scott Barry Kaufman (eds.), *The Philosophy of Creativity: New Essays*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2014.

18

The process of separating music from mathematical science in the history of the progress of human knowledge ran parallel to the process of transition of scientific interests from the field of theory to the field of practice. The seventeenth century was key for the above processes. See more: John Fauvel, Raymond Flood, Robin Wilson (eds.), *Music and Mathematics: From Pythagoras to Fractals*, Oxford University Press, New York 2006. The authors of this book cite, amongst others, the visual ponderings of Robert Fludd, also known as Robertus de Fluctibus (1574–1637).

tion of the individual. The lack of freedom is a vale of tears of uncreativity. A person who lives their life not having risen to the level of creation in unborn (in Fromm's terms). The termination of conversations on human freedom also makes it impossible to ask questions about human creativity. What remains is hierarchy and war, manipulation and migration, paid advertisements and assassins.

Every creation is a process that takes time. The time in which the process has convicted duration is sentenced to rushing. Creativity 'in a rush' is a simulation of what is real with quickly moving shadows on the wall.

If our ways of perceiving are defined by the systems of education and manipulation, then the object of our perception is a stereotype. Creativity must be contained in the way of perceiving in order for us to be creative in the active act. Without freedom there is no 'eternal sweetness of creation', to borrow from Nietzsche.

Hegel's directive, which claims that philosophy envelops its time with concepts, also contains a message about the changes which new age can add to certain concepts or words. An age is reflected in concepts in the same way the concepts evidence the age. There is nothing permanent except change.

What was once *tehne* (technique, skill, craft) – has risen, in part, to the level of art. A *nation* has grown from a group of people with common interests into a political community (with the advancement of printing techniques). A *reader* of manuscripts (whose readings were all done aloud in the beginning) has advanced (with the advancement of printed media) to the level of the part of the audience which picks content and authors to its taste. Similarly, *democracy*, since its beginnings in Athens and the *agora*, has entered ages and spaces where it is difficult to separate from spectacle and business. The credibility of state borders and the *state* as such has been made doubtful by satellites, policies of global corporations, and global migrations. *Politics* itself has been devalued from the skill of possibility to the potential benefits of doing politics.¹⁹

In this context, we want to examine the concept of creativity. Does the contemporary shadow of the concept loom over the concept itself? Is there an ugly, dark, unacceptable side of creation, a dark side of creativity?²⁰ Has the industry of mass-media hypnosis entirely taken over the concept? Does someone appropriate the licence to creativity and how do they do it?

3.

The creative, compared to the stereotype, is a lesser or greater miracle. The strangeness of the new, the different, the unexpected is part of the beauty that is available to man. Poets were thus the 'wonderment of the world' not because they walked the well-trodden paths, but because they investigated, perceived differently, experienced with no inhibitions and lived outside the box. The creative undoubtedly grows in unfenced soil. The plots on which it grows must have enough sunshine, water, air and diversity. Wherever a wall is erected, the soil's power is reduced. Factory farming can only result in industrially formed products whose main task is profit, and here – there's no wonder. Creating is the most powerful form of resistance to the industrialisation of human consciousness, uniformity of the human act, submission by human behaviour. Creation is the opium of freedom. The creative act also contains human rebellion and the effort to establish a more humane world; a further step is made towards the emancipation of human sensibility, human

thought and its aesthetic dimension. In this act, man reaches the absolute (human) level, which metaphorically compares to the divine act.²¹

Goodness, beauty, and truth are the mirrors in which the creative act self-observes and controls itself. Both when the environment can understand the act, and when it cannot (such as in the case of Baudelaire). It is the creator's duty to define the determinants of what is true, good and beautiful. And time is to judge his work. The importance of creativity has been confirmed by the holy books of monotheistic religions, which state that God created the world. It is a human perspective that unconsciously gives credit to the human act of creation by ascribing it to transcendence. Our understanding of our existence cannot transcend the concept of creation, birth out of nothing, the nature of development from seed to ashes. To rise above this means to think in terms that are unavailable to us. In God's creative act, man expresses the helplessness of his idea, while also expressing the magnificence of the world in which the only magnificent thing is man's ability to become involved in creating.

Human history (when studied in accordance with the red letter days from the calendar, as Walter Benjamin would put it, that is, the wars and the blood shed on these dates) is the history of creativity's progression and/or regression. At the same time, it is a story about harnessing creativity for the purposes which the creators often do not ponder when discovering their orders in the universe, or creating their own beauty. This co-opting of the creative act for unproductive purposes is one of the grandest historical wiles of stereotypical human souls, the laziness of the human spirit, or merely evil as such. The stereotype is evil or is yet to become evil, just as the human spirit is evil when it uses stereotypes to judge the other and the different.

Art history testifies to the persistence of man to survive in the dimension of creativity in spite of political, religious, corporate and other walls. Art is the temple of the creative spirit, which unifies *goodness, beauty and truth* in order to create the grounds for the realisation of true human being. This temple is not built of stone, at whose altar each of us delivers their divine likeness; it is a temple on whose walls are the images, texts and thoughts of the true martyrs of human spirituality – the holy creative spirit. These martyrs of human spirituality will not be recognised as saints by the hierarchy, since sainthood requires loyalty to the hierarchy. They will merely, like Kamov, slap the face of the lie in which they live and banish themselves from the calculations of the religious hierarchies. However, in a deeper sense of the 'unity of kinship', these people are the most valuable of the human race. Not, of course, in that they are artists or because some of their works nowadays accrue astronomical

19

"Help, a thief!" is what thieves often cry. People with shady ethics often discuss honesty (or so they say). The meanings of concepts change because language is a mixture onto which we press our own imprints. The cover can sometimes serve as a backdrop, decoration or guise for cuckoo eggs.

20

The relevance of these questions is evidenced by a book edited by a group of authors, which questions the 'dark side of creativity'. See: David H. Cropley et al. (eds.), *The Dark Side of Creativity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2010. The issues of biological warfare, new technologies and nuclear war-

fare are some of the issues analysed along the lines of the synthetic viewpoints of this text.

21

The importance of such ponderings is evidenced by, amongst others, a book entitled *Creativity*, by liberal theologian Matthew Fox, which moves from the comparison of the holy and creative spirit towards the basic issues of humankind as such. It is a way of thinking that shows that theological thought can definitely draw to the essence of modern issues, which should worry both religious and secular worlds alike. See: Matthew Fox, *Creativity*, TarcherPerigee, London 2004.

values. They are ‘blood brothers with the universe’, they are the people one need not offer explanations about, they are those about whom everything is clear.

Creativity does acquiesce to carrying its burden on its own back. Sometimes it is the Inquisition, sometimes the fatwa, sometimes persecution, as a rule: poverty, often ridicule and being shunned by contemporaries. But in the depths of a creator’s soul there lies the creative power by which we are the best of what we can be as human beings.²²

We are all creative, but over the years we learn to give up bit by bit and in the end most often give in completely. Some are struck by fear, some are taken hold of by the Order of some interest; some are removed from creativity by running away from their own freedom, but in most cases it is the stereotype of redundancy/superfluity of creative acts in a ‘well-ordered world’, where everyone has to know their place. As children of Eden we are all free to commit creative acts. When we start merely telling stories about heaven, it is a sign that we are no longer children and that we have been abandoned by creative magic. The paradox lies in the fact that we abandon all hope of reaching heaven by letting go of the magic of creativity.

There is less and less talk of creativity in this roundabout reality. Just as we no longer talk of freedom, the emancipation of the human sensorium, the equality of the (unjust) laws that allow class division and false consciousness (ideology) calcified by such relations. The phenomenon which heats humanity up from the inside is most often decided on by the stereotypical awareness of hierarchies. What is creative no longer needs to be beautiful, good or true. The prevailing opinion is that what is important is that it is useful.²³

Of course, what is creative does not reside only within art. The act of tolerance by a true believer exposed to the hierarchy’s apprehension is as creative in its essence as a brush stroke or a scientific discovery. It creates new ways of seeing and makes man open to his own freedom. Being close to the other and the different in true and complete faith means being in the ways of a living human spirit that comes to know itself in the beauty of diversity.

Creativity is much like the process of giving birth. It always brings to life something unique. It is the unique characteristic of all faiths in the One. It is proof that there is something in which all people can believe despite their divisions. Creation occurs in a silence similar to prayer; creation comes to be when we manage to escape our own everyday interests, and free ourselves up to something new. Creation is the only proof that we are still alive and that we are more than the roles intended for us by the orders of existence.

Information and communication technologies, however pivotal in the huge leap in the history of human communication, are the most successful channels/ways of robotising the human experience. In their intense and pervasive communication, they affect broad masses and take them away to the external and the superficial. It will take decades of enlightenment in order to return to the level of the pre-information epoch. However, the basis for a new and deeper creativity will be vastly broader than.

In every struggle for a more humane human order there is something poetic and saintly. Likewise, in the discovery of the new types of energy that can help man in his return to himself. But history shows that there are always people ready to steal someone else’s thunder just around the corner from creators, following them about. They will send the spirit to the stake and invest in satellites that will orbit flat disks. They will impoverish the body housing a

creative spirit, but will collect royalties for its inventions. That is how it used to be. Today it is much worse.

4.

It requires a lot of creativity (and probably too little morality) in order to erect a monument to Native Americans in the US, nearly exterminated people, a monument that glorifies the sacrifice of the people in the development of a new ‘glorious nation’.²⁴ It cannot have been easy to exterminate Native Americans and to keep writing/standing straight.

Around 30 million people were killed. That was about 95 percent of the population of people who had felt no need to expand their civilisation. Those who spread the European experience carried out the genocide. Killing 30 million people and having the monument say that these people ‘gave themselves and their property’ in order for a glorious nation to arise from those who did the killing – that means laughing in the face of meaning, it is a mockery of truth, it is a prototype of morbid creativity.

A document quoted by Chomsky claims that Native Americans “were not human beings, they were but a nuisance for the ruthless triumph of America”. Perhaps someone (in light of today’s tearing down of value systems) could say that this is no time to question triumph. Winners have always written history. History is nothing more than a historical record by the victors... However, it required skill, dare I say creativity, in order to face literate people with a phrase such as ‘ruthless triumph’.

Not challenging the writing of history based on victory being claimed through weaponry has its consequences. After the Second World War, the socialist order through weapons was imposed as the ideology fought for both by those fighting for their lives and those fighting for their hearths. The victor had incorporated ideology into the victory of his weapons. Opposing Fascism obviously had but a single alternative. The story of citizenry did not exist.

The transitional breakup of Yugoslavia is a similar story. No one ever asked the citizens of the states that emerged from the breakup of Yugoslavia whether they wanted socialism or capitalism instated. The defeat of the Soviet Union, the demolition of the Berlin Wall, and NATO’s strong geo-strategic and media initiative engraved in the consciousness of the citizens of these states the

22

Perhaps the simplest confirmation of such an attitude is contained in the introductory part of *Creativity: The Psychology of Discovery and Invention* by Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, where he states that we are 98% similar to chimpanzees, but that the 2% of difference is in fact the percentage making all the difference through creativity (language, art, science, technology). Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, *Creativity: The Psychology of Discovery and Invention*, Harper Perennial, New York 2013. The introductory chapter: “Setting the Stage”.

23

In *Izazov negativnog (Challenge of the Negative)*, Danko Grlić states: “The lack of freedom is, in fact, only truly at work when it no longer feels like a lack of freedom. And nothing is more capable than technology to

prepare man – precisely because it can provide us with so much prosperity and comfort – for such integration into order, structure, the nameless existence, that it is no longer considered fitting into something alien and even hostile to man. Utter greyness most safely prevents the greyness to be discerned at all.” See: Danko Grlić, *Odabrana djela, Izazov negativnog [Challenge of the Negative]*, Naprijed, Nolit, Zagreb, Belgrade 1988, p. 260.

24

At the beginning of his *Failed States*, Chomsky quotes Alexis de Tocqueville, who noted that the United States of America managed to “exterminate the Indian race (...) without violating a single great principle of morality in the eyes of the world”.

needlessness of questioning. The consequences are catastrophic and smack of the mafia.

But let us remember the beginnings with Native Americans. What is the point of winning if there are so few left to feel vanquished? What sort of a victory is it when Native Americans believe they have made an ‘agreement of souls’ and Europeans take the ace out of their sleeve in the form of ‘consent without consent’? One soul, that of the Native American, sees the immigrant as a soul similar to his own, and wants to reach an agreement. For this soul, words and agreements are sacred. However, the other party has developed the kind of creativity that has broken free of morality.

‘Consent without consent’ is a morbidly ‘creative’ contempt against entire nations, human reason, the ideas of good and justice, and human civilisation. Wealth and expanses have stretched someone’s refusal all the way to consent, rejection to assent, and have thus equated life with death: with the Europeans’ arrival, Native Americans were, in fact, already dead. They only had to understand the fact, and settlers took care of that.

Noam Chomsky recognises a similar ‘creative method’ in assigning different terms to the same thing, depending on whose hands have made it. A certain kind of shaping history is called indoctrination or propaganda in hostile political systems, while the same method is called ‘education’, ‘moral lessons’ or ‘character building’ for domestic needs. This creative method does not suffer from any sort of ‘immature self-criticism’. It is completely free from any critical effort, which is probably what makes it such a success. What is creative in this method is, among other things, how it neglects Marx’s theses about ideology. Like a complete ignorant, the creators of this approach evaluate situations-relations-ideas based on whether they come from the friendly or hostile camp. The fact that the enemy should be respected, that clashing opinions enrich us and further progress, these and similar phrases belong to nations who do not want to ‘ruthlessly triumph’.

The roots of this mechanism, as suggested by Chomsky, lie in ‘diverting attention’. Naturally, he is right. Perhaps, however, one could add a few more things. First of all, even at the level of text put to paper, or, if you will, the level of impulses circulating through neurons, it is obvious that the incompatible is put together and the identical separated. If it dared, common sense would react. But it is in the cave, watching shadows. What little is left of the critical mind in the US is looking at consequences as if they were the feet of a good dribbler.

How can something serve as a moral lesson to the citizens of a nation that wants to ‘ruthlessly triumph’? That very ruthlessness is the basis of the ruthless killing through which it had ‘ruthlessly triumphed’. Apparently, morality was buried with tens of millions of people who had believed in the agreement of souls. Of course, evil creativity can do anything, so it can even see a moral triumph in its ruthlessness, i.e. immorality.

5.

The aura of the creative act was once a form of the immunity of humanity’s organism against drowning in the currents of the rivers of hierarchy. True, more or less every art form had its patron, but the question is who had more use of whom and how much the patron could affect the creator’s Promethean fire. Today, however, when stereotypes have been given the powerful weapon of unification by the tools of multiplication, we have found ourselves in a

situation where the space of goodness, beauty and truth has been narrowed down to individuals, who, much like Truffaut's (Bradbury's) forest people, attempt to keep books from being burnt by learning them by heart.

The low cost of digital technology has created a situation which can be outlined with concepts such as the democratisation of the media, creating a surplus of information, destruction of the value system, the art of manipulating the plurality of the unimportant... Nowadays, books are burnt through the production of their insignificance. The entrepreneurial and corporate success has hitched a ride on the backs of meaning and creativity. This has created an atmosphere that implies the impossibility of the existence of that which does not create profit. Whatever the name of the social order that treats creativity in this way, it is distorted and transient. The last stage of this transience is hiding the grotesque relations under the robes of the creative act.

It has long been understood that, in fact, logic has aspirations towards accuracy, and that it relies on the precision of execution. In this sense, logic lies somewhere beyond creativity. Unfortunately, the shapers of the global public saw logic in introducing that which opposes logic into a system of relations that should be logical, but which carries an aura of acceptability. This is how the creative approach began moving into the empty rooms of logical mazes. However, this creativity is really just the shadow of creation, which serves as a Trojan horse, introducing unacceptable relations into the systems of public communication. Creativity is being introduced as an excuse for all kinds of absurdities.

Mass media have put an inscription above their doors: *No access to anyone who does not understand the industry*. Because the industry is relatively easy to learn, their schools are filled with a mass of mass-media shaped souls, who, having learned the stereotypes, think that they have become creators. The multiplication of their images creates a delusion of divinity within them, so we often encounter empty souls multiplying gossip, who see divinity in their mirrors.

But not even this phase of hiding grotesque relations is what is worst for people. What is pernicious is the mass-media production of consent, indifference, helplessness, passivity, lack of critical thinking, and forgetting the fundamental issues. This is the context in which the very concept of creativity is being changed by the power of stereotypes. Creativity becomes a tool for the industry, a manipulating device for the hierarchy, and a newfound power of seduction and manipulation. The scope of human reliance on intellect is a world of common sense relations. Capitalism is a social system with a common sense character. For it is not difficult to understand, convince someone of it and even seduce the entire world with the common sense story of equal opportunities, dreams and accomplishments. But that does not mean that man (despite the failures throughout history) cannot be more than that.

When it became unquestionable and clear (that is, foggy and inconsequential), creativity was given the form suitable for the expansion into those areas it had previously tried to escape. The aura of creativity is taken over by the economy, directors, communication, technology, management as such, and even accounting. As the new 'engineers of human souls', creative directors know what their customers/principals need. They encourage the profligacy of their teams, but suggest as teamwork those ideas that can serve the fundamental task. In this sense, their engineering approach has less to do with creativity and more with servile innovation.

Creativity is nowadays often referred to as the most important element of business success. Creative business means using innovative forms of communication, sales, technology, management, team coordination, etc.²⁵

The world in which the president of the largest world power resignedly admits that we have become indifferent towards crime is a world which should be used as a mirror by the manufacturers of creative murder weapons, creative drones, creative pornography, the producers of creative killers/mercenaries, and the creative segments of hierarchies which only seek to maintain their position in the hierarchy.

The indifference seen by the president of the US has been recognised by many theorists, sociologists, psychologists, philosophers... The production of consent and the industry of awareness have been more or less openly spoken about since the 1920's. The only novelty is that an important president has become aware of this indifference. Of course, in his way of thinking, this applies only to the example of mass murder in American colleges, and the American public. If he should come down a little from his presidential heights, he would see a world that is divided into a few percent of the rich (and undisciplined) on white cocaine, and the rest of the world, which mainly uses white flour (if it manages to come by it).

When arms producers run out of the market, it is clear that they will try to establish it. They will engage 'creative teams' whose primary task will be finding possible triggers for hatred in some part of the world. It is important that these parts of the world are far from home and that they have some form of economic potential (oil, gold, diamonds, gas, etc.).

6.

The word *creator* once belonged only to God. Only he could truly be the creator of something new. The historic exaltation of the divine in man has set free vast resources of human energy. However, the prefix of humanity brings with it the bipolarity of the energy's quality. The role of deities has been taken over by the people who have realised that it is most profitable to design/create the human consciousness of their subjects. Today, obedience no longer requires unscientific belief in someone or something. Nowadays, obedience is achieved through the hypnotic agents of games, seduction and manipulation.

The big players have become the creators of the game where the Earth is inflated like a balloon. Hundreds of thousands and even millions of movies and shows have been created, where the thesis that the essence of our life lies in following the values prescribed by the investors of these films is repeated ad nauseam. We observe in Chaplin's fashion, most often thinking that we are powerless. Great is the power of the great Inquisitors (big investors, great editors) and if not even Jesus could stand a chance against them (as described by Dostoevsky), the question is what we humans can do.

The great new creators are ready to edit our consciousness through the military, because our consciousness is nothing more than an industrial product to them. An unedited consciousness is a defective product and must be eliminated from the sales chain. When Salvador Dalí advocated for the creation of confusion, because in his opinion it gave freedom to creativity, he naturally did not mean the reading of his viewpoint which would transfer the idea to the geostrategic creation of confusion in those parts of the world that ought to be 'creatively' injected with an interest in oil camouflaged by the décor of democracy. Consciousness edited by the military is nourished by the media edited by the mili-

tary and intelligence. The discipline of beautiful frames breaks the backbone. The hypnotic repetition of mantras gives birth to faith in new mantras. The military-intelligence-media prophets announce the extermination of all other religious hierarchies. The order is determined by tactics and strategy.

Only the greatest world power could have introduced onto the scene the consciousness maintained by the military as a historical project: both the one that is the most powerful in the production of standard weapons, and the one with the most powerful weapons of mass media. Privacy has become a pale intermediary between the generals of the key armies in the production of lies within people.

In *Target: China*, William Engdahl evidences Ralph Peters' glorification of the western Rambo culture of stars, violence, sex and the production of addiction, in the Army War College newspaper.²⁶ Even more interesting is Ralph Peters' admission that this culture is a powerful weapon that the US can use to impose on the world. However, the height of cynicism is reached when such a culture is called the realisation of Karl Marx's dream, or something the believer will reach for rather than the holy book. The author supplements the idea that religion is the opiate of the masses with the thesis that video is the crack of the masses. What can creativity do in a society hooked on crack? How perversely immature does one's thinking have to be in order to interpret Karl Marx so arrogantly, and yet entirely wrong? How conceited is the opinion which believes that it thinks, and yet it has associations linking the reality of the entertainment industry with a life that should be worthy of an emancipated human individual?

But what is particularly hurtful in this imperial shallow thinking is the degradation of truth, goodness and beauty into the glass beads that were once offered to Native Americans and the Incas, and are now, in the form of images on screens – offered around the world. In that sense, one can only conclude that today the only possible creativity is the one speaking from the essence of the artistic – speaking through rebellion. If there is no rebellion, what is at work is likely the participation in the apocalypse of entertainment, transience, empty time, non-existence, the stereotypical, machines, the slavelike zombified inhalation and exhalation of air.

Karl Marx's dream was not the dormant consciousness that accepts ideological stories. On the contrary, he saw in the disenfranchised the energy of change (which is only natural and logical). This has always been so and always will be, so long as man exists. It follows that all efforts to make consciousness uniform by this or that government, all attempts to shape the awareness of hypnotised citizens through the military, to 'creatively' lead them to the world of passivity – must fail sooner or later.

The foundations of such creativity consist of lies, and a house built upon such foundation can only float until it reaches a new, grand, but noble wind.

25

It also means something else, especially at higher levels of large corporations. It turns out that a new creative software installed in cars can create advantage in the sales of these cars. Such a program is undoubtedly beneficial to the corporation. At least until it is detected. It proves to be a powerful means of improving sales. The corporation's 'creative' leaders are not particularly concerned with the fact that the data on environmental pollution is faked. Faster, stronger and better does not also mean

more responsible and more ethical. However, morality and responsibility, at least for now, do not decide the number of cars sold.

26

William F. Engdahl, *Uništite Kinu: što Washington čini da ograniči utjecaj Kine u svijetu* [*Target: China: How Washington and Wall Street Plan to Cage the Asian Dragon*], translated by Branka Maričić, Profil, Zagreb 2014, pp. 254–257.

Sead Alić

Prisvajanje dozvole za stvaralaštvo

Sažetak

Stvaralaštvo se uvijek povezuje sa slobodnom ljudskom djelatnošću, s ljepotom, umjetnošću, ljudskom invencijom, itd. – ona je najčešće nešto prihvatljivo i dobro. Ali što se događa u vrijeme globalne manipulacije? Razvija li ovaj period nove tipove i forme stvaralaštva? Što će nam pokazati analiza rada globalne medijske manipulacije? Ideja članka je ukazati na tamnu stranu stvaralaštva u masovnim medijima. Masovni mediji smanjuju mogućnost kreativne aktivnosti u medijima dok istodobno razvijaju manipulativne oblike stvaralaštva. Ti oblici zahtijevaju da ih se ustanovi, objasni i komentira.

Ključne riječi

bog, religija, manipulacija, politika, mediji, tamna strana stvaralaštva

Sead Alić

Aneignung der Lizenz zur Kreativität

Zusammenfassung

Die Kreativität wird stets mit der freien menschlichen Aktivität, mit der Schönheit, Kunst, den menschlichen Erfindungen usw. assoziiert – größtenteils mit etwas Akzeptablem und Gutem. Was geschieht aber in einer Zeit der globalen Manipulation? Entwickelt diese Periode neue Typen und Formen der Kreativität? Was werden uns die Analysen der Beobachtung der Medienmanipulation durch globale Spieler der Medienindustrie zeigen? Die Idee hinter dem Artikel ist es, die Schattenseiten der Kreativität in den Massenmedien aufzuzeigen. Die Massenmedien reduzieren die Möglichkeit des kreativen Handelns in den Medien. Zugleich entwickeln sie manipulative Formen der Kreativität. Diese Formen erfordern Feststellung, Erklärung und Kommentierung.

Schlüsselwörter

Gott, Religion, Manipulation, Politik, Medien, Schattenseiten der Kreativität

Sead Alić

S'approprier la licence pour la créativité

Résumé

La créativité est toujours associée à l'activité libre de l'humain, à la beauté, à l'art, aux inventions humaines, etc. – elle est considérée la plupart du temps comme quelque chose d'acceptable et de bon. Or, que se passe-t-il en ces temps de manipulation globale ? Cette période développe-t-elle de nouveaux types et de nouvelles formes de créativité ? Que vont montrer les analyses sur les manipulations médiatiques auxquelles se sont livrés les acteurs mondiaux de l'univers des médias ? L'idée sous-jacente de cet article est de montrer le côté sombre de la créativité dans les médias de masse. Ces derniers réduisent la possibilité d'une action créative au sein des médias et développent en parallèle des formes manipulatoires concernant la créativité. Ces formes requièrent une identification, une explication et un commentaire.

Mots-clés

Dieu, religion, manipulation, politique, média, côté sombre de la créativité