

If its destructive, it's not creative

Concerns have been raised on negative aspects of creativity, and that creativity may be used to meet destructive ends. Creation and destruction, however are opposites of each other. A creative act is the opposite of a destructive act. A creative act implies intentionally bringing something nonexistent into existence to interact with the rest of life. A destructive act on the other hand implies intentionally removing an existence. These are opposite ends of intention and destructive is certainly not creative. The confusion arises because a destructive act may well have elements of novelty, surprise and non-obviousness. Some sections of society may even find it useful. An act with a destructive intent or end is a destructive act and not a creative one. A creative act must include a holistic perception (of its effects) and take responsibility that it leads to creation and not to destruction. There is a thin line in being creative or destructive. The destructive acts, however cannot and should not be equated to creativity because at the root of its motivation lies a harmful or self-serving intent.