



II. CREATIVITY IN SOCIETY AND IN SOCIAL ENVIRONMENTS

SOCIAL CREATIVITY AND PHENOMENON OF SUCCESS IN POSTINDUSTRIAL SOCIETY

Anatoliy STOLETOV

Bashkir State Agrarian University,
Faculty of Information Technology and Management,
Department of Philosophy and History
ul. 50 let Oktyabrya, 34, Ufa, Republic of Bashkortostan, Russia, 450001
E-mail: aistoletov@gmail.com

Received 11 April 2016; accepted 8 August 2016.

The article deals with the problem of mutual relations between the social creativity and the substance of success. This problem is analyzed with reference of contemporary conceptions of social reality which unite objective and subjective aspects of the society and make accent on the complex and dynamic its character. Such approach leads to idea that success means capability to change social space and time. The success creates a new point of attraction not only by success itself but also by future possibility. The success in postindustrial society obtains the symbolic form more than material. The direction of the social mobility in case of success may be not only vertical. These transformations are the process of social creativity.

Keywords: creativity, postindustrial society, social creativity, social reality, society, success.

Introduction

Based on socio-cultural understanding of reality, I can distinguish religious, philosophical, artistic, social, political, legal, economic, scientific and technical creativity. All kinds of creativity are aimed at the transformation of the world and the subject of creativity itself, but each one has its own characteristics. The first three of them are remarkable for their activity in spiritual sphere, changing spiritual reality, creating meanings. Accumulation and extension of knowledge about the universe is basic to scientific creativity, whereas a priority line of technical creativity is transformation of material world.

Social, political, economic and legal creativity are oriented to the transformation of society. These forms of creativity are focused primarily on the intersubjective space, turning to social reality. As a result, the effectiveness criterion of creative process in

the field of socially oriented activities frequently is the success of creative subject, which I consider as a socio-cultural phenomenon.

The idea of social success is common to almost all types of society and stages of its development apart from those in which the vertical mobility level is very close to zero (primitive society) or absent owing to the tightness of boundaries among strata of society (Indian castes). Modification in views concerning success is usually followed by the change of socio-cultural conditions, and, as a consequence, transformation of social reality. Thus, the understanding of successfulness in a particular era and type of society is closely linked with the character and nature of sociality and creativity.

Approach to social reality

Those concepts of sociality which seek to mitigate the confrontation of subjectivist and objectivist approaches to society are used as a guide. These conceptions represent the structural-constructivist approach, seeking to combine organically the objectivity of social structures with the dependence of these structures on the activity of individuals constituting a society. The most notable among conceptions of this kind are the concepts of the social construction of reality (Berger, Luckmann 1966), genetic structuralism (Bourdieu 1987), the structuration theory (Giddens 1984), the autopoietic social systems theory (Luhmann 2012), the polysubjective sociality conception (Kemerov 2012). For instance, Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann determine the social reality in a certain way:

“The social reality of everyday life is thus apprehended in a continuum of typifications, which are progressively anonymous as they are removed from the ‘here and now’ of the face-to-face situation. At one pole of the continuum are those others with whom I frequently and intensively interact in face-to-face situations – my ‘inner circle’, as it were. At the other pole are highly anonymous abstractions, which by their very nature can never be available in face-to-face interaction. Social structure is the sum total of these typifications and of the recurrent patterns of interaction established by means of them. As such, social structure is an essential element of the reality of everyday life” (1966: 47–48).

This continuum of typifications represents the unity of the subjective (“here and now” of the face-to-face situations) and the objective (“highly anonymous abstractions”).

A specific definition of social reality is not so important for us as a methodological strategy for its interpretation (Kemerov 2012; Frolova 2004). In this aspect, contemporary study of society and human requires antireductionist approach, representing the sociality as very complex:

“The problem of becoming, conservation and changing of social form as a form of definite subjects’ interaction arises. In this view, arises the perspective on considering subject and individual dimension of social projects, models and constructs that become forms of social interactions. In general, its methodological aspects are actually problematization, operationalization, instrumentalization of a system of coordinates that were offered by Albert Einstein. In the social-ontological aspect it is

problematization, dynamization, personalization of social forms, deducing them from the context of polysubjective sociality” (Kemerov 2012: 92).

This treatment of sociality is based on a dynamic social ontology in which it is difficult to maintain the idea of the plain predetermination of social actions by social forms because the presence of social forms depends on the social activity of more than one individual and there is no guarantee that this activity will be automatically supported by social actors. For example, traffic rules prohibit crossing the street at a red light. But if everyone ignores this rule, it will cease to exist.

Existentialist’s concept of human abandonment implies limiting:

“ourselves to a reliance upon that which is within our wills, or within the sum of the probabilities which render our action feasible [...] but one does not rely upon any possibilities beyond those that are strictly concerned in one’s action” (Sartre 1975: 357).

Therefore, if we expect that the social form or the relationships between social actors is constant, we risk getting into a position about which Jean-Paul Sartre wrote:

“I shall always count upon my comrades-in-arms in the struggle, in so far as they are committed, as I am, to a definite, common cause [...]. In that respect, to rely upon the unity and the will of the party is exactly like my reckoning that the train will run to time or that the tram will not be derailed. But I cannot count upon men whom I do not know, I cannot base my confidence upon human goodness or upon man’s interest in the good of society, seeing that man is free and that there is no human nature which I can take as foundational” (1975: 358).

There is no confidence that our social action will be welcomed and will form a communicative situation and the dialogue between subjects which is only our hope. Therefore, as suggested by Anthony Giddens, society is produced and reproduced almost from the ground by the participants of social existence. But, despite the fact that social actors have an extensive knowledge on the conditions and consequences of what they do in their everyday lives, this knowledge is probabilistic, not giving a firm confidence in a future event. Due to its subjectivity, the knowledge about the social context of human interaction depends on the specific probabilistic structures, i.e., the specific social basis and social processes required for its maintenance:

“One can maintain one’s self-identification as a man of importance only in a milieu that confirms this identity; one can maintain one’s Catholic faith only if one retains one’s significant relationship with the Catholic community; and so forth. Disruption of significant conversation with the mediators of the respective plausibility structures threatens the subjective realities in question” (Berger, Luckmann 1966: 174).

Approach to creativity

Now we turn to creativity. A lot of research on different aspects of creativity conducted in the field of psychology (see Hennessey, Amabile 2010). But in this study attention will be paid more to philosophical grounds of the creative process.

Creativity may have different quality characteristics that have an impact on the process and its results, in general, if it is correlated with the standing in the creative

flow. Therefore, perhaps more properly understanding creativity not only as creative ability. This is the traditional psychological understanding. Creativity is rather a certain direction, disposition, intentionality. It seems a fair point of view, which linking creativity with the transcendence of the personality. Considering the semantic plan of the personality Vasilij Vasil'evich Nalimov believes that transcendence as a transformation way (i.e., self-forming, "autocreation") of the personality is "going out its rigid sense capsulation" (1989: 210). This dynamic transformation generates a representation of the illusory nature of the person, which, for example, is the foundation of Buddhism and Taoism in the Eastern culture. He calls the cause of this illusory: "Illusory of personality is due to her spontaneity. Personality is the spontaneity. Spontaneity is openness universal potentiality. It is the ability to get into resonance with it" (Nalimov 1989: 204). In other words, we can understand creativity as "depressurization" of personality, its commitment to new and dynamic presence in the streaming state.

Based on the fundamental ontology of Martin Heidegger, it is possible to say that creativity is the openness of the personality to the World, some kind of the "openness of Being" which is founded in the artistic creation. Heidegger says that the creation does not affect the present existence by any causal relationship. The effectiveness of creation is not a part in any impact. It rests in the transforming of unconcealment nature that commits inside creation itself, and thus in the transforming of the unconcealment Being (Heidegger 2008). Speaking about the essence of creation in his specific figurative manner, Heidegger sees it in accordance to Being of things. But this accordance to Being of things, this mood is inherent in every sphere of human activity, although it is obvious that the "mood" of philosophy, art and religion are similar in nature, in contrast to, for example, the "mood" of science and technology. It is also clear that the different types of human "mood" have a different potential. If comparing, for example, the mythological consciousness with scientific one's, it is easy to fall into error with respect to the advantages of the second over the first, keeping in mind the scientific and technological advances in our time. But it is hard to argue seriously that the "Golden Age" of humanity generated by the mythological consciousness was deprived of creative potential in the light of what we know about the art of ancient Greece. Until now the mythology of those times is enough impotent for the contemporary artist. Perhaps, it could be explained if creativity in common contains two types of creativity. The first type is "intensive". It is typical for the mythological, art consciousness. The second type is "extensive". It is intrinsic to scientific and rational oriented consciousness. These types of creativity characterized as a "range" of mood, as well as the methodology and the results of the creative process.

Intensive creativity tends to ontological foundations in the way of revelation and creation by the parallel existence and reality, albeit at the harm of empiric reality. It is focused "inside", "in depth". In this case, the novelty has an existential character. Moreover, due to the ontological aspirations, in this type of creativity organically combined epistemological, aesthetic and ethical components. In general, intensive type of creativity "works" in the spiritual sphere of activity and the main "product" of it can be called spiritual values.

Extensive creativity seeks to expand its influence to the empirical reality through its analysis, to identify the laws of interaction and the creation of new things: mechanisms, machines, technologies etc. It seeks the ability to change the material world and to create wealth. This kind of creativity is inherent in the science and technology activities mostly. Its benefits, as well as drawbacks associated with the rational cognition of the world. It seems the main disadvantage of this type of creativity in terms of worldview can be regarded as a reduced ontological and ethical component.

Intensive creativity is characterized by the fact that seeks to bring existence and Being together. From an existential point of view, existence is being. It is found in the “border situation”, which shows us reality beyond the ordinary things. This type of creativity is associated with the undivided character of Nothingness and Being and its mutual-generation in the creative process. Producing corporeal things, extensive creativity separates it from existence. It raises the problem of the essence of things, as well as the diversity of the human being and things. In fact, extensive type of creativity is devoid of moral perspective precisely because of their focus outward to the surrounding Universe, not suggesting moral problem at all.

Figuratively speaking, intensive creativity is like passive radar, extensive creativity is like an active ones. It means “wide” intentionality range of areas, passivity, the lack of a specify “subject”, thing, problem for intensive creativity and “narrow” focus on a specific object (problem), activity in the extensive ones. Thus intensive creativity is synthetic, extensive is analytic. So in Western society, preferring a rational basis, extensive type of creativity and scientific approach is the dominant type. In the Eastern society intensive type of creativity, artistic and religious approach is more proper. We could see that in different area of society: from art and traditions to the technological development. But this problem is some out of our research intentions. More wide essential and cultural aspects of creativity and its types were discovered in some works (Stoletov 2007, 2008, 2014).

Based on the above, the principle of complementary is quit suitable for creativity. On one side creativity can be represented as a condition of substantial emptiness, some kind of human openness to the world. In this sense, creativity is a quality of person that makes him (person) different from individual. It is a special condition of the subject. This condition precedes the beginning of the process which we shall call “creation” later. She appears as the possibility of separation from the existing structure in an attempt to create a new one. But on other side creativity emerges as a process quality, a certain kind of focus, intentionality, if we look at the very creative process.

It seems that creativity is a social quality. Moreover, it should be inherent in any community of highly developed beings, not just humans. There is a point of view (see Kulikov 2014; Porshnev 2007), according to which Paleolithic tools are the result of reproductive creativity, based on spontaneous collective action. A similar process in the human community characterized by awareness, reflection, generalization, an ideal content:

“Thinking involves the exchange of thoughts and pure is planning the situation with regard to the behavior of other people [...]. The product of reflection is the thinking as a reflection of the reflection, i.e. the reflection of the representation of the objective world in the forms of activities. Thus creativity can appear as a process of constructing of new patterns of activity embodied in the product, and creativity can appear as discovery of a perfect, ideas in the product, i.e. the subjective content of creation process” (Kulikov 2014: 16, 19).

However, new observations of the behavior of higher animals confirm that they have the same human qualities: reasoning, ability to generalize, creativity, etc. Books of Frans de Waal (1982, 2014) are indicative for that matter. In this respect, more research is needed. However, it seems that idea about the collective basis of creativity is plausible. It is possible to agree with the theory of humanity’s uniqueness is that in the human community the social aspect of creativity contains a significant proportion of intensive type.

Arising of social reality as a result of the uniting of parts in an organic whole in nature can be creativity’s foundation. This is an effect of “the whole is greater than parts” in that case. The more this effect is successful, the more it anchors itself in the community, becoming relatively self-sufficient determinant of social reality of post-industrial society step by step. There is a new social group, in whose activities the creative process becomes the determining factor (Florida 2002). The educational system of post-industrial society is set up to produce conditions that enhance people’s creative potential (Dudek *et al.* 1993). Attitudes of society toward consumerism, happiness and the environment are changing (Baltrėnas *et al.* 2015).

For approach to the place of success in post-industrial society the investment theory of creativity is very suitable (Sternberg 2006). It means that creative people are able to make out of favor ideas more requested and popular filling big potential of them. In my opinion it is possible due to special ability in those people. They can combine intensive and extensive intentions in creative process and cognize or fill other people’s intentions. Knowing that, they can create new conditions opening potential of those ideas which is inaccessible for average people.

Relationship between success and social creativity

The meaning of the term “success” depends on historical time and type of society. There is a book in which the problem is analyzed from philosophical point of view more particularly (Karakhanyan *et al.* 2011). The current perception of success is due to dynamic social ontology, which presupposes a constant formation, reproduction and projection. In this regard, success is not just getting the maximum results with the least expenditure of energy, time and efforts, which satisfies the inner profound human needs and entails feeling of gratification, because of activity which does not end with the goal attainment or failure, and, accordingly, success cannot be full and final. Becoming the first is much easier than remaining the first.

A success is not simply an indicator of vertical mobility, the importance of which has been noticeably reduced in the post-industrial society. Today, living standard in

developed countries is so high that it reduces the importance of financial incentive for development equalizing it to the importance of other factors. Alvin Toffler in his book *The Third Wave*, using the data from a public opinion researcher Daniel Yankelovich, concludes that money no longer has its former motivating force and loses its previous value in the system of remuneration:

“Largely young middle-managers, they are, declares Yankelovich, the ‘hungriest for more responsibility and more vital work with a commitment worthy of their talent and skills’. They seek meaning along with financial reward” (Toffler 1981: 388).

The post-industrial society changes motivation. As rightly noted in one study, a creative worker is rich not by having a lot of things to be consumed but by satisfying things for realization of creative intentions. It entails changes in the understanding of the essence of happiness that involves satisfaction from creativity (Baltrėnas *et al.* 2015). Understanding of success changes too. It is the search for meaning which indicates the increasing role of symbolic power and symbolic criterion of success. Without going into details of the nature of the symbolic, I note that a symbol contains suggestion, the ability to infuse. Success is unachievable without changing social relations, social space and time by the activity of the subject. In her monograph Irina Vasilevna Frolova analyzing modern sociality concepts notes that in order to change the world, it is necessary to change the ways in which it is formed, i.e., the vision of the world and the practical operations by which groups are constructed and reproduced (2004: 27). This requires a symbolic power, the ability to convince, which, on the one hand, allows the subject to influence the social space through changing its structure, and on the other hand, which is a consequence and an indicator of this creativity. “Successful” social subject changes social reality by moving up the social ladder, raising their own status, reaching new positions, thus – *a posteriori* to success – establishing a new network of interactions and social ties relative to their place in the society. Besides changes occur due to the fact that social subject – *a priori* to success – creates an appropriate social space answering their needs and contributing to the achievement of objectives. Thus, the most successful and visionary businessman does not just study the demand in order to provide goods or services for customers and make a profit, but creates a demand for available products and services, designing the market “for themselves”, transforms the market space. It is reasonable that such a social action will result in the growth of material wealth which manifests itself in almost all stratification criteria. Therefore, in my opinion, it is not enough to consider success as the mechanism constituting social reality in the post-industrial society. This definition of success simplifies its essence because the success of an action can be judged by the results of this action. (By the way we can talk about creative process after getting a result too. To predict the quality of the result is problematic. In this sense, creativity is phenomenal.) But, if achieved, success becomes a change factor in the net of social ties attracting attention of different social subjects and increasing the degree of resources possession. It may even cause a kind of cumulative effect because true success gives a positive experience which, however, does not guarantee future success and creates a sort of “stabilization fund” of resources needed for further development.

Success is likely to attract a new success, creating a resonant movement, like on a swing. No wonder it is said: “Money makes money”. The same cumulative effect may occur with an unsuccessful outcome when one problem begets another. This situation is also mentioned in proverbs and sayings: “Misfortunes never come singly”.

Nevertheless success in the post-industrial society may have the character of a descending mobility when a person consciously loses high status in the social hierarchy. I mean a well known social phenomenon of downshifting.

The ability to influence social reality and to achieve success depends on a delicate balance of two factors. Firstly, symbolic capital is the power granted to those who have gained sufficient recognition to be able to inspire trust. Symbolic effectiveness depends on the extent to which the proposed project is based on reality. Such trust (impossible, I note, without another actor) may be based on the closeness of the social character of the creative subject to the socio-cultural norm of the society. Totally alien and incomprehensible individual is not able to inspire others simply because they have no common ground. They will not be the “significant other” for the target audience.

Secondly, a successful person should be able to create alternatives to the existing reality and deviate from norms within “reasonable limits” because the vertical mobility implies the inevitable marginalization of the subject who goes beyond the boundaries of the lower stratum for entry into the higher. It is necessary to create an attractor to restructure social space. This attractor certainly differs from the others by offering something more, than there is in the system. In my point of view, the reality which promises greater prospects is the more attractive. Therefore, the scope of the concept of “success” should include creation of prospects for further growth. This means actualization of the individual’s ability to influence social reality including creating new social ties and attractive alternative symbolic universes.

Berger and Luckmann speak about the importance of effective plausibility structure for the transformation of reality. It serves as a model, sample for the transformation:

“This plausibility structure will be mediated to the individual by means of significant others, with whom he must establish strongly affective identification. [...] These significant others are the guides into the new reality [...] The individual’s world now finds its cognitive and affective focus in the plausibility structure in question. Socially, this means an intense concentration of all significant interaction within the group which embodies the plausibility structure and particularly upon the personnel assigned the task of resocialization” (Berger, Luckmann 1966: 177).

A successful person becomes a “significant other” for a number of social actors creating a new attractive reality for them concentrating vectors of social orientation on themselves and setting a new configuration of social space. A person from the past also may be a “significant other”. In this case we can speak about configuring social space and social time as well. Developing his concept of polysubjective sociality, Vyacheslav Evgenevich Kemerov denotes the common point which associates social actors:

“The point of view limited by the situation ‘here and now’ doesn’t create the conditions for the right understanding of social reproduction; as people have to interact, taking into account diversity and dynamics of social world, they are obliged to correlate their ‘here and now’s’ with other ‘here’s and now’s’, i.e. with other regions of sociality” (2012: 92).

The social ontology develops as the creation of social subjects which describes, supports and reproduces continuity of being. The human situation is the space-time “here’s and now’s” which separated and associated at the same time. It is multidimensionality of cooperation, a result of collaborative reproduction. Hence successful individual might be considered as a person having resources for association of social efforts and intensifying social interactions by their activities. In social aspect the success indicates that social activity of an individual does not simply recreate and support social reality, but results in the change of the latter in both subjective and objective aspect. A lot of examples can be found in modern world and in the past, from famous generals, philosophers, poets and rulers of Antiquity, saints and religious ascetics of the Middle Ages, to scientists, workers of culture, politics, sports and businessmen of modern times and contemporary era.

Conclusions

The subject of social creativity transforms social reality generating new social forms and communications. But if the results of scientific, technical, artistic, philosophical kinds of creativity are “objectified”, i.e., take the material form, the result of social creativity obtains a symbolic form because what is a sign of success in one case in another may it not be. New generalized interpretation of success includes the ability of a social subject to influence social reality: changing social relations, social space and time, creating prospects for further growth.

References

- Baltrėnas, P.; Baltrėnaitė, E.; Kačerauskas, T. 2015. Social Environment of Creativity, *Filosofija. Sociologija* 26(1): 46–54.
- Berger, P. L.; Luckmann, Th. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Bourdieu, P. 1987. *Choses dites*. Series: Le sens commun. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Dudek, S. Z.; Strobel, M. G.; Runco, M. A. 1993. Cumulative and Proximal Influences on the Social Environment and Children’s Creative Potential, *The Journal of Genetic Psychology* 154(4): 487–499.
- Florida, R. 2002. *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It’s Transforming Work, Leisure and Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Book.
- Frolova, I. V. 2004. *Opravdanie Utopii: opyt sotsial’no-filosofskoy rekonstruktsii*. Ufa: BashGU Publ.
- Giddens, A. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Heidegger, M. 2008. The Origin of the Work of Art, in Krell, D. F. (Ed.). *Basic Writings*. Series: Harper Perennial Modern Thought. New York: Harper Collins, 139–212.
- Hennessey, B. A.; Amabile, T. M. 2010. Creativity, *Annual Review of Psychology* 61: 569–598.
- Karakhanyan, E. V.; Stoletov, A. I.; Frolova, I. V. 2011. *Uspekh: sotsial’no-filosofskaya kontseptualizatsiya*. Ufa: BashGU Publ.

- Kemerov, V. E. 2012. The Changing Role of Social Philosophy & Methodology of Antireductionism, *Journal of Siberian Federal University: Humanities and Social Science* (5)1: 86–94.
- Kulikov, D. 2014. Proiskhozhdenie simvolicheskoy deyatelnosti (o proiskhozhdenii tvorchestva v antropologii), *Mezhdunarodnyy zhurnal issledovaniy kul'tury* 4(1): 5–19.
- Luhmann, N. 2012. *Theory of Society*. Vol. 1. Series: Cultural Memory in the Present. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Nalimov, V. V. 1989. *Spontannost' soznaniya: Veroyatnostnaya teoriya smyslov i smyslovaya arkhitektonika lichnosti*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Prometej" MGPI im. Lenina.
- Porshnev, B. F. 2007. *O nachale chelovecheskoj istorii. Problemy paleopsikhologii*. Sankt Peterburg: Aletejya.
- Sartre, J.-P. 1975. Existentialism Is a Humanism, in Kaufmann, W. (Ed.). *Existentialism: From Dostoyevsky to Sartre*. New York: New American Library, 345–368.
- Sternberg, R. J. 2006. The Nature of Creativity, *Creativity Research Journal* 18(1): 87–98.
- Stoletov, A. I. 2007. K postroeniyu filosofskoj kontseptsii kreativnosti, *Sotsial'no-gumanitarnye znaniya* 12: 462–472.
- Stoletov, A. I. 2008. *Ontologiya Tvorchestva*. Ufa: Vagant.
- Stoletov, A. I. 2014. Sushchnost' kreativnosti i ee tipy, *Mezhdunarodnyy zhurnal issledovaniy kul'tury* 4(17): 43–52.
- Toffler, A. 1981. *The Third Wave*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Waal, de F. 1982. *Chimpanzee Politics: Power and Sex among Apes*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Waal, de F. 2014. *The Bonobo and the Atheist: In Search of Humanism among the Primates*. New York, London: W. W. Norton & Company.

SOCIALINIS KŪRYBINGUMAS IR SĖKMĖS FENOMENAS POSTINDUSTRINĖJE VISUOMENĖJE

Anatolij STOLETOV

Santrauka

Straipsnyje gvildinama abipusių santykių tarp socialinio kūrybingumo ir sėkmės esmės problema. Ši problema analizuojama remiantis šiuolaikiniais socialinės tikrovės konceptais, jungiančiais objektyvius ir subjektyvius visuomenės aspektus bei pabrėžiančiais jos sudėtingą ir dinamišką pobūdį. Toks sumanymas kelia mintį, esą sėkmė reiškia gebėjimą keisti socialinę erdvę ir laiką. Sėkmė iškelia naują patrauklumo tipą, kurį lemia ne tik pati sėkmė, bet ir ateities galimybės. Postindustrinėje visuomenėje sėkmė įgyja labiau simbolinę, o ne materialią formą. Turint omenyje sėkmę, socialinio mobilumo kryptis gali būti ne tik vertikali. Šios transformacijos – tai socialinio kūrybingumo procesas.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: kūrybingumas, postindustrinė visuomenė, socialinis kūrybingumas, socialinė tikrovė, visuomenė, sėkmė.