SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY AND PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

UDC 165.3+[1:316.4
DOI **https://doi.org/10.26661/hst-2019-1-78-01**

PSEUDOSCIENCE AND INFORMATION SECURITY IN SMART – SOCIETY

© VLADIMIR TOVARNICHENKO
Engineering institute of Zaporizhzhya national University (Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine)
E-mail: tovarnichenko_vladimir@ukr.net ORCID iD 0000-0003-0782-0231
Engineering Institute of Zaporizhzhia National University, Soborny Avenue, 226, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine, 69006

Abstract

There is no doubt that science-intensive technologies are crucial in the modern world, the lag in which leads to a lag in economic and military development. It is difficult to overestimate the role played by scientific rationality in the life of modern society. It is the basis of modern information technologies. Without it, achievements in space exploration, medicine, genetics, Cybernetics would be impossible. In the modern world there is no sphere of activity in which science has not penetrated. But not only does science have an impact on society, but society also has an impact on science as a social institution and, in particular, on scientists who are members of society.

In the postmodern situation, the cultural function of science is changing. Her identity is blurred. Science, from this point of view, is one of the spheres of professional activity, has only applied value - in creating opportunities for the design of new technical systems-but claims to possess the truth have no grounds. With this understanding, both science and pseudoscience are equal in culture, the game attitude to life triumphs. Pseudoscientific games do not require the use of cumbersome and expensive equipment, and are more financially efficient than science classes. In these conditions, the boundary between science and pseudoscience is blurred, which inhibits technological development. The main principle of postmodernism is the new for the sake of the new. And this principle has fundamentally influenced the development of modern science. In today's modern society, the amount of information is growing in arithmetic progression, textbooks are overloaded with mathematical calculations.

The Genesis of science cannot be considered separately from the events taking place in the cultural and political life of society. It is convenient to declare the representatives of the competing paradigm pseudoscientific and the paradigm itself pseudoscientific. Pseudoscience is a specific type of research and a form of ideology. Pseudoscience arises in the period of rapid development of science. This applies especially to those areas of natural science based on the unification of ideas and methods of different Sciences.

Keyword: pseudoscience, pseudoscientific rationality, scientific rationality, smart society, information society, information security.

Introduction

There is no doubt that science-intensive technologies are crucial in the modern world, the lag in which leads to a lag in economic and military development.

It is difficult to overestimate the role played by scientific rationality in the life of modern society. It is the basis of modern information

technologies. Without it, achievements in space exploration, medicine, genetics, Cybernetics would be impossible. In the modern world, there is no sphere of activity in which science has not penetrated. But not only does science have an impact on society, but society also has an impact on science as a social institution and, in particular, on scientists who are members of society. In the postmodern situation, the cultural function of science is changing. Her identity is blurred. Science, from this point of view, is one of the spheres of professional activity, has only applied value - in creating opportunities for the design of new technical systems- but claims to possess the truth have no grounds.

With this understanding, both science and pseudoscience in culture are equal, the game attitude to life triumphs. Pseudo-scientific games do not require the use of cumbersome and expensive equipment, and are more financially efficient than science classes. In these conditions, the boundary between science and pseudoscience is blurred, which inhibits technological development

Analysis of the literature.

The article uses the materials of the following authors Voronkova V.G. , Pozhuev V.I. , Lektorskij V.A., Kasavin I.T., Tovarnichenko V., Melkov Yu.A., Lebedev S.A, Mironov A.V., Bojko Elena, Nikitenko Vìtalina, Zaharenko K.V. , Rizhova I.S., Zaharova S.O., Romanenko T. P. , Andryukaytiene R.

Aim and tasks

- to analyze characteristic features and signs of pseudoscientific rationality;

- to give a comparative analysis of scientific and pseudoscientific rationality;

- to determine the criteria of pseudoscientific rationality.

Methodology and research methods.

The methodology is understandable as a set of techniques for the implementation of cognitive activity. It is based on an integrated approach due to its interdisciplinary nature. That methodology reflects the need for selection, application of scientific methods in their unity for a true representation of the problem study. The article uses the following methods of scientific knowledge: historical and logical, analysis and synthesis; measurement; movement from abstract to concrete; synergistic approach.

Discussion of problems

There is no doubt that the development of science and high technologies is vital for modern society. It is well known that the amount of information is growing in arithmetic progression, textbooks are overloaded with mathematical calculations. In contrast to the science of the late XIX century, when the universe and its description were simple and understandable, in the science of the XXI century, the clarity of the picture is lost and mutual understanding between representatives of close scientific directions disappears. The tendency to explain the incomprehensible because of the incomprehensible has become the norm of our time. Therefore, it is necessary to be able to separate useful

information from redundant.

Ukraine has a huge scientific and production potential, which should be used not to try to catch up with the European level of production, but for the development of simple and cheap technologies based on revolutionary ideas, allowing to create products that have no analogues in the world.

In order for Ukraine to become a truly European state, «it is necessary to fundamentally reform its economic complex, change the principles of its functioning, and ensure the competitiveness of its economy in the European market…» [1, p 26].

Formation of the economy based on knowledge, instead of consumption of natural resources, reduction of production wastes, "the solution of ecological problems, introduction to benefits of technogenic civilization" [2, p. 7].

We need decisive measures to «strengthen the vitality of intelligence, support and build the intellectual potential of society. If the intellect declines, the people, the nation, the culture degenerates» [3, p. 6].

Intelligence is a powerful source of social growth that needs to be protected and enhanced. At the time of introduction of an innovative model of economic development based on the advantages of high technologies.

In modern Ukraine, as in most other countries, there is a postmodern situation in which the illusion of losing the leading role of scientific rationality in culture is formed. Postmodernism, having emerged as a kind of continuation of the avant-garde experiments of the early twentieth century, goes from stating the insolvency of global "claims of reason" to attempts to identify the landmarks of "post-neoclassical" intellectual experience.

Postmodernism puts forward as the main creative principle a radical pluralism of styles and artistic programs, ideological models and cultural languages, the lack of hierarchy. Within the framework of postmodernism, deconstruction develops-a direction of poststructuralist criticism, which aims not to clarify the fundamental experience of being, but to comprehensively disregard the concept of being as such. Criticism of the fundamental concepts of traditional philosophy – «reality», «identity», «truth» - proceeds from the premise that the status of the rational in culture is not self-reproduced on its own material, but is supported by a constant effort to displace from its sphere the elements that contradict it.

Some signs allow us to define the current state of science as a crisis: it is «the growth of anti-Nazi currents, and even movements in society, and the increase in the proportion of metaphysical components within natural science knowledge and as a limiting case, the appearance of more works written by natural scientists, where attempts are made to build some new religious-metaphysical scientific knowledge» [4, p. 20].

The reason for this crisis is disappointment in science as such. Since scientific rationality does not cover all manifestations of human life, there is an appeal to rationalities of other types. In particular, there are

quasi-scientific, pseudo-scientific systems of views that try to fill the gap between the scientific picture of the world, myth and religion.

In modern «postmodern» culture, the view is spread that «there is no fundamental difference between knowledge and ignorance, between truth and lies, between science and pseudoscience»[5].

The main principle of postmodernism is the new for the sake of the new. And this principle has fundamentally influenced the development of modern science.

Science as a social institution is rational and communicative, its results are formed in a concise logical form, which are subjected to further deductive structuring, and, as a consequence, easily and fully assimilated by the next generations.

Scientific skepticism demands that the formation of the problem be recognized as rational-theoretical, that is, independent of the play of the subjective spirit.

That is, science is largely the result, the product of collective social intelligence, the effect of cumulative explosive growth and self-organization of knowledge. Figuratively speaking, science develops as a living organism: an alternation of processes of distribution, disciplines of specialization, analysis and then synthesis of a new quality, a new ontology, a new language. It is a synergistic process of morphogenesis that occurs at all levels of the organization of science, and when its foundations are revised, we are talking about paradigm revolutions. Now it is such a moment of interdisciplinary synthesis, self-organization of science-a stage of acute reflection, the formation of a new post-non-classical evolutionary paradigm [6, p. 191].

Is the European understanding of science the only possible one? We can agree with the opinion of Bazhenov Lb, who answers this question positively. Would. Russell focused on two intellectual tools that constituted modern science-the deductive method invented by the Greeks, and the experimental method, first widely and systematically used by Galileo. The deductive method allowed the Greeks to create mathematics, logic and speculative philosophy. The combination of it with experiment gave rise to what we call modern science (it is first of all natural science, but not only it). Cultural norms absorb different types of knowledge, and not just knowledge.

Culture determines the life of society, and that is why it is integral, and science in this sense is partial. The problem is that this particularity is not recognized by the scientific community and society as a whole. The result is an unjustified expansion of the natural science approach and the scientific picture of the world in situations that require completely different approaches for their solution, for example, project and completely different pictures of the world, thinking and activity. According to the «standard concept of science», the most important difference is that science is universal and in this sense one, culture is multiple. You can talk about Chinese, Indian or European

culture, but scientific knowledge is the same everywhere.

Science in its claims to truth and universality is self-sufficient, monologue and aggressive. Modern culture, on the contrary, finds its place and itself only in dialogue with other cultures.

Modern consciousness is forced to give up rationalistic illusions about the absolute priority of rational consciousness over all other forms of pre-rational and irrational consciousness. There are such forms of culture, which are based on other than rationality, types of relations to the world, with the change of intervals, scientific rationality itself changes, including the irrational component.

The Genesis of science cannot be considered separately from the events taking place in the cultural and political life of society. The development of science takes place within the framework of the development of a society that is hostile to new ideas and their carriers: for example, Galileo was tried, and Giordano Bruno was burned, with good reason defending the existing culture. After the October revolution in the USSR, party ideology replaces religious ideology and exerts its influence on science. As a result of the introduction of political motives into science, domestic genetics and Cybernetics lagged far behind the Western one. A similar situation could have happened with physics, which is now recognized as the embodiment of scientific rationality, and which was almost recognized as a mystical pseudoscience.

Sometimes it is very convenient to declare the representatives of the competing paradigm pseudoscientific and the paradigm itself pseudoscientific. In other words, pseudoscientific is something that does not correspond to generally accepted ideas and does not correspond to the ideas of official science. The question of the rationality of «pseudoscience» is currently being discussed quite actively. Pseudoscience is a specific type of research and form of ideology, the peculiarity of which is associated «with the desire to bring their procedures and conclusions to a scientific form, although their content goes beyond the currently recognized scientific concepts»[7] .

Signs of pseudoscience can be defined as follows: the idea is put forward, devoid of theoretical and experimental arguments, which is in isolation from the logic of the development of science. At the same time, in this idea there is a big claim-pseudo-scientist undertakes «world» problems and promises to revolutionize both science and practice. Sources of pseudoscience: dilettantism and ignorance, neglect of strict concepts and experience, ignoring the previous development of science. Psychologically, «pseudoscience is defined by uncontrolled arrogance, or fanaticism unscrupulous careerism» [8].

These trends are most often combined. If we consider the criterion of rationality of pseudoscience its similarity to science, we can not consider it rational. Kasavin I. T. distinguishes three situations of

problematization of pseudoscientific rationality:

1) under the Scientic form hides an ideological concept (usually reactionary);

2) immature science tends to the status of Mature science;

3) under the form of science lives some practical art, the prospects of turning it into a science in General are unclear.

How to draw the line between what is scientific and unscientific? As an example, consider the struggle between the two paradigms of N. Tesla and A. Einstein, for the struggle between which were used not so much scientific arguments as political and economic means of influence. See details [9 ; 10]

More than a hundred years ago, the resonance effect was discovered and widely used in radio engineering. With this effect, in the early twentieth century, Nikola Tesla created a transformer-generator, operating at a frequency of about 100 kHz, receiving energy from the «ether». The output power of this transformer was hundreds of times higher than the input power. Then there are very interesting things: about the work of Tesla in the 20-ies of the twentieth century, as it were forgotten, but the theory of relativity begins to dominate. Einstein, in fact, pure sophistry, confusing and contradictory, the sole purpose of which is to refute the existence of the ether.

Einstein's theory of relativity is recognized as an official science, but for more than a hundred years it has caused philosophical and scientific disputes. It resembles a beautiful air castle that has no Foundation, and therefore has been constantly criticized by a significant group of physicists. These Are Yu. B. Molchanov, A. K. Timiryazev, K. Popper, B. Riemann, G. Lorenz, A. A. Michelson, I. L. Fizo, N. A. Ponimal, M. Born, J. John. Thomson, et al. the theory of relativity is incomprehensible to many, but the problem of misunderstanding is not in misunderstanding, but in the absence of content. But political influence, conventionalism and conditions make the theory of relativity is undeniable. Gradually the theory of relativity has become a dogma, a new religion. But if the theory of relativity is wrong, how could it become universally accepted? From the point of view of pragmatism, what is useful is true. Indeed, the theory of relativity is very useful to oil tycoons, if it is considered as a weapon it is admired, but unfortunately, this weapon is directed against us.

Einstein makes statements with which it is impossible to argue, and which he successfully applies: «the Main thing is the content, not the mathematics...With the help of mathematics you can prove anything...Mathematics is the only way to lead yourself by the nose...There is an opportunity to master the subject mathematically, without understanding the essence of the case...In physics, there are only a few fundamental ideas that can be expressed in ordinary words. No scientist thinks in formulas».

Einstein behaves like a Sophist, deliberately violating the laws of

logic. Consider the second postulate: the Speed of light in a vacuum is the same for all inertial reference systems. It does not depend on the speed of the source or the speed of the receiver of the light signal. In this form, this postulate is staggering. It sounds mysterious and shrouded in a halo of magic. But it can be formulated differently without changing the physical meaning:

1. The speed of light is different in different environments.

2. The velocity of wave propagation in any homogeneous medium is constant. It does not depend on the speed of the source or the speed of the receiver of the signal (Doppler effect). It would seem the same physical sense, but there is no mystery and magical areola. Sounds pretty mundane.

With a periodicity of about twenty years there are publications of such researchers: V. Dokuchaev, A. Chernetsky, V. Atsyukovsky, which describe the production of energy by resonance. Of particular interest are the works of A. Melnichenko, who tuned in resonance not only transformers but also electric motors (an increase in power several times, which can not be explained by cos). But these publications are not paid attention, they are proclaimed pseudoscientific, because they contradict the theory of relativity and allegedly violate the law of conservation of energy. But if there is an ether, the law of conservation of energy is not violated. How to distinguish what is scientific and what is pseudoscientific? There is a fairly simple way to choose between the two theories correct. We should not forget that the criterion of scientific is the repeatability of the experiment. Science disappears when, instead of turning to experience, transitions to personality begin.

So, to get a resonance, but it is much easier to do than to build a hadron Collider . Formulas for calculating the parameters of the oscillating circuit can be found in any Amateur radio directory. Thus, the oscillatory circuit, acquired in resonance, allows you to get an increase in power several times. The higher the frequency, the greater the power output. The question of where the energy comes from (approximately from the ether) is still open and requires further study. The cognitive sociology of science considers science as a social institution. Cognitive sociologists openly attacked one of the main epistemological attitudes shared by all the previous philosophy of science from bacon and Descartes to Popper and Lakatos about «the special epistemological status of scientific knowledge. According to this attitude, it was believed that scientific knowledge, unlike other types of knowledge (philosophy, religion, mythology, art, everyday knowledge, ideology, and the like), should have and has a social and value neutrality.

As a paradigm model of such ideas about science acted natural science, and, above all, physics. Social and value neutrality of science was considered as an absolutely necessary condition for achieving objective and true knowledge - the main goal of scientific knowledge. Objectivity of

scientific knowledge was understood as its complete independence from the «subjective» qualities of specific scientists: their individual creative abilities, interests, preferences, beliefs, ideological values, cognitive horizon, etc. Cognitive sociologists expressed disagreement with the thesis of social and value neutrality of science, its special epistemological status in the sense of the possibility of achieving objective knowledge by pure science.

They questioned the interpretation of the scientist as a transcendental subject in any of its three variants: the carrier of a priori knowledge (Kant, Hegel), logical-empirical mechanism (positivism, postpositivism), defenders of the scientific community (classical sociology of science Weber and Merton). It should be noted that the emergence of cognitive sociology of science is in the 70-ies of XX century. was prepared by such circumstances:

a) the existence of theories and paradigms competing and competing in all areas of knowledge;

b) non-cumulative nature of the development of science, accompanied by qualitative jumps, scientific revolutions;

c) there are qualitatively different types of science, based on a significantly different understanding of what science is, each of which has its own rationality. When conducting an experiment, a scientist deals with a certain part of the physical world.

What factors are considered important by the experimenter, and which are irrelevant, depends on the sympathies of the scientist, the norms of science, which are accepted in this science today, the norms that are cultivated by society, religion, etc.What factors should be considered as harmful, depends on the General cultural ideas of the scientist, and not «objectively» existing criteria. Such social influence cannot be removed and cannot be reprimanded by a scientist. The scientist convinces himself that the object of research is something holistic, self-sufficient. The interrelations of the object, outlined by a certain framework of the experiment, are evaluated as secondary, not affecting the results obtained.

Therefore, scientists are unable to predict even a small fraction of the consequences caused by human activity. Social influence penetrates into science and through those language norms that are used by scientists to inform about the results of their scientific activities. The scientist should formalize the results of the observation linguistically. What a scientist has "seen" is the result of interpretation according to what a particular scientist has been taught. A modern scientist is a person who is involved in the activities of specific scientific groups, in which whole generations of people, carriers of this tradition, develop a style of thinking. For those who belong to this collective, «the style of thinking inherent in this collective necessarily appears as the only correct, if not the only possible» [11, p. 143].

Belonging to real scientists of different groups in the scientific community leads to differences in views on the results of their own

activities and the assessment of the work of their colleagues. There is a conflict of interpretations, theories, methods, facts – «a situation that cannot be explained using the old notions of objectivity in science»[12, p. 104].

Scientists differ not only in their assessment of the role and behavior of their colleagues, but also in the meaning they attach to the content of scientific terms and the scientific theory itself; in time they may become intellectual opponents.

Problems of social humanitarian and behavioral sciences are considered in interconnection and interdependence, since a person is a complex system that allows to determine its structure, interrelations of elements, functions and their role in a changing and contradictory globalized world. It is thanks to this method that human activity appears to be an open and unbalanced system that orientates the scientist to study the complex of back relations between the nation, dissipative structures, nonlinearity, and others like that [13, p.30].

Complex information security of man and society includes the vectors such as: ensuring information rights and freedoms of man and citizen; protection of person from undue interference information; provision of national, cultural and spiritual identity from undue interference; ensuring a functioning legal and institutional mechanisms for the protection of corresponding rights, etc. Today, there are a number of problems in the field of information and national security in Ukraine "that require solutions both in conceptual, theoretical and legislative terms, and in terms of building an integrated system for the implementation of strategic objectives in the practice of the real information society" [14, p. 49].

In the modern world, a new interpretation of the information society, namely Smart-society, has spread. The term «Smart society» entered science after the G20 Summit in Seoul (November 2010), where the information technology forum" Smart and sustainable growth «was held. In particular, it was there that the development strategies of individual countries (Germany, South Korea, Australia, the Netherlands, etc.) related to Smart-technologies or «smart» technologies were announced. In the future, the accumulation of information technologies by society will lead to the emergence of a new quality, which is now called Smart-society. In such a society, technologies that were based on information are transformed into technologies that will be based on interaction and knowledge» [15, p. 84]

At the heart of our Smart society is the development of the «knowledge society», digital technologies, digital society, all that is called the «digital era» of civilization. Smart society is built in such a way that "smart" work, which is formed by «smart» life, government and business, is based on «smart» infrastructure and «smart» citizens, who play a Central role in creating a smart culture [16, p.122-134].

Conclusion

1.The main principle of

postmodernism is the new for the sake of the new. And this principle has fundamentally influenced the development of modern science.

2. In today's modern Smart society, the amount of information is growing in arithmetic progression, textbooks are overloaded with mathematical calculations.

3. The Genesis of science cannot be considered separately from the events taking place in the cultural and political life of society.

4. It is convenient to declare the representatives of the competing paradigm pseudoscientific and the paradigm itself pseudoscientific.

5. Pseudoscience is a specific type of research and a form of ideology.

6. Pseudoscience arises in the period of rapid development of science. This applies especially to those areas of natural science based on the unification of the ideas and methods of the various Sciences.

7. Signs of pseudoscience can be defined as follows: the idea is put forward, devoid of theoretical and experimental arguments, which is in isolation from the logic of the development of science. At the same time, in this idea there is a big claim-pseudo-scientist undertakes «world» problems and promises to revolutionize both science and practice.

REFERENCES

1. Voronkova V. H. (2009). Politika Євroatlantichnoї integracії Ukraïni: metodika antropologichnoї ekspertizi. *Humanities bulletin of Zaporizhzhe state engineering academy*. Vip. 39. 21-35.

2. Pozhuev V.I. (2009). Strategichni cili i zadachi perekhodu Ukraïni do informacijnogo suspil'stva. *Humanities bulletin of Zaporizhzhe state engineering academy*. Vip. 39. 4-20.

3. Pozhuev V.I. (2007). Informacijna kul'tura informacijnogo suspil'stva. *Humanities bulletin of Zaporizhzhe state engineering academy*. Vip.9. 4-17.

4. Nauka i kul'tura (materialy “kruglogo stola”) (1998). *Voprosy filosofii*. № 10. 5-24.

5. Lektorskij V.A. (2001). Psevdonauchnoe znanie v sovremennoj kul'ture (materialy "Kruglogo stola") http://www.LOGIC.ru/Russian/vf/Papers2001/table62001.htm

6. Budanov V.G. (1996). Sinergeticheskie mekhanizmy rosta nauchnogo znaniya i kul'tura. *Filosofiya nauki*. Vyp. 2: Gnoseologicheskie i metodologicheskie problemy. M.191-199.

7. Kasavin I.T. (1995). O situaciyah problematizacii racional'nosti. Racional'nost' kak predmet filosofskogo issledovaniya. M.204.

8. Vol'kinshtejn M. (1976). Biofizika v krivom zerkale. *Nauka i zhizn'*. N 7. 62.

9. Tovarnichenko V. (2010). Psevdonauka ta ïï racional'nist': sociokul'turnij analiz. *Gumanitarnij visnik zaporiz'koï derzhavnoï inzhenernoï akademiï*. Vip.41. 30-41.

10. Tovarnichenko V.A.)2007). Analiz filosofskih i geopoliticheskih osnovanij opyta Majkel'sona i teorii otnositel'nosti A.Ejnshtejna. *Kul'tura narodov Prichernomor'ya*. Vip.118. 117-124

11. Melkov YU.A. (2004). Fakt v postneklassichesskoj nauke. K.: Izdatel' *PARAPAN*. 224.

12. Lebedev S.A, Mironov A.V. (1998). Kognitivnaya sociologiya: ot kritiki osobogo gnoseologicheskogo statusa nauki k probleme nauchnogo konsensusa. *Vestn. Mosk. Un-Ta.* Ser. 7. Filosofiya. N 4. 99-109.

13 Bojko Elena. Voronkova Valentyna. Nikitenko Vìtalina (2018). Methodology and organization of scientific researches in the field of social-humanitarian and behavioural sciences. *Humanities bulletin of Zaporizhzhe state engineering academy*. Vip. 72. 2018. 23-35

14. Zaharenko K.V. (2018). Kategoriya informacijnoї bezpeki u vitchiznyanomu filosofs'kopolitologichnomu diskursi. *Humanities bulletin of Zaporizhzhe state engineering academy*. Vip.72. 44-52

15. Rizhova I.S., Zaharova S.O. (2018). Vpliv "smart tekhnologij" na rozvitok "smart-mista" v informacijnomu suspil'stv. *Humanities bulletin of Zaporizhzhe state engineering academy*. Vip.72. 81-90.

16. Voronkova, V.H., Romanenko, T. P., Andryukaytiene, Regina (2016). Concept of development of design-oriented business in the conditions of digital transformation to Smart – society. *Humanities bulletin of Zaporizhzhe state engineering academy*. Vip.67. 122-134.

Товарниченко Володимир Олександрович - кандидат філософських наук, доцент міжфакультетської кафедри загальноосвітніх дисциплін, Інженерний інститут Запорізького національного університету (Запоріжжя, Україна)

E-mail: tovarnichenko_vladimir@ukr.net ORCID 0000-0003-0782-0231

ПСЕВДОНАУКА ТА ІНФОРМАЦІЙНА БЕЗПЕКА У СМАРТ-СУСПІЛЬСТВІ

Не викликає сумніву, що в сучасному світі вирішальне значення мають наукомісткі технології, відставання в який приводить до відставання в економічному і військовому розвитку. Важко переоцінити ту роль, яку грає наукова раціональність в житті сучасного суспільства. Вона лежить в основі сучасних інформаційних технологій. Без неї були б неможливі досягнення у сфері освоєння космосу, медицини, генетики, кібернетики. У сучасному світі немає такої сфери діяльності, в яку б не проникла наука. Але не лише наука здійснює вплив на суспільство, але й суспільство впливає на науку як соціальний інститут і зокрема на вчених, які є членами суспільства.

У ситуації постмодерна змінюється культурна функція науки. Її ідентичність розмивається. Наука, виявляється з цього погляду однією зі сфер професійної діяльності, що має лише прикладне значення - у створенні можливостей для проектування нових технічних систем, - але претензії якої на володіння істиною не мають основ. При такім розумінні і наука, і псевдонаука в культурі рівноправні, тріумфує ігрове відношення до життя. Псевдонаукові ігри не вимагають використання громіздкого і дорогого обладнання, і є більш ефективними у фінансовому відношенні, чим заняття наукою. У цих умовах розмивається границя між наукою і псевдонаукою, що гальмує технологічний розвиток.

Головним принципом постмодерна є нове заради нового. І цей принцип докорінно вплинув на розвиток сучасної науки. В сучасному смарт суспільстві обсяг інформації росте в арифметичній прогресії, підручники перевантажені математичними викладеннями. Генезис науки не можна розглядати окремо від подій, що відбуваються в культурному і політичному житті суспільства. Зручно оголосити представників конкуруючої парадигми псевдовченими а саму парадигму псевдонауковою. Псевдонаука - це специфічний тип дослідження і форма ідеології. Псевдонаука виникає в період бурхливого розвитку науки. Це відноситься особливо до тих областям природознавства, що будуються на об'єднанні ідей і методів різних наук.

Ключові слова: псевдонаука, псевдонаукова раціональнысть, наукова раціональнысть, смарт суспільство, інформаційне суспільство, інформаційна безпека.

Товарниченко Владимир Александрович - кандидат философских наук, доцент межфакультетской кафедры общеобразовательных дисциплин, Инженерный институт Запорожского национального университета (Запорожье, Украина)

E-mail: tovarnichenko_vladimir@ukr.net ORCID 0000-0003-0782-0231

ПСЕВДОНАУКА И ИНФОРМАЦИОННАЯ БЕЗОПАСНОСТЬ В СМАРТ-

ОБЩЕСТВЕ

Аннотация

Не вызывает сомнения, что в современном мире решающее значение имеют наукоемкие технологии, отставание в который приводит к отставанию в экономическом и военном развитии. Трудно переоценить ту роль, которую играет научная рациональность в жизни современного общества. Она лежит в основе современных информационных технологий. Без нее были бы невозможны достижения в области освоения космоса, медицины, генетики, кибернетики. В современном мире нет такой сферы деятельности, в которую бы не проникла наука. Но не только наука оказывает влияние на общество, но и общество влияет на науку как социальный институт и, в частности, на ученых, которые являются членами общества.

В ситуации постмодерна меняется культурная функция науки. Ее идентичность размывается. Наука, оказывается с этой точки зрения одной из сфер профессиональной деятельности, имеет лишь прикладное значение - в создании возможностей для проектирования новых технических систем, - но претензии на обладание истиной не имеют оснований. При таком понимании и наука и псевдонаука в культуре равноправные, торжествует игровое отношение к жизни. Псевдонаучные игры не требуют использования громоздкого и дорогостоящего оборудования, и являются более эффективными в финансовом отношении, чем занятия наукой. В этих условиях размывается граница между наукой и псевдонаукой, что тормозит технологическое развитие.

Главным принципом постмодерна является новое ради нового. И этот принцип в корне повлиял на развитие современной науки. В современном смарт обществе объем информации растет в арифметической прогрессии, учебники перегружены математическими выкладками. Генезис науки нельзя рассматривать отдельно от событий, происходящих в культурной и политической жизни общества. Удобно объявить представителей конкурирующей парадигмы псевдоучеными а саму парадигму псевдонаучной. Псевдонаука - это специфический тип исследования и форма идеологии. Псевдонаука возникает в период бурного развития науки. Это относится особенно к тем областям естествознания, основанные на объединении идей и методов различных наук.

Ключевые слова: псевдонаука, псевдонаучная рациональность, научная рациональность, интеллектуальное общество, информационное общество, информационная безопасность.

Received date 22.09.2019
Accepted date 12.10.2019
Published date 20.11.2019