

21 Nov 2012

Why is Creativity so Subjective?

Although it is commonly presumed that creativity is subjective and can never be judged or compared; it indeed seems to be a very inconsiderate hypothesis of a race that can even determine the elemental composition of other galaxies, just based on some imagery provided by satellites.



Let's assume the times before Sir Isaac Newton formulated the laws of motion and gravity into calculable mathematical equations. It might sound surprising but people, back then also had fair idea of how much forces would be necessary for particular weights to cause desired motion or derive the required work. This is because, comparing and deriving the relative interrelationships between two related entities is possible even without having any exact or absolute details about each. You might not be able to tell the exact weight of an elephant or of swine, but by balancing ten against one, you can definitely conclude that elephant is roughly ten times heavier than a pig. This is quite similar to comparing the creativity of Hans Zimmer's compositions and that of AR Rahman. But we somehow like to consider it very personal, subjective and incomparable; when it comes to judging creativity (howsoever, every kind of creative work and their makers are always ranked by various experts all the time, across the world!)

If immensely complicated multinational organisations can be ranked based on various aspects; why is comparing art and artists considered such a taboo? May be that's because we haven't thought much about developing any standard format, as far as creativity is concerned. Another possible reason could be the egoistic disapproving attitude of many creative people refraining from getting judged or ranked. While doing so, they indeed exhibit their insecurities more than the true zeal of preserving creativity in its 'subjective form'.

Although just based upon the expression of two creative works one might feel pretty confused about judging or ranking them, however based on the gravity of the message (intended to be delivered by the maker), the uniqueness of the concept and logic behind the formation of that idea and several other aspects; the creativity can very well be compared (if we really want to). However, we must ensure that we don't consider



style and media of expression while calibrating creativity; as they are a subject to personal preferences, availability of resources for the creator. Also while comparing creative works; we are dealing with that particular expression only and not the creativity of the maker itself. One might then like to argue as of how can one find out how creative someone actually is, if his work is not a complete replica of his own

creativity? Unfortunately, we don't yet have an exact tangible mechanism or enough technological advancement that can calculate creativity of any person or his work. This all depends on how good one is, at conveying his creativity in the form of thoughts, ideas or concepts using various media of expression.



The immense potentials concealed in creativity are often misused under its 'impossibility to be explained'; which serves as a blatant license for all sorts of rubbish to be dumped into the realm of creativity. One might see figures of elephants or horses amidst the patterns of clouds but it doesn't mean that the sky intends to show us its creativity. For an instance; if a child, who can barely hold a pencil, carves out some unique pattern on a page, doesn't imply that he is creative. Similarly if one genuinely expresses his creativity and later discovers it to be in the similar lines of an already existing work; it doesn't demean his creative abilities either (however that particular work may lose its importance and relevance). This very clearly signifies that creativity is in the thoughts, ideas, intentions and its core motive rather than methods, media or tactics of its expression, execution or derived perceptions from the resultant outcomes.

Moreover, calling creativity subjective, invites all sorts of personal perceptions of biased and sometimes bizarrely idealised opinions of viewers or critiques. If an ape fails to get anything out of Mona Lisa, the painting doesn't become a piece of crap. Similarly, if 'reputed' Mr X declares a broken mug lying in a dump yard to be the most creative work of mankind ever; the scrap doesn't become a masterpiece either. The problem is all about figuring out who is that ape and who Mr X is!

