

Maxim Miransky

“From P’ATHOS to  
EMP’ATHEIA: anthropology  
of change”

Moscow,  
October 14<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

In memory of Mrs. Elena G. Bonner (15.02.1923, Turkmenistan -  
18.06.2011, Boston, US), for making me believe  
One may or even must free oneself,  
In spite everything around to the contrary.

## VITAL SIGNS

"Unstable condition,  
A symptom of life,  
Of mental and environmental change.  
Atmospheric disturbance,  
The feverish flux  
Of human interface and interchange.

The impulse is pure;  
Sometimes our circuits get shorted  
By external interference.  
Signals get crossed  
And the balance distorted  
By internal incoherence.

A tired mind, become a shape shifter,  
Everybody need a mood lifter,  
Everybody need reverse polarity.  
Everybody got mixed feelings  
About the function and the form.  
Everybody got to deviate from the norm.

An ounce of perception,  
A pound of obscure.  
Process information at half speed.  
Pause, rewind, replay,  
Warm memory chip,  
Random sample, hold the one you need.

Leave out the fiction,  
The fact is, this friction  
Will only be won by persistence.

Leave out conditions,  
 Courageous convictions  
 Will drag the dream into existence.

A tired mind, become a shape shifter,  
 Everybody need a soft filter,  
 Everybody need reverse polarity.  
 Everybody got mixed feelings  
 About the function and the form.  
 Everybody got to elevate from the norm..."

Neil Peart,  
 Canadian poet, composer and musician,  
 1981

THEN

"And in a time that's closer, life will be even bolder then.  
 Souls will be complicated, life will be consummated then.  
 Hearts will be brought together soon in our minds forever then.  
 As long as we see there's only us, who can change it -  
 Only us to rearrange it at the start of a new kind of day.  
 And in a time that's closer, life will be even bolder then.  
 Love is the only answer - hate is the root of cancer then.  
 Thoughts will be thought together, soon in our minds forever then.

Love is the only answer - hate is the root of cancer then.  
 Truth is just for the being and there's the sight for seeing then.  
 Thoughts will be brought together soon in our minds forever then.  
 As long as we see there's only us, who can change it -  
 Only us to rearrange it at the start of a new kind of day.  
 And in a time that's closer, life will be even bolder then.  
 Love is the only answer - hate is the root of cancer then.  
 Thoughts will be thought together, soon in our minds forever then".

Jon Anderson,  
 British composer, singer, musician and poet,  
 1970.

## The content

1. P'ATHOS: medical anthropology of cohabitation with illness.
2. Typology of medical and socio-psychological matrixes: illness as ideology; ideology as illness.
3. There is no such thing as norm? Role of substance and role of symbolical substitutes.
4. Does system nature of personality make its forming fatal? Nature of personality: personality as ultra-complex constellation of factors.
5. Is there some X Factor? Anthropology of change (EMP'ATHEIA).

## From p'athos to emp'atheia: anthropology of change.

Is world outlook fatal: how medical anthropology of cohabitation with illness may alter our view on nature of personality?

### 1. P'ATHOS: medical anthropology of cohabitation with illness.

Chief Inspector of Scotland Yard Mr. James Harold Jap – as surely any devotee of immortal Agatha Christie remembers – had a theory (if any), according to which if Mr. Hercule Poirot was involved in any case, there must be a murder, even though in the beginning everything told otherwise. For he believed Mr. Poirot, in a way, attracted murderers – metaphysically in order to defeat them.

Could he be kind of Jesuitical instrument of providential punishment? Hardly so, since there were cases when victims were hardly better than criminals and there were cases, albeit very special, when Mr. Poirot, just like Mr. Sherlock Holmes before him, decided to let murderers go, without letting police know. So it was mostly about restoring some ontological balance of justice rather than about legit formalities (no matter how important) or lex talionis (no matter how ancient). And justice presupposed conscience of course, rooted deeply in his personality. (In Christianity, let me remind, only personality may be saved, not groups or states!)

Being one of the greatest Goodness Knights world literature has ever invented, he was also extremely, even painfully sensitive personality, which allowed him to see that every detail matters here on Earth (as hologram of the whole, so world itself talks and prompts to Poirot), and a man of unprecedented inner strength, camouflaged under outer subtlety. That inner strength so valued by ancient Greeks who named it differently from time to time, speaking about their heroes, and one of famous names was P'ATHOS.

Greeks invented the conception of P'ATHOS – still key one in modern anthropology – in a very special way and characteristically so. Its deep ambivalence was clearly seen right from the beginning. Its very origin was that of duality. Emotional health and illness (suffering) coexisted and still coexist in its content. But, as language as well as philosophy tells us, duality and dualism is not the same thing.

What's dual in ontology (duality as normal feature, which you may find anywhere in biology, in philosophy etc.) becomes dualistic in epistemology (in which duality is conceptualized). For example, what's normally dual yet intertwined in human behavior (body and psyche), in the history of psychology led to the famous and famously misleading Cartesian dualism, overcome only by 1970s! The same we see in the destiny of P'ATHOS. For Greeks and in Greek P'ATHOS means and is "suffering" but at the same time just "emotion"/ feeling (see Onions, [657]). Of course, the latter term is broader and includes the former. But if we remember that, in a way, all feelings mean suffering or at least overcoming, we understand that there is no dualism between 2 concepts. We can even go further if we remember that in pedagogy (so important for Greeks!) upbringing and education are always twofold: with one world being one to be interiorized (when we accept/react to the outer world, world of parents, world of society) and the other being one to be exteriorized (when we try to change/overcome the outer world or describe it in our not others' terms). So overcoming is absolutely natural, part of the process of socialization.

Once we remember this, we see it all in P'ATHOS. P'ATHOS tells us not only that to feel is to suffer but moreover: that to suffer is not necessarily to lose and to go wrong but rather and even primarily to learn, to know and to overcome, and to persist. Hence we still have P'ATHOS as suffering (hence pathology and all medical terms of this kind: neuropathy, homeopathy, psychopath, morpho-pathology -in all European or Europe-influenced languages) and P'ATHOS as feeling (as in modern English we have such words as pathos, pathetic, pathological, patience, of course all of them Greek by origin). English language also has saved for the word "pathos" such meanings as "sensitivity" and "something which makes you sad or merciful". Pathematic means just "emotional" (it is also the second meaning of the word pathological - sic!). "Patient" is too from this etymological nest, and below during talk about iatrogenic therapy we will see how important it is.

For Aristotle P'ATHOS, along with ETHOS and LOGOS, was a mode of persuasion in his "Rhetoric". And it was equally significant. Moreover, whereas ETHOS was a result and feature of moral identity and LOGOS of intellectual identity, P'ATHOS was a result and feature of self-identity. Below we will see that in postulating this Aristotle foresaw the

ultramodern theory of pathology, according to which namely self-identity, if overstressed or misled, may become destructive to one's health. For me the very sequence inside the triad is something most interesting, too: it is no use to go down to arguments themselves without first having persuaded the audience that you're to be trusted and that you're emotionally close to them. That's how elegantly Aristotle showed that emotions are so worthy not only because they make us human but because of quite rational reasons, too. But does it narrow the art of persuasion as much as only imaginable?

Or is it just realistic?

According to recent researches, human reasoning, far from being solely rational and truth seeking driven, is based on mental models, probabilities assessments, memory, knowledge of contexts, emotionality and desire to win rather than on strictest formal rules as such, however universal and intact the latter logically are.

Vide: "Mental models and human reasoning", by Philip N. Johnson-Laird, PNAS, October 26, 2010, vol. 107, number 43, pp. 18243-18250.

And I am talking not only about the famous Mercier - Sperber so-called argumentative theory, according to which conceptualizing powers not searching for truth were and are drivers for progress. Like many allegedly universal theories, it simplifies reality (proudly). Thirst for truth does push us onward but truth is neither given in its pure form (out of history and personality) nor therefore fully attainable. So Sperber and Mercier use a sledgehammer to crack a nut. Vide: "Reason seen more as weapon than path to truth: people argue just to win, scholars assert", by Patricia Cohen, New York Times, June 14, 2011.

Aristotle also anticipated the idea of empathy by inventing the conception of catharsis. For him even friendship was a state of shared positive and negative emotions. Theater was a model of such communications, model of "feelings refinement", as in 18<sup>th</sup> century they would say.

Apathy means losing both emotionality and health, for health always needs emotionality to maintain and feed itself, so low emotionality (apathy) is as dangerous for health as over-emotionality. Indeed, in modern psychiatry and surely in all organic medicine, too, apathy accompanies number of pathologies (so sorry for my pun!).

In Greek music too the relations between ETHOS and P'ATHOS was rather functional, for music, which is abstract enough to contain both

sources, was viewed as medium for improving one's character. ETHOS was not only message but primarily behavior music inspires one to, and P'ATHOS (quality of emotions) was judged by practical behavior/training. Practicing ETHOS meant cultivating habits/abilities of emotional control and self-possession. Measure, sense of measure (between Dionysian and Apollonian modes) was highest pedagogical ideal. And music indeed was a part of public pedagogy.

The duality of PATHOS was a duality of Dionysius cult and Dionysius music. Haunted by emotions and desires, one is only partly free and so eventually he/she will have to pay a price, be it excess or even death, thus destroying the very force – vitality – one once chose to rely upon. Remember Solon's "nothing in excess".

On the other hand, as epicureans told stoics while criticizing the latter, to over-control emotions is no less dangerous, for through emotions, namely through letting them freely go sometimes we are likely to grasp our own primary nature. Moreover: such attempts to leave one's frontiers for a while are of key importance for any personal development.

The very fact that in modern music P'ATHOS gets much greater role than and at the cost of ETHOS is not that bad as it seems, for is it not true that to understand and even accept others' emotions is to be human, ethical? Hardly would Greeks invent the concept of P'ATHOS, albeit in unity with LOGOS and ETHOS, had they not put so much faith in personality and its freedom, freedom so often expressed namely in the uniqueness of individual P'ATHOS. For Greeks, let us remember, any mortal being was a bearer of Divine spirit.

For one thing, laws of dialectics are still in force, so to overstress ETHOS in music is to put it at risk, for too easily it will degrade into sort of moralist music, in which stilted content absorbs the grandeur/beauty of style. Too often we saw it in the history of music, especially in totalitarian states. Reversely, stylistics provoke emotions, and, being perhaps the quickest way of learning and recognizing others' feelings (EMPATHY), music of P'ATHOS helps us deviate a bit from our self-control, self-identification, helps us open ourselves not only to ourselves but also to His/Her Majesty The Other.

However, for Plato in his "The Republic" to build a character (ETHOS) was par excellence to learn how to resist emotions that is P'ATHOS. Both Plato and Aristotle believed music directly affected/produced/trained

emotions so must be controlled in its forms/pitches/motives. Plato was just more pro-state in his advises. However, this key element of resistance/persistence, as we have seen above, was included into the meaning of P'ATHOS, too, and from the very beginning. But since Greek youngsters were supposed to learn how to resist emotions, P'ATHOS might be seen as power to be re-directed to itself!

Vide idem: Gertsman E. "Modern perception of ancient Greek and Byzantine music", in *ORBIS MUSICAE*, 10, 1990-1991; **Герцман Евгений «Античное музыкальное мышление»** [Antic musical thinking; in Russian], Ленинград, 1986; **он же «Языческие и христианские музыкальные древности»** [Pagan and Christian musical antiquities; in Russian], СПб., Лебёдушка, 2006, стр. 15-334, 440-598; **он же «Тайны истории древней музыки»** [Mysteries of ancient music history; in Russian], СПб., Невская нота, 2004.

And it takes us directly to perhaps the most mysterious derivatives of P'ATHOS, namely to the grand triad of sympathy, antipathy and empathy... For Greeks if people have the similar P'ATHOS (= the way they feel the world), there must be some sympathy between them. If they have different P'ATHOS, antagonism may appear between them, i.e. antipathy. But the third variant is much more interesting, being integrative. If one tries to feel what others feel, tries to understand them and place oneself in their boots, empathy comes into existence (the conception still central both for modern psychotherapy and psychodiagnostics of mental states and types, which differ by the level of empathy, amongst other criteria). Antipathy and sympathy are static, being just acknowledgments of facts. Empathy is dynamic, being a driving yet changing-reality force.

The one of divisions which runs between West and East concerns namely P'ATHOS, the way we feel and express it, the way we understand it. But I wonder whether such black-and-white dichotomy of sensualist East and rationalist West might be sufficient to explain everything?

Sensualistic doctrines flourished in the West in no lesser extent than they did in the East (take only epicureans and British philosophical traditions as examples), and rationalism, this psychologically understandable intention to put human instincts and emotions under some control, came to the East no rarer than it did to the West (take only

legists and early Confucians as examples, let alone Muslim Aristotelians of early KALAM and Muslim rationalists MUT'AZILITES).

But of course certain trends exist and continue existing. All I am trying to say is it goes much deeper than to the differences between mentalities, no matter how influential they were and are in behavior building. Human race faced the dilemma of dualistic - monistic ways of understanding or feeling the world at our humans' very dawn. As history of philosophy (even up to now in Western civilization Aristotle, with all his moralistic views I outlined, embodies monism whereas Plato dualism), religion (magic was much more monist than abstract cults) and medicine (empiricism - spiritualism controversy) shows, we have here one of the most ancient and most rooted problems of trust and control. Both freedom of P'ATHOS and control of P'ATHOS may lead to excesses. But not to trust P'ATHOS is to challenge ontology at its deepest level, since primarily instinctive, sensual, emotional and intuitive ways of dealing with macro- or microcosm are either evolutionally or ontogenetically the oldest. Ratio came much later, and as early as freewill creatures appeared, it was and is ever since used as medium to control and suppress emotions.

Yet this scenario, as we have already seen referring to the concept of EMPATHY, is neither justified nor necessary at all. EMPATHY'S monism is evident. Not only does EMPATHY let us avoid egocentrism, and does so not by sacrificing emotions before the altar of rationalism but by widening one's reality to all potential others whose Selves one needs to accept. Rational aspect is one learns how to communicate, how to understand others in the most profound way possible. What's more EMPATHY widens one's reality by shifting one's self-identification. One needs Other/others to be self-identified. One really needs to make one step backward in order to make then 2 steps forward.

Obvious philosophical and cultural parallel is Buddha's teachings, according to which one is not fully free, healthy and happy unless one is also free from one's desires and wishes, let alone obsessions or manias. Do YOU wish something, or is it your wish which rules over you? To be is to be as a subject of being, not as sum of dependencies to slave you by eating your Self away. Dependencies lead to permanent disappointments, which lead to permanent frustration, which is a mother of number of pathologies. So P'ATHOS may be either balanced (healthy) or imbalanced

(pathological), depending on one's measure as well as method of self-identification...

Rationalism, distrusting the frightening world of emotions, is at pains to impose as strict self-control as only possible. Truth, however, is only open self-control works.

Since at least the classical period (5-4 BC) Greeks understood that any illness is a union of corporeal dimension and the way one lives. The latter was especially stressed, being part of education and self-education (self-development, self-improvement). Asclepius (Roman Aesculapius) was an Apollo's son, but he was born after much suffering (Caesarian operation was in fact made by his father-god himself). The very art of medicine (healing) was taught to him by centaur Chiron. One of Asclepius' daughters -of central role -was Hygieia (which meant just health); hence the modern word (term) hygienic. Her Roman equivalent was Saluta (salus means health in Latin); hence the modern words "salubrious", "salubrity", "salutary", "salute", "salutation" and even "salvation" through Latin SALVE (see Onions, [784-785]). And even more: -SALW was shown as proto-Indo-European root, common for at least 11 languages, modern and ancient, ones that are alive and ones dead. See the reference from the academic database (of Russian linguist Professor Sergei A. Starostin).

<http://starling.rinet.ru/cgi-bin/response.cgi?root=config&morpho=0&basename=\data\ie\piet&first=2301>

And what about "to san" that is "to heal"? SAN- too was shown as proto-Indo-European root, albeit with narrower geography. So interesting is the fact its meaning embraces both "healthy" and "happy".

<http://starling.rinet.ru/cgi-bin/response.cgi?root=config&morpho=0&basename=\data\ie\piet&first=2321>

Besides gods mentioned, though, many gods were seen as responsible for various aspects of health.

Asclepius cult dates back to 7 BC. The role of water hygienic procedures was especially stressed in Greek temple medicine. Water was considered "the best helper of gods". Empirical and magical methods were coexisting and even mixing. Syncretism of ancient (not classical) Greek thought therefore medicine was, in a way, a precursor of holism of modern

synergetic science. Homeopathy, from my point of view, is more efficient in saving this spirit of Greek thought. We will return to it later.

The School of Koss (since 6<sup>th</sup> BC) was first to deny rather vividly the metaphysical causes for illnesses, insisting instead on physical ones. But from holistic point of view it had ambivalent consequences. In 19<sup>th</sup> century it was progressive step to acknowledge that mental disorders could be explained biologically and psychologically rather than theologically, which immediately led to a far more humanistic psychiatry than it was before (Pinel, Charcot, others). Exorcism, ships of fools and metal cages had been replaced by introspection and mesmerism. But by fully throwing away immaterial causes, New Age medicine became enchanted by another extreme, no less devastating than natural philosophy - by positivism. Paradox is its pompous and pretentious expectations gave little whereas taking much away: intuitivism flourished till microbiology made medicine real science only by the middle of 20<sup>th</sup> century, and in several countries psychiatry was ruthlessly used as an ideological weapon up to the fall of communism. Now thanks to system psychophysiology we know that physical and mental causes do not exclude one another in scientific medicine -rather the opposite is the case! And of course medical ethics as well as methodology were undermined: the more elementary etiologies physicians discovered and tried to reduce any disorder to, the less important organism as a whole seemed to be. The golden maxima of the necessity "to heal who is ill not illness" was almost forgotten. Yet both homeopathic and allopathic school shared it as principium sacrum. Or claimed they did...

Hippocrates too was from the School of Koss, and characteristically he was allopath, but the difference between him and positivist of 19<sup>th</sup> century is great, for by the 18<sup>th</sup> century science lost its ancient syncretic impulse (to regain it only by 1950s).

Greeks were amongst first to discover diagnostics and prognostics, traumatology and desmurgia, the healing force of mineral water, the phenomenon of psychological suggestion, the diet, the pulse, the brain as organ of thinking and the corpse dissection methodology, to name but few.

The conception of 4 temperaments and their being caused by 4 liquids' proportions was a precursor of psycho-types and neuro-endocrinology.

Through Crete, the Mycenae civilization and directly Greeks received the vast medical systems of ancient India and Egypt, albeit in a reduced volume.

Yet resulting vectors were not that impressive at all. Neither Hippocrates' humoral approach (5-4 BC) nor Erasistrates' discrete approach (4-3 BC), nor Galen's dualism (2-3 AD) was progressive, for all foretold reductionism. The whole Mesopotamian medicine (Sumerian - early Babylonian civilizations) seems to be dualistic (mystical and empirical explanations were parallel realities for Sumerians, and even later preferences of metaphysical meta-paradigms were hardly models for any serious unification). Then Babylonian and Assyrian syncretism came only to complicate things. Egypt offered an economy of thinking. And for the very first time it was in Egypt when medicine started differentiating by illnesses/objects of treating.

Vide: Sorokina T.S. "A History of Medicine"/ "Istoriya meditsiny", in Russian language, Moscow, Academia, 2008, 8<sup>th</sup> edition, pp. 38-183, idem: bibliography in English language [including Nutton V., *Medicine in the Greek World, 800-500 BC*, in: *Western Medical Tradition, 800 BC to 1800 AD*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995; Withington E. Th., *Medical history from the earliest times*, L., 1964]; for the content in English see pages 7-9.

Generally speaking, since the very dawn of medicine and, perhaps surprisingly but it is not so surprising as it seems to be, even up to now 2 major trends have been clashing in medical science when it comes to understanding the nature of pathology. One approach holds it so that any pathology, however primitive, organic and linearly caused it might be, is indirectly or directly caused by psyche, be it just unhealthy way of life one leads, which, in turn, goes back to some unhealthy way one sees life, or be it direct trauma one's psyche has got. Another point of view was and is psychology sometimes matters, yes, but psyche is no more than an epiphenomenon of complex biology human brain contains, therefore it is simply to be cut off by Ockham's razor and all pathologies, being basically organic, have to be cured organically. As a result, they say, psyche too will be returned to normalcy.

Characteristically, other dualistic debates - some no less ancient than those just mentioned - are resonating with them accordingly. I mean policausal theory as well as nervism, stressor (adaptation), biosocial,

nosological (etiological) and psychoanalytic theories to adjoin the first approach; monocausal, as well as cellular and syndromatic theories to adjoin the second one.

From the point of view of anthropology, the most interesting thing is these debates are still buoyant (only take holists - reductionists and allopaths - homeopaths debates as examples) in spite of the fact system psychophysiology resolved the problem outlined by 1970s, and not in favor of one of points of view but in favor of their integration. About what are they still so vividly debating? Great inertia and conservatism of traditional allopathic medicine, insufficient attention of homeopaths to microbiological mechanisms of pathologies, as well as insufficient reception of system psychophysiology by both schools matter but these facts do not explain everything. System psychophysiology integrated body and psyche to such an extent many suspect (rightly) that it cancelled the psychophysical problem at all by showing one cannot have purely psychic and purely somatic phenomena separately, whatever the level of integration. Sure, system psychophysiology does not deal with scholastic questions like "does a cell have soul" (any cell has some autonomy, so autonomy may be seen as precursor of regulatory system, nervous including) but equally it does not consider goal of behavioral act (which it showed as a main psychophysical integrating factor) as direct cellular production. Why? Because of system laws, one of which holds that the whole cannot be reduced to the sum of its elements and their functions, and another that any higher level of integration produces new qualities of integration without leaving lower levels intact or dissolved. Take cell again. Whatever the level of its autonomy/structural complexity, it is involved into so many and so complex interactions, it becomes a hologram for the whole organism to mobilize and change, if needs be. So cell cannot become something new without changing all its systems first. We do not consist of amoebas or laboratory neurons. So psychic phenomena like goal, planning, love or consciousness, despite realized only on material substances like cell, tissue or organ, cannot be their by-products. And this is simply because there is no cell, tissue or organ to develop in a linear, isolated and subject-preserving way. In other words: subject of change develops only when it stops being only itself, when it loses its self-identification, if anything. Below we will see just how important it is for understanding the nature of health...

So there is no such thing as material cause and psychic sequence discretely or, reversely, psychic cause and material sequence discretely: so intertwined and interwoven they are. But it does not cancel the problem of personal responsibility. Indeed one gets a cold not because demons haunt her/him but because after bathing she/he just came out when it was wet and windy. Yet in no way it explains WHY she/he did it. That's how P'ATHOS again comes into picture, for hardly everyone would make such a mistake. Misbehavior is trigger, not biochemical mechanisms themselves. So economy of thinking, with all its progressive potential, is kind of crypto-dualism.

Medieval medicine inherited almost all controversies ancient medicine produced and left unresolved. Then it added its own ones. Moreover, not every achievement was mechanically carried into new era. Take hygienic practices, for one. On Crete the sanitary system of water communications was invented in the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium BC! In the 8<sup>th</sup> century BC Assyrians invented the water-providing system of underground and above-ground hydro-technical channels, which not only inspired Romans to build aqueducts 300 years later but also survived... to our very days (sic!)! I find it especially interesting that in comparison with Middle Ages civilizations earlier civilizations had much higher standards regarding hygienic and sanitary culture/practices (compare ancient and medieval Egypt, ancient Mesopotamia and medieval Baghdad Caliphate, ancient Rome and medieval proto-Italian kingdoms - with all corrections concerning Muslim hygienic requirements been taken into account). Only dualism, with its (ontologically deeply naïve) division of the world into higher/sacral one (cultural) and lower/sinful one (physiological) might produce such prolonged effect...

Yet in no way it was single. Iatro-mechanics of Lamettrie and iatro-chemistry of Paracelsus were representing rather painfully the famous elemental - humoral controversy in medicine, which dated back to antiquity and simultaneously anticipated, albeit only partly, reductionism - systemology controversy of 20<sup>th</sup> century (accordingly).

Humanism, however, was slowly gaining its ground...

If to feel is to suffer, and to suffer is to learn and to know, then the first object to which learning [interpretation or misinterpretation] may be applied is suffering itself that is illness. From 18<sup>th</sup> century onwards it is called iatrogenic (doctor-caused) illness. Also the modern conception of

patient-hood is used, which embraces psychology of patient as well as repertoire of doctor's influences/attitudes. I deem it useful to distinguish between classical iatrogenic pathologies and positive outcome of doctor-patient relationships. Iatrogenic phenomena in negative sense (sort of psychogenic phenomena in negative sense like Freudian transfer) mean that either doctor's behavior/attitudes undermine patient's recovery or patient's own interpretation of doctor's attitudes/behavior does so. Taken in positive sense (for example, when it comes to placebo or the factor of trust and faith), iatrogenic phenomena mean that either doctor's behavior/attitudes facilitate patient's recovery or patient's own interpretation of doctor's attitudes/behavior does so, or, furthermore, patient's own activity does. The latter includes the very specific strategy of some patients who try hard not only to help doctor do her/his job, by forming positive attitudes and by sticking to all recommendations doctor gives, but also to study medicine to learn more about their illness - and not in a way hypochondriacs do but in a profound and self-reforming way. They may even change the very model of doctor-patient relationships from traditional subject-object to subject-subject one, given doctor is smart, open and responsive. In full variant they do become doctors for themselves, thus realizing an ancient wisdom - or, rather, 2 wisdoms, Biblical one (about healers who must heal themselves first) and Sufi one (about murid, pupil, who must become murid, teacher for himself/herself, true sheikh).

In fact, they intuitively grasp what is now known scientifically: that patient's active position and positive thinking do deepen and facilitate recovery because there are biochemical regulators or correlates to make it real. I mean of course various hormones and neurotransmitters [mediators], which were shown as multifunctional, feed-back-driven common agents of neuronal, immune and humoral systems, despite 2 last systems being partly autonomous from the brain. Yet neuronal system is in itself architectonical. So psychological attitudes, given cortical up-down pathways are intact, may launch not only cascades of neurotransmitters through neuronal nets but, due to them being partly hormones partly immune agents, the whole organism's response as well.

Organism is not a strict hierarchy; it is a multi-levels super-system, in which no regulatory sub-system has monopoly's rights.

For absolutely splendid and thoughtful study of vast modern data on iatrogenic phenomena, vide: "YOUR MEDICAL MIND, or How to Decide What Is Right for You", by Jerome Groopman and Pamela Hartzband, 308 pp., NYC, The Penguin Press, 2011; and "HOW DOCTORS THINK", by Jerome Groopman, 307 pp., NYC, Houghton Mifflin Company, 2007.

Suffice it to say, any recovery presupposes bringing some normalcy into cell's biochemistry, whether it concerns ions channels inside membrane or proteins/carbohydrates/lipids correlations, none of which can be restored without hormones/transmitters aforementioned (gluco-corticoids, insulin, growth hormone, growth factors, adrenaline, acetylcholine, vasopressin, oxytocine etc.).

Here - in regulatory architectonics - we see once again the fundamental principle of biology: life is not about tough verticality of power. Brain structures do govern other systems and organs, but to make overall system flexible therefore adaptive, it is normal and quite inevitable to let various degrees of freedom at all levels of organization. At the output we will have quite fragile but at the same time highly changeable, trans-mutable and reactive therefore almost invulnerable super-system that is complex of sub-systems. To serve a common system any structure itself must turn into system first. Thus, any psychic governance, whether cortical, thalamic or hypophysis', does make lower somatic structures neither insignificant nor fully dependent. Just like human thought, albeit activating the bulk of brain structures to make it formed and expressed, in no way ceases to remain human thought. Fundamental principles of half-autonomy, positive and negative feed-back and compensation only add to the invulnerability of the whole system.

Take sexual behaviour as example of how it works. Though realized on different biochemical substances (most of all, sex hormones like estrogens and androgens, but also stress hormones (like gluco-corticoids, adrenaline or dopamine) as well as hormones of pleasure (like endorphins, oxytocine or serotonin), it does not cease to be extremely complex, full of rituals, presuppositions, superstitions and any other cultural associations. At the same time that hormonal regulation is not only highly interwoven with neuronal regulation, and so much so it is hard to say where's trigger where's consequence in given behavioral act, in biology or in psychology. What's more, as we've seen, the very regulatory systems are architectonical, so sex hormones are not only synthesized at

different levels of organization (in gonads as well as in adrenal glands) but also are governed, albeit in non-linear and feed-back-related way, by highest or just key brain centers, prefrontal cortex and hypothalamus including, and themselves are responsible of other phenomena like rewarding system in the brain or ontogenesis, for androgens and estrogens were shown as epigenetic factors (ontogenesis inductors). So in no way testosterone produces erotic daydreaming of Romantic poetry, for at the level Romantic poetry appears in the brain, testosterone's influence is mediated by number of other influences, non-sexual and associative including. Linear organic determinism is out of question in modern biology.

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century many theories discovered and highlighted the role of inner pre-conditions or pre-attitudes in any vital activity, thus showing inapplicability of linear cybernetics to biology/psychology. The classical model of stimulation and (stimulation-driven and stimulation-determined) reaction turned out to be too primitive to explain behavior. Stimuli may indeed provoke some more or less predictable reaction, but only within certain triad, which includes the measure of preparation (readiness) to reaction. Great American cognitive psychologist Ulric Neisser discovered that the whole human perception necessarily includes models/schemes/frames of perception, which are permanently corrected by experience but through which any stimuli come before turning into reaction. These schemes are modi, in/through/by which mind operates, for they reflect its overall structure and functionality.

Vide: Neisser, Ulric (1993), *The Perceived self: Ecological and Interpersonal Sources of Self Knowledge*, Cambridge University Press - New York, NYC; Neisser, Ulric (1967), *Cognitive psychology*, Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York; Neisser, Ulric (1976), *Cognition and reality: principles and implications of cognitive psychology*, W.H. Freeman, NYC.

The theory of neuron-detector by Russian Academician Evgeniy Sokolov too holds it so that even at neuronal level any cell's reaction is only partly determined by stimulation: even greater role is played by the whole (biochemical, synaptic) readiness of neuron to react. Neuronal activity cannot be fully explained without taking into account the resulting vector of such activity, vector, which integrates all outer and inner influences, thus determining either the given reaction (principle of

selectivity) or rather the spectrum of potential ones. In other words, even if there is such thing as any determiner [of neuronal behavior], it is a given state of neuron and stimulus, the latter being only necessary not sufficient condition of activity (moreover, spontaneous pace-making neurons do not need even this!).

Vide: *Sokolov E.N., Spinks Y.A., Naatanen R., Lyytinen H., The Orienting Response in Information Processing, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Ass., 2002, 384 p.*

*Sokolov E.N. Perception and the conditioning reflex: vector encoding // Int. Journal of Psychophysiology, 2000, volume 35, pp. 197—217.*

*Sokolov E.N. Local plasticity in neuronal learning // Memory: Organization and Locus of Change / Ed. by L.R. Squire, N.M. Weinberger, G. Lynch, and J.L. McGaugh, Oxford, NYC: Oxford University Press, 1991, pp. 364—391.*

According to one of world leading experts in neuroscience Professor Marcus E. Raichle, Default Mode Network of the brain (he himself et al. discovered in 1996) also proves that even at rest brain's spontaneous activity is so high (nearly 20 times energetically higher than the outer-task-driven activity), it is enough to maintain the necessary plateau of bioelectricity, and it is organized in such a way as to prepare system to millions of potential risks/dangers/tasks. Otherwise, it would be impossible for the brain to immediately react to any given task, which itself provokes only 5% of the brain's baseline activity. In fact, our brains always keep anticipating the world, and are destined to do so!

Vide: Marcus E. Raichle "The Brain's Dark Energy", in *Scientific American*, March 2010, pp. 28-33.

For the experimental basis for the phenomenon of anticipating mind see Professor Neisser's books above also: "Me, Myself and I" by Uwe Herwig, *Scientific American Mind*, July/ August, 2010, p. 58-63.

In system psychophysiology as a whole, too, the reaction is only a sequence of multi-complex coordination of memory, planning and motivation, for all of which stimuli are sometimes triggers never determiners of behavior (this role GOAL of behavioral act plays). To extend it to medicine, it must be remembered that the very mobilization of functional systems (recovery) may be seen as a result of setting a

GOAL to recover, which easily explains why medical treatment itself, being only group of stimuli (or system of stimuli, at best), cannot determine the outcome. In the light of system psychophysiology any recovery is a resulting vector of treatment, the whole organism's state and motivation to recover (with the latter being as strong as strong positive iatrogenic strategy is).

And even more: the very stimulus may be viewed as not accidental for given person. The old representation of stimulus as independent reality given to us out of the blue is too naïve to be accepted by modern science. I am even going to say that EVERY stimulus, negative or positive, destructive or constructive, unhealthy and healthy, does, in a way, pre-exist in given personality, for the specificity of personality may attract stimuli by making certain mistakes, by leading life she/he leads, by living where one lives, by communicating with certain personalities, by participating in certain activities etc., etc., etc., disregarding whether one is aware of such things happening or not. So outer reality is relative, being actualized this way or that by our uniqueness, this uniqueness, in turn, being pre-image of outer reality. This is why homeopaths say that every illness is unique, out of any typology, for it is attracted by unique personality, which is full of idiosyncrasies, these gates of perception, normal or abnormal...

Powerful role of psychic filters in world reception the phenomenon of placebo can easily illustrate. Placebo was also shown as one of mechanisms of iatrogenic recovery. Vide: "Placebo effect: a cure in the mind", by Maj-Britt Niemi, in Scientific American Mind, February 2009. According to most fresh and statistically vast researches, poor health literacy does indeed correlate with risks to begin to ache and even to be hospitalized. Researches summed up their data in the following way.

**"Data Synthesis: 96 relevant good- or fair-quality studies in 111 articles were identified: 98 articles on health literacy, 22 on numeracy, and 9 on both. Low health literacy was consistently associated with more hospitalizations; greater use of emergency care; lower receipt of mammography screening and influenza vaccine; poorer ability to demonstrate taking medications appropriately; poorer ability to interpret labels and health messages; and, among elderly persons, poorer overall health status and higher mortality rates. Poor health literacy partially**

explains racial disparities in some outcomes. Reviewers could not reach firm conclusions about the relationship between numeracy and health outcomes because of few studies or inconsistent results among studies. Approximately 80 million Americans have limited health literacy, which puts them at greater risk for poorer access to care and poorer health outcomes.

Vide: Low Health Literacy and Health Outcomes: An Updated Systematic Review, by Nancy D. Berkman, PhD; Stacey L. Sheridan, MD, MPH; Katrina E. Donahue, MD, MPH; David J. Halpern, MD, MPH; and Karen Crotty, PhD, MPH; in *Annals of Internal Medicine*, July 19, 2011, vol. 155, number 2, pp. 97-107.

Thus, positive iatrogenic phenomena are sort of empathy, but empathy re-directed to your own self.. What exactly happens to your psychophysics when you try to study and to understand your illness, to cohabitate with it? You again become whole, albeit differently than before.. Such mental intellectual activities presuppose activating prefrontal cortex, which is a center of the most complex behavior patterns, integrity including, which is synonymous to health! And in full accordance with the ethics contained in the term P'ATHOS, you cannot avoid paroxysm whilst recovering (confer: homeopathy, immunology). For Samuel Hahnemann (1755-1843), this homeopathy founding father, illness like personality develops by totally integrating our whole experience as well as all our psychosomatic peculiarities. Any illness, however organic, furthermore, has psychological states to accompany it (see below).

To sum up, when P'ATHOS is in balance, feeling does not degrade into pathology; when, reversely, P'ATHOS is too exaggerated (as in hysteria, borderline personality disorder or mania) or too simplified (as in depression, bipolar disorder or schizophrenia), pathology appears. The same is true for any ideology. Idea [as existent] is not an evil per se; only over-pretentious idea or one of poor reflection on itself is [as existence]. Anthropomorphism in English is symptomatically called pathetic fallacy.

But how each personal, i.e. individual, i.e. unique P'ATHOS is determined, if it is determined at all?

According to clinical studies, pathology can change personality, person's pathos, so to speak.

Take so-called [relatively] incurable deceases (like cancer, leprosy or pathologies with genetically determined early death), treatment of which is often reduced to so-called maintenance that is helping people not only avoid severe pain but also accept the very possibility of passing away. So both the pathogenesis of certain pathology of this kind and as itself waiting for the end of life may change and do change personality. But how?

No less interesting another group of pathologies, namely life-long ones (people have to live with them, for they do not cause early death, being only risk factors). I mean people suffering from traumas, pre-natal and post-natal, from allergy, certain skin and metabolism deceases, including diabetes, so all physically challenged people let alone mentally-challenged ones. Some of these pathologies/deceases/disorders are curable, some not (at the present level of medicine), but even curable ones are cured during years, even dozens of years, which is period enough for causing some changes in personality.

Consider also the phenomenon of cultural assessments (stigmatizations?) of certain deceases (diabetes, obesity, anorexia, barrenness, impotence, dwarfishness, being humpbacked etc.) as well as phenomenon of psycho-type, which forms AS A RESULT of such deceases.

Examples are psychological changes in diabetics and adjoining deceases suffering patients. Vide: GREENSPAN'S BASIC AND CLINICAL ENDOCRINOLOGY, 8<sup>TH</sup> EDITION, NYC, McGraw Hill - Medical, 2007; in 2 volumes, edited by Professor David G. Gardner, Professor Dolores Shoback, v. 1, chapters 7 & 9-11; it also of course concerns alcoholism, growth hormone/ growth factors deceases (psychogenic hypophysis' diminution and hypothyroidism/ hyperthyroidism including) and obesity [ibidem].

Especially sensitive in this regard is sexual sphere: not only it often suffers because of psychological disturbances, it also, once disturbed, causes a range of psychic phenomena to accompany sexual deceases (barrenness, say, and all libido deviations). Especially interesting are intercourse misbehaviors, early ejaculation and other such pathologies/pathological states/patterns, which clearly have maddening force. Testicular pathologies lead up to social des-adaptation at the level of

personality. Functional hypothalamic amenorrhea leads to personal des-adaptation and, correlatively, to non-sustainability to distress. Professional women sport is accompanied by many similar illnesses up to growth delay and sex development delay. Functional hypothalamic amenorrhea has 2 most famous kinds - anorexia and bulimia. Their link with obsessive-compulsory disorder-driven personality has been proved. Personality is also changed quite dramatically under Turner's syndrome (X des-genesis of gonads): up to ugly look and intellectual deficits and spatial disorientations. Treatments of patients with all pre-natal sex identification anomalies (whether biochemical or just genetic) must always include psychotherapy for both children and parents, whereas "parents' level of understanding" of problems their children face is "most important" amongst factors of successful psychotherapy. Moreover: in many cases hormones' unexpected dynamics and, as a result, genitals' morphological changes do not determine sex identification as themselves: only constellation of cultural, religious, biological and psychological factors does. E.g., in modern surgery operative intrusion in favor of female sex is recommended only when patient's receptors are fully insensitive to androgens. Vide: ibidem, volume 2, chapters 13, 14, 15, 16, 20 and 24.

Sexual identification as search for one's Self may be seen as kind of cul-de-sac, dialectically speaking and leaving beyond consideration all biological cases (in which personality does change, too, but such people - lesbians, bisexuals and homosexuals - have to change their sex or maintain untraditional role, all alternatives being destructive for them). Greek idea of Androgyne as search for The Other is much more productive in terms of self-identification. Namely behavioral yet cultural (axiological) balance between Female side and Male side within one's self allows us to avoid dangers of unilateral perception/outlook. Neither gender experiments - like in transgender culture - nor medical phenomena like feminization or masculinization produce such effect, for again primordial nature seeking and attempting to find palliative surrogates/ compensations are not the same thing. Discovering within one's self both sources of personality - feminine and masculine - is holistic by definition (and it clearly shifts one's self-identification, makes it dynamical and open), whereas gender experiments only highlight what's discrete. Only soft gender experiments like metro-sexuality fit the andro-gyne ideals more or less, for it insists

on gender balance, inclusive (ontological) not exclusive (epistemological) ethics and superposition of selves. LGBT phenomena let us feel the frontiers of Self; Androgyne ideals show such frontiers reflect only lower levels of reality, at which womanhood and manhood are not yet fused.

Mental disorders are themselves personality's decay or restructuring (according to recent researches, the most fundamental feature of all mental disorders is the lowering of the level of system coherence in mind structures, i.e. personality).

Vide: Marcus E. Raichle "The Brain's Dark Energy", in Scientific American, March 2010, p. 33; Thomas R. Insel "Faulty Circuits", in Scientific American, April 2010, pp. 28-35.

But even physical pathologies which last for so long (and no physical pathology is purely physical due to psycho-somatic principle) provoke people to choose between 2 strategies: either to let all go as it goes (passive doctor-dependant style) or to learn how to cohabit with her/his illness, however hard it takes to overcome the given illness by trying to understand its nature (active subject-subject style). In both cases, however, we have, in fact, 2 types of personality characteristically reacting to challenge.

In psychology such dilemma is called the locus of control. If ill, people with external locus of control tend to blame outer world and therefore prefer to wait till someone else help them, rather than trying to go back to the origins of disease. Such patients usually decline to study their illness, considering doctor as the only actor in any treatment whatsoever. To grasp that their passiveness only makes things worse is too much for them. In striking contrast, people with internal locus of control tend to blame inner world, meaning themselves, therefore to be active, to fight and to struggle. They are at pains searching for the etiology of their illness. As I have already said above, some even start to study medicine, to learn about what's happening to them, thus becoming half-doctors to heal themselves! The logic of external locus is if illness is something beyond my control, something external, then nothing I can do to change it. The logic of internal locus is if illness is something I caused (something simultaneously alien to my nature but grown from within my behavior/outlook), then nothing doctor can do, without my primary efforts. So illness only sharpens what is already in personality, waiting to be revealed.

So it seems my thesis can be reversed. And criminal psychiatry too says much in favor of this. I mean can personality affect pathology - and to what extent? Or even more - can personality cause some/ certain pathology? Many phenomena co-exist and co-influence to make it real and even inevitable and inescapable after the point of bifurcation (in terms of synergetic meta-theory). Problem of behavioral patterns and life style I mentioned, problem of temperamental types, problem of psycho-types, and problem of constitutionality - all attract challenges selectively. Yet causing does not mean predetermination (for causes may be indirect ones, non-linear and accompanied by other causes/factors). Psycho-type, e.g., is challenge not fatal verdict. But it is also some filter through which world perception flows, as it flows through many other filters as well (mental models, behavioral patterns and so on).

Such a constellation of illness and personality is an object homeopathy cures. It does not cure illness as allegedly parallel reality. Consequently, the main paradox of homeopathy is it denies panacea, universal cure, at the same time being a universal theory of illness. Since there is no such thing as isolated illness, you cannot heal it without healing the whole organism/personality. Laws [of biology] are universal; persons unique.

In homeopathy the stronger than illness and the more similar to illness the cure is, the higher the likelihood treatment will be successful. But from this thesis it follows that during treatment symptoms must be and turn out to be even stronger than before cure was taken; hence the art of cohabitation with illness (homeopaths call it "homeopathic initial worsening"). Outer symptoms point out to the inner cause, at the same time being signs of recovery! There is a connection between sensitivity [common and specific to stimuli/drugs] and the very likelihood of recovery (vide: **Кент Джеймс Тайлер «Лекции по философии гомеопатии», М., Гомеопатическая медицина, 2000, стр. 174/ James Tyler Kent, Lectures on philosophy of homeopathy, 1900; secondary translation back into English is everywhere mine).**

"Illnesses only reflect the inner world any human being contains" (Kent).

"Our own inner I is thoroughly reflected in the illness we suffer from" (Kent).

"No one is fully cured without first symptoms again appearing, this time as last ones" (Kent).

But does it all make personality -pathology connection fatal?

Certainly the reverse is true, for as personality may cause/make more likely various illnesses, it may equally help us get rid of them/ of their psychological consequences, as famous medical cases showed and still show: Lord Nelson and Steven Hawking in England, Ruben David Goncales Galego in Spain, Jean-Paul Marat in France, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and late Ronald Reagan in US, Irina Yasina in modern Russia, and many more. The stronger and smarter the personality, and the more integrative and motivated it is, the subtler the cohabitation with illness, and the more information/reflection it gives to personality, thus closing the circuit. For such a personality pathology is always a challenge/new method of learning oneself, no matter how bad/deep pathology is.

Adaptation theories (most famous being of course that of great Hungarian-Canadian pathologist Hans Hugo Bruno Selye, 1907-1982) too highlight the importance of cohabitation with illness. Starting point for them is the empirical and methodological generalization that the very illness may be seen as sort of (des-) adaptation (to some pathological inner or outer factors). In Russia the similar ideas were developed by our great pathologist Academician I. V. Davydovsky in 1960s-1970s. Hence Selye differed between adaptation (psychobiological mechanism of normal non-specific reactions to challenge) and des-adaptation (individual failure to cope with stress posed by illness), between eustress (normal mobilizing stress as precursor of future recovery) and distress (pathological process not stopped by adaptation).

Pathology is a resulting vector of many actualized causes and personal idiosyncrasies; hence the concept of GENERAL adaptation syndrome, universality of stress. Selye was first who scientifically discovered that neuro-endocrine regulation underlines this universality (architectonically at thalamic, hypophysis', thymus glands' and adrenal glands' levels).

Of great interest are his thoughts on main mechanism of curing. He proposed a conceptual link between pathology and failure to uphold emotional dealings with others. For Selye lack of such feelings as love and thankfulness may lead to disruptions in health, whether social or then personal. Symptomatically, he invented his famous ethical principle of altruistic egoism, basing on biological mechanisms of cell dynamics: as cells in order to survive must act by permanently referring to other cells/levels of organization, so people in order to survive (egoism) must act altruistically.

See by references: Selye Hans, *"The Stress of life"*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956, 1976 [second edition substantially enlarged]; Selye, H. "Stress and disease", *Science*, Oct.7, 1955, 122: 625-631; Selye Hans, *From Dream to Discovery: On Being a Scientist*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964; Selye Hans, *Hormones and Resistance*, Berlin; New York: Springer-Verlag, 1971; Selye Hans, *Stress without Distress*, Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1979.

For me here this very link between pathology and egocentrism is of vital importance. *Imbalance of Ego (no matter, to which direction) is not pathology as such but clearly a gate for probable pathologies of different kinds to appear through.*

## 2. Typology of medical and socio-psychological matrixes: illness as ideology; ideology as illness.

So if in pathogenesis thought plays no lesser role than its substrates, and ideology is thought's extreme, what's common between illness and ideology?

Both phenomena grow from within personality, at the same time being alien to its ontology. When we suffer from some illness or when we make ideological models we do so because of some problem/problems we allowed to appear: it might be some misbehavior (say, smoking leading to cancer), it might be some inner personal contradictions (say, between your temper and upbringing, leading to sort of psychological compensation), and it might be any mistake eventually leading to certain price to pay for it. Ideology too may compensate for the lack of personal integrity. This way or that, WE decide, WE do it so WE pay. Image of reality, albeit distorted as itself because of laws of human perception and memory, becomes even more distorted as time goes by and mistakes are built up. It's all inside of us. Even externally determined pathologies such as infectious ones are only partly determined by outer factors: immunology plays an even bigger role in forming organism's system reaction, and the stronger and the smarter the immune response, the less the likelihood you get a bug. And furthermore: being partly autonomous, immune system is still dependant on other regulators up to higher psychic functions and mind's state as a whole.

Human behavior was shown as key factor for the majority of most frequent pathologies (circa 55% out of all factors, according to Russian expert Academician Yury Lisitsyn, 1970s, vide his «Теории медицины 20-го века»/ [Theories of XX century medical science], М., Медицина, 1999, страницы 77-85; genetics gives only 20-22%; pathogenic outer factors give 20-25%; and in 80s and 90s both Russian and US data fitted these figures all right, with all natural fluctuations, not being substantial, having been taken into account; page 82). The prevalence of chronic cardiologic, neurological and oncological deceases over infections, severe pathologies and traumas in modern world statistics is only confirming the evidence just mentioned (pages 50-68).

In homeopathy any illness is as epiphenomenal (accidental) as any ideology is in relation to nature. They are only partly real, as Sufi doctor would say. "There are no such things as [separate] illnesses, there are only ill people to be cured" (Samuel Hahnemann). Hence we deal with any illness as unique one: no illness is a mere repetition of old anamnesis; any illness is always new. See: Kent, opus citatum.

When epoch of ideology collapsed (after the fall of communism) the most dangerous thing was to try to find substitutes for it at the same level ("national idea", quasi-religious doctrinairism and like), not at the level of human being/ being itself/ existentiality. Life, being at the same time extremely changeable and not fully available to us (quantum mechanics and psychology of perception found limits of human knowledge), is always broader than any conception formed to explain it, so in fact there is no conception let alone ideology to cover life fully intelligibly, therefore life can be embraced only holistically that is equally sensibly, intelligibly and intuitively. So paradox is life, being total, cannot be totally explained. Subsequently, it is human, for it a priori includes everything possible. Whole needs a part, but it gives part a context. Ideology, in great contrast, being local, partial by origin (idea of ontos and ontos itself do not coincide), tends to be total, in order to subdue what's lower, thus contradicting the very nature of life. So it cannot be right or wrong, it's just antihuman, for it wants to control everything, no matter phenomenon is controllable or not controllable at all. It may destruct life of course, and it spreads like illness, having no choice - but also no chance ontologically... as quasi-alternative to life (in no way interchangeable with

it). Part needs a whole, but only in terms of the part the whole is never the same.

Both phenomena grow as symbolical substitutes of some inner unresolved problem (psychosomatics, psychogenic disorders, neuroses, psychoses, ideology as insolvent substitute of religion). See below.

Both phenomena mimic and/or use reality, to some moment remaining hidden, only to outgrow reality afterwards (paradoxically by extremely simplifying it). Uncertainty (normal for any biological system and its environment) brings the necessity (for any subject/actor) to rely on Gestalt perception or (for scientist) to study system laws to overcome uncertainty, in a sense. According to Academician Davydovsky's pupil Doctor Boris Kaurov, in such circumstances brain tends to mimic reality (in dreaming, daydreaming, anticipating, modeling or planning) in order to approximate some wholeness/ certainty.

The whole algorithm of ontogenesis is uncertain, as twin method evidently shows.

Cell genesis is not determined up to certain fixed moment (redundant production - proliferation - induction - differentiation - competitive elimination in cell dynamics), and it is called trans-determinism in synergetic paradigm.

Strategies of survival do not vary as much as negative/ positive factors do. And as time goes by (as organism or organ gets older), strategies only diminish in their number. Mutations only complicate the situation by making it more uncertain. So choosing this strategy or that may be sort of Sherrington's funnel. Pathology may easily become inevitable.

Like personality pathology develops as integrative system, one of self-regulation, self-evolvement and self-reproduction. Principle of positive and negative feedback works unmistakably well disregarding whether one is ill or not.

Doctor Kaurov's key articles on general pathology (since early 1980s) may be found on his site: <http://patho-not.narod.ru>.

According to modern cybernetic medicine, even cell cannot go pathological way without launching a whole programmed state (vide: CHURILOV L.P. "System approach in general pathology: necessity and principles of pathoinformatics"/ «О системном подходе в общей патологии: необходимость и принципы патоинформатики», Вестник СПбУ, 2009, 11, выпуск 3). Moreover: some fundamental mechanisms are common for

health and pathology, and their involvement depends on outer triggers, development's stage and all regulatory systems' roles (I mean such mechanisms as apoptosis, cellular differentiation, hormones' and neurotransmitters' by-effects and so on). Principles of cascading reactions and of equi-finality (when parallel redundant processes lead to the same result) are common, too, in pathology (take only inflammation) and in health (take only embryogenesis).

Both phenomena, subsequently, tend to be total (take for pathology how inflammation may easily slide into all-organism system shock due to inflammation mediators cytokines' multiplying effects; take for ideology fascism's and communism's trend to cover the whole planet).

Paradoxically though, they both are to be blocked locally in terms of information (thanks to half-autonomy of immune and humoral systems; and for ideology thanks to "think globally, act locally" system principle [famous principle of Rome Club]).

Say, both cancer and fascism are total; fascism for history is a cancer to be destructed by "apoptosis" with profoundly healing consequences.

### 3. There is no such thing as norm? Role of substance and role of symbolical substitutes.

So characteristically pathology and ideology tends to mimic broader reality, which reminds us of self-identity again, for both true self-identity and false self-identity mimic reality, transcendent (God's) and symbolic one respectively.

Rizzolatti's (now famous) mirror neurons may serve as possible mechanism: it may go either way, depending on behavioral goals.

"Since Rizzolatti's discovery (in 1996 - M.M.), other scientists have revealed that mirror neurons reflect not only the actions of other people but their intentions and emotions as well. The discovery is offering scientists new insight into, among other things, human empathy, language evolution and theories of mind. In addition, mirror neurons may help explain certain neurological conditions. For example, some evidence suggests that autistic children may suffer from mirror neuron deficiencies, leaving them unable to intuit others' emotional states. Our own work indicates that the mirror system can be enlisted to expedite the rehabilitation of hemorrhagic stroke patients".

Vide: "Therapeutic reflection" by Ferdinand Binkofski and Giovanni Buccino, *Scientific American Mind*, June 2007 issue.

But what is it -self-identity? As I said above, by nature and by definition, and in contrast with the Absolute, human being cannot be fully self-identified, for our consciousness and being (existence) do not coincide. So the more the difference between psyche and nature, the more disturbed the inner harmony is. Hence we have inevitable pathological (meaning not natural, deviant) consequences, be them ideological or medical. We have disruptions, with question only being to what extent.

But from the impossibility of full self-identification it follows at least, first, that it is normal to live with such uncertainty, and second, that to compare pathology and norm is not that eureka-provoking as it is usually thought to be. Furthermore, since Freud and Reich the very definition of psychological norm is not considered as something certain and eternally given. It evidently varies from culture to culture, from epoch to epoch and from one scientific school to another.

So we must compare pathology with something no less certain but at the same time opposite. And what is it? Certainly, it is happiness - and not in some undetectable literary sense but in a sense and in terms of psychophysiology and its correlates (e.g., pleasure). Pleasure is an alternative to pain - however primitive pleasure may be - for it clearly must not always be that primitive it is usually expected to be. EUDAIMON'IA of Greeks - let me remind you - dates back to 2 other fundamentals of Greek ethics: to Socrates' inner freedom of personality and to the spirit of AGON'IA (spirit of perfection, of competition, of permanent refinement one sticks to in order to develop). And if we do choose pleasure as a state, with which pain may be correctly compared, we come to something extremely interesting.

Hormones of pleasure (dopamine, endorphins, serotonin etc.) are responsible for low-wave dreaming, they reduce pain at the level of MU-opioid receptors and fight alcoholic dependence, and they soothe stressful experience and help come out of depression. Let us go then step by step in this list. Dream is an activity characterized by no censorship of consciousness. Subsequently, whilst dreaming we are free from self-identification, and whilst mediating, too. Pain is an almost indispensable companion/result of pathology, and in case of pathology

self-identification is either heightened (say, in narcissism or hysteria) or dramatically misled (take all manias, ill-nutrition, alcoholic, paranoid and psychosomatic disorders etc.). And vide: Uwe Herwig, opus citatum, Scientific American Mind, July/ August, 2010, p. 62-63; ibidem: Molly Knight Raskin, opus citatum, pp. 44-51; Kent A. Kiehl and Joshua W. Buckholtz "Inside the Mind of a Psychopath", Scientific American Mind, September/October 2010, pp. 22-29. Pathology is paradoxically as natural as it is not at all, so it may happen only when inner idiosyncrasy and outer risk factor meet and match. Further, dependence is now recognized as one of main mechanisms of pathology, from drugs dependence to computer gamers' dependence and social dependences. And, finally, distress is a mother/companion of great number of various illnesses.

"The lack of pleasure, anhedonia, is one of the most important symptoms of many mental illnesses, including depression. It is difficult to conceive of anyone reporting happiness or well-being while so deprived of pleasure. Thus anhedonia is another potential avenue of evidence for the link between pleasure and happiness.

Alternatively, core "liking" for fundamental pleasures might persist intact but unacknowledged in anhedonia, while instead only more cognitive construals, including retrospective or anticipatory savoring, become impaired. That is, fundamental pleasure may not be abolished in depression after all. Instead, what is called anhedonia might be secondary to motivational deficits and cognitive misappraisals of rewards, or to an overlay of negative affective states. This may still disrupt life enjoyment, and perhaps render higher pleasures impossible".

Vide: Morten L. Kringelbach and Kent C. Berridge "The Neuroscience of Happiness and Pleasure", in Social Research, vol. 77, 2, Summer 2010, pp. 659-678.

So we see that pleasure is a true alternative to pathology, whether intact during some illnesses or not. As intensive and deep as pathology may be, pleasure affects self-identification in a very different way (see below).

If pathology is metaphysically deeply unnatural, then it cannot affect the ontological level, cannot be of essence; but it does destroy human being from within in case it is chronic or severe; not from nature by its origin, it acts through nature; hence pathology is paradoxical: not being

essential, being alien to nature, simultaneously it seems to be as real as nature. But what is this, which can mimic reality in such a persuasive way? Certainly it is symbol, symbolic reality. According to semiotics, we have 3 levels of reality: THING, NAME and MEANING. First is only partly explainable/understandable/available, due to quantum physics and psychology of perception. Second - NAME - is symbol itself, which can form parallel reality, absorbing both MEANING and THING. And we saw it almost everywhere, especially during 20<sup>th</sup> century - this epoch of ideology. Not only many people but even some peoples lived and live in symbolic realities for ages, taking them for granted. As Freud would put it, force of illusion is still at work, being in no way weaker than the force of reality.

As we saw above, both pathology and ideology exploit the symbolic reality in order to mimic/alter ontology, and there are certain mechanisms to make it possible: NAME (SYMBOL) is as real as THING and MEANING (so intertwined they are!), and worlds making is a natural mode of human brain's activity. Really destructive is the impulse to replace THING and MEANING by NAME (SYMBOL) thus undermining the very structure of Reality. Something exists; therefore we can name it somehow; therefore we can understand it somehow; therefore we can behave accordingly (this fourth element - ACTIVITY - psychophysiology adds, and it helps integrate first three).

So symbolism in health may be constructive. According to modern cybernetic medicine, the very language of bio-regulators is symbolic, for their effectiveness is dependent on cell's targeting state as well, and hormones themselves "are symbols, meaning of which is determined by context, not only by cell's receptors for them" (vide: CHURILOV L.P., opus citatum).

When we try to identify ourselves with ourselves, what exactly we do? Too often we only pretend we identify ourselves with ourselves, for usually we identify ourselves with anything save ourselves: with other people's ideals and expectations, with cultural and family norms, with symbols, behind which one may easily hide oneself from any personal transformation one must face. Even great emphasis on Ego may easily be mistaken for true self-identification. For true self-identification necessarily includes the understanding of the limits of self.

It is even too easy to see that world is full of false self-identifications: drugs, alcohol, tobacco, all other dependencies varying from biochemical to political, nationalism, fascism, terrorism, glamour escapism, environmentalist alarmism, criminal and deviant sub-cultures, sports fanaticism, sexual obsessions destroying the very nature of human eroticism, which, far from being sin (all sins are in minds to make sins partly real!), is pure manifestation of being. Different though they are, they are also profoundly common by origin, all being kinds of dualistic unilateralism.

Perhaps the most interesting theory about such personality misidentifications was coined by modern Russian religious philosopher Professor Sergey S. Khoruzhiy. Vide: **Хоружий С.С. «Очерки Синергической Антропологии», М., Институт философии, теологии и истории Святого Фомы, 2005, стр. 58-124, 229-326/ "Studies in Synergetic Anthropology"**, in Russian language; for summary and contents in English see pages 397-407; for his publications in English vide: Khoruzhiy S.S. "Global dynamics of the Universe and the spiritual practice of Man" in "Nature and technology in the World Religions", edited by P. Koslowski, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pp. 64-80; idem: Khoruzhiy S.S. "Globalization and anthropology" in "Bulletin of the World Public Forum DIALOGUE OF CIVILIZATIONS", 2004, number 3, pp. 118-140; idem: Khoruzhiy S.S. "Man as a Being with the 3 ways of unclosing himself" in "Philotheos - International Journal for Philosophy and Theology", Belgrade, 2003, number 3, pp. 53-78.

According to him, the main waterline in the history of European philosophy lies in mid-19<sup>th</sup> century when philosophers - for the very first time since Aristotle - again began studying the microcosm of human being as main driving force of being ("energetic paradigm": expressionists, existentialists and like) instead of further studying the essence of being ("substantial paradigm"). And they did so mainly because the Western civilization, as he sees it, by mid-19<sup>th</sup> century came to sort of epistemological crisis, not having found in the substantiality any answer to the eternal question of human being - WHAT is he/she? Scholastics held it so, foretelling scientific psychology, that for human being, in sharp contrast with the Absolute, full self-identification is unreachable, here in corporeal world, for substance and knowledge of it do not coincide. Hence the most tense drama of human life: no matter how she/he tries, she/he

is able to fully accept - it seems - neither oneself nor the other whoever/whatever it is (God, world, beloved). Thus we come to 3 options of dealing with this profound drama: we are either to reconcile ourselves to it or try to overcome it (as in asceticism and in so-called direct miracles), or try to find oneness not by transcending the corporeal (as again in ascetic sainthood and direct miracles) but by transforming it (as in indirect miracles [behavior nobleness] and in holistic sainthood [perfectionism as ever self-refining personality, for which body is as spiritual as spiritual intention embodied, for soul and body are one, as existents]). According to our author, the last attempt was no success in the end (Hegel was last great philosopher of substantiality, and Heidegger and Nietzsche launched a new era). You cannot become whole again (as you were before the fall of Adam) remaining corporeal/ within the corporeal world. Western philosophy failed to identify any empirical otherness whatsoever for selfness. That was why Western philosophy changed its trend by redirecting its attention from substantiality to human being/human nature. Characteristically though, neither he nor scholastics give us any answer of how to obtain oneness of being and consciousness out of sainthood or miracle. Or it is impossible at all? Sergey Khoruzhiy subtly noticed that since dialectically problem of self-identification presumes and is defined by acceptance of the Other (not I, not Self), the searching for true self eventually leads to various practices of transcending one's Self (what he calls "the anthropological frontier"). But he differs between genuinely metaphysical transcendence beyond this frontier and desperate palliatives of doing so. All misidentifications of personality I've outlined slightly above he calls "ontic reductions" that is illusions of transcendence. Symptomatically, such illusions have been only growing in numbers nowadays. Virtual reality he places between them and true (ontological) transcendence. Apparently, we are witnessing/living in/practicing an epoch, in which the very existentiality of humans is being extremely sharpened, both at personal and social/national levels, what produces a highest grade of desperation. Or hope?

Personality clearly needs frontier in order to develop that is to outgrow oneself, in a way. But I think that in creating any theory it is quite useful to avoid perhaps the most destructive paradigm history of human thought contains - dualism. What our author offers, despite all its

elegancy and attractiveness, is implicitly dualistic, because by understating the role of material world in crossing the anthropological frontier he again postulates the exclusive ethics of thinking, so traditional for Orthodoxy he represents. Again we have here not only distrust to everything material ("lower" world of dualism), but also an attempt (far from being first in history!) to coin a universal theory not basing on universal reality. Inclusive (holistic, monistic) thinking, on the contrary, simply by definition cannot produce any theory without taking ALL reality into consideration. In holism reality is everything so it includes the corporeal as well as spiritual, being and nothing, Man and God, Body and Mind, everything which is united primarily by one thing – IT EXISTS. It dates back to the most initial, purest form of being, free from content or conceptualization. Which means everything is equal in terms of ontological origin. Holistic philosophy starts from the thesis that something does exist (absolutely unalienable fact); the rest is philosophy. How something exists, religions, philosophies, sciences and arts argue, rarely coming to agreements. It is a realm of thought, no matter how precise, how close to existentiality, but the unalienable feature of thought is too that it just exists. Thus, corporeal realm is neither negligible/alien to spirit, as Orthodoxy holds, nor quintessential, as Marxists hold. It just is; like everything else.

Moreover, like it often happens to dualistic theories, monism undercuts them from within: not only the central idea of Christianity – Christ and his dyadic nature, by Chalcedonian creed – has nothing to do with escaping from the corporeal; Sergey Khoruzhiy himself, as specialist on HESYCHIA (medieval Byzantine ascetic mysticism), admits bodily resurrection and mystical bodily practices as gates to metaphysical experience (in Yoga and Sufism too, although his views on Sufism as gnosis-unfriendly school are absolutely historically naïve; vide: Seyyed Hossein Nasr "The Garden of Truth", Harper One, New York City, 2007, 2008, pp. 209-234). He rightly points out to phenomena like synesthesia and panesthesia as results of monks going into the extremes of experiences. But he is wrong in postulating only asceticism may push practitioners to such existential points: history of several moderate Sufi orders like Shadhiliyyah, Chishtiyyah, Mawlawiyyah and Baktashiyyah as well as Buddhist Tantric and Mahayana schools shows asceticism is not the only answer.

Vide: "Twilight Goddess", by Thomas Cleary and Sartaz Aziz, Boston & London, Shambhala, 2000, throughout the book, but especially see chapter 10; Seyyed Hossein Nasr "The Garden of Truth", Harper One, New York City, 2007, 2008, pp. 59-80, 139-208.

In history we saw for so many times just how dangerous for national economy, ecology and culture any dualistic theory was, and mostly because it underestimated the realm of corporeal. Hardly would one build a strong, stable and nature-friendly society based on hard-working ethics and other traditional values, had one got a transition mentality of a believer who's just a guest or traveler to go soon into a better world. Most dangerous sects in the history of Christianity and Islam were too especially skeptical towards corporeal world, which they saw as devil's work and a main obstacle for one's purification and ascension (katars, albigensians, wahhabists and like). Distrust to sensuality and corporeality is simply counter-productive, as counter-productive is any idea which pretends it is universal whilst cutting out from reality something that exists.

And even more: distrust to so-called low worlds comes into great contradiction with the very core of Christian mysticism: namely events in our cosmologically little and vulnerable world, this shadow of Eden, let alone Heaven, DETERMINE - along with God's mercy - what happens to you in the world to come... Yet it's evident that this little world is full of hints to the celestial/transcendental...

Dialectically also Western over-attention to the corporeal is not a useless addiction, as Professor Khoruzhiy sees it, but quite understandable intention: to become eternal one must become whole corporeally first (hence the highest quality of life in Western societies); on the contrary, to pay too much attention to the beyond often results in losing the very impulse of transcendence (as widespread of dualistic consciousness as well as Soviet materialistic revisionism so painfully demonstrated).

For me over-tattooed and over-pierced teenage girl who escapes from her own self in chats and moralizing monk who mortifies his flesh are both at pains to find their own little world rather than reality as a whole. Ascetics do not transcend the anthropological frontier by "freeing" themselves from the sensual and corporeal world, for in metaphysics world is one and nothing is secondary.

For me the role of Ego therefore the role of individual pathos is much more important than the role of spirit allegedly wanting to free itself from the material prison. For pathos embraces and unites both worlds – and even third – celestial – as psychology of religiosity shows (clearly for many personalities even to accept the idea of “the other” is great existential challenge indeed). How to become closer to the beyond holistically that is without sacrificing body (as ascetics offer) or soul (as it follows from ontic reductions)? What changes humans without dissecting the human nature? What unites spiritual and material in one inseparable whole? What is in a monad way irreducible to any of its substrates? Clearly it is human intention or, in general, intentionality (of doing/thinking/feeling something). Which brings us back to P'ATHOS, for character of intentions is one amongst key criteria of defining it.

You cannot fix it, having all its physiological correlates at the same time. You cannot fully explain it by assembling and cumulating all mechanisms and elements it includes and/or mobilize in order to happen or appear. You cannot reduce it to something simpler, for, as I above outlined, system laws have it so that lower levels of any architectonics cannot outgrow themselves into something more complex without ceasing to be what they were, in a way. For example, laboratory mice do not and cannot live in the wild; forest is not a sum of indoor plants and trees – or any decorative ones whatsoever; and our bodies consist of only cells in vivo, never of cells in vitro. So, human intentionality, like human feelings or thoughts, these results of intentionality, does remain phenomenon sui generis, however ontogenetically deep and evolutionarily old its precursors were. At the same time intentionality is personally unique, thanks to inimitability of any development, which in turn brings us back to the problem of Ego and its identifications as well as misidentifications. If human nature is universal due to certain laws of biology and psychophysiology, and personal intentionality, on the contrary, is unique, then any identification with other personalities or others' personal features is contradiction in definitions. Although simultaneously the contrary trend of putting too much emphasis on Ego is no less misleading, for it turns us away from universality of human nature. Holistically, only approach that combines uniqueness and universality may work. For instance, empathy reflects both uniqueness of personality (level of empathy) and universality of human nature (human being is social being).

Empathy is itself unique, for it allows us to refer and to give to others without weakening our self; rather opposite is true, for we strengthen our selves in doing so (actor profession, say, and priests' CARITAS are fully based on this). Empathy is neither about referring only to one's self nor about referring only to others (i.e., not about identifying oneself only with oneself or outer realities); it's fully about identifying oneself with THE OTHER/OTHERNESS.

I am not going to say that human intentionality is purely metaphysical; it's clearly not; but it is not purely material, either. Not being metaphysical, it just constitutes, thanks to being irreducible, the channel to Thisness (initial existentiality of everything) and to the Otherness. For if something exists, then something another exists too (even God created out of nothing which exists). And, contrary to what Marxists and other materialists say, intentionality cannot be reduced to the corporeal, either, for it links it to the intermediary/mediating realm of monads (which, according to Leibnitz, can be reduced only to monads... themselves).

Thus, to be ourselves we need otherness, simply otherness, without details (hence opposition xenophobia - empathy). Solely "I" or "others" as manifestations of otherness are not enough for true self-identification. That is why egocentrism is as impotent as "ontic reductions" (when people try to approximate the anthropological frontier by identifying themselves with/or by experiencing extremes, other people ideals and so on).

Otherness is Divine Embassy on Earth.

And, contrary to what Orthodoxy says, irreducibility of the transcendent to the transcendental, transcendental to the corporeal etc., does not mean lower levels cannot tunnel the higher ones, being their precursors or pre-images. Theologically this may be reversed as well, not only because the created pre-existed in God at the level of God's attributes, but also because, as Sufi and Kabbalah mystics subtly recognized, from the very fact of creating freely - to create World as Mirror, Otherness for Himself - it follows God assumed His dependence on us (so strong His faith in us is). As Absolute, he might not create (out of nothing that too exists), but He freely chose to do it. Being fully free, He wants us to be fully free in returning to Him. So free will is no illusion, it is substantial, or, more precise, deeply existential.

And intentionally realizing this freewill - for instance, by practicing empathy - we do change anthropologically. One needs only to look at world history in right scale - say, in the scale of millennia - and to bear in mind that history speeds up, to see that I am right. I do not mean only biological evolution of hominids. I mean world civilization as a whole as well, despite all variability in tempo. And all stipulations about warfare, poorness, and other globalization's inequalities considering, it is nonetheless not evident only to experts that world does evolve and advance, becoming - especially since mid-19<sup>th</sup> century - freer, safer, healthier, wealthier and more competitive. Ideological totalitarianism has collapsed almost everywhere (with only few exceptions). And nowadays, thanks to information era, world has also been becoming smaller, more available potentially for everyone. And the freer and more open and competitive the country is, the higher the challenge culture and the higher the likelihood people are more able there to creative thinking. Hence we have the progress in science, information technologies and soft economy. And since both challenge culture and creativity select people with relevant capabilities, people in such societies are more likely to develop permanently, to change and to refine their personalities. Challenge taking culture bearers are more likely to be tolerant, to accept Otherness as such, for to take challenge is to be open, be responsible for oneself and others, and to look deeply into human nature; and freer people are more likely to cooperate and empathize, for they do it in a natural organic way not under social or political pressure. Furthermore, it all happens even literally, because at neuronal level information increase has biochemical correlates (transmissions at synapses), and sensitivity has as well (receptors' reactions' thresholds).

Vide: "The evolution of God" by Robert Wright, NYC, Little, Brown and Co., 2009; "The better Angels of our nature: why violence has declined?", by Steven Pinker, NYC, Viking, 2011.

To cross "anthropological frontier", to find our Otherness, we do not need to leave the corporeal in search for the incorporeal - and simply because it's already here, which to understand it requires abandoning the literal approach to metaphysics. As corporeal world fully independent from our (let alone God's) conceptualizing powers is illusory, no less illusory is literally represented incorporeal world materialistically thinking theologians are so happy not to find under the sun.

Moreover, incorporeal world must not be represented here in a literal way by definition. In order to preserve its nature, it must be represented only at the level of image (Otherness) or at the level of vector (pathos' intentionality's direction).

Consequently, the painful paradox is by insisting so energetically on one's selfness, one is likely to lose rather than regain it, for selfness (your inner world, your true primordial reality freed from conceptualizations) and its identifications (we are provoked by culture and traditions to make) are not the same thing. To some extent they are even antonymous. So problem does not lie in self-identification as itself but in surrogates one wants to identify oneself with. In other words, it lies in self-obsession and equally in self-neglect.

The famous neo-Freudist F. Alexander warned about dangers of false self-identifications as early as in 1960. For him they may cause psychosomatics as well. He called it somatization of emotions.

And moreover, according to Hegelian dialectics, the greater the emphasis on one member of dialectical pair (in our case Self - Other pair), the higher the likelihood we lose it soon, often in favour of other member, albeit in its distorted form (for the very way of stressing something too much is unnatural: world is balance). Take so-called collectivist states for example. In post-Cold war era, after decades of individual freedoms suppression, they became so devastatingly individualistic that the very gist of their societies is now degrading. Reversely, in free world, where individual freedoms were for ages taken for granted, the spirit of cooperation and association is as strong as it has never been before. Analogously, in Communist states economy was thought to be a leading force to change society fundamentally, and by 1980s their planning economy became so weak and so artificial it lost its competitiveness completely. In free world, however, founding fathers of capitalism were mostly Christian moralists who never put economy first, understanding it is secondary, only a form of expressed values. Capitalism, despite million of attempts to bury it, and despite real challenges and crises too, is still alive and resistant. Again, in USSR Bolsheviks were at pains to defeat traditional religion (Orthodoxy), but the consequences were far from being it: rather pretty opposite had happened. Not only by 1930s they created the ersatz religion of Stalinism, but by 1990s the Orthodoxy, after decades of cohabitation with Communist ideology, became so

influential the very secular character of modern Russian society is now at risk.

In our case too, the exaggerated attention, even obsession regarding oneself might lead not to strong self-identification, but to its destruction, for one may obtain one's true nature only by ethically sacrificing oneself that is by exploring all possible ways of how to refer to others. One is defined/distinguished by referring to others. One and others (no matter, other people, gender, world or God) are absolutely inseparable yet distinguished and differentiated. One IS another but not in a primitive sense of dependence (false self-identification) but in a sense of Sufis and Buddhists, when they speak of self-annihilation as a medium to reach one's true self. By freeing oneself from dependences that is by serving others, one may be happy to approximately reach her/his primordial self. In Sufism it is called FAN'A [annihilation of Ego with its following ascension to higher Divine Reality] and 'UBUDIYYAH [spiritual servitude], in Methodism Rotaryism, in Buddhism Boddhisattva mission and so on.

That's how elegantly, deeply and acutely this idea of strengthening oneself through serving Otherness (God, beloved, human beings, whatever) is discovered by one of world leading experts in Islamic mysticism Professor Seyyed Hossein Nasr (George Washington University, US).

"The highest meaning of servant-hood is in fact the realization of our "nothingness" before God [ontologically]. It is only by passing through this gate of "annihilation", or what the Sufis called fana', that we are able to gain subsistence, baqa', in God and to reach the root of our "I" and also therefore the Divine. Human beings qua human beings cannot enter the Divine sanctuary, but there is within us a reality that is already Divine. To be fully human is to realize our perfect servitude and to remove the veil of separative existence through spiritual practice so that God, transcendent and immanent within us, can utter "I" (vide his "The Garden of Truth", reference above, p. 13).

"To become truly human is to realize, with the help of those who have already realized the state of perfection, the reality of the Universal Man, which we all are potentially. Realization means reaching the state of the Universal Man [androgynic microcosm, which contains all realities save transcendent, that is God]. It means returning to our primordial

state [al-fitrah] and ultimately to our reality in God with the guidance of those who have already realized, to one degree or another, the state of the Universal Man. To realize the state of the Universal Man is in turn to become the veritable servant of the Lord, to be aware of our central state in this world as His vicegerent [khalifah], to realize our fana', and finally, through this annihilation of the ego, to reach with the light of the intellect within us the Supreme Essence, which alone is ultimately real...

The Prophet said: "Man is asleep, and when he dies, he awakens". Sufism is meant for those who want to wake up, who accept dying to the ego here and now, in order to discover the Self of all selves, and to be consumed in the process in [of] the fire of Divine Love" (ibidem, pp. 21-22).

Love, being simultaneously the Divine Attribute and perhaps the most mysterious experience here on Earth, grants us a perfect model of such annihilation of Ego.

"The sexual dimension of love is itself impregnated with spiritual significance. Sexual union is an earthly reflection of a Paradisal prototype. The male experiences the Infinite and the female the Absolute in this earthly union, which returns, albeit for a moment, the human being to his or her androgynic wholeness. The bliss of sexual union is also a foretaste of the bliss of the union of the soul with the Spirit, about which Christian Hermeticism as well as certain other schools of Christian mysticism speak. As mentioned above, the soul can of course withdraw from this earthly attraction through asceticism to seek direct wedding to the Spirit, as we see in monasticism and many forms of Christian spirituality, but the sexual union remains spiritually significant, especially in Sufism, which like the rest of Islam sees sexuality as a sacred reality, hence to be governed by the Sacred Law, not as a sinful act simply resulting from the Fall. Sexual union can lead to the experience of FANA' or annihilation and therefore liberation, however momentary, from the bonds of separative existence and limitations of ordinary consciousness. From the Sufi point of view, the urge for sexual union, which is the most powerful sensuous urge within most human beings, is in reality the search of the soul for union with God, especially when human union is combined with love. Every beloved is ultimately a reflection of the Beloved or MASH'UQ, as the Sufis say, who is God in His inner

reality, a reality to which Sufis often refer in the feminine. The Essence of God is called AL-DHAT in Arabic, and it is grammatically feminine in gender. Seen as the Beloved, the inner dimension of the Divine is that feminine Beauty for which the male soul yearns. In His aspect as Creator and Sustainer of creation, however, God is seen as masculine. From the purely metaphysical point of view, the Divine is of course above the male-female distinction in the same way that in Far Eastern doctrines the supreme Tao transcends the dualism of YIN and YANG" (pp. 65-66).

And love gives us fruits only when we men, women do not think of them. "Detachment from the fruits of one's actions is not unrelated to the Chinese doctrine of wu-wei, that is, to act without acting. Our ordinary actions plunge our souls into the cosmic chain of actions and reactions, or the chain of karma, as the Hindus would say. But that is because of our attachment to the fruits of our actions and the loss of the contemplative spirit, which reduces the soul to a substance that identifies itself solely with acts rather than with being, with preference for action over contemplation. But to act without acting requires also that one die before dying, as asserted in the famous Prophetic tradition, "Die before you die". It means to detach our will from our passions and impetus toward external actions and surrender it to God. The sage acts without acting like a lamp that illuminates its surroundings by simply existing. The sage contemplates and lives in a dimension of inwardness and by virtue of that interiority has a SYMPATHEIA with the inner reality of other beings and then acts upon them in the deepest sense without external action. The sage demonstrates in his or her reality the precedence of being over all external accidents and the priority of contemplation over action. But the sage nevertheless does act, and his or her acts are selfless, detached and based upon sincerity, goodness, compassion, and truthfulness" (pp. 88-89).

"Paradoxically, the greatest gift that has been given to us is the possibility of realizing our own nothingness. The process of cosmo-genesis has brought forth and bestowed existence upon all things from the Origin, which is Absolute Being. In the cosmos there is generation and corruption, but only God can bring being out of nonbeing and turn being into nonbeing (Moreover, according to great teacher of Kabbalah Yitzhak Ben Shlomo Ashkenazi Luria (1534-1572), God himself performed what Luria called Tzim-tzum - sort of self-removal, self-curtailing - in order

to constitute nothingness, upon which to reflect God's qualities, in order to create a world in its freedom, in order then to allow us to repeat freely the same procedure in our Imitatio Dei; and as God is free even from His Absoluteness, we are to be free even from our freedom to be, from our selves; for obsessive freedom is no freedom at all -M.M.).

And yet in a universe, in which each existent, from the dust to the archangel, occupies its own distinct state of being, from which it cannot transgress, God Himself has allowed human beings to undo the cosmogonic process and realize their own nonexistence before the Truth, which alone is, giving their existence back to its Origin. Through the threshold of what the Sufis called annihilation or extinction (al-fan'a), humanity is able to enter the Garden of Truth and to subsist in God (baq'a)...

As human beings, we have the ability to reach the state of extinction and annihilation and yet have the consciousness that we are nothing in ourselves and that all being belongs to God. We can reach a state of unitive consciousness prior to bifurcation into object and subject (pp. 134-135 and see further on p. 136).

Too often, however, something entirely opposite does happen. There is even a spatial-temporal mechanism of misidentifications of Self...

"Most of our lives are constituted of daydreaming, whereby we seek not to be here but somewhere else and not to be in the present but either in the past or the future. The goal of the spiritual path is to bring us to the here and now, to the Center, which is also the eternal present moment (for God is equally transcendent and immanent, absolutely irreducible yet resides in our very hearts and souls -M.M.)" (vide p. 140).

And surely this thirst for the Otherness has social, psychological and biological dimensions.

Further, in social animals like humans, it is worth noting that social interactions with conspecifics are fundamental and central to enhancing the other pleasures. Humans are intensely social, and data indicate that one of the most important factors for happiness is social relationships with other people. Social pleasures may still include vital sensory features such as visual faces, touch features of grooming and caress, as well as in humans more abstract and cognitive features of social reward and relationship evaluation. These may be important triggers for the brain's hedonic networks in human beings.

Vide: Morten L. Kringelbach & Kent C. Berridge, opus citatum, pp. 673-674.

If you want to be really fully free, free from ill thoughts as well, you must be also free from the obsession to be free that is from your Ego's needs.

Clinically too it is the case, for there are recent data, which show scientifically what Buddha foresaw 25 centuries ago: that putting too much stress on selfness (false self-identification not with one's being but with one's desires and conceptions, no matter how deep) might lead to various medical consequences. The fact that full self-identification is impossible (our thinking/conceptualizing the world and our existence correlate but never coincide) may cause sort of desperation, especially if one has not been taught to live with uncertainty. Uncertainty, or more, ethics of uncertainty, if anything, is absolutely normal, since ideal unity of essence and form, world and thought, and mind and body is unreachable for us all, at least here. As a result of a lack of ethics of uncertainty people begin searching for outer fulcra. As if to add to these difficulties, ones already fundamental, people are known to be full of stereotypes (personal, interpersonal, cultural). Being products of psychological compensation, for it is easier to make one's world than to look behind points of view, behavioral and mental stereotypes are offering media for almost total escapism. In other words, instead of trying to shorten that lag between being and thinking I mentioned, people only widen it, with dramatic consequences, both for their health and life philosophy.

It is absolutely interesting and inspiring that pleasure, especially extreme one like orgasm or some kinds of meditation, was shown as stereotypes-breaking experience. Not only pain diminishes, but also other markers of vitality change: e.g., self-consciousness blurs whereas mental picture of one's body either goes beyond itself or does not but gets clearer. In other words, sense of self-identity becomes weaker, and frontiers of one's body become larger - up to out-of-body experience (or, during orgasm, they become sharply felt). It helps experience world from other people's perspectives, which leads us back to that key force of human development - to empathy. Brain structures like right angular gyrus are activated both during Buddhist meditations and during attempts to imagine you're someone else.

Vide: "The neurobiology of Bliss –Sacred and Profane", by Nadia Webb, Scientific American Mind, July 12, 2011; "Meditation on demand", by Peter B. Reiner, in Scientific American Mind, November– December 2009, pp. 64–67; Baumeister, R. F. (1986) Identity: Cultural Change and the Struggle for Self. New York: Oxford University Press; Baumeister, R. F. (1989) Masochism and the Self. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; Baumeister, R.F. (1991) Escaping the Self: Alcoholism, Spirituality, Masochism, and Other Flights from the Burden of Selfhood. New York: Basic Books.

As Nadia Webb writes, "Left prefrontal cortex activation correlates with happiness and Tibetan Buddhist monks have created the greatest measured spike in activity in this region produced by simple thought when meditating on compassion. The reported depth of meditation also corresponds to activity in the brain's pleasure centers, such as left forebrain bundle, anterior insula and precentral gyrus. This overt pleasure is accompanied by a shift in emotional self-regulation; meditators are more aware of thoughts and feelings conceptually, but less emotionally disrupted by them, according to one study. Both hemispheres are involved in self-observation".

"Pleasure is also linked to a loss of awareness of the boundaries of our body, and this, too, involves both sides of the brain. Orgasm and meditation dissolve the sense of physical boundary, but the activation patterns are distinct. Meditation does so in a somewhat cerebral way, altering bodily self-awareness by enhancing activity in specific brain regions, such as right angular gyrus—regions that become most lively during attempts to imagine ourselves from a stranger's perspective, during out of body experiences or *déjà vu*, and in a neurologically obscure disorder in which patients lack awareness of their own paralysis or bodily infirmity".

For the healing role of meditation vide idem: Molly Knight Ruskin, opus citatum, pages 50-51; Uwe Herwig, opus citatum, p. 63. Meditation allows us to maintain a free-of-judgment perception of here and now, which of course helps loose self-identification. Indeed, meditation and self-regulation, the latter being profound biological alternative to over-strict self-control, are interconnected through emotional and cognitive centers of the brain. EEG shows meditation may produce the fastest

gamma-rays earlier known in norm almost only for REM state [i.e., paradoxical sleep].

Concerning woman orgasm, there are also data most of the mind neurons (especially in fields responsible for emotional and cognitive control) went silent at its peak, thus substantially losing self-control. For men it was discovered something similar happens, namely brain's center responsible for vigilance and critical thinking shuts down. Vide: *The Orgasmic Mind*, by Martin Portner, in *Scientific American Mind*, May 2008.

"Mention of the default network brings us back to the topic of eudaimonic happiness, and to potential interactions of hedonic brain circuits with circuits that assess meaningful relationships of self to social others. The default network is a steady state circuit of the brain, which becomes perturbed during cognitive tasks (Gusnard and Raichle, 2001). Most pertinent here is an emerging literature that has proposed the default network to carry representations of self (Lou et al. 1999), internal modes of cognition (Buckner et al. 2008), and perhaps even states of consciousness (Laureys et al. 2004). Such functions might well be important to higher pleasures as well as meaningful aspects of happiness".

"And activity changes in the frontal default network, such as in the subgenual cingulate and orbitofrontal cortices, correlate to pathological changes in subjective hedonic experience, such as in depressed patients (Drevets et al., 1997)".

"Pathological self-representations by the frontal default network could also provide a potential link between hedonic distortions of happiness that are accompanied by eudaimonic dissatisfaction, such as in cognitive rumination of depression. Conversely, mindfulness-based cognitive therapy for depression, which aims to disengage from dysphoria-activated depressogenic thinking, might conceivably recruit default network circuitry to help mediate improvement in happiness via a linkage to hedonic circuitry". Vide: Morten L. Kringelbach & Kent C. Berridge, *opus citatum*, pp. 672-673.

But the opposite feelings, namely painful experience, bodily obsessions and exaggerated self-awareness are symptoms/precursors of various pathologies. Exaggerated self-awareness was even shown as an obstacle to some pedagogical methods, in particular ones related to foreign language learning. Vide: Умрюхин Е.А. «Механизмы мозга:

**информационная модель и оптимизация обучения»/ Brain's Mechanisms: information-based model and optimization of learning [in Russian language], М., РАМН, 1999, стр. 54-74. Anyway, since exact norm is unknown, and we compare pleasure and suffering, and we see them as different modes/degrees of self-identity, we may return to it in hope. When one, running from one's true self, self freed from explanations, self given in relations, runs towards one's surrogate, Ego-driven self, one still feels he/she must identify oneself with something. And namely at this dangerous point windows open for ideology or illness to fill the inner emptiness of egoism and to serve as substitutions for Self. The more we identify ourselves with our Selves as isolates, and the more we identify explanations with ontology/nature/experience, which explanations are only supposed to explore, the further we go from natural happiness and the higher the likelihood its ersatzes take hold of us.**

Far from being itself a verdict, self-identity is an unavoidable challenge we all take, whether aware or unaware of doing so. For some even illness is a mode of learning and self-discovery; for some even happiness may turn into a void.

Health is a high degree/level of integrity of organisms' systems, which in biology means elements of freedom on lower levels of the whole (cell is less predictable than tissue, tissue is less predictable than organ etc.), whereas pathology takes it all upside down: coherence and integrity are violated, but at the same time physiological reactions become far more predictable.

#### **4. Does system nature of personality make its forming fatal? Nature of personality: personality as ultra-complex constellation of factors.**

So we may conclude that personality is extremely complex, both in normalcy and pathology. Since prenatal period number of outer factors is influenced by number of inner factors in a nonlinear way, and vice versa, which often makes the task of identifying where's cause where's consequence of a given behavior almost impossible. Furthermore, due to laws of biology and psychophysiology being universal and their applications, on the contrary, unique (for challenges in nature are never absolutely the same and genetic matrix determines only scope for

variables), any personality is unique to such an extent, it forms pre-morbidities to different pathologies as well as chances not to suffer from them. It does not mean free development is impossible for human being. It only means any new stage of personal development in no way can come out of the blue. Initial conditions for any new stage are formed on the basis of previous stage results, these results being new psychic qualities (say, self-consciousness, self-esteem, self-reflection, professional skills or whatever) as well as their substrates (brain structures consecutively formed and selectively involved into behavioral patterns or into psychic functions maintenance). Even cells differentiation is based on hormonal regulators determining when, where and into what kind of cells primordial stem cells proliferate. Disruptions in this extremely complex process (at the level of epigenetic factors open to prenatal as well as postnatal outer factors) may cause serious pathologies to appear.

When child is born, he/she discovers her/his first otherness – an outer world – only to rediscover at 7 how interdependent they are – inner world and outer one. And being challenged by this otherness may go 2 ways, for it may provoke either fear or acceptance, depending on mother's speech's tonality, her emotionality, facial expressions and her touching. Once new quality is formed, it becomes a filter for world perception to go through. So, the dramatic character of postnatal period is determined; outcome not. But once outcome realized, it starts only worsening or improving things, especially when nothing is done to overcome it. And to overcome it (say, by placing personality into provocative challenging contexts) is only harder as time goes by.

When at age of 3 child discovers his/her third otherness (2<sup>nd</sup> by the crisis of 1 year – see the 1<sup>st</sup> conceptual scheme in the end of the article for more details, page 57) by going from mother-controlled world to mother-uncontrolled world dependence/independence quality may be formed and may be not, which depends on mother's readiness to let her beloved creature go on partly freely, but once it is formed, it becomes a filter for world perception to go through. So, the crisis of 3 years is determined; outcome not. But once outcome realized, it starts only worsening or improving things, especially when nothing is done to overcome it. And to overcome it (say, by placing personality into provocative challenging contexts) is only harder as time goes by. We slice our common

macrocosm up by forming stereotypes, which in turn form us, who in turn are even more ready to slice macrocosm up only further.

The same is true for every crisis human being is destined to go through: one faces otherness (symbols for 1 year children, science and love for teens, "functional I" for adults to become professionals, presentiment of death for olds), then one reacts depending on parents/contexts/previous stages results, then attitude is formed, and it starts selecting what's more relevant to it, thus closing or opening one's world, depending on attitude formed (either monistic or dualistic).

So development is sort of Sherrington's funnel: the further we move into it, the harder the efforts trend change may take (the harder to get out). If, say, dependence quality is formed, and suppose it is never to be altered by opposite qualities/challenges/contexts (sure an idealized course of events), then it filters whatever happens afterwards: self-esteem is likely to be low, self-reflection poor, self-consciousness painfully fixed as compensation, and for the same reason primary (prospect) identifications at school are likely to be obsessive, and conformism is likely to flourish both at family and at work. Political and economical attitudes are likely to be Left, philosophy materialistic or strictly clerical. Hardly will she or he become a scientist, for science apparently requires freedom and independence of thinking. Life is likely to be full of disillusion, for rigid identifications too often mistake image for reality. Hence mid-age crisis is likely to be a nightmare. Expecting death may drive such people mad, for they are too dependent on life. As a result, dependence becomes a norm, which it never ought to be. If multiplied due to certain historical contexts (say, ones dualistically favouring vertical relations in society), what at personal level is behavioural norm becomes cultural norm, sometimes even with quasi-religious justifications. Thus, vicious circle is formed, feeding itself by itself.

That is why the uniqueness of method (medicine) in homeopathy reflects the uniqueness of any illness, which, in turn, reflects the uniqueness of personality. General symptoms do not reflect the specific nature of any given illness, according to homeopaths; only individual, strange, whole organism-related symptoms do.

So, both personality and illness are too complex to be easily reversed, for to form them a whole range of constellations of inner peculiarities

and relevant outer challenges must assemble first. The famous neo-Freudist F. Dunbar called these constellations "personal profiles".

Expert criminalists have too assembled evidence worldwide to prove you can trace/identify any person whoever she/he is, should you have at least something personally related (blood, hair, dust, dirty, clothes, skin fragments or whatever).

Let me remind you that the neo-constitutionalism came back in 1920s as a reaction to the dehumanization in medicine! Man, neo-constitutionalists were proving, must be seen as a psychosomatic whole, in union with her/his environment. The principle "heal who's ill not illness" was being reborn. Holism was being united with individual approach therapy. It led to GP neo-revolution (GP as ideal Hippocrates-ethics doctor!). GP as family doctors return us to the problem of eco-self (family as superposition of selves).

For one of leading neo-constitutionalists N. Pende man was a sum of "neuro-hormonal constellations". It clearly dates back to Selye's discoveries. The great German pathologist Ernst Kretschmer (1888-1964), who coined the famous theory of temperamental psycho-types, was from this school, too! Vide: **Лисицин**, opus citatum, pp. 137-142.

Yet as synergetic theory showed, over-complexity of a system does not mean there are no keys to it. Role of empathy is enormous in personal development, for it is a key to selfness: by opening it, by testing it, by challenging it, empathy only strengthens it. Self is being forged by empathy, for empathy requires neither self-neglect/self-denying nor self-obsessions, but only self-openness. By accepting personality unconditionally emotionally it takes it back to first period in life (1-3 years), when mother's unconditional love made a world friendly and trustworthy for any child and when challenging problem of self-identity was not that actual and painful.

Hardly any other scenario of change is possible, since out of sensitive periods - or their models like empathy-induced sensitivity - both being analogous to synergetic chaos prior to bifurcation - closed disrupted personalities are highly unlikely to be responsive or responsive enough for serious change to occur.

Also empathy is fundamental in creating an alternative to dualistic personality, which forms compensatory self-identifications with outer fulcra or slides into escapism of whatever kind or into pathology to hide

deeply from uncertain and ever-changing, ever-provocative reality. To change in real terms one must see an embodied example of monistic outlook and way to live; and empathizer is perhaps the best one.

In the end, the very complexity, meta-stability and contingency of any biological system, human including, opens a door simultaneously to pathology and to recovery. Risks produce development; development produces risks.

## 5. Is there some X Factor? EMPATHEIA: anthropology of change.

So we may conclude that empathy plays a fundamental role both in personal development of any child and in personal change to occur when personality is already formed.

If empathetic acceptance as model of mother's unconditional love may hold a key to disturbed personality, in other words, may serve as sufficient condition for deep change, what are necessary ones (when one is loved/accepted/empathized not unconditionally but for something, for achievements)? What makes personal change advance after having been launched by empathy? Or, closer to the bone, are there some personality's features, which substantially lighten any reform Ego is in need of?

From the primacy of ontology over ideology principle (being secondary, ideology wants to return to the universality, which is itself dangerous), as well as from the principle of the uniqueness of any individuality/personality [principle of the totality of experience], it follows that nothing is more persuasive than behavior/action. The more evident and apparent the monistic paradigm is, the higher the likelihood misplaced personality will change. For it will have a lighthouse to steer by [meaning embodied alternative].

Second. Irony and especially self-irony, too, may serve as ground-breaking strategies. If these qualities do remain despite all pathological or ideological disruptions personality has been through, it means at least she/he does put ontology over ideology, for irony shows any idea is deeply relative and may be easily turned to be seen at different angles.

Thirdly, Death of ego, about which all mystic schools from Sufis to Tantrists wrote and write, holding it as "Gate to Heaven", is even more likely to bring personal breakthrough about, as we have already seen

above (the more mature one's personality is, in terms of genuine achievements, the less obsessive one is about oneself).

Fourthly, roles gaming in the spirit of commedia dell'arte (Italy, 16-17 centuries) may help us avoid rigid self-identifications, for, along with Shakespearean idea of "world as a stage", it creates archetypically predictable yet individually infinite media for us to deviate from the thrust norms and roles, to test all other ones, thus showing we all are richer than any role we traditionally play. Sacral method of improvisations within scenario only made commedia dell'arte precursor of post-modernism.

Full or fixed self-identification is impossible and unreachable even from purely humanitarian point of view (vide: Professor M. Epstein, «Философия возможного, модальности в мышлении и культуре», СПб., Алетейя, 2001; and «Знак пробела, о будущем гуманитарных наук», М., Новое литературное обозрение, 2004). Since in humanitarian science/thinking object and subject coincide, and since humanitarian mind reads and studies itself, it always changes, only becoming newer and newer, so we have no fixed self-identification at all, only continuum of states. Hence the importance of being/understanding/grasping here and now and danger of always wanting to be somewhere else, whenever else, somebody else, about which Sufis warned.

The main task of humanitarian science is to unfix human being, to make him/her creative, or creator of ever changing realities. Self-identification is given only in processing.

Other benefactors/strategies/individual features to develop personal evolution may include sincerity and behavioral light style, because sincerity makes the whole process genuine and light style serves as sort of entelechy, for the less specific the content of personality is [meaning the broader the Aristotelian form and, consequently, the lighter the personality], the higher the likelihood it may accept something really new. Analogously at national level, arts, sports, science, free trade, high tech and tourism (these realms of Aristotelian forms for everyone to freely fill) help nations cooperate not at cost of their national identities but at cost of their national over-identities (fascism)...

E.g., in history of arts socialistic realism is by now significantly marginalized whereas Arab abstract geometric arts are widespread since

the 8<sup>th</sup> century! Ethnic arts are popular worldwide, but thanks to whom? Western intellectuals with their world outlook and desire for abstract (that is, potentially open to new contents) music, literature and painting, were in 1960s and 1970s so interested in various ethnic – especially Orient and South American – arts, that they made it understandable to public of the whole planet.

Still actionism, computer art and performance arts – and modern art as a whole – despite all its provocative nature or maybe thanks to it as well – are more easily accepted worldwide than ethnic art in its pure form.

So we have here the sacramental problem of accepting the Bakhtin's "Other", intolerance to whom may provoke number of pathogeneses/deviances. Symptomatically close are seem-to-be different intolerances. Sociology and social psychology tell us that those nationally xenophobic, especially in totalitarian/patriarchal countries, are simultaneously xenophobic to liberal opposition, various sub-cultures and informal societies, sexual minorities, minorities per se. No less symptomatic is the very term xenophobia, which means hate to all what's different, alien, unfamiliar, disregarding the content. Impression is appearing that for some hating the others is primary, no matter to whom/to what hate is applied. Why is quite evident. Boy wants to be boy, no more. Given town dweller wants to be only such, no more. Narrow professional wants to be only such, no more. Given religion believer wants to be only such, no more. Given blood bearer wants to be only such, no more. Given ideology devotee wants to be only such, no more. Etc infinitely we may go. In all cases we have strict and strictly applied self-identification. No extra inch is allowed.

Only deep fear may cause such rigid behavior. Perhaps the fear to lose one's selfness (say, as a result of loosing self-control or of dis-focusing one's attention from one's deeds/wishes) is as old as selfness itself. But, as we have seen above, such outcome is mythical. If you are to develop, you cannot for ever remain exactly the same. In Love, say, you do not need to sacrifice yourself a la lettre: only change is needed, leading to a new you.

Love is, of course, a universal cure, but to all obsessions I've just mentioned there are alternatives equally real. Roles psychology shows how dangerous for any productive socialization are these strict roles traditions impose/attribute to youngsters/adults. Furthermore, self-

identification with certain age does simply contradict with the most fundamental laws of pedagogical psychology, according to which learning must always take the lead over given chronological age to create a gap for development to fill. Gender theories and practices are antidotes to male chauvinism, which dominated the scene for centuries. In family psychology, say, narrow and narrowly understood roles/roles stereotypes are amongst the most frequent reasons/predictors for future divorce. No less ground-breaking is inter-scientific synthesis to overcome over-specialization of positivistic era. Inter-culturalism, which is replacing multiculturalism before our very eyes, is antidote to nationalism of every kind, for it presupposes neither cohabitation nor isolation between nations but learning others' mentalities/folkways inside common supra-national activities like science, tourism, free trade and sport. Ecumenism, both at Christian and world religions levels (inter-Christian and inter-religions ecumenism), helps us save local religions by highlighting theological insufficiency of their isolationism (or, which is the same, by highlighting that what's common between religions is more fundamental than what's different).

People either open what's already inside of them (self-exploring way) or change, which entails overcoming oneself in a sense. And that's, as we saw in the beginning, what P'ATHOS is all about: to feel is to suffer, to suffer is to feel. Dialectics even holds that you cannot be or remain yourself for long without becoming someone else, in a way, in order to grasp what unites you and not-you.

Anyway, you, albeit being microcosm, this model of macrocosm, are not macrocosm until you get the generic for both. So development, taken at its fullest, means to embrace macrocosm, which automatically means to step out from yourself to accept others. As Sufis and Buddhists would say, to become everything you need first to become nothing.

## Conceptual schemes of the article

### Conceptual Scheme 1: Self in transition

- **Upon being born:** 1<sup>st</sup> discovery of the other (outer World)
- **1 year:** 2<sup>nd</sup> discovery of the other (World of Symbols, which means World and its description are neither separable nor the same thing)
- **3 years:** self-image, formed by the age of 2, expands to reach the 3<sup>rd</sup> discovery of the other (Mother-uncontrolled World - World of others)
- **7 years:** self-consciousness/ apperception/ reflection and self-esteem
- **Teen:** First Selfness War - primary (prospect) social identifications
- **Teen:** 4<sup>th</sup> discovery of the other - Science
- **Teen:** 5<sup>th</sup> discovery of the other (Human Beings in Gender Dimension)
- **Profession** as 6<sup>th</sup> discovery of the other ("I can")
- **Profession** as Second Selfness War - secondary (actual) social identifications
- **Mid-age crisis:** Third Selfness War - the crisis of meanings - rearranging of Self
- **Old Age:** 7<sup>th</sup> discover of the Other (Death)

## Conceptual Scheme 2: Self in pathology

In round brackets: negative scenario – positive scenario

- Synergetic Attractor [goal/forecast as determiner of the present] (fear of losing/losing self-control and/or self-identification – widening of reality means shifting in self-identification)
- Bifurcation (escapism: modern fear of loneliness, and false self-identification with anything but one's primordial nature; yet one's nature in order to be of oneness mustn't be exclusive ("I am Russian, I am 25, I am rocker"); rather, it must be inclusive, open to the Other holistically, in full volume of being: "I am everything – I am nothing")
- Choosing (clutching at straws of linear self-identity – or Art of Actor: freedom of identifications as freedom from identifications...)
- Initial conditions (we are never one; so self is misplaced; in search for oneness it desperately tries either to deny itself or to overstress itself; but many pathologies/ideologies are based on such phenomena; pathology/ideology mimics reality in order to become total; pathology/ideology appears when personal idiosyncrasies meet and match relevant outer factors so personality development is precursor and sometimes predictor never determiner of certain pathologies/ideologies, rather of variety of potential pathologies/ideologies [constitutional/ temperamental pre-morbidity; sleeping oncology genes; models of upbringing, and like]; in synergetic theory only post-bifurcation/ pre-attractor stage is determined). Synergetic "wandering on fields of possibilities/ likelihoods" and acceptance of constructive/ creative power of chaos and contingency.

Conceptual Scheme 3: X factor (empathic intention)

