# Article information:

A naturalist response to Kingma’s critique of naturalist accounts of disease | SpringerLink  
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11017-020-09526-9>

# Article summary:

1. Naturalists believe that determinations of disease do not depend upon judgments of value or well-being, while normativists believe that diseases must express some form of disvaluation.

2. Boorse introduces the idea of “disease-plus” concepts to account for the judgments of value that normativists build into their accounts of the nature of disease.

3. Naturalism is defended by considering metaphysical possibilities such as death being followed by heavenly bliss, and the Epicureans being right about death being neither a harm nor a benefit.

# Article rating:

May be slightly imbalanced: The article presents the information in a generally reliable way, but there are minor points of consideration that could be explored further or claims that are not fully backed by appropriate evidence. Some perspectives may also be omitted, and you are encouraged to use the research topics section to explore the topic further.

# Article analysis:

The article provides an overview of naturalist and normativist accounts of disease, with particular focus on Christopher Boorse's "unrepentant naturalism". The article is generally reliable in its presentation of both sides, providing a balanced view and exploring counterarguments to each position. However, there are some potential biases in the article which should be noted. For example, the author appears to favour naturalism over normativism, as evidenced by their use of language such as "unrepentant naturalism" and their suggestion that normativism has "well-known problems". Additionally, there is a lack of evidence provided for some claims made in the article; for example, when discussing how diseases can be beneficial or harmful depending on context, no evidence is provided to support this claim. Furthermore, there are some points which could have been explored further; for example, while the article mentions Soviet psychiatry and how it pathologized dissenters, it does not explore this point in any depth or provide any further information on this topic. In conclusion, while generally reliable and balanced in its presentation of both sides' arguments, this article does contain potential biases and lacks evidence for certain claims made within it.

# Topics for further research:

* Soviet psychiatry and dissenters
* Benefits of diseases in different contexts
* Christopher Boorse's naturalism
* Normativist accounts of disease
* Problems with normativism
* Comparison of naturalism and normativism
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