

## Philosophers' Debate about the Nature of Deaf-Blindness (Arguments from “Limited Liability Methodology”)

VM. Rozin\*

Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

**Citation:** Rozin VM. Philosophers' debate about the nature of deaf-blindness (Arguments from “Limited Liability Methodology”). *Medi Clin Case Rep J* 2024;2(2):294-299. DOI: doi.org/10.51219/MCCRJ/Rozin-VM/79

**Received:** 24 May, 2024; **Accepted:** 27 May, 2024; **Published:** 30 May, 2024

\***Corresponding author:** Rozin VM, Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia.

**Copyright:** © 2024 Rozin VM. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

### A B S T R A C T

The article examines the controversy between two famous Russian philosophers regarding the factors determining human development, as well as the reasons for the falsification of E.D. Ilyenkov of the real conditions of the “Zagorsk experiment”. If Ilyenkov argued that the formation of personality depends exclusively on social conditions and means, then D.I. Dubrovsky insisted that genetic factors also play a significant role in this process, which must be taken into account in solving problems of upbringing and education. In addition to the reasons for falsification, we are talking about an old psychophysiological problem, however, in its modern form - the relationship between the psyche and the brain, as well as the influence of genetic factors on the formation of an individual. The Zagorsk experiment is compared with an experiment on the domestication of wild animals, which was carried out by geneticist Dmitry Belyaev around this time, and the similarities and differences between these experiments are noted. The author sets the task of more thoroughly analyzing the relationship between the psyche and the physicality, for which he outlines the stages of the genesis of human development. He shows that the need to adapt to communication, work with signs and tools, and act together transforms the biological substance of hominids, creating on its basis, on the one hand, the human psyche, and on the other, the “anthropobiological organization” of his physicality. These lines are connected by the principle of “psychosomatic unity”, according to which every mental process requires its own somatic (physiological) support (support) and vice versa. In the last part of the article, based on the obtained theoretical concepts, arguments are put forward in support of Dubrovsky's position. The strategy of bringing deaf-blind people into the world of normal life and creativity is compared with the strategy of psychotherapist Pavel Volkov, which allows him to take clients out of the world of schizophrenia.

**Keywords:** Deaf-blindness; Physicality; Genes; Biology; Psyche; Formation; Prerequisites; Schizophrenia; Genesis; Organization

### Introduction

It's worth making two clarifications right away: what is limited liability methodology, and also what the controversy was about, which began in the last century between Professor David Izrailevich Dubrovsky and the famous Russian philosopher Evald Vasilyevich Ilyenkov. Limited liability methodology is a methodology that is developed by the author, focusing on the cultural-historical approach and modern versions of semiotics, cultural studies and personalities (see in the book “Renewal of Methodology”<sup>1</sup>).

Now, the crux of the argument. Her in a small book

“Deafblindness: historical and methodological aspects. Myths and reality” was clearly stated by Dubrovsky himself. “Philosophers of the younger generation, at least many of them,” writes Dubrovsky, “probably no longer know that in the 70s of the last century not only philosophical literature, but also the mass press trumpeted the whole country and beat the fanfare about outstanding achievements Soviet science: thanks to its Marxist methods, four people who were deaf-blind from birth were able to successfully graduate from the psychology department of Moscow State University. Such an impressive achievement was called the “Zagorsk experiment”. The key point of the “Zagorsk experiment,” Dubrovsky explains the

position of his supporters, in particular, Ilyenkov, - it was precisely the fact that all four were blind and deaf from birth, completely isolated from external social reality: the formation of personality began from “zero”, from their complete absence of the human psyche. “The initial condition,” Dubrovsky quotes Ilyenkov, “is rigid: there is no psyche at all, and it does not arise “by itself.” It must be made, formed, educated”. “The initial condition is what is given by nature, biology. Insignificant - only the simplest organic needs: food, water and physical factors of a certain range. Nothing more”.

And so, thanks to special methods of education based on the Marxist theory of personality, they acquired a developed psyche. But soon contradictory facts began to emerge. It turned out that none of them were blind or deaf from birth. They lost their sight and hearing in late preschool or even school age, when they had accumulated extensive mental experience of perceiving the world and developed developed speech.

E.V. Ilyenkov,” Dubrovsky further explains the theoretical foundations of the controversy, “categorically argued that the formation of personality depends exclusively on social conditions and means. I insisted that genetic factors also play a significant role in this process, which must be taken into account in solving problems of upbringing and education”<sup>2</sup>.

In other words, in addition to finding out the truth in the question of why Ilyenkov hid from the public the real conditions of the “Zagorsk experiment” (“not a mistake, but a falsity formation of individual genetic factors. Ilyenkov is a firm supporter of the concept, according to which socio-pedagogical actions are leading and, in fact, determining such formation, while the role of the genome, brain and other biological structures (we will call all this the “anthropobiological organization” of a person) is negligible.

Here I involuntarily remembered the famous experiments of the Soviet geneticist Dmitry Belyaev, who was able to turn wild silver foxes into domestic ones. On the contrary, he believed that the key to the mechanism of domestication lies not in the principles of social formation, but in “Mendeleevian inheritance.” “Jason Goldman of Scientific American said: “Belyaev hypothesized that the anatomical and physiological changes observed in domesticated animals could be the result of selection on the basis of behavioral traits. More specifically, he believed that tameability was the decisive factor” started with 30 male foxes and 100 female foxes, most of them from a commercial fur farm in Estonia.” From the very beginning, Belyaev selected foxes solely for tameability, allowing only a tiny percentage of male offspring and a slightly larger percentage of females to breed. The foxes were not trained to be sure, that their tameness was the result of genetic selection and not environmental influences. For the same reason, they spent most of their lives in cages and were allowed only short-term encounters with people. The only criterion for allowing them to reproduce was their tolerance for human contact.

After more than 40 generations of breeding, Belyaev produced “a group of friendly domesticated foxes. Many domesticated foxes had floppy ears, short or curly tails, a long reproductive season, changes in fur color, and the shape of skulls, jaws, and teeth. They have also lost their “musky fox scent”<sup>3</sup> “Externally, foxes also differed from their wild relatives. Their color has become more spotted and lighter, and some foxes have become almost completely white. At the moment,

experts in the domestication of foxes state that their charges can easily live next to people, but not in apartments or houses, but in farmsteads. Their pets are unique: they get along with humans, but are not dependent on them and are willful. They are not aggressive towards people and can be trained, but their cleanliness leaves much to be desired. They live for about 10 years, while their wild counterparts live for about 4. Foxes can be both hunting assistants and simply beautiful pets<sup>4</sup>”.

I’ll comment. As a geneticist, Belyaev was confident that the evolution of animals is determined only by genetic selection, and not by environmental factors. But where, one wonders, did he get foxes for the experiment? From fur farms, where foxes lived in an artificial environment (they were raised, fed, cleaned, guarded, etc.), and they communicated with the people who looked after them. That is, these were domestic animals in the initial stage of development, and not purely wild animals; By the way, American biologists Elinor Carlson and Catherine Lord also noted that “the experiment began with the breeding of foxes that were not wild”<sup>5</sup>. Only those foxes were selected for breeding that were not afraid of people and were drawn to them for communication. It is not difficult to guess that the genes of these individuals have undergone a mutation, which Belyaev, at the level of behavior, called a sign of “tameability” (the desire to communicate with people and the absence of aggression). It was the foxes from this population that were allowed to reproduce, which contributed, on the one hand, to a certain direction of gene transformation (on humans), and on the other hand, to further stages of the formation of domestic animals. That is, the evolution of foxes was influenced by two factors - not only genetic selection, but also the influence of the environment created by man, an environment conducive to the formation of domestic animals.

Thus, on the one hand, there is a contrast (in the first case, the role of the anthropobiological organization is negated, in the second - the socio-pedagogical formation), on the other hand, there is a similarity (in both cases, the original reality is falsified in favor of the semantic concept of their creators). In the debate between Dubrovsky and Ilyenkov, I am on the side of the former, but his position on the role of genetic and biological factors is formulated in general terms, not specifically. Understanding the complexity of this problem, I set myself the task of considering the connection between the psyche and the anthropobiological organization. To do this, within the framework of the limited liability methodology, I show that the solution to such problems presupposes the genesis (in the logic of the cultural-historical approach) of human origin.

Before I present the result of such genesis, I will make one remark. Belyaev, by crossing foxes, contributed to the transformation of a wild animal into a domestic one, but again the result was an animal. Historical evolution on earth, based on animals, “created” man. Probably, the animal should have disappeared (not altogether, but faded into the background, become one of the “behavior? They are forced to adapt to new conditions and change. Only those individuals survive who begin to focus not on signals and events, but on signs, those individuals for whom “temporary insanity” on the basis of signs (i.e. imagination and representation) become the norm of life, those who learn to work with signs (create, understand their meaning, etc.).

Adaptation to new conditions dramatically changes the natural processes of development of hominids as a biological

species. New types of limb movements, new types of sensations, new actions and operations in the psyche are formed. At the same time, it can be assumed that the biological evolution and formation of the species *Homo sapiens* should have proceeded like all inhabitants of our planet, that is, under the influence of ordinary factors of microevolution: natural selection, gene mutations, their combinations, etc. The need to adapt to communication, work with signs and tools, and act together transforms the biological substance of hominids, creating on its basis a “being of a transitional form.” This is no longer an ape, but also not a human being, but a special changing, adapting creature undergoing metamorphosis. Judging by paleontological studies, by the end of the Quaternary period the adaptation of creatures of the transitional form ends, i.e. their physicality (physiology, genome, body organs, appearance, actions of the senses) now fully meets communication, the requirements of joint activity, and sign behavior (I called this physicality an anthropobiological organization). The behavior of “transitional creatures” (now more human-like) becomes completely iconic and social<sup>6</sup>.

Based on the concept of anthropobiological organization, in particular, I introduced the principle of “psychosomatic unity” (one of the solutions to the psychophysiological problem). In accordance with this principle, every mental process requires its own somatic (physiological) support (support), and vice versa, a somatic process cannot unfold if it is not supported at the mental level with the help of certain mental processes, stresses and events<sup>1</sup>. Let me take a step back and tell you how I have used this principle to explain homeopathic treatment.

“Let’s take from the Homeopathic Bulletin an article by Dmitry Khramov about the effective treatment of colds in children<sup>7</sup>. Somatic processes are known - hypothermia, fever, often, but not always, runny nose, cough, coated tongue, sore throat, etc. A disease like a cold at the psychological level must be supported by such processes as headache, lack of appetite, weakness, the same cough as a psychological reaction, difficulty breathing, sore throat, etc. By launching the corresponding psychological processes, a cold as a somatic process (processes) seems to inform the psyche.

If the principle of psychosomatic unity is correct, then it is clear that the reaction from the action of a homeopathic medicine must also be supported at a psychological level. Thus, homeopathic medicine, as it were, informs the psyche. Let us now think about what happens when the psychological support of the homeopathic reaction in terms of symptoms coincides with the symptoms of the disease. In this case, as I assume, and specifically analyzed the material of acupuncture treatment of alcohol dependence, the stronger somatic effect of a homeopathic medicine draws on psychological support<sup>1</sup>. The fact is that our psyche can only support one clearly defined “package of somatic processes.” That is why, as Hahnemann shows, with the simultaneous development of two dissimilar diseases, “the disease from which the patient initially suffered, as a weaker one, will, with the onset of a stronger one, be removed and suppressed until the latter completes the cycle of its development or is cured, and then the old disease will appear again uncured”.

In this case, the processes are also dissimilar (a natural disease and a reaction from a homeopathic medicine), and they have a common somatic basis (similarity of symptoms). As a result, three cases are theoretically possible: interference of

both processes, their integration and intensification, and finally, the displacement of one by the other. As I show, in the case of acupuncture, and probably homeopathic effects, the third case most often occurs<sup>1</sup>. In general, in the human body, especially the old one, all three cases are observed: how often some processes strengthen others (trouble has come - open the gate), overlap each other, displace each other, and all this against the background of the action of systemic processes; Therefore, diseases often go away on their own, without any treatment, but also reappear.

So, with homeopathic treatment, the somatic processes that form the somatic basis of the disease are deprived of psychological support. What does this mean? Probably the fact that they cannot protest more freely levels. It is interesting that a similar pattern can be observed in psychotherapy: on the one hand, it is necessary to block a mental illness, on the other, to start and support the recovery process. Moreover, if the methods of blocking in psychotherapy are generally similar (the psychologist avoids communicating on the topic of the disease and tries to transfer the patient’s interest to normal life), then the methods of starting and supporting recovery are quite complex and different. For example, G. Nazloyan solves this problem by portraying his patients, and P. Volkov by palming them off with the “Trojan horse” strategy<sup>8</sup>.

Now the second transmutation is the formation of an “archaic culture” on the basis of the first transmutation. Here, “semiotic schemes” (hereinafter, simply “schemes”) played a big role, which made it possible to create a special form of social life (let’s call it conventionally “anthroposocial”). For example, archaic culture was “built” (unconsciously, of course) on the basis of three types of schemas: schemas describing unique situations (for example, an eclipse), a “soul” schema, and an “arche” schema.

“In the Tupi language,” writes E. Taylor, “a solar eclipse is expressed in the words: “a jaguar ate the sun.” The full meaning of this phrase is still revealed by some tribes in that they shoot flaming arrows to drive away the ferocious beast from its prey. On the northern continent, some savages also believed in a huge sun-eating dog, while others shot arrows into the sky to protect their luminaries from imaginary enemies who attacked them. But next to these prevailing concepts, there are also others. The Caribs, for example, imagined the eclipsed moon as hungry, sick or dying. The Hurons considered the moon sick and performed their usual charivari with shooting and howling dogs to heal it<sup>9</sup>”.

Here the narrative “the jaguar ate the sun” within the framework of a certain reconstruction is an example of a scheme. Reconstruction of the diagram involves: “identifying a problem situation” (in this case, fear of an eclipse, lack of understanding of what is happening and what to do); a description of the “semiotic invention” (the “jaguar ate the sun” narrative) that allows this problem to be resolved; characterization of “reality” given by the scheme (a jaguar feeding on celestial bodies); creating conditions for a “new action” (we force the jaguar to let go of the sun). That is, a scheme is not just a semiotic construction, but a structure reconstructed in accordance with the specified logic<sup>10</sup>.

And here is one of the variants of the archaic idea of the soul: it was understood as a living being that has a house (a human body), capable of leaving or entering it like a bird; Accordingly, the meaning of death was understood as the departure of the soul from the human body forever, illness - as a temporary exit, a dream - as the journey of the soul during sleep, rock carvings

of people and animals - as a visual manifestation of souls to viewers. But there were other schemes and interpretations of the soul, everything depended on the problems that needed to be resolved (schemes, as I show, are invented and introduced precisely to resolve “problem situations”), the living conditions of social groups (tribes, clans), the ingenuity of shamans and leaders.

If initially the soul diagram was used to resolve the, so to speak, anthropological problems indicated here (understanding death, illness, dreams, rock carvings), then later this diagram with the arche diagram (we translate as “beginning”, source of origin) began to be used to resolve three more types of problems: for understanding the natural elements (“life” of the sun, moon, wind, earth, etc.), social life (birth, death, marriage, hunting, etc.) and, as we would say today, understanding of events related to the reproduction of culture (training of young team members, rules and customs).

It is on the basis of these three types of schemes and the meanings and techniques associated with them (rituals, collective actions) that archaic culture takes shape as a form and organism of anthroposocial life. Individual social organisms of archaic culture corresponded to the level of human development of that time and the unique characteristics of the life of social groups (climate, composition of people, conditions for hunting, etc.). Both did not coincide in certain regions of the Earth, therefore there were many variants of archaic culture.

### Arguments In Support of Dubrovsky's Position

David Izrailevich correctly states that if children were deaf-blind from birth, they would not be able to be made normal people, since there would be nothing to rely on in terms of biological prerequisites (foundations). S.A. writes about the same thing. Sirotkin (one of four deaf-blind graduates of Moscow State University) and E.K. Shakenova. “Totally blind-blind people are an extremely rare phenomenon. Modern research shows that such deaf-blind people usually have congenital organic and brain pathology; therefore, their training and education to the highest forms of the human psyche is hardly possible at all. Therefore, it is unlawful to categorically reject the role of biological and genetic speech and communication and only then becomes blind and deaf, and secondly, the child is deaf-blind from birth. In the first case, the child develops meanings and elements of experience in the psyche that have developed in communication with parents and adults. Here, semiotic schemes also play an important role, allowing us to understand what is happening and begin to see the corresponding reality. Here are examples from K. Chukovsky's book “From Two to Five.”

“Mashenka about the radio:

- How did the uncles and aunts get in there with the music?

And about the phone:

“Dad, when I talked to you on the phone, how did you get into the tube?”

Here the scheme is as follows: people are sitting on the radio and telephone, so there are voices and music.

“My six-year-old Tuska,” S.A. Bogdanovich writes to me, “saw a pregnant woman and began to laugh:

- Wow, what a belly!

I tell her:

- Don't laugh at your aunt: she has a baby in her belly.

Tuska with horror:

“Have you eaten a child?!”

The scheme is “ate the child”, that's why the belly is so big.

Now there are diagrams of the second type, explaining not only what is happening, but also what to do in difficult situations.

“Walking along the street with his aunt, a boy of two and a half years old stops at a bookstall.

The seller asks:

- Can you read?

- I can.

The boy is given a book:

- Read.

He, imitating his grandmother, suddenly grabs his pocket:

“I forgot my glasses at home.”

In this case, the scheme: “I forgot my glasses at home.” And you shouldn't think that the child is lying; he creates a reality that allows him to avoid reading.

“Dad, please cut down this pine tree. It makes the wind; and if you cut it down, it will become quiet and I will go for a walk.”

The scheme is typical, including for the aborigines: “trees make the wind.” On the one hand, it explains why the trees sway (they wave their tops, driving the wind), on the other hand, it is clear what to do: we need to stop the trees.

“Lenochka Lyulyaeva asked her grandmother for a Chinese set.

-When you get married, I'll give it to you.

Lenochka go to her father now:

“Daddy, dear, let's get married, and then we'll have a Chinese set.”

The scheme is clear: “dad is a potential husband, and Lenochka is a wife<sup>11</sup>”.

It is not difficult to notice that in children's discourse there is a convergence of the correct knowledge received by the child from experience or from adults, and the knowledge that he receives from diagrams. The scheme is constructed in such a way that it becomes clear and the child can realize himself. A scheme can be successful, working, and unsuccessful, not working. In addition, it is necessary to take into account that adults are interested in the child learning not just any patterns, but the correct ones, for example, they begin to understand that the wind shakes the trees, and not vice versa. In this sense, adults contribute to the assimilation of such schemes, which can also work as models.

Based on communication and patterns in the psyche of children, corresponding meanings are formed, as well as elements of experience, which is clearly manifested, for example, in dreams. Children may well dream of a radio, and a dad who got into the phone, and a child in the stomach, and forgotten glasses, and trees driven by the wind. To dream brightly, naturally, although they are sleeping, they don't hear or see anything at the moment. In other words, in a dream, certain elements of mental experience are actualized (see the author's theory of dreams<sup>12</sup>, which developed during the waking period.

Later loss of hearing and vision does not mean the disappearance of established meanings and elements of mental experience. Teachers of the deaf are beginning to rely on

them, looking for workarounds (tactile, inventing new graphic schemes) in order to get to the preserved meanings and elements of experience, update them and then create new ones based on them. What can they rely on for those born totally deaf-blind? Only on the genome, which is a purely biological structure. But how to get to it and how to use it, because the child does not see or hear? Today, after deciphering the genome, it is true that it is possible to get there, but it is still impossible to force the genome to determine the desired behavior. Tactile contacts and communication are clearly not enough to solve this problem.

It is worth dwelling on the role of communication. "Back in the 20s," write Sirotkin and Shakenova, "L.S. Vygotsky perspicaciously noted that a special school "creates a cut-off and closed world in which everything is adjusted and adapted to the child's defect, everything fixes his attention on the physical defect and does not introduce him to real life. Our special school, instead of leading a child out of an isolated world, usually develops in this child skills that lead him to even greater isolation and strengthen his separatism<sup>13</sup>". From this point of view, one should be critical of the status of the complex for the deaf-blind being built in Zagorsk, which clearly embodies the deeply flawed idea of a "town of the deaf-blind", which is fraught with the danger of reproducing old and new contradictions (in particular, the expansion of the gestural environment, dependent sentiments with the corresponding ideology of the disabled). The complex should be an educational and rehabilitation center for deaf-blind children and adults, with a rotating contingent. In addition, it is necessary to find opportunities and forms of joint education of deaf-blind and sighted-hearing children, their communication and cooperation, the creation of a network of groups of deaf-blind people in other educational institutions, forms of organizing the work and life of adult deaf-blind people among people with normal sensory abilities<sup>14</sup>". Indeed, the correct meanings that ensure effective life in a real life environment can only develop where deaf-blind people can communicate with ordinary children and adults.

It is interesting that a similar strategy for communicating with normal people was proposed by psychotherapist Pavel Volkov to bring clients who are completely healthy in terms of vision and hearing out of the schizophrenic world. Deaf-blind people are in a closed, limited world due to illness, and schizophrenics - due to their own mental constructs. One of the ways to get them out of this world is to communicate with normal people. Here's an example.

Volkov's patient's name was Sveta. "Already in childhood," Pavel reconstructed the genesis of her disease, "she was distinguished by her originality. Mother's favorite, spoiled girl, lovely, with blond, beautifully curly hair, sweet, but with character. I read a lot, did not strive to join the cheerful and thoughtless group of peers. Even when she was little, she lived by her own principles, demanding their recognition from those around her. Since childhood, she felt her exclusivity, her specialness.

And so she left the narrow family world into the bubbling big world. I want to have my say, to take a place in society in accordance with my "natural aristocracy." In the soul, more and more often there arises a feeling of the intractability of the world, a kind of resistance to its dreams and desires. Something soulless and cold is revealed in the world. The world turns out to be opportunistic, vulgar, in different to its subtlety and richness of self-expression.

(Sveta, like Chukovsky's children, creates a diagram that allows us to understand what is happening; she discovers that there are two types of people - "successful" and "losers." - VR). The loser is distinguished by a pathological inability to adapt his "I" to something profitable, but spiritually antipathetic. A lucky person, on the contrary, has this most important "talent" for life. Viable opportunists achieve success, and those who seek truth must give way to them. Gradually, Sveta begins to develop a militantly negative attitude towards people who have achieved success: after all, their success stands on the bones of losers, true people.

Sveta's internal attitude towards the lucky man becomes more and more aggressive. More and more in relationships with people, hidden fangs, but ready for an attack, make themselves felt. The patient still does not know who exactly her pursuers are, much is unclear, but still it seems to her that the "situation" is connected with her relationship with the lucky ones. They probably felt unpleasant when she, a loser in spirit, suddenly achieved success and at the same time did not lose her individuality and freedom. Seeing that the loser had become a success, someone could not allow this and dealt her a crushing blow<sup>15</sup>".

In response to the conspiracy of the lucky ones, Sveta takes countermeasures: she begins to hide her feelings and thoughts, and stops communicating with others. In the light of a new understanding of events, she reconsiders her life and becomes convinced that yes, indeed, successful people have always envied her, and all her problems were actually connected not with her, but with the machinations of successful people. Every day Sveta felt the conspiracy more and more clearly, saw how it was growing, becoming more and more sophisticated, already close people, and therefore more and more actively she erected a wall between herself and people. She decides to leave her job and stops trusting her loved ones. The conspirators are increasingly depriving her of her freedom, Sveta is increasingly isolating her life from people. Then the lucky ones deal her the final blow: she is placed in a psychiatric hospital. Sveta desperately resists, but again and again ends up in a psychiatric hospital.

What did Volkov offer her? "In general terms," he says, "what I tried to convey to Sveta sounds something like this: I know that your actions are understandable, but to whom? To you and me. What about those around you? Agree that those around you only see your external behavior, evaluate it by the standard yardstick by which it turns out to be abnormal. You need a reason for hospitalization, and you gave it. you have a choice: either continue to live as before and with the same consequences, or behave without violating written and unwritten contracts, thereby avoiding hospitals.

You cannot exchange souls and personal experiences. We have an option. First: everyone tries to prove that they are right, but no truth triumphs and there is a conflict between us. Second: everyone agrees that everyone has the right to their own truth and their own myth, while deep down in their souls they consider themselves right, but in real relationships they are correct and build "With the beginning of our work," writes P. Volkov, "the patient no longer ends up in hospitals, after a year the disability is removed and resumes work as an assistant director, sharply reducing the intake of psychotropic drugs. Subsequently, several severe psychotic exacerbations were noted, but thanks to our

contact, even during these periods it was possible to avoid hospitalizations and, continuing work, endure exacerbations with a minimum of medications. The success of psychotherapy, which quickly led to unexpected social rehabilitation, surprised everyone who knew the patient closely. And how not to be surprised if psychiatrists considered Sveta hopeless. For example, the chairman of VTEK literally said about her: “She’s absolutely crazy! I remember her very well from the previous VTEK, she carried such things there”.

Perhaps there are general approaches to leading a person out of the closed world into which he finds himself, either because of illness or because of incorrect attitudes in his consciousness. These include both reliance on social foundations (living environment, communication, education, etc.) and anthropobiological prerequisites (taking into account genetic preconditions, health disorders, the nature of strength, energy, emotional state, experiences, etc.).

## References

1. Rozin VM. Analysis of Yatsenko’s method, which allows you to quickly relieve alcohol addiction. *World of Psychology* 1997.
2. Dubrovsky DI. Once again about the phenomenon of deaf-blindness: historical, philosophical issues and facts of falsification. In: *Deaf-blindness: Historical and methodological aspects*. *Intell M. Myths and reality 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition* 2018;5-35.
3. *Domesticated silver fox* 2022.
4. *Instead of dogs: A successful Soviet experiment in domesticating foxes*. 2022.
5. Bittel J. Tame foxes taught us about animal domestication. But did we get the story wrong? (English). *The Washington Post* 2020.
6. Rozin VM. *Cultural Homo: An Introduction to Anthropology* URSS 2019;240.
7. Khramov D. Notes of a beginning homeopath. *Homeopathic Bulletin*. 2004;11.
8. Rozin VM. *Psychology: science and practice*. 2005.
9. Taylor E. *Primitive culture*. *Sotsekgiz M* 1939;602.
10. Rozin VM. *Introduction to circuitry: Circuits in philosophy, culture, science, design*. URSS 2011;256.
11. Chukovsky K. *Collected works in 15 volumes. T2: From two to five*, M. Terra - Book Club 2001;638.
12. Rozin VM. The doctrine of dreams and psychic realities is one of the conditions for the psychological interpretation of art. In: *Rozin Nature and genesis of European art (philosophical and cultural-historical analysis)*. *Ifran MG*. 2011;350-397.
13. Vygotsky LS. *Fundamentals of defectology*. *Plenum Press* 1993;2:369.
14. *Deaf blindness: Historical and methodological aspects. Myths and reality*. 2<sup>nd</sup>Edn. *Intell M*. 2018;194.
15. Volkov P. *Diversity of human worlds: A guide to the prevention of mental disorders: the basics and nuances of characterology, the psychology of mental illness, the search for mutual understanding and psychotherapy*. *M Agraf* 2000;525.