

## CHAPTER «PHILOSOPHICAL SCIENCES»

### THE PRODUCTIVITY OF ORDER AND CHAOS IN THE METAMORPHOSIS OF CREATIVITY

Mykola Lipin<sup>1</sup>

Nataliia Husieva<sup>2</sup>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-190-9-10>

*“O caos é uma ordem por decifrar”* [31, p. 105]

**Abstract.** An important feature of the contemporary human situation is the ever-increasing speed of sociocultural, economic and political transformations. Today, any stable elements are only temporary zones of stability, moments of «order» in a stream of «chaos». This situation leads to the actualization of the proportion of order and chaos in the existence of modern human beings and society. The deployment of the creative forces of the individual in the post-industrial economy leads to a total deconstruction of all the fundamental foundations of social being, and the creative activity of individuals begins to be interpreted as one of the manifestations of chaos, as «productive destruction». As a result, uncertainty, chaos, disorder, and risk are the result of the creative activity of «Prometheus Unbound» (H. Jonas). Purpose of the paper. It is important to investigate what forms human creative activity takes in modern conditions, what threats and prospects it can create as an irrational, chaotic force. Methodology. The study was conducted using the methods of theoretical generalization, comparative analysis, analysis and synthesis, which allowed to identify the educational content of nihilism as a revaluation of values. Scientific novelty. It is proved that chaos, irrational activity, as well as order, reasonable purposefulness,

---

<sup>1</sup> Doctor of Philosophy, Professor at the Department of Philosophy, Sociology and Political Science, Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics, Ukraine

<sup>2</sup> Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor at the Department of Philosophy, Sociology and Political Science, Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics, Ukraine

can erase the individual, dissolve it in the totality of the common. Each of these can form the basis of a special, totalitarian principle, indifferent to development. Chaos is the totality of the irrational. Order is the totality of the rational. Their interaction, then, is expressed as a flickering embodiment of a repressive totality in which all difference dissolves. Chaos appears as the controlled result of a hidden order, and the desire to organize the social world results in the spread of disorder and irrational consequences. On the contrary, creativity opens up a world beyond the extremes of order (law) and chaos (randomness). But this becomes possible in the space of vital, universal forms of human interaction and address to others and to oneself. People cease to be torn between the determinism of order and the arbitrariness of chaos when they enter the realm of caring interpersonal relationships created by humans. It is in them that the image of wholeness opens up, which is then realized in the interaction of community members with each other and society with nature. Creativity is always addressed to another person, it has an addressee, and therefore is dialogic. The search for completeness from which any creative act springs requires the other as co-creator, as one who is able to reflect the intent of the creator and through this to continue the creative process, to sustain life in the work. Hence the significance of the past for present creativity is revealed. In turn, the increasing efficiency of the rationalization of the social system is accompanied by a loss of meaning in the world around modern people. The connection of individual things into the unity of the world, of disconnected actions into the justification of personal destiny, of diverse thoughts, impressions, ideas, and desires into subjective identity is broken.

### 1. Introduction

The transformations of modernity in the direction of «post» are accompanied by a disintegration of the «reasonable order» of the social system into a multiplicity of multidirectional streams. In the past, the social system was constituted by reducing empirical diversity to a certain unity. Since the modern era, rationality has acted as a homogenizing principle. On the other hand, the postmodern era postulates the fundamental impossibility of reducing the various forces and currents of social existence to a single basis. As a consequence, the elements of the once coherent human world are fragmented. Henceforth it appears not so much as an ordered unity as

a «rhizome» [23, p. 3–4]. An important feature of the new mode of human existence is the ever-increasing speed of sociocultural, economic and political transformations. Today, any stable elements are only temporary zones of stability, moments of «order» in a stream of «chaos. It is clear that this situation leads to the actualization of the relationship between «order» and «chaos» in the existence of modern people and society.

The immersion of the human «life world» into «chaosmos» [29, p. 128] is accompanied by the revival of the idea of the world as a space of violence. In this context creativity begins to be treated as one of its moments, as «productive destruction». The deployment of the creative forces of the individual in the post-industrial economy leads to a complete deconstruction of all the fundamentals of social existence. Uncertainty, chaos, disorder and risk are the products of the creative activity of the «Prometheus Unbound» [28]. Therefore, it is important to investigate what forms human creative activity takes in modern conditions, what threats and prospects it can create.

## **2. The potential for creativity in a complex world**

In the context of socio-economic transformation, which is constantly accelerating, people' ability to organize their own existence is problematic. There are no longer any habitual reference points in one's space of life that could indicate the «right» way. In the past, people chose their life strategy options on the basis of the small number of possibilities that traditional society could offer them. The cyclical nature of agricultural activity created a ritual and tradition that absorbed risk, uncertainty and chaos. In previous eras, uncertainty was not less, but rather more than it is now. However, the saving wall of tradition separated order from chaos and, by clearly marking them, located each of them. Chaos was separated and tamed by order, enabling man to participate in the attainment of a certain goal of life's strategy. They dealt with «harmonized» chaos, that is, the kind that pulsed under the shell of the cosmos. Even when this shell collapsed, one knew that this was only a temporary deviation from the cosmic harmony, which would surely be restored. A significant role in the maintenance of such a worldview was played by the experience of the past, recorded in the ritual.

We are currently deprived of this experience. Partly because of its inadequacy in the context of the constant acceleration of sociocultural processes, and partly because of the discrediting and loss of trust in tradition

as such. For previous eras, the past determined the present and the future. Man was bound by the chain of the past, but at the same time protected by a meaningful tradition containing certain ways of self-realization. Otherwise, than through the experience of past generations, a person could not join them. Individual freedom was limited not so much by external coercion as by the immanent limitations of human existence. That is, the individual was «not ready» for personal freedom. Therefore, the purpose of activity under ordinary conditions was set externally, and one could only diligently follow one's «vocation». Belonging to an ancestry, family or tribe provided humans with an ordering of the world, turning it into a «big family»: in parallel with the ordering of the outer world there is an ordering of the inner world. If the chaos outside unfolds into a space, the chaos inside unfolds into a microcosm.

Despite the slow pace of development, traditional society contains the creative potential, but directs it towards strengthening the foundations of collective existence. That is why, in most cases, tradition directs society's gaze to the past rather than to the future (for example, within the mythological worldview, the point of reference for social progress is in the past). Creative activity here is aimed at reproducing a standard, which, for example, is revealed in the myth of the Golden Age. Creativity is therefore understood as an engagement with an ideal defined in the past; it does not destroy, but rather strengthens the existing order. Even Utopia, which goes back to the works of Plato, unfolds its own space, drawing material from notions of a past ideal society.

Obviously, modernity is realized in the attempt to become something different from the tradition of reproducing the past in the present. It begins precisely as a rejection of tradition, its destruction, a break with the reality that tradition represents. J.-F. Lyotard wrote: «Today we suspect that this 'gap' is not so much a way of surpassing the past as a way of forgetting and repressing it, that is, of repeating it» [12, p. 106]. The repressed past suddenly returns to people, despite all attempts to escape into the future. Hence the constant cloning of the prefix «post-»: modern, post-modern, post-post-modern [14, p. 174]. This process of reproduction, repetition of the same thing indicates the inability to go beyond the «present».

But now the energy of the past no longer protects people from the chaos and uncertainty associated with it. The point is that not only has time lost

confidence in the past, people no longer trust the future either. In the situation of the constant reproduction of a «devastated present» [24], both the past and the future are lost. A consequence of this social condition is the absence of a clear purpose for human existence that would give meaning to the creative activity of the individual. Alongside rationalized individual activity unfolds irrational chaos as a reflection of the lack of a universal context of human existence. Partial rationality is contrasted with the irrationality of the whole. This situation arises as a consequence of the dominance of such purposefulness, which is devoid of purpose. Paradoxically, the increasing rationalization of the social system is accompanied by a loss of meaning in the surrounding world. The connection of individual things into the unity of the world, of disparate actions into the justification of personal destiny, of various thoughts, impressions, ideas, and desires into the identity of the subject, is broken.

In this context, it is important to understand the relationship between the ideas of progress inherent in the modern era and the creative essence of man. The former served as a reference point for individual self-determination: the individuals were aware of themselves as creators of history. In addition, they had to create, rejecting tradition, from themselves, that is, from nothing. The flip side of the creative potential of the idea of progress is the destructive attitude to the «connection of times» [27]. The modern era denies its connection to the previous history of mankind, it struggles with it, trying to overcome it. In fact, it begins history with itself alone, contrasting it with the mythological epoch.

The peculiar self-isolation of modern society acts as the reverse side of the process of formation of the atomized modern European individual. Society, which begins history with itself, is deprived of a «living tradition». The individual confronting society is deprived of caring participation in the common-sense reality of human existence. In this case creativity is presented as repulsion, isolation, and destruction, rather than connection, involvement, and imitation. In creative activity the realization of the subject's autonomy is achieved, which is thought of as freedom from external coercion. However, the achievement of freedom through the destruction of tradition causes unconscious dependence on it, enclosed in the desire for the new. «Those who, relying on the objectivity of their methods and denying their own historical conditionality, consider themselves free from prejudice, feel

the power of these prejudices, which dominate them without any control on their part, as a kind of *vis a tergo*» [5, p. 424]. «Unconscious tradition» affects all human endeavors, regardless of their aspirations. The creation of the new turns into the reproduction of obsolete meanings and content in an innovative form. Therefore, the «new» is infected with the «tradition» virus even before it is born. The duration of such novelty begins to be measured in moments. Gradually, the goals of human activity, which were defined by the idea of progress, turn into tradition and thus lose their legitimacy.

### 3. Creating goals and disrupting the whole

The destruction of grand narratives in the twentieth century was nothing less than the destruction of those sense-goals that have been dominant for European culture since modern times. It should be emphasized that «purpose» is one of the basic concepts that define «order in any form of the dynamic human world. Purpose does not allow for multiplicity. Only one goal can make sense of the disorder. As soon as the goal multiplies or constantly changes, the movement becomes chaotic» [15, p. 7–8]. Thus, the destruction of goals capable of mobilizing the diversity of human life in a single meaningful pursuit leads to an unprecedented expansion of the boundaries of chaos and disorder.

Creativity enters reality together with chaos as a possibility of new being. However, it should be emphasized that chaos does not only refer to the process of giving birth to the new, but also to the destruction of the «old», and thus potentially contains the possibility of violence. Therefore, the destiny of creativity is closely linked to violence and destruction, and the creation of the new to the destruction of the old. Within this understanding, chaos usually begins to be identified with irrational factors and, from a social perspective, with anarchy and uncertainty. Now such ideas are being revived under the aegis of the synergetic approach. For example, according to S. Kurdyumov's point of view, synergetics allows one to understand «destruction as a creative principle, and 'passion for destruction' as a creative passion, as M. Bakunin wrote» [10, p. 65]. As a result of this transformation of the ideas of the founders of anarchism, creativity appears as a process of liberation from the past, which suggests that the new is born only on the wreckage of the old. This expresses the negative dependence of modernity on the past, the impossibility of getting rid of it. «Those who flee

are not yet free, because in their flight, they are still conditioned by what they are fleeing from», G. W. F. Hegel observed on this subject [6, p. 233].

The emphasis on the chaotic nature of creativity is an echo of the «cult of reason» with its claim to be the universal force that organizes and regulates the world. Within this «rational order», creativity appears as a subordinate moment of human existence. It is made official. Despite numerous attempts, the modern era has failed to define the creative principle as an otherness of reason. It is enough to recall the uncertainty of I. Kant talking about the role of reason and productive imagination in the process of cognition, as a result of which creativity, intuition and imagination fall under the suspicion of irrationality [13, p. 82]. This assumes that reason has no boundaries, that is, there is nothing that could be fundamentally alien to it. Therefore, creativity is opposed to discursive thinking, which is brought to it from the outside. At the same time, I. Kant does not deny the possibility of «intuitive reasoning». «We can think of a reason which, because it is not discursive, as ours is, but intuitive, goes from the synthetically general (knowledge of the whole as such) to the partial, that is, from the whole to the parts...» [9, p. 248]. However, «intuitive thinking» turns out to be inherent not in the human but in the «divine mind», that is, it is external to the human being.

The chaotic and irrational character of creativity in new European culture stems from the fact that it is formed on the basis of a market economy. The dominant type of rationality in this dimension is «discursive reasoning». This type of thinking unfolds in the context of civil society and is an expression of the interaction of individuals acting as individuals whose goal is the satisfaction of their own interests. The main goal of their activity is their own self-affirmation. According to G. W. F. Hegel, the system of civil society can be seen «as a state of need and reason» [7, p. 228]. The necessity of satisfying a need through «instrumental» reasoning is the basis of the dominance of common sense, which excludes creativity as an unnecessary, redundant and risky element.

Creativity is usually understood as something beyond the norm of human existence, that is, as an anomaly [13, p. 81–83]. However, such notions are based on the assumption that normal, natural is a reproductive, non-creative human existence. Now that calls for «creativity» are a habitual part of our daily routines, creativity is simultaneously perceived as one of the most valuable and rare resources and as something underlying economic activity.

However, the «creative destruction» on which entrepreneurial activity is based is quite different from actual creative activity. Capitalism, the essence of which, according to J. Schumpeter, is «creative destruction» [32, p. 83], leads to the leveling of creativity, its mechanization and utilization. The growing demand for creativity leads to its displacement and replacement by innovative creativity.

### 4. Order, chaos and revolution

The social order based on formal-logical rationality is accompanied by latent violence and disorder. It is the revolutionary explosion that elevates this type of rationality and its latent absolutization of force to the rank of a dominant principle. Struggle, anarchy and freedom are the founders of order. Life as a whole is nothing but the transition of chaos into order and vice versa. According to this logic, «struggle is life» and disorder is a life-giving force [11, p. 48]. Instead, order appears as a static, dogmatic and repressive principle that oppresses life. It is clear that creativity in this context is associated with chaos and reproductive activity with order. As P.A. Kropotkin wrote in the second half of the 19th century, disorder «is the uprising of thought on the eve of revolution; it is the destruction of superstitions sanctified by the static nature of previous centuries; it is the appearance of a whole stream of new ideas and daring discoveries; it is the solution of the most difficult, complex scientific problems that accompany any revolutionary awakening» [11, p. 61]. Now it is possible to observe the revival of the ideals of the «revolutionary worldview» in various branches of social and humanitarian thought.

The age of Enlightenment finally established the idea that true creativity is possible only on the basis of destruction. Recall that the self-creation of the Age of Modernity took place precisely as the destruction of the medieval heritage, the rejection of its inherent prejudices. Obviously, this process could not take place outside the actualization of the discourse of force and violence. Therefore, for example, K. Marx's belief that revolutionary violence is «the midwife of any old society when it is pregnant with the new» is quite logical in modern times [18, p. 695]. In the Modern Age, struggle, disorder and competition are the sources of the birth of the «modern». The social system of the Modern Age is formed within a framework of chaos and violence. The «reason» of modernity emerges from irrational principles,



and social peace emerges from war. It is civil society that forms the space of order only on the surface, but within it there is a constant fierce struggle (competition). Here «discursive reasoning» receives justification for the use of violence, even if limited by law, but still violence. There is a sacralization of power.

In connection with the above, it is worth noting that the absolutization of the ordering principle, which at that time was reason, was due to the power of irrational, chaotic forces within the framework of the Modern era. Reason, like order, is only one, outer pole of new European culture.

Note that, for modern consciousness, everything associated with disorder has been pushed to the margins of civilization. Order is thought of as the «realm of reason», providing universal, orderly maxims for life, while violence is exclusively in the «territory» of chaos. The result is that rational order is contrasted with disorder, which appears as a sphere of violence and destruction. Disorder appears devoid of the «voice of reason». If speech is a means of self-representation of a reasonable person, violence is numbed, it does not need to be addressed to another [30, p. 96]. This situation results in a peculiar distinction: those who possess a «voice of reason» are on the side of civilization, while those who remain on the side of barbarism are proclaimed supporters of «voiceless violence» [1, p. 265]. Through this division into «friends» and «enemies», violence is silenced but not eliminated. The consequence of this repression is the failure of modernity to recognize that violence and chaos are immanent to it. Therefore, modernity recognizes in art only its own productive dimension, but overlooks the consequences that accompany the purposeful construction of a «civilized» society. Postmodernism goes even further, developing creative, «painless» ways of consuming violence. Through creativity there is an aestheticization of pain and cruelty. Hence the desire to give reality the appearance of a frivolous game and violence a virtual character.

The institutionalization of revolutionary movements transforms undisguised physical violence into an implicit, disciplined form, but it does not disappear forever, but only acquires another form. In other words, the chaos generated by «creative destruction» is not replaced by order, but continues to exist in it. Chaos only takes the form of order, constantly threatening to destroy it. It is therefore impossible to see in recent history the triumphant march of order and reason alone. Assuming that civil order is a struggle that continues

by other means, it becomes possible to imagine the tension that lurks beneath the shell of rational ordering. From M. Foucault's point of view, there is a conviction in the Modern era that the political order does not arise as a result of the end of the war of all against all. Society, law and state «seem to embody a state of truce... Law is not a way of truce, because in the presence of law, war continues to rage within all, even the most orderly mechanisms of power. It is war that drives institutions and order: even the smallest manifestations of peace are generated by war. In other words, it is necessary to identify the presence of war in the world: war is a code for peace. Thus, we are all at war with each other; the war front constantly pervades the entire society. ... There is no one who remains neutral. Involuntarily everyone is an opponent of the other. The structure of society turns out to be binary», the scientist wrote on this subject [21, p. 67–68].

The Modern era does not reject chaos, but places it alongside the «realm of reason». Within this dualism, they seem torn and opposed to each other. When order seeks to eradicate disorder from itself, it generates it as its own, albeit unwanted (i.e., unconscious), opposite [25, p. 459]. Thus, civilization, which has encompassed all spheres of social existence by control and organization, suddenly encounters the uncontrollable disorder that emerges within it. Barbarism turns out to be the inverse of civilization. The «light of reason» is followed by its shadow, chaos. And each of them does not recognize its reflection in its opposite.

The consequence of this dualism is the absence of a source of development within order, and thus of the reason on which it is based. Order appears as a kind of immutability, or, in other words, as a quantitative transformation of the same quality. Progress, then, is not the emergence of qualitatively different forms of human coexistence, but the limitless extension of the boundaries of that form which in the modern era has proclaimed itself the embodiment of rational order. But if such an order contains no source of development, then the creative capacity for change is something external to it. Therefore, creativity is opposed to rationality and is on the side of the irrational principle, chaos. Reason here organizes and preserves the existing, while creativity gives birth to the new. It is quite logical that this birth of the new is combined with the destruction of the old, since without violence it is impossible to overcome the resistance to the status quo, which does not allow the new to unfold.

However, the «rational order» that displaces chaos as the source of creativity is in fact based on an unreflexive mind, that is, a mind that is not aware of the objective foundations of its own activity, but acts unconsciously. Similarly, «discursive reasoning» works unconsciously when one displaces violence as something external to oneself. In addition to recognizing the violence inherent in «instrumental rationality», reason remains «blind» and thus powerless to control the «irrational» forces within itself. According to J. Bataille, the recognition of the inherent nature of human existence is linked precisely to the achievement of self-awareness. Modern humans need this «in order to limit the sphere of influence of destructive means, to strive for what they fully aspire to, namely, to have these means at their disposal if they feel the need, using them, however, further within the limits determined by self-consciousness, and resolutely abandoning them to the extent that they lose the ability to oppose them» [17, p. 101].

Consequently, consciousness, unaware of the presence of the chaotic principle in itself, loses the ability to control it. It falls under the power of «enchanted» chaos and thus becomes a hostage of its own «means», which as a result substitute for the goal up to its complete denial. But without «purpose», as we already know, there is no order, and chaos never achieves formality. Thus, a «rational order» devoid of reflexive self-consciousness turns into its opposite, a disorder in which violence is committed first in the name of reason and then as an end in itself, as «productive destruction».

The «unreflexive order» presupposes chaos as its continuation. In other words, it imagines chaos and disorder as an «imperfect order», that is, an order that has been distorted as a result of imperfect human thinking and activity [32, p. 81–87]. But in reality, this ordering of sociocultural space depends on creative chaos, it needs it for its continued existence. It is therefore important to emphasize that the «passion for destruction» is sanctioned by the most «reasonable order».

The Modern era needs a crisis for its effective development, and this tendency is particularly acute in the economy. As is known, the violation of equilibrium here is a source of further development. Let us note that it is creative activity that causes the destruction of equilibrium. The subject of creative destruction is the entrepreneur, who in search of new sources of enrichment ruthlessly destroys old, inefficient forms of capital accumulation. It is this, its infinite need, that causes the constant

acceleration of transformation. As is known, the functioning of the modern economy depends on how quickly things appear and disappear in this world. This is precisely the point of innovative development – it undermines the stability of the system for the sake of profit. The irrational rationality of the «economic man» generates constant changes in the socio-economic system, which eventually leads to its plunge into the space of dynamic chaos. According to G. Deleuze, the latter can be defined as «an accelerated movement where everything has time to be only the ‘beginning of the end» [8, p. 51]. In this case, the ability to see the one in the motley multiplicity is lost. But at the same time, the ability to identify the difference, the certainty of things, is lost. Therefore, the connection between one certainty and another is excluded – everything is «erased» in continuous flicker with enormous speed of appearance and disappearance [8, p. 60]. Consequently, it is possible to interpret chaos as an order within which transformations have acquired enormous speed. From the static point of view, it contains many possibilities, but in the context of dynamics they all merge into a nebulous wasteland.

Thus chaos appears as «emptiness, but not non-existence, but virtuality, which contains all possible particles and which takes all possible forms that, as soon as they arise, instantly disappear, without sequence or reference, without consequences», write F. Guattari and J. Deleuze [8, p. 135]. This emptiness also captures the meaningful horizons of human existence. The economic power of modern society, through constant acceleration, is «chaoticizing» the world. At the same time, social connections between people, which are increasingly mediated by violence and coercion, are subject to «chaoticism», that is, indistinctness, uncertainty.

### **5. The repressiveness of order and chaos**

In our view, violence is a sign of the formalization of human relations, the destruction of the living immediacy of their social ties. The point is that violence is demanded only when one tries to achieve one’s goal not thanks to the other person, but in spite of that person, at the other person’s expense. Creativity also manifests itself as violence when the goal of activity is carried out not because of the objective meaning of the world, but in spite of it. The imposition of partial, abstract, «dead», meaningless forms always generates violence. Therefore, the need generated by scarcity,

emptiness, never reaches the actual forms of creativity. After all, it sees in the world the space of its own realization, of its own self-affirmation. But what is asserted here is not individual freedom, but only what is permitted by the prevailing principles of empirical existence. What is available is perceived as an absolute limit beyond which it is impossible and unnecessary to cross. In other words, the individual, trying to turn the world into manipulative material, is unreflectively (uncreatively) set within the framework of existing «values». They are external and indifferent to the individual. Therefore, its activity is always an attempt to free itself from their limiting influence, and the entire value universe acts as a huge set of repressive institutions. As a result, the innermost desire for such unreflexive self-affirmation becomes the absence of all values and norms, that is, the only desire becomes arbitrariness. Within this framework of reasoning, it becomes clear that the other person in the horizon of arbitrariness is another limitation over which the self-affirming individual seeks to gain the upper hand. But in creativity, the self-affirmation of the individual is limitless, and the struggle here is a struggle with one's own limitations. Creativity itself is a process, not a givenness, so it makes no sense to try to measure creativity solely in terms of results.

Creativity is always addressed to another person, it has an addressee, and therefore is *dialogic* [31, p. 103–104]. The search for completeness from which any creative act springs requires the other as co-creator, as one who is able to reflect the intent of the creator and through this to continue the creative process, to sustain life in the work. In this way, the significance of the past for present creativity is revealed. Thus, for example, the lack of a living connection with the past can be compensated for by various kinds of traditionalism. However, this appeal to the past is inherently affected by utilitarian interest, which causes the impossibility of giving tradition a modern meaning. «The forces that cling to what no longer holds, that insist on the continuation of the familiar, become the more senseless (i.e., violent) the more exhausted their content, they—the senseless forces—occupy the place of their ‘dead gods’. The more devastated the «beliefs» on behalf of which the nonsensical forces – whether ‘Western’ or ‘Eastern’ – act, the more insistently they call for a return to tradition, and the more aggressively their fundamentalism. They carry with them only their own emptiness and an end without a beginning [3, p. 7].

Thus, an order established by violence is only a partial order, a formal order that has lost its capacity for development. Similarly, «creative activity», dominated by destruction and violence, appears only as formal creativity (the creation of new things), but in reality, such activity is only a means of satisfying partial interests. True creativity does not destroy the old order, but overcomes it, that is, introduces it into the new whole. Thus, the «old order» does not disappear completely; it retains its existence, but not as a whole, but as a part within the new whole. In other words, it enters into a dialogue with other regimes of order. Understanding creativity as the destruction of the old, as making room for the new, is one-sided and abstract. It reproduces the linear logic inherent in the 19th-century idea of progress, where tradition (the old) must be destroyed precisely in order for modernity (the new) to emerge on its fragments.

The widespread definition of creativity as a product of the new is a consequence of the cult of continuous modernization inherent in the age of Enlightenment. Novelty here appears as an obsession in all spheres of social existence. «The very idea of modernity is closely related to the principle that it is possible and necessary to overcome tradition and establish some entirely new way of life and thinking» [12, p. 106]. Moreover, the speed of modernization correlates with the rate of growth of the number of things to forget, and reaches unprecedented proportions in our time. The need for constant acceleration stems from the need to model transformation in the perspective of the threat of failure into chaos. The cult of progress through an existential lens is an escape from nothingness. The abstract order is doomed to flee chaos because of its focus on the future, but this is why the present loses its self-value and finds itself at the mercy of nothingness. The present becomes meaningful only through constant movement into the future. Only there does it acquire meaning and significance. What happens is what H. Lübbe called the «reduction of the present» [16].

In fact, the new European «modernity» recognizes progress as the reproduction of the same. To remain stable, however, such a system must constantly accelerate its own self-renewal. As a consequence, there is a «reduction of the present» that leads to its logical conclusion – «the end of history» (F. Fukuyama) [26]. The great explosion of creative energy reaches its limit at the end of the twentieth century, and «creative entropy» begins. The modern era begins with revolutions and ends with innovations.

In another perspective, this tendency is directed from the attempt at conscious self-determination of the new European individual to the passive omnipotence of the «silent majority» (J. Baudrillard) [22, p. 19–29]. This is why H. Arendt's warning is relevant now: «one can imagine that the Modern era, which began with such an unprecedented and unprecedentedly promising activation of all human abilities and activities, will eventually end in the most static, the most sterile passivity that history has ever known» [1, p. 402].

It should be understood that chaos is not only a source of creativity, but also a cause of passivity. In a situation of lack of purpose and meaning in human activity, intrinsic motivation disappears, just as in a situation of complete emancipation of all spheres of social existence comes complete apathy. One finds oneself in a state of indifference to the many opportunities that modernity supposedly offers. Passivity and apathy are caused by an inability to truly create and an overwhelming need to choose.

An appeal to chaos, uncertainty and disorder is a modern way of recreating lost wholeness. Whereas in the modern era human existence was presented as a reasonably ordered space, at the end of the nineteenth century it is already presented as irrational chaos. For modernity, humans are rational figures capable of arbitrarily transforming the world around them and themselves. For postmodernism, humans are the center of disorder and randomness. They cannot cope either with the world around them or with themselves. The integrity of the world exploded with chaos outside and inside. The reason for this explosion is the constant growth of the «concentration of innovation» of the socio-economic system. Contrary to Proudhon, order now breeds anarchy, which declares the former source of science, progress and organization – reason – an obstacle to knowledge and progress. «Without 'chaos' there is no knowledge. Without frequent rejection of reason there is no progress», P. Feyerabend notes [20, p. 322]. The problem, however, is that the creative principle in this «chaos» continues to be an accident. Instead, the question remains: how to turn creativity into a norm of human existence?

Another important aspect of the relationship between chaos and order, creativity and reason is the problem of the meaningfulness of the possibility of their coexistence. The point is that it is impossible to realize these processes from a position of chaos or irrational creativity. In rejecting

reason, it is meaningless to speak of progress. It is necessary not to reject reason, but to supplement it to its wholeness. More precisely, it is not reason that should be supplemented, but reason («instrumental reason»). Reason does not oppose creativity and imagination, but contains them in itself as an organic moment. The reason is based on serving the functions of adaptation and use, but «the competence of the mind (along with productive imagination) is creative transformation» [4, p. 33]. If, in keeping with the classical philosophical tradition, a distinction is drawn between reason and reason, it becomes clear that reason is not opposed to the chaos of creation. Rather, it is a cultural-historical way of making sense of them, of turning them into a meaningful process. Human beings are creatures in need of meaning. Human beings are «islands of common sense, which as naturally and inevitably arose out of chaos. But if chaos can be understood on the basis of this «island of common sense», then common sense is incomprehensible on the basis of chance» [2, p. 533]. Therefore, creativity cannot be identified with chaos and disorder. It very quickly exhausts itself when it loses the involvement of reason or tradition.

Thus, intelligent, cultural creativity is realized not only in ready-made things, but above all in the existence of the human being. The source of all creativity is the search for human authenticity, the attempt to give meaning to the chaos of empirical moments. In this context, the opinion of K. Svasyan is relevant, according to which culture is «man, homo totus, imprinted in all the potential of semantic realizations; it is the cult (or rather, the cultivation) of human existence, the painful and long transformation of this existence, from a given material to a vivid artistic form» [19, p. 228]. The inability to see human similarity in the various fragments of culture leads to likening it to a stream of disjointed fragments, that is, to chaos (barbarism). In contrast, attempts to curb creative disorder are identified as civilization (order). In each, fixed in its isolation, the need to participate in the overall constitution of human existence fades away. Creativity then gives way to adaptation to supra-individual structures.

### 6. Conclusions

Chaos, like order, can erase the singular, dissolving it into the totality of the common. Each can become the basis of a special, totalitarian principle, indifferent to development. Chaos is the totality of the irrational. Order is the



totality of the rational. Their «dialogue» then manifests itself as a flickering mask of repressive totality in which all difference dissolves. Chaos appears as the controlled result of a hidden order, and the desire to order the social world turns into the spread of disorder and irrational consequences.

On the contrary, creativity opens the world beyond the extremes of order (law) and chaos (randomness). But this becomes possible in the space of vital, universal forms of human interaction and address to others and to oneself. People cease to be torn between the determinism of order and the arbitrariness of chaos when they enter the space of caring interpersonal relationships created by people. It is in these that we discover an image of wholeness, which is then realized in the interactions of community members with each other and of society with nature.

The overcoming of classical metaphysics, begun by F. Nietzsche continues today, not simply destroying «metaphysical» values, but replacing them with «new» ones. Reason, order, rationality and integrity give way to instinct, chaos, irrationality and difference. Contemporary transformations of worldviews are caused by transformations of the human position in the world. First, the integrity of the human world was destroyed, and only then did the process spread to the realm of nature. In other words, chaos, which has become immanent to human daily existence, manifests itself in the chaotic nature. Now, however, chaos is mostly perceived only from the outside: humans do not recognize in the external disorder a reflection of their inner state.

Thus, an appeal to chaos, uncertainty, and disorder is a modern attempt to recreate the foundations of the creative self-determination of the individual. However, the cause of chaotic life lies not so much in the plane of physical discovery as in the dimension of disintegration of social relations. Directed toward self and others, «productive destruction» turns human relationships into meaningless temporary contacts. Hence the growing role of violence in our lives, which appears as a way of holding, seducing and enslaving one person by another. The dehumanization of social relations generates the need for power and violence. In this case, creativity appears as a means of aestheticizing the impersonal mode of human existence in the space of «chaosmos».

### References:

1. Arendt, H. (2000). *Vita activa, ili O deyatel'noy zhizni* [Vita active, The Human Condition] / trans. by V.V. Bibikhina. Sankt-Peterburg: Aleteyya. (in Russian)
2. Arslanov, V. G. (2007). *Postmodernizm i russkiy «tretiy put'»: tertium datur rossyskoy kul'tury XX veka* [Postmodernism and the Russian «third way»: tertium datur of Russian culture of the XX century]. Moscow: Kul'turnaya revolyutsiya. (in Russian)
3. Akhutin, A. V. (2005). *Povorotnye vremena* [Turning times]. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka. (in Russian)
4. Voznyak, V. S. (2019). *Vrazumlenie kak neobkhodimyy vektor sovremennoy politiki v obrazovanii* [Explanation as a necessary vector of modern politics in education]. *Vestnik Kazakhstansko-Amerikanskogo Svobodnogo Universiteta. Nauchnyy zhurnal*, no. 4, pp. 19–25. (in Russian)
5. Gadamer, Kh.-G. (1988). *Istina i metod. Osnovy filosofskoy germeneytiki* [Truth and Method. Philosophical Hermeneutics] / trans. by M. A. Zhurinskaya, S. M. Zemlyanoy; Obshch. red. B. N. Bessonova. Moscow: Progress. (in Russian)
6. Hegel, G. (1990). *Filosofiya prava* [Philosophy of law] / trans. by D. A. Kerimov i V.S. Nersesyants. Moscow: Mysl'. (in Russian)
7. Hegel, G. (1974). *Entsiklopediya filosofskikh nauk: V 5 t.* [Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences] / trans. by B. Stolpnera; ed. by A. Deborina, N. Kareva. Moscow: Mysl'. T. 1. (in Russian)
8. Delez, Zh., Gvattari, F. (2009) *Chto takoe filosofiya?* [What is philosophy?]/ trans. by S. Zenkina. Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt. (in Russian)
9. Kant, I. (1994). *Sochineniya: V 8 tomakh* [Works: in 8 volumes] / trans by Yu.N. Popova. Moscow: Choro. (in Russian)
10. Knyazeva, E. N., Kurdyumov, S. P. (2002). *Osnovaniya sinergetiki. Rezhimy s obostreniem, samoorganizatsiya, tempomiry* [Foundations of synergetics. Regimes with aggravation, self-organization, tempowords]. Sankt-Peterburg: Aleteyya. (in Russian)
11. Kropotkin, P. (2004). *Anarkhiya, ee filosofiya, ee ideal: Sochineniya* [Anarchy, its philosophy, its ideal: Works]. Moscow: Eksmo. (in Russian)
12. Lyotard, J.-F. (2008). *Postmodern v izlozhenii dlya detey: Pis'ma: 1982–1985* [Postmodern in presentation for children: Letters: 1982–1985] / trans. and ed. by A.V. Garadzhi. Moscow: Ros. gos. gumanit. un-t. (in Russian)
13. Lipin, M. V. (2019). *Tvorchistj ta kreatyvniyj: sposoby ljudsjkogho isnuvannja.* [Creative work and creativity as a way of human existence]. *Visnyk Kyjivsjkogho nacionaljnogho torghoveljno-ekonomichnogho universytetu*, no. 1, pp. 79–91. (in Ukrainian)
14. Lipin, M. V. (2018). *Osvita v modyfikacijakh suchasnogho svitu* [Education in modifications of the modern world]. Kyiv: Kyiv. nac. torgh.-ekon. un-t. (in Ukrainian)
15. Arutyunova, N. D. (Ed.). (2003). *Logicheskij analiz yazyka. Kosmos i khaos. Kontseptual'nye polya poryadka i besporyadka* [Logical analysis of the language. Space and chaos. Conceptual fields of order and disorder]. Moscow: Indrik. (in Russian)

16. Lübbe, H. (1994). V nogu so vremenem. O sokrashchenii nashego prebyvaniya v nastoyashchem [In step with the times. The shortened stay in the present] / trans. by N. S. Plotnikova. *Voprosy filosofii*, no. 4, pp. 94–113. (in Russian)
17. Markov, B. V. (2001). *Znaki bytiya* [Signs of being]. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka. (in Russian)
18. Marx, K. (1983). *Protsess proizvodstva kapitala: Kn. 1. Kapital. Kritika politicheskoy ekonomii* [Capital. A Critique of Political Economy. Volume I: The Process of Production of Capital] / trans. by I. I. Stepanova-Skvortsova. Moscow: Politizdat. (in Russian)
19. Svasyan, K. A. (1989). *Filosofiya simvolicheskikh form E. Kassirera* [Philosophy of symbolic forms by E. Cassirer]. Erevan: Izdatel'stvo AN ArmSSR. (in Russian)
20. Feyerabend, P. (1986). *Izbrannye trudy po metodologii nauki* [Selected Works on Science Methodology] / trans. and ed. by I. S. Narskiy. Moscow: Progress. (in Russian)
21. Foucault, M. (2005). *Nuzhno zashchishchat' obshchestvo: Kurs lekt-siy, pročitannykh v Kollezh de Frans v 1975–1976 uchebnom godu* [Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège De France, 1975–1976] / trans. by E.A. Samarskoy. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka. (in Russian)
22. Baudrillard, J. (2007). *In the Shadow of the Silent Majority, or The End of the Social* / trans. by P. Foss, P. Patton and J. Johnston. New York: Semiotext.
23. Deleuze, G., Guattari, F. (1988). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* / trans. by Brian Massumi. London: Athlone Press.
24. Eriksen, T. (2001). *Tyranny of the Moment: Fast and Slow Time in the Information Age*. London: Pluto Press.
25. Foucault, M. (2006). *History of Madness* / trans. by J. Murphy and J. Khalfa. London/New York: Routledge.
26. Fukuyama, F. (1989). The end of history? *The national interest*, no. 16, pp. 3–18.
27. Jameson, F. (1992). *Postmodernism, or, The cultural logic of late capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
28. Jonas, H. (2003). *Das Prinzip Verantwortung: Versuch einer Ethik für die technologische Zivilisation* [The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of Ethics for the Technological Age]. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp Verlag.
29. Joyce, J. (2012). *Finnegans Wake*. London: Wordsworth Editions.
30. Levinas, E. (1990). *Difficult freedom: essays on Judaism* / trans. by Sean Hand. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
31. Saramago, J. (2002). *O homem duplicado* [The Double]. Lisboa: Caminho.
32. Schumpeter, J. A. (2010). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. London, New York: Routledge.
33. Vozyak, V., Lipin, N. (2020). Education like breach between past and future. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, no. 17, pp. 98–109.