

"Norm" And "Pathology": A Comparative Analysis Of Concepts

Natalia Nikolaevna Shelshakova

Candidate Of Psychological Sciences, Petrozavodsk State University, Petrozavodsk, Russia

Annotation

The article provides a comparative description of the concepts of "norm" and "pathology". The controversial nature of the issue of the identity of concepts is noted. The classical theories of cognition of the norm through the study of pathology actually reduced the very category of "pathology" to indicators of quantitative deviations from the norm. Pathology as a way of cognizing the norm requires concretization not only as a general medical, but also as an epistemological category. It is necessary to move to the category "health - negative factor - imbalance - disharmony - disease".

Keywords Norm, pathology, identity, disease, modification, boundaries, indicator

An analysis of the scientific literature on the research topic allows us to conclude that during almost the entire 19th century, the essence of normal and pathological vital phenomena, taking into account the understanding of the presence of opposite values of human experience (which were studied in the field of philosophy and psychology), aroused the interest of biologists and physicians. This dogma was set forth in the French philosophy of knowledge by the founder of positivism O. Comte and the physician practitioner C. Bernard, each of whom worked in completely different directions: the first was a theoretical philosopher, the second was a practicing physiologist.

In particular, in his reflections, O. Comte passes from pathological to normal with the aim of speculatively defining the laws of the normal; because it replaces biological experiments that are often impossible, especially for humans, with logical constructions. It is in the works of O. Comte that the identity of the normal and the pathological is affirmed as the acquisition of knowledge about the normal [10, p. 343]. Perhaps this means the following: an object similar to us and corresponding to social norms can be designated as "normal", since we have little knowledge about it, as we gain experience of communication, a comparative analysis begins in favor of the presence of signs of similarity with oneself. Most often, signs of differences are found in conflict situations. And then, if in a pair of "norm" and "abnormal" a dialogue begins about the causes of what happened, then their state is recorded as

"non-pathology", while the manifestation of verbal aggression in one of the partners is the first signs of manifestation of a painful state;

In a pair of "norm" and "disease": if one of the partners shows physical aggression, then it is necessary to analyze the physiological state of the person and his individual characteristics of the psychological standard. Manifestations of physical aggression are "abnormal" from the point of view of physiological indicators, and may be "normal" from the point of view of the personality principle, since the personal interests of a person may be affected. Therefore, any manifestation of a person's condition from the point of view of humanism is a manifestation of the "norm" initially, but in different life circumstances, and this must be taken into account when determining the directions of rehabilitation work.

Thus, the phenomena "normal" and "pathological" are the extreme points of one and the same phenomenon, since initially the object is born "normal", and only with changes in the physiological and psychological nature in the direction of the inhuman one can we assume the manifestation of pathology.

In accordance with this, in the writings of O. Comte, pathology is a logical indicator of the norm. In his studies, K. Bernard, on the contrary, moves from the normal to the pathological with the aim of rational action directed at the pathological; because it is precisely as the basis of a non-empirical theory that knowledge about diseases (based on physiology) is needed. The identity of the normal and the pathological is asserted as a comparison to achieve a result, namely the elimination of the pathological [11, p.16].

Thus, O. Comte deduces the essence of pathology as a pure logical concept, as an indicator of the norm; while K. Bernard is trying to clarify the essence of pathology in relation to the norm in a quantitative, numerical interpretation. There is another opinion that it is practically impossible to do this, since an explicit fixation of the "pathology" is possible only with a prolonged change in the physiological state when taking medications, which should be recorded and analyzed in a short period of time, not having common population characteristics, and for accompanying "pathology" - this is an extreme variant of the manifestation of the disease under the influence of medications, external pressure, external biological and social conditions, not caused by volitional regulation of a person.

The spread of the ideas of O. Comte and C. Bernard in medical, scientific and literary circles is most felt in the field of psychology.

The phenomena, which in the normal state are almost erased due to their insignificance, seem to be more tangible in emergency crises, since they are exaggerated [9, p. 24]. This includes the perception of life events as fragments, photographs, which the imagination changes in the direction of reducing short-term memory. Most often, this perception of life events occurs in post-stress disorders during the release of prisoners of war. The course of rehabilitation was determined on the basis of the

biographical data of the prisoners of war: at the first stage, taking medications - creating frightening scenarios - sleep deprivation - connecting voice support.

In his article, D. Levine notes that "the physicist does not study galvanism in small quantities found in nature, but increases it through experiments to make it easier to study, although the laws studied in this exaggerated state are identical to the natural state, that is the norm" [7, p. 678]. This situation is typical for scientists who do not own the tools for working with people in normal conditions and show an inhuman attitude towards a person, which will not allow modern scientists to create tools recognized by law. An experiment is possible in natural conditions: in case of a sudden illness, when it is necessary to understand that the human body is individual and there is no exact treatment plan, while it must be remembered that the conditions of an artificial experiment contradict faith, the laws of the universe. This is probably why the supporters of this concept believe that physiology and pathology, both physical and psychological, are not opposed to each other as two opposites, but rather should be studied as 2 parts of one whole.

The "pathological" method proposed by French researchers seeks both pure observation and experimentation. This is a powerful research tool: "a disease, in fact, is an experiment of the most subtle order, established by nature itself in very precise circumstances with the help of means inaccessible to human skill, since nature reaches the inaccessible" [8, p.496]. It is interesting that the famous German philosopher, F. Nietzsche, borrowed from K. Bernard the idea that "the pathological is homogeneous with the normal." Citing a long passage on health and illness, taken from the treatise of K. Bernard "Lec, ons sur la chaleur animale" ("Lectures on heat in animals"), F. Nietzsche formulates the following statement: the value of all disease states in what they show us under a magnifying glass certain states that are normal, but not always clearly visible in a normal state "[8, p.498]. This statement is valuable from the point of view of preventing disease states, but this statement should not be the goal for experiments with human participation.

It is noteworthy that in his positivist concept O. Comte often refers to the aphorism of F.Zh. Brousset: "each modification, natural or artificial, of the real order concerns only the intensity of the corresponding phenomena; in spite of the differences in degree, the phenomena always retain the same arrangement; besides, any change in the real nature, that is, the class of the object is recognized as contradictory" [10, p.342]. The inconsistency may be due to ordinary ideas about this. Moreover, in fact, the entire positivist theory of the variability of phenomena is completely reduced to this universal principle and is the result of the systematic application of F.Zh. Brusset.

Directly useful for the study of biological problems, this principle is viewed by most researchers as a logical preparation for similar procedures in any science. Society, as a collective organism, due to the high degree of its complexity, has many problems. They are varied and more frequent than that of

an individual organism. Therefore, some modern authors tend to spread the principle of F.Zh. Brousse on all social processes, in particular, he is actively used to limit or improve sociological laws [11, p.30].

It should be admitted that the essence of the experiment according to the principle of F. J. Brousset is not in the artificial intervention of the researcher into the system of the phenomenon, which he deliberately seeks to violate, but rather in the comparison between the control phenomenon and the phenomenon changed in relation to any of its conditions.

In accordance with the exclusively philosophical principle of F.Zh. Brousset, who in the 21st century became the general basis for the positivist concept of pathology, the pathological state is not at all radically different from the physiological state, in relation to which, regardless of how the subject of cognition interprets it, it can be only a simple extension, coming out more or less beyond the higher or lower limits of variation characteristic of each normal state phenomenon [11, p.32].

Therefore, every concept of pathology must be based on prior knowledge of the corresponding normal state. However, from the epistemological point of view, the scientific study of pathological cases becomes a necessary phase in the general search for the laws of the normal state. The transition from a normal to a pathological state is slower and more natural in the case of illness, and a return to normal when it occurs spontaneously provides the necessary resistance.

According to this approach to pathology as an indicator of changes in the norm, some modern researchers propose the study of anomalies and monsters: the "teratological approach" (the study of monsters) complements the positivist pathological method "[9, p. 27]. In this case, the concept of "pathology" may be applicable to a community of people with "painful conditions" and uncritical to themselves. The term "pathology" can be used as a description of an intense and negative in scale social phenomenon with many objects that do not realize the severity of their actions (do not evaluate their actions in terms of the laws of human existence: do not be angry, do not steal, etc.) personality, individuality, this term is not recommended as initially any living object is "normal" as "individual", the parameters of variability are relative.

It should be noted that, despite the mutual nature of the explanation achieved by comparing the normal with the pathological and assimilating the pathological and the normal, O. Comte repeatedly insists on the need to determine the normal and the limits of variation of normality before methodically investigating pathological cases.

However, in the theses of O. Comte and his followers, there is a serious gap in that none of them still provide a criterion that would allow us to find out what a normal phenomenon is. It remains for us to conclude that in this respect O. Comte and his followers refer to the usual corresponding concept, taking into account the fact that they use the concepts of normal state, physiological state and natural state as interchangeable concepts [6, p.45].

As a result of this interpretation, the concept of normal or physiological is finally clarified by the concept of harmony, characterized by the manifestation of the aesthetic and moral.

As for the statement about the identity of normal and pathological phenomena, it is equally clear that its main purpose is to deny the qualitative difference between these two phenomena. Logically, the negation of qualitative differences should lead to the approval of homogeneity, which can be expressed in quantitative terms. However, it should be recognized that the quantitative terms used by the supporters of the O. Comte concept, they still have a qualitative aspect, while the differences between the normal and the pathological state can be expressed in quantitative terms, since only the quantity allows taking into account both homogeneity and variation.

Thus, the actual concept of a norm depends on the possibility of its violation. From the point of view of epistemology, such a statement is almost completely meaningless, since if a norm cannot be cognized without changing it, and a norm in its altered state is not necessarily a pathology, then the object of cognition loses all meaning. Thus, any natural phenomenon is a priori humane and approved. In this case, human action, on the one hand, is a natural phenomenon, and on the other hand, it is a volitional act that must be controlled.

In other words, it is impossible to comprehend what is constantly changing, but at the same time remains unchanged. Thus, all of the above approaches to pathology as an indicator of the norm are again reduced to the concept of "thing-in-itself", which finally negates the whole meaning of further discussions about the method of cognizing the norm through pathology.

On the example of society as a special social organism with a complex and susceptible to "disease" organization, we can say that the concept of O. Comte in its transformed form led to the fact that in Western societies there is a process of direct substitution of concepts, when the norm is interpreted as pathology, and pathology, on the contrary, is elevated to the status of the norm. Thus, it can be stated that in none of the modern studies devoted to the role of pathology in the analysis of the norm, there is no emphasis on the epistemological aspect of the problem: the cognizing subject must, at least, be aware of himself as cognizing in order to interpret his own state.

With a distorted consciousness of the subject of cognition itself, it is virtually impossible to prove whether a change occurs or not, whether the norm itself exists or not.

Thus, the method of cognizing the norm through the study of pathology requires a radical revision in modern philosophy, taking into account the fact that all the classical concepts still belonged not to social philosophy, but to the philosophy of medicine and bear a more than noticeable imprint of physiology and biology. At the same time, the organic theories of society at the present stage, no matter how close in spirit they are to physiological concepts in medicine, still do not correspond to the new state of society as a subject of cognition.

Summarizing all of the above, we can draw the following conclusions:

1. the classical theories of cognition of the norm through the study of pathology actually reduced the category of "pathology" itself to indicators of quantitative deviations for the norm;
2. pathology as a way of cognizing the norm requires concretization not only as a general medical, but also as an epistemological category. Therefore, in our opinion, the most promising direction for further research in the field of correlation between the categories of "norm" and "pathology" in modern epistemology is a radical revision of the classical descriptive and terminological apparatus used initially in the field of philosophy and medicine. A transition to the category "health - negative factor - imbalance - disharmony - disease" is possible.

Bibliography

1. Ivanova NN Integration of children with disabilities into society: content, forms, methods: method. recom. Tambov: Tamb. state un-t them. G.R.Derzhavin. Tambov, 2018.51 p.
2. Isaev D.N. Mental retardation in children and adolescents. SPb .: Rech, 2017.389 p.
3. International classification of diseases of the 10th revision (ICD-10) [Electronic resource] // Access mode: URL: <https://mkb-10.com/> (date of access: 24.07.2021).
4. Nosachev GN, Baranov VS Semiotics of mental illness (general psychopathology) Textbook. Samara: Etching, 2017.380 p.
5. Shipitsyna LM "Uneducated" child in the family and society. Socialization of children with intellectual disabilities. SPb .: Rech, 2019.477 p.
6. Gromova E.I. "Another" and conceptualization of mental illness // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 7. Philosophy. 2019.No. 6. - P. 3344.
7. Drozd A.L. The problem of illness and human adaptive capabilities in the mirror of philosophical reflection // Manuscript. 2017. No. 12. - S. 63-67.
8. Zhilin V.I. Psychology of perception and epistemology // Bulletin of the Saratov University. New series. Philosophy Series. Psychology. Pedagogy. 2020. No. 41. - P.18-23.
9. Mustafazade D.T. Philosophy and medicine: dialectics of their relationship // Bulletin of medical Internet conferences. 2019.No. 11. - S. 11-23.
10. Frere B. Positivism. Chapter in The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology 2020. – P. 4469. DOI: 10.1002/9781405165518.wbeosp061.pub2
11. Levine D. Auguste Comte and Positivism: The Essential Writings. Contemporary Sociology. 2019. Vol.47(6). – P. 677678. DOI: 10.1177/0094306118805421cISBN: 00943061

12. Normandin S. Claude Bernard and An Introduction to the Study of Experimental Medicine: «Physical Vitalism,» Dialectic, and Epistemology. *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*. 2017. Vol. 62(4). – P. 495-528.
13. O'Donohue W. Epistemology and Logical Positivism. Chapter in the book *Clinical Psychology and the Philosophy of Science*. 2nd edition. 2019. P. 234-2.
14. Park Y.S., Konge L., Artino L.R. The Positivism Paradigm of Research. *Academic Medicine*. 2020. Vol. 95(5):1. – P. 1726. DOI: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000003093 ISBN: 10402446
15. Pickering M. Auguste Comte and Positivism. In book: *The Cambridge History of French Thought*. 2019. – P. 342-352. DOI: 10.1017/9781316681572.040 ISBN: 9781107163676 Swiatczak B., Tauber A.I. Philosophy of Immunology. Chapter in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 2020. – P. 1544. DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780190098353.003.0001 ISBN: 9780190098353