evaluating digital systems, and into the formation of institutional culture. This, in the deepest sense, is the demand that the regional tradition from al-Farabi to Abai has always made that education form not only capable practitioners but also human beings worthy of the trust society places in them.

References

1. Al-Farabi. Traktat o vzgliadakh zhitelei dobrodetelnogo goroda [Treatise on the Views of the Inhabitants of the Virtuous City] / per. A. V. Sagadeev. – Moscow: Nauka, 1985. – 168 p.
2. Kunanbayev A. Slova nazidaniia [Words of Edification]. – Almaty: Zhazushy, 1993. – 272 p.
3. UNESCO. Rethinking Education: Towards a Global Common Good? – Paris: UNESCO Publishing, 2015. – 85 p.
4. Nussbaum M. Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities. – Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010. – 192 p.
5. Giroux H. Neoliberalism's War on Higher Education. – Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2014. – 240 p.
6. Readings B. The University in Ruins. – Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996. – 232 p.
7. Kant I. Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. – 108 p.
8. Beauchamp T. L., Childress J. F. Principles of Biomedical Ethics. – 8th ed. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. – 496 p.
9. Dewey J. Democracy and Education. – New York: Macmillan, 1916. – 434 p.
10. Floridi L. The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023. – 312 p.

UDC: 1:61, 13:61

PHILOSOPHY OF HEALTH AND MEDICINE

Mingisheva N.A.
assistant professor at the History of Kazakhstan and SPD Department, Karaganda Medical University,
e-mail: mingisheva@qmu.kz
Harsh
student at Karaganda Medical University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan
e-mail: harsh071@qmu.kz

Philosophy of health and medicine is an essential interdisciplinary field that examines the deeper intellectual foundations of medical science, clinical reasoning, and healthcare systems. Although medicine is often presented as a purely scientific discipline grounded in biology, chemistry, and technological innovation, its practice rests on conceptual distinctions, value judgments, and assumptions about human nature that require philosophical clarification. Every diagnosis presupposes a theory of disease, every treatment decision implies an understanding of well-being, and every healthcare policy reflects ethical priorities. For this reason, philosophy of medicine is not external to medical practice but embedded within it, shaping how physicians think, how patients are understood, and how health systems function.

Historically, medicine and philosophy evolved together rather than separately. In ancient Greek thought, medical inquiry was inseparable from philosophical reflection on nature, causation, and ethics. Hippocratic medicine rejected supernatural explanations of illness and emphasized careful observation and rational analysis, laying early foundations for clinical methodology. Aristotle's biological works furthered systematic understanding by introducing teleological explanations and a classification of living organisms. These early philosophical commitments shaped the development of medicine as a reasoned and disciplined inquiry into the human body. In later centuries, Islamic scholars such as Avicenna integrated Aristotelian metaphysics with medical science, reinforcing the idea that health involves balance and harmony within the organism. Medieval European traditions continued this integration, linking physical health with the moral and spiritual dimensions of life.

The scientific revolution and the Enlightenment brought dramatic shifts in medical thinking. Advances in anatomy, physiology, and microbiology fostered a mechanistic model of the human body. The discovery of microorganisms and the development of germ theory provided powerful evidence that diseases have identifiable physical causes. This success strengthened the biomedical model, which defines disease primarily as biological dysfunction and locates pathology within organs, tissues, or cells. The mechanistic approach enabled extraordinary progress in surgery, pharmacology, and diagnostic technology, contributing

Buketov University

significantly to increased life expectancy and the control of infectious diseases. Yet philosophical questions emerged about whether this model captures the full reality of health and illness.

The twentieth-century philosophy of science began examining the structure of explanation in medicine. Scholars asked whether medical knowledge operates under the same principles as physics or involves distinctive forms of reasoning. The concept of disease became a central topic of debate. Naturalistic theories attempt to define disease objectively as a deviation from normal biological functioning. According to this perspective, organs and systems have statistically typical functions, and dysfunction constitutes pathology. This account aims to ground medical concepts in empirical facts independent of cultural or moral evaluation. However, critics argue that identifying "normal" functioning is itself value laden. Statistical averages do not automatically determine what ought to be considered healthy or unhealthy, and variation within human populations complicates strict biological definitions.

Normativist approaches contend that disease concepts inherently involve evaluative judgments about harm and undesirability. A condition becomes a disease not merely because it deviates biologically from statistical norms but because it interferes with a person's ability to flourish within a social context. For example, certain psychological traits may be pathologized in one society yet regarded as personality differences in another. Mental health diagnoses illustrate the interaction between biology and social norms. These debates demonstrate that disease cannot be understood solely through laboratory measurement; it also reflects human values and cultural frameworks.

The concept of health is equally philosophically complex. Defining health as the absence of disease is insufficient, as many individuals with chronic illnesses lead meaningful, satisfying lives. Contemporary philosophical perspectives increasingly describe health as the capacity for adaptation, resilience, and goal-directed activity. Health may involve the ability to respond effectively to environmental challenges and maintain internal balance. This broader understanding recognizes psychological strength, social relationships, and environmental stability as integral to well-being. It also shifts the focus from the perfection of biological systems to the functional and experiential dimensions of life.

Closely related are the distinctions between disease, illness, and sickness. Disease often refers to objective pathological processes identifiable through scientific investigation. Illness captures the subjective experience of symptoms, discomfort, or suffering. Sickness may denote the social role granted to individuals recognized as unwell. These conceptual distinctions reveal that medicine operates at biological, personal, and societal levels. A patient may feel ill without an identifiable disease or have asymptomatic disease without subjective illness. Understanding these differences improves communication between healthcare providers and patients and highlights the multidimensional nature of medical practice.

Reductionism has long driven biomedical research by focusing on molecular and cellular mechanisms. Advances in genetics, immunology, and neuroscience illustrate the explanatory power of this approach. However, critics argue that an exclusive reductionist approach risks neglecting the psychological and social determinants of health. Chronic conditions such as cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and depression involve lifestyle, stress, socioeconomic factors, and cultural influences. A purely biological explanation may fail to address these contributing factors adequately. Philosophical reflection encourages a more integrative understanding of causation, recognizing that health outcomes emerge from complex interactions rather than isolated mechanisms.

The biopsychosocial model marks a significant philosophical response to reductionism. By integrating biological processes, psychological states, and social environments, it recognizes the layered structure of human experience. It suggests that effective treatment requires attention to emotional well-being, community support, and environmental conditions, in addition to pharmacological intervention. Philosophically, the model challenges strict materialism and promotes a system-based view of causation. It aligns with contemporary complexity theory, which emphasizes interdependence and dynamic interaction across multiple levels of organization.

Epistemology is crucial to understanding how medical knowledge is generated and justified. Evidence-Based Medicine (EBM) emerged as a movement to standardize clinical practice around rigorous research methods, particularly randomized controlled trials and systematic reviews. While this approach enhances reliability and minimizes bias, philosophical analysis reminds us that evidence does not interpret itself. Clinical guidelines must be applied within the context of individual patient circumstances, values, and preferences. Moreover, aspects of care such as communication, empathy, and cultural competence are difficult to quantify yet remain essential to healing.

Medical reasoning operates under uncertainty. Physicians frequently make decisions based on probabilities rather than certainties, weighing risks and benefits in complex situations. Diagnosis often involves abductive reasoning, in which clinicians infer the most plausible explanation for observed symptoms.

Buketov University

This interpretive dimension shows that medicine is not a mechanical application of rules but a practical discipline that requires judgment and experience. Philosophical engagement with uncertainty underscores the importance of humility, continuous learning, and ethical responsibility in clinical practice.

Ethics is inseparable from medicine because healthcare decisions directly affect human life and dignity. Principles such as autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice provide normative guidance. Respecting autonomy means recognizing patients as active participants in their care rather than passive recipients of treatment. Beneficence and non-maleficence require careful evaluation of potential harms and benefits. Justice concerns the fair distribution of resources, particularly in contexts of scarcity. Debates about organ transplantation, end-of-life care, reproductive technologies, and access to expensive medications illustrate the ethical complexity inherent in modern medicine.

Technological innovation intensifies philosophical challenges. Advances in artificial intelligence, genetic editing, and digital surveillance expand diagnostic and therapeutic capabilities. However, these tools raise concerns about privacy, consent, equity, and accountability. If algorithms guide medical decisions, questions arise about transparency and responsibility for errors. Genetic modification technologies prompt debates about the boundaries between therapy and enhancement. Philosophical inquiry provides critical frameworks for evaluating these innovations, ensuring that technological progress aligns with respect for human dignity.

Public health policy further underscores the relevance of philosophy. Decisions about vaccination mandates, pandemic restrictions, and environmental regulations require balancing individual freedoms with collective welfare. Philosophical theories of justice and political authority inform these deliberations. Health is increasingly recognized not merely as an individual matter but as a social good shaped by structural determinants such as housing, education, and employment. Addressing these determinants entails ethical commitments that extend beyond clinical settings.

Another significant theme in contemporary philosophy of medicine is medicalization, the process by which non-medical aspects of life are classified as medical conditions. While medicalization can reduce stigma and provide access to treatment, it may also expand medical authority into areas better addressed through social or cultural change. Philosophical analysis encourages careful evaluation of when medical intervention is appropriate and when alternative approaches are preferable. This reflection helps prevent overdiagnosis and overtreatment while preserving necessary care.

Empirical research has increasingly informed philosophical debate. Experimental philosophy examines how different populations conceptualize health and disease, revealing variability across cultures and professional groups. These findings challenge the assumption that medical concepts are universally fixed and underscore the importance of contextual sensitivity. Philosophy thus collaborates with the social sciences and clinical research, contributing to a more nuanced understanding of healthcare realities.

Humanism remains central to medicine. Scientific competence, while indispensable, alone does not ensure healing. Patients seek recognition of their narratives, fears, and hopes. Narrative medicine emphasizes listening to patient stories as integral to diagnosis and treatment planning. This approach reinforces the idea that medicine addresses humans, not merely bodies. Philosophical reflection sustains this humanistic orientation, reminding practitioners that healthcare ultimately aims to promote meaningful lives.

Global health inequalities further underscore the moral dimension of medicine. Access to basic healthcare services, clean water, and essential medicines varies widely worldwide. Philosophers argue that health should be considered a matter of social justice and global responsibility. Efforts to reduce disparities entail ethical commitments to solidarity and fairness. Healthcare systems must therefore integrate scientific innovation with policies that address structural injustice.

In conclusion, the philosophy of health and medicine deepens understanding of what medicine is and what it ought to be. By clarifying concepts of health and disease, analyzing methods of reasoning, and articulating ethical commitments, philosophy strengthens clinical practice and public policy. Medicine flourishes when it balances empirical rigor with compassion, technological advancement with moral reflection, and biological knowledge with appreciation of human experience. The future of healthcare depends not only on scientific breakthroughs but also on sustained philosophical engagement that keeps medicine aligned with its fundamental purpose: promoting human well-being in all its complexities.

References

1. Philosophy, medicine and health care – where we have come from and where we are going / E. Kingma, M. Goldenberg, K. Borgerson [et al.] // Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice. – 2014. – Vol. 20, no. 6. – P. 902–907. DOI: 10.1111/jep.12275.

Buketov University

2. Kulhari D. Exploring the intersection of medicine and philosophy: a comprehensive analysis of medical philosophy / D. Kulhari, R. Ysmailova // Scientific Collection «InterConf». – 2024. – No. 195. – P. 255–257 [Электронный ресурс] URL: https://archive.interconf.center/index.php/conference-proceeding/article/view/5818 (дата обращения: 20.02.2026).

3. He Z. X. Our thoughts on medicine and philosophy / Z. X. He, J. H. Lang // Chinese Medical Journal. – 2017. – Vol. 130, no. 3. – P. 253–255. DOI: 10.4103/0366-6999.198936.

4. Reiss J. Philosophy of medicine / J. Reiss, R. A. Ankeny // The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy / eds. E. N. Zalta, U. Nodelman. – Winter 2025 ed. [Электронный ресурс] URL: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2025/entries/medicine/ (дата обращения: 21.02.2026).

5. Lalumera E. Health concepts in medicine and the role of philosophy / E. Lalumera // Philosophy of Medicine. – 2025. – Vol. 6, no. 1. DOI: 10.5195/pom.2025.220.

6. Tosam M. The role of philosophy in modern medicine / M. Tosam // Open Journal of Philosophy. – 2014. – No. 4. – P. 75–84. DOI: 10.4236/ojpp.2014.41011.

7. Saad J. M. A philosophy of health: life as reality, health as a universal value / J. M. Saad, J. O. Prochaska // Palgrave Communications. – 2020. – Vol. 6, no. 45. DOI: 10.1057/s41599-020-0420-9.

УДК: 316.4

ЭТНИЧЕСКАЯ И РЕЛИГИОЗНАЯ ИДЕНТИЧНОСТЬ В УСЛОВИЯХ ЦИФРОВИЗАЦИИ

Муканова А.К.
доктор философии (PhD), старший научный сотрудник ДНиИ, Карагандинский технический университет им. А.Сагинова, г. Караганда, Казахстан
e-mail: kudasel26@mail.ru

Buketov University

В условиях стремительной цифровизации общества этническая и религиозная идентичность переживают глубокую трансформацию, затрагивающую как формы их проявления, так и механизмы формирования и воспроизводства. Цифровые технологии изменяют каналы коммуникации, способы передачи традиций и символических значений, а также создают новые пространства для конструирования коллективного «Мы» и индивидуального «Я». Как отмечают Н. С. Зимова и Е. А. Мацнева, в цифровой среде религиозная идентичность молодых людей формируется в условиях расширенного доступа к информации, множественности интерпретаций и роста рефлексивности, что ведёт к изменению традиционных механизмов религиозной социализации [1]. При этом усиливаются как интеграционные, так и дезинтеграционные тенденции: с одной стороны, цифровая среда облегчает поддержание связей диаспор, конфессиональных и этнокультурных сообществ, с другой - способствует фрагментации и индивидуализации идентичностей [2].

Актуальность темы обусловлена тем, что цифровая среда становится ключевым контекстом социализации, особенно для молодёжи, а значит - важнейшим фактором конструирования этнической и религиозной идентичности. Возникают новые формы «цифровой религии», онлайн-общин, этнических и конфессиональных сообществ в социальных сетях, которые дополняют или частично замещают традиционные институты - семью, религиозные организации, образовательные учреждения [3]. В этих условиях научный анализ динамики этноконфессиональной идентичности приобретает не только теоретическую, но и практико-ориентированную значимость для политики в сфере межэтнических и межконфессиональных отношений, профилактики экстремизма и укрепления социальной сплочённости.

В современной социальной науке идентичность понимается как динамический процесс конструирования представлений индивида и группы о себе, основанный на совокупности культурных, символических и социальных маркеров. Этническая идентичность традиционно трактуется как осознание индивидом своей принадлежности к определённой этнической общности, включающее когнитивный, аффективный и поведенческий компоненты; в цифровую эпоху данные элементы получают новые формы выражения и репрезентации в онлайн-пространстве [4].

Религиозная идентичность, в свою очередь, связана с признанием принадлежности к определённой конфессии или религиозной традиции, принятием соответствующей системы верований, ритуалов и моральных норм. Религиозная идентичность, в свою очередь, связана с признанием