Turkish Archives of Pediatrics

EDITORIAL
DOI: 10.65717/TurkArchPediatr.2026.1101

Human Creativity in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Could We Lose Our Capacity for Thought While Increasing Our Productivity?

Özgür Kasapçopur[1], Servet Altay[2]

[1]Department of Pediatric Rheumatology, İstanbul University-Cerrahpaşa, Cerrahpaşa Faculty of Medicine, İstanbul, Türkiye
[2]Department of Cardiology, Trakya University Faculty of Medicine, Edirne, Türkiye

Artificial intelligence (AI) is emerging as one of the most profound technological transformations in human history. Every great technological leap, from the mastery of fire and the invention of the wheel to the printing press, electricity, and the internet, has reshaped not only how we live but also how we think and how our thoughts unfold. Yet AI may well be the most consequential transformation in human life since the Industrial Revolution. That is because, for the first time, we are beginning to hand over to a machine not just our physical strength or our capacity to calculate, but some stages of our intellectual production as well. This raises the possibility that our freedom to think may be curtailed and our creativity constrained.

This is why the debate over AI cannot be confined to science and technology. It is just as much a philosophical, social, and human debate.

The central question is this:

WILL AI EXPAND HUMAN CREATIVITY, OR WILL WE GRADUALLY SURRENDER OUR OWN CAPACITY TO THINK AND CREATE TO IT?

A contemporary scientific outlook does not meet this question with hostility toward technology. On the contrary, it sees technological progress as a powerful means of human emancipation. But a scientific outlook does not mean embracing technology uncritically either. The question that really matters is whether technology frees us, whether it develops our abilities, and whether, in the end, it makes us more creative, freer, and stronger.[1]

Seen in this light, one of the greatest risks we face as AI develops in the years ahead is the steady outsourcing of human mental productivity.[2]

CREATIVITY IS MORE THAN AN OUTCOME

We tend to judge creativity by its products: a beautiful poem, a successful paper, a striking painting, a new scientific hypothesis, a well-designed project.

Yet creativity is more than its outcome. It is also the journey that leads there: the searching and wondering, the mistakes and the moments of giving up, the trying again, the connections made, and the unexpected ideas met along the way. This process lies at the heart of contemporary research methodology, a tradition that traces back to Aristotle.

A child drawing a picture is not simply producing a picture. They are discovering how they see the world.

A scientist formulating a hypothesis is not merely producing a scientific result. They are pushing at the edges of the unknown.

Corresponding author:
Özgür Kasapçopur
✉ ozgurkc@iuc.edu.tr
Publication Date: October 28, 2026

© 2026 The Author(s).
Licensee Turkish Pediatrics Association
This article is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

Cite this article as: Kasapçopur Ö, Altay S. Human Creativity in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Could We Lose Our Capacity for Thought While Increasing Our Productivity? *Turk Arch Pediatr.*, 2026;61(11):962-965.

A poet writing a poem is not only arranging words. They are forging a connection with their inner world, with society, and with their time.

This is where AI's influence on the creative process, and its tendency to constrain it, becomes critical.

If we routinely hand the difficult, laborious, and uncertain parts of the creative process over to AI, the result may well come faster and be more polished. But offloading the most demanding parts of the mental work that creativity is made of may leave those cognitive capacities underused and, eventually, atrophied.[3]

Just as someone who drives everywhere may find their ability to walk declining over time, someone who constantly hands the burden of thinking to AI may find their mental abilities wasting away.

CONVENIENCE DOES NOT ALWAYS MEAN PROGRESS

Convenience is one of technology's greatest promises, and in science AI truly delivers on it, offering researchers extraordinary support. It can summarize a long text, suggest ideas, look at a problem from different angles, give feedback, translate, produce presentations and visuals, and complete in seconds tasks that would take a person hours.[4] These are major gains for humanity. But they come with an important paradox.

MAKING A TASK EASIER DOES NOT MEAN WE KEEP THE MENTAL SKILLS THAT DOING IT OURSELVES WOULD HAVE BUILT AND SHARPENED

Calculators made arithmetic far easier. But once people were relieved of the burden of calculating, they began to use some of their mental arithmetic skills less and less, and largely lost them.

Navigation systems made finding our way easier. But people who rely on them constantly spend less mental effort on orientation, and their sense of direction and awareness of their surroundings have noticeably declined.

AI is doing the same for many stages of intellectual work. The core problem is not that AI thinks for us; it is that we fall into the habit of turning to AI before we have thought for ourselves. Which raises the question: where, then, does original thinking fit in?[5]

One of AI's most valuable contributions may come at the very start of idea generation: it can quickly tell us whether a hypothesis we have in mind has already been tested. Facing a blank page is hard at first. Yet that very struggle is an essential part of creative thinking. We try to form our own idea, realize it is wrong or incomplete, and develop another. At some point, we discover a connection we had not seen before. Sometimes we go for hours without finding anything. Then, suddenly, an idea arrives. That is part of the magic of creativity.

But if, instead of asking ourselves, "What could I write about this?", we go straight to AI and say, "Give me some different ideas on this topic," we have outsourced the work of our own minds before it has even begun. Over time, our minds may grow used to choosing ideas rather than generating original ones. This seemingly small shift matters a great deal, because a creative person is not only someone who picks good ideas but someone who can bring into being ideas that do not yet exist.

THE GREATEST DANGER IS NOT LAZINESS, BUT MENTAL AND INTELLECTUAL DEPENDENCE

AI is often said to make people lazy, but the deeper danger is not laziness; it is mental dependence. Once we start asking "What does AI suggest?" instead of thinking for ourselves, we may gradually begin to doubt whether our own thinking is good enough.[6]

Consider a researcher who asks AI to produce the text instead of writing the manuscript themselves. They are not just making the job easier; they may also be giving up the practice of organizing their thoughts, building sentences, choosing words, and developing an argument. An academic who has AI generate every research idea first may draw less and less on their own mind's capacity for unexpected connections. An artist who keeps working within aesthetic patterns suggested by AI may find their own artistic voice slower to develop. The problem is not that AI is bad. The problem is reaching for a tool before reaching for our own minds.

The contemporary scientific approach does not reject AI. Opposing AI, therefore, is not the answer. We could not have protected books by rejecting the printing press, defended intellectual labor by rejecting the computer, or set knowledge free by rejecting the internet. Rejecting AI is no better a way to protect human creativity.

A contemporary scientific approach to AI might rest on the following principles:

- AI belongs beside human thought, not in its place.
- AI can be the researcher's assistant, not the researcher.
- AI can teach the student, but it must not do the student's thinking.
- AI can edit the author's work, but it must not take the place of the author's creativity and imagination.
- AI can open new possibilities for the artist, but it must not erase the artist's originality.
- The first idea, the development of alternatives, and the final decision must remain human.
- The aim is not to limit technology, but to make our use of it conscious and deliberate.

CREATIVITY

At the heart of creativity lies the freedom to make mistakes and then to own them in the light of criticism and self-criticism. Indeed, one of the defining features of human creativity is its capacity for error, because so many new ideas look "wrong" at first. The history of science shows that many great discoveries came from stepping outside established ways of thinking. The same is true in art, where new movements were often met with bewilderment by traditional sensibilities. In literature, most great works grew out of forms of expression no one had tried before. AI, by contrast, generates suggestions largely by drawing on existing data and patterns. That is

why one of its strengths is making rapid connections between existing knowledge and forms. Humans, on the other hand, can sometimes break new ground precisely by making a connection that seems illogical. If we want to protect human creativity, then, we must leave room for error. In a world where everything has been perfected, creativity cannot develop naturally.[7]

RETHINKING THE EDUCATION OF THE FUTURE

In the age of AI, the core purpose of education must change as well. Transmitting knowledge to students used to be paramount. Today, information is ever easier to access. What will matter most in the education of the future, then, is not how much information students store, but how they question it, connect it, and turn it into new ideas. We must teach children to use AI responsibly, but we must equally teach them to think freely without it. Critiquing AI outputs, spotting AI errors, and building counterarguments to AI should become a regular part of education.[8] From time to time, we should ask students to write, imagine, debate, and solve problems without any digital tools at all. The most valuable person of the future may not be the one who uses AI best. Perhaps it will be the one who can ask the questions AI can neither ask nor imagine.

ETHICAL PRINCIPLES

Academic writing is not just a technical exercise in transmitting knowledge; it is an activity that shapes the mind. AI touches every pillar of publishing: authors, editors, publishers, and reviewers. Its misuse can erode the meaning of authorship, let unverified scientific content seep into academia, and weaken academic thinking skills. As academics, we must strike a careful balance between AI and scientific integrity. Authors are obliged to disclose their use of AI transparently, reviewers are bound by confidentiality, editors are responsible for setting policy in this area, and publishers have a role in building the legal and ethical framework.[9-11]

In healthcare, AI speeds up diagnosis and reduces the risk of human error. At the same time, it can raise data privacy concerns and produce biased algorithms, which may in turn lead to discriminatory practices in patient care. We must therefore harness the full potential of AI in healthcare while managing its ethical complexities.[12-15]

THE REAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HUMANS AND MACHINES

AI can be extraordinarily fast; the human mind and human creativity may be slower. AI can process vast amounts of information; a human being may know far less. AI can weigh thousands of possibilities in a second; a human being may spend years pursuing a single idea. Yet our greatest strength has never been knowledge or speed alone. It is wisdom, something AI can never possess. Our strength lies in our curiosity, intuition, experience, emotions, conscience, imagination, and search for meaning. A machine can give powerful answers to the question "What can be done?" But "Why should we do it?" and "What should we do?" remain among humanity's most fundamental questions.[15]

"WHAT KIND OF WORLD DO WE WANT?"

That question cannot be left to algorithms. The real goal is not a world with less of the human touch, but one with stronger, more knowledgeable, and more sensitive human beings. In the age of AI, our aim should never be to make human beings redundant. Quite the opposite: technological progress should make us freer, more creative, and more productive. We need technology that helps people think better, not technology that spares them from thinking. We need technology that expands people's capacity to produce, not technology that shuts them out of production. We need systems that help people make better decisions, not systems that make decisions for them. One of the defining cultural questions of the AI era, then, is not about technology at all; it is about what humanity wants to do with its own future. There is no denying that AI gives us great power. But like all great power, it brings great responsibility: the responsibility to protect our own minds.

In conclusion, what we must resist is not AI, but the abandonment of thinking and the retreat from intellectual effort. The risk that AI will erode human creativity is real. But it is not inevitable. AI need not destroy our intellectual creativity. Used wisely, it can clear obstacles from the path of human thought, open new territories of thinking, democratize access to knowledge, and make possible creative collaborations that were once out of reach.

For that to happen, however, we need one guiding principle: AI must be an assistant in our thinking, not a replacement for our own minds.

We must think, create, and bring our ideas to life first. Only then should we turn to AI.

We must form our own ideas first. Only then should we listen to what it suggests.

We must dream our own dreams first. Only then should we explore the new worlds it can open for us.

We must question what AI gives us, and the final decision must always be ours.

For human creativity is more than what it produces. It is curiosity, searching, getting things wrong, starting over, imagining, and, finally, being able to conceive of something that did not exist before. AI can teach us to write, calculate, and produce faster. But it must be we who decide why we write, why we create, and what future we imagine. The goal of contemporary society is not to fear AI, but to harness its power for the good of humanity and nature.

Perhaps, then, the most important principle for the future is this: AI should not think for us; it should push us to think better. However far technology advances, humanity's true progress will be measured not by how much more machines think, but by how well we protect our freedom to think, to imagine, and to create.

REFERENCES

1. Can Demirbaş K, Yıldız M, Saygılı S, et al. Artificial intelligence in pediatrics: learning to walk together. *Turk Arch Pediatr*. 2024;59(2):121-130. [CrossRef]
2. Fasoli M, Cassinadri G, Ienca M. The dark side of cognitive enhancement: a framework for the technologically induced cognitive diminishment. *J Cogn Enhanc*. 2025;9(3):346-359. [CrossRef]
3. Jin P. Amplifier or inhibitor? A moderated mediation analysis of generative AI's impact on creative self-efficacy through dual-process thinking. *Cogn Process*. 2026;27(3):921-932. [CrossRef]
4. Koker O, Sahin S, Yildiz M, et al. The emerging paradigm in pediatric rheumatology: harnessing the power of artificial intelligence. *Rheumatol Int*. 2024;44(11):2315-2325. [CrossRef]
5. Hermann E, Puntoni S, Morewedge CK. GenAI and the psychology of work. *Trends Cogn Sci*. 2025;29(9):802-813. [CrossRef]
6. Tian J, Zhang R. Learners' AI dependence and critical thinking: the psychological mechanism of fatigue and the social buffering role of AI literacy. *Acta Psychol (Amst)*. 2025;260:105725. [CrossRef]
7. Garcia MB. The paradox of artificial creativity: challenges and opportunities of generative AI artistry. *Creativity Res J*. 2025;37(4):755-768. [CrossRef]
8. Yu H, Guo Y. Generative artificial intelligence empowers educational reform: current status, issues, and prospects. *Front Educ*. 2023;8:1183162. [CrossRef]
9. Koçak Z, Altay S. Balkan Medical Journal policy on the use of chatbots in scientific publications. *Balk Med J*. 2023;40(3):149-150. [CrossRef]
10. Ekmekçi PE. Reflections on the "ethics guideline for using generative artificial intelligence in scientific research and publication process of higher education institutions." *Balk Med J*. 2025;42(2):174-175. [CrossRef]
11. Korkmaz S. Statistical rigor and reproducibility in the AI era. *Balk Med J*. 2025;42(5):386-387. [CrossRef]
12. Haque F, Simon BD, Özyörük KB, et al. Generative artificial intelligence in prostate cancer imaging. *Balk Med J*. 2025;42(4):286-300. [CrossRef]
13. Kumar I, Dhingra B, Malik S. Healthcare data security and privacy in the AI era. In: *Artificial Intelligence in Smart Healthcare Systems*. CRC Press; Boca Raton; 2026:151-160. [CrossRef]
14. Korkmaz S. Artificial intelligence in healthcare: a revolutionary ally or an ethical dilemma? *Balk Med J*. 2024;41(2):87-88. [CrossRef]
15. Kasapçopur Ö. Science and pseudoscience during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Turk Pediatri Ars*. 2020;55(4):335-336. [CrossRef]