

PSYCHIATRY AND SOCIETY - MOVE TOWARDS THE TRANSDICIPLINARITY IN ETHICS AND POLITICS

Erik Brezovec¹, Luka Janeš² & Danijela Tiosavljević^{3,4}

¹Department of Croatian Studies, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia

²Faculty of Philosophy and Religion Sciences, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia

³Faculty of Medicine, Department of Humanities, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

⁴Clinic of Psychiatry, Clinical Centre of Serbia, Belgrade, Serbia

SUMMARY

A main aim of this paper is to critically turn to the cruciality, and inevitability of the transdisciplinary approach in the context of the contemporary psychopathological stances of the individuals. In this paper, transdisciplinarity will be observed as a kind of necessity in the broadly differentiated disciplinarity of the modern societies. A given disciplinarity of the particular exacts sciences, in its self-sufficiency and the distance (paralaxis) from the other particular disciplines is forfeiting from sight a consciousness (and the self-consciousness) regarding the necessity of the focusing to the research object universality. Authors will propose thesis that transdisciplinarity is the shift towards the consciousness regarding the research object as the fundamental segment of the science. Following the given context, contemporary disciplinary boarders should be set a side and approach a certain phenomena un-hierarchically, through all the available scientific methods. In the frame of such placed predispositions of science, contemporary issue of more and more frequently presence of the neurotic must inevitably include psychiatric and psychological knowledge as the base, but certainly the sociological and philosophical knowledge as well, in the context of understanding etiology, socio-genesis and psychogenesis of the certain issue in the most adequate way. Only when the excluding hierarchisation of the disciplines, in the context of understanding the neurotological disorders, is set aside, a true impacts of the science can come to the fore. A given certainly includes analysis of the sociocultural context, psychosocial development of the individual, ethical social norming, development of the ones spirit and self of its own beingness, as well as the various development issues of the physiological structures of the human brain. In the given context, in this paper we will discuss a transdisciplinary synthesis of the psycho-therapeutical approaches along with the original sociological-philosophical variants of the socio-therapy.

Key words: transdisciplinarity – dialogue - psychiatry and society - neurotic disorders - pluriperspectivity

* * * * *

INTRODUCTION

Anecdotal confrontations of the life-world can sometimes be a useful tool to start a serious scientific and philosophical debates. It can also be a generator of a criticism and self-criticism. Namely, it happened on the bus station while one of the authors of this paper sat and waited for a bus. A drunkard came to him and started a conversation. The main theme of it has been the life occupancy of the author who happened to be sociologist. When he stated that he is a sociologist he awoke the interest of the drunkard which asked what sociology is exactly. The sociologist, as young and euphoric started to explain that sociology is the science which explain the social structure, action, aspects of the identity and so on, only to stop and see that the drunkard is laughing at him. Drunkard then said that he cannot see any of these things inside of the very society; he could not even see society as a social fact that sociologist presume. He then asked a sociologist to show him the identity, ideology, social structure, society itself. Sociologist realized that all the meta concepts in the sociology but science itself are not useful for the everyday society. Not only that but those concepts are not the same in sociology as they are in philosophy, medicine or psychology. Every discipline had its own

“confusing reality” for that drunkard on the bus station. So how can we, in whatever aspect of the science, get back to the “ordinary human” problems? The answer on that issue in the framework of this paper lies in the concept of transdisciplinary as the new approach to the object of study. The special focus of this paper lies in the need of the new methodological paradigms to approach the neurotic disorders of the individual as well as of the society. Transdisciplinarity as the approach for understanding of neurosis in this paper will be presented through the synthesis of knowledge in psychiatry, philosophy and sociology, in order to reach teleological, intentional tangents which unites the given disciplines aim and expediency.

THE PARADIGM OF THE MODERN SCIENCES – BIRTH OF THE DISCIPLINES

There is a discrepancy between scientific knowledge and the life-world of some community or individual. That discrepancy expands to the lengths where social, or humane scientists can no longer reflect to the world that they are investigating. As Karl Marx would say for philosophy and now for almost every aspect of science that include living human – science has become non-minded, distinct from the world that it explains (Marx

1971; 70 u Pavić 2014; 34). Science, either humane, social, STEM or biomedical should deontologically give back the credit of usability to the society in which it operates. But the very root of the science in that matter can be found in its very functionality which began in the dawn of the process of modernity. One of the key aspects of modernity is functional differentiation (Parsons 1971) which from the very beginning of the modern science produced various disciplines which through time distanced themselves from each other. In that sense, the very world science wanted to explain became dependent to the field of science, or paradigm that wanted to explain some of its aspects. But in our opinion this differentiation, “disciplination” (Krznar 2017) of science not only distinct sciences from each other, but from the world and also from itself. We notice that, in a very similar way as in (post)modern society, the (post)modern man is going through the very process of self-realisation and individuation, in one and very strict way, by which he is distancing not only from other human beings (where he is distancing from the very social part of his nature as well), but from other parts of himself (all his biopsychosocial potentials).

One could say that the science today fell to the iron cage of bureaucracy and rationality (Weber 2001). It became alienated in few ways – first of all science is alienated from the world that it explains. Second, science today is alienated from its own components (disciplines are becoming self-sufficient) – which can be explained through the lack of dialogue between various disciplines (in example – psychiatry, sociology, philosophy). Thirdly – science alienates from its very being (*sein*). In the frame of this article’s discourse we could even propose a psychiatric-psychological classification for the state of science of the modern society as a deeply neurotic – in the context of the bifurcative “disciplinary narcissism” of the modernity, sometimes with a lot of anxiety between different disciplines.

Namely, diagnosis of the general narcissism of the western culture was set by Christopher Lasch more than 30 years ago (Lasch 1991), and the strength of the narcissistic development reached its climax with the help of the social media and the smartphones as a kind of high-tech permanent “self-reflection” in the frame of the small screens. Analogical kind of screen-reflection closed in the frame of screen we recognize in the various exact sciences, in the context of using only self-image in dealing with various issues, without observing knowledge and perspectives provided by the other scientific disciplines. When talking about narcissism, it is useful to refer to Kohut’s thoughts regarding secondary narcissism (Kohut 2009), the ones that are marked with the insecurity but masked with the delusional grandiosity of the self, in order to mask insecurity and fear of loss which is lying in the core, under the facade. A useful reference which argues in the given context is also present within the Marčinko’s

paper *From the Unfermented Mourning in the Past to the Perfectionism in the Actuality* (Marčinko 2018).

And it is a context where we could recognize that kind of the situation with this narcissism of discipline, which annihilates potential dialogue and integration between the various perspectives, and we could conclude that psychiatry should be out of that kind of scope in order to provide holistic and wide implementation of wide knowledge for the more complete understanding of the mental disorders. Issue of the disciplinary narcissism of the certain science, therefore the bifurcation from the other sciences, we will put in the context of the bifurcation from the universality of the life issue, as the nominally initial task of the science *per se*.

TRANSDISCIPLINARITY AS A NEW APPROACH TO THE SCIENCE

Transdisciplinarity address this problem of scientific alienation through deconstruction of the disciplinary borders (Jakovljević 2014) for the sake of phenomena of the study, with the deontological (Kant 2002) focus on the life protection as the key methodological and object step. In that sense we propose the term of pluriperspectivism as a key methodological matrix for the transdisciplinary approach, and implementation of the integrative bioethics in the frame of society. Since pluriperspectivism marks many notations of the term, drawing a lot of controversies with it, it is the best for this paper to explain its semantic value through the pragmatic contextual use. So we will recall Ante Čović’s use of it. Namely, in his book *Ethics and Bioethics* he notes as follow:

»Man's power over nature and over himself has grown to the point where it is revealed that science does not contain measures of its use, that it cannot set the goals of existence or set civilizational frameworks. In other words, science has lost its relevance for human existence and regulation for shaping the whole of life, reduced to the role of a powerful tool whose use must be conceived outside the profession and beyond science itself, precisely from the stronghold of bioethical pluriperspectivism (Jurić 2017). Namely, in the sign of a shattered faith in science, there is a turning point of civilization epochs, a transition from the new century, which marked boundless confidence in the leadership power of science, in a new, bioethical epoch, which emerges with a vision of a new goal and a different role for science.« (Čović 2004).

It is important to mention that the purpose of transdisciplinary approach is not a destruction of the scientific disciplines and disciplinarity as such, but the sensibility regarding the disciplinary borders of approach to the certain phenomena of a life-world. A transdisciplinary approach is all about the dialogue of the disciplines that should be involved in the study of some field or subject. The focus in this approach is shifted

from discipline to the subject of study and main premise in all of that is appreciation of other (discipline). Only through appreciation of the other, can one realize itself (Merleau Ponty 2002) as in ethical, political, social way.

It is the key argument and the main thesis of this paper that this kind of transdisciplinary approach (with the use of the term pluriperspectivism) should be applied to some of psychiatric phenomena and the scope of the psychiatric praxis.

TRANSDISCIPLINARY APPROACH TO THE NEUROTIC DISORDERS

Psychiatry and psychology have been dominant disciplines in defining, diagnosing and treating a mental disorder. The given fields also have a legal jurisdiction in defining a dominant discourse for setting the methodology, professional guidelines and along with it inherent power to decide which behavior can be classified as a mental disorder (MKB10 1996). But the problem in this approach is that contemporary world, along with the structural uncertainty and constant societal change (Bauman 2001) cannot explain the ongoing growth of neurotic disorders, especially amongst the young people. Non-psychiatrists and non-psychologists mostly post a question regarding this data: have we as human species biologically evolved to be neurotics or is it some kind of social inquiry that affects our psychological wellbeing? Is psychiatry and psychology enough to solve the issue of rising, contemporary neurosis? Although their contribution to the mental wellbeing is fundamental and undisputed, transdisciplinarity can in great measure strengthen and expand the way we perceive, approach, treat and re-socialize persons with neurotic disorders¹. As valuable assistance to phenomena of neurosis comes a knowledge produced by disciplines of philosophy and sociology. While sociology can provide a better understanding of social etiology and provide a functional ways of reintegration of people with the problem of neurosis (as well as destigmatize the neurosis itself), philosophy can give a possibility of phenomenological explanation of the causal interrelation of self/society and the diagnosis of neurotic disorder (Bolton & Hill 2004). In the matter of transdisciplinarity, neurotic disorders should be analyzed, synthesized and approached through the combined use of sociology (in defining social setting), psychiatry (diagnostical criteria, understanding of the biological part of etiology as well as the influence of psychodynamic factors, treatment.) and philosophy (to achieve functional synthesis of the knowledge about social setting and the ways it can help

¹ It is the aim of this paper to focus on the neurotic scope of disorders, since this problematic can be transdisciplinary addressed in much lighter way than psychosis (which has exact measures of biomedical diagnosis).

in the treatment). With that, the classical dispute over the question which discipline occupies which area of study is set aside for the purpose of finding the active solution of problem – without which, contemporary explanation of neurotic disorders as well cannot be functional for both scientific knowledge and for the people which should profit of the knowledge that science provide.

CONCLUSION

For the purpose of usability of scientific knowledge as for the science itself it is necessary for it to switch to the phenomena instead of setting disciplinary boundaries about who should take what part of phenomena. In that sense, neurotic disorders as a contemporary actual phenomenon should be discussed transdisciplinarily taking the usable knowledge of multiple disciplines. Sociology in the matter of neurosis should be used in the way which it can explain the contemporary societal context and with it help defining the etiology of some of the mentioned disorders (social relations of family, group, workplace, and psychoactive substances consumption, etc.). Psychiatry in the matter of neurotic disorder with some specific knowledge of social scientific disciplines can achieve more sensible approach to rehabilitation and functionality of patient in his/her everyday life. But for that to work, it is necessary to include philosophy as a relational tool for conceptualizing self/society for the sake of an even better understanding of the human person with the defined disorder. The philosophical tool that should be used in that matter is phenomenology, in the context of persons being-in-the-world and being -towards-the-world.

Acknowledgements: None.

Conflict of interest: None to declare.

Contribution of individual authors:

Erik Brezovec has been involved with conception and design of the paper, literature search, manuscript preparation, critically revising it and giving the final approval of the version to be submitted.

Luka Janeš made substantial sociological contribution to conception and design, literature search, also has participated in drafting the article and revising it.

Danijela Tiosavljević contributed by reviewing the article and its conclusions from the psychiatric and bioethical domain

References

1. Bolton D & Hill J: *Meaning, and Mental Disorder: The Nature of Causal Explanation in Psychology and Psychiatry, Second Edition, Oxford University Press, New York, 2004*

2. Cifrić I: *Socijalni kontekst zdravlja i bolesti*, in Jakovljević M et al. (eds): *Duševno zdravlje, kultura i društvo: psihijatrija pred izazovima*, 111-125. *Pro Mente*, Zagreb, 2014
3. *Complex Systems: INDECS 2020*; 18:26-35
4. Čović A: *Etika i bioetika*. Pergamena, Zagreb, 2004
5. Jakovljević M: *Duševno zdravlje, psihopolitička kultura i bolesti društva: kuda ide (hrvatska psihijatrija)*”, u Jakovljević M et al. (eds): *Duševno zdravlje, kultura i društvo. Psihijatrija pred izazovima*, 27-62. *Pro mente*, Zagreb, 2014
6. Jurić H: *The Footholds of an Integrative Bioethics in the Work of Van Rensselaer Potter*, *Facta Universalis* 2017; 15: 127-144
7. Kant I: *Critique of the Practical Reason*, Hackett Publishing Company, London, 2002
8. Kohut H: *The Analysis of the Self. A Systematic Approach to the Psychoanalytic Treatment of Narcissistic Personality Disorders*, Univesrity of Chicago Press, 2009
9. Lasch Ch: *The Culture of Narcissism. American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations*, W.W. Norton and Company, 1991
10. *Savezni zavod za zaštitu i unapređenje zdravlja: MKB10, Savremena administracija*, Beograd, 1996
11. Marčinko D & Rudan V et al. (eds.): *Discomfort of the 21st Century Culture. Psychodynamic Discussion (Nela-goda u kulturi 21. stoljeća. Psihodinamska rasprava)*, Medicinska naklada, Zagreb, 2018
12. Merleau Ponty M: *Phenomenology of Perception*, Routledge, London, 2002
13. Parsons T: *The System of Modern Societies*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1971. (*Foundations of Modern Sociology Series*)
14. Pavić Ž: *Marxova rana kritika religije*, *Studia lexicographica* 2014, 8: 33-53
15. Weber M: *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, [1930]. London and New York: Routledge, 2001

Correspondence:

Asst. Prof. Danijela Tiosavljević, MD, PhD
Faculty of Medicine, Department of Humanities, University of Belgrade
Belgrade, Serbia
E-mail: tiosavljevic.danijela@gmail.com