choice. J.-P. Sartre connects the responsibility of individual choice with the responsibility of all humanity.

These ideas are closely connected with Z. Freud ideas of self, and especially with E. Fromm`s social psychology, which became the basis of anthropocentric paradigm of contemporary culture.

Person should be defined by her(him)self not only because traditional points of view are too suspicious and controversial for her (his) reason, but also because self-determination can give the answer for the deep philosophical questions: "What is the truth? What is happiness? What is the difference between living and being alive? What is the meaning of life? What is consciousness? And others?" These philosophical questions are easy to understand but difficult to solve. But thinking about them clearly can help us improve our critical thinking, and gain a better understanding of ourselves and the world.

The problem of self-determination is one of the central in philosophical anthropology. The choice of an integral part of the nature, purpose and meaning of human life. At the same time a broad discussion of this problem is particularly necessary in today's society, which updates and also eliminates the ability of human self-determination. On the one hand, there is no common ideals, absolute role model, on the other, – unique opportunities to think, explore, learn, communicate, find your way to the truth.

Scientific supervisor: Poda T.A., PhD, Associate Professor

UDC 001:316.344.24 (043.2)

Povaliaiev D.V. National Aviation University, Kyiv

PARASCIENCE IN MODERN SOCIETY

Nowadays, different existing pseudo-scientific practices are gaining more and more popularity. The diversion of such practices is very extensive from extrasensorics and prediction of the future with the help of magic artifacts to the theories that exploit the fact of the science imperfection and hide under the cover of revolutionary inventions rejected by the conservative scientists.

The term "parascience" stands for a complex set of theories and practices competing with the official science for the explanation of particular facts and phenomena but essentially contradicting its views. Parascience and science emerged simultaneously (for the first time they were mentioned in the XI century) as a reflection of myths, rituals and rites accumulated in the society. The most interesting fact is that each turn of science rationality development is accompanied with the development of parascience. The famous XX century scientist and philosopher Karl Raimund Popper has played a great role in the search of solution of the problem of science and parascience demarcation. He proposed to introduce the so-called "falsification criteria", later called "Popper criteria" after him. These criteria proclaim the possibility of experiment conduction as the only possible sign of theory's scientific nature no matter in the present or the future that can unequivocally confirm or rebute the theory. Despite all the efforts, the XX century was marked with the record growth in the quantity of parascience theories and practice.

The correct classification of parascientifical phenomena and doctrines is considered to be a significant problem. There are several methods of classification of parascientifical trends:

1. Discursive-analytical – the ideological part of the trend is taken into account along with the subject of the study. Phenomena can be divided into "pro-scientific", "pro-religious" (e.g. creationism), "pro-ideological" (e.g. Arian Physics) etc.

2. Subject-analytical – classification by the field in which the parascience is interested in. Therefore, parascience can be split into those having natural sciences' field of interest (physics, chemistry, biology), humanitarian (history and anthropology), social (economics and sociology) and formal (math and logic) ones.

3. Praxeologic – allows dividing parascience according to their specifics and the results achieved in relation to the particular subject. Therefore, the phenomena of protoscience (e.g. heliobiology of A.L. Chyzhevskyy), pseudoscience (e.g. torsion theories), antiscience (e.g. creationism and its derivatives), quasiscience (e.g. scientific creationism) can be distinguished.

4. Institutional – parascience can be generated either within the science on behalf of scientists (e.g. Michurin's agrobiology) or beyond it (e.g. astrology). The latter is often based on rituals and shamanism.

Despite the old history of parascience, it became most widespread after the emergence of the mass culture phenomenon. Nowadays, the qualification of an ordinary member of society is insufficient to obtain even a brief coverage of modern science's achievements. This fact leads to the adoption of either the competent opinion or the opinion that seems to be competent of truthfulness of the given facts. Under these conditions, the identification of the parascientific knowledge becomes a very complex task.

The spread of the parascientific knowledge becomes wider in the context of globalization. The mass media can be thought as one of the main sources of parascientific study because of the insufficient level of expertise of the authorities engaged in some definite field or the race after increased profits. Subcultures that tend to the alternative worldviews along with individuals stripped of attributes of the "legitimate culture" and trying to gain a higher social status are very prone to consumption of the para-scientific knowledge.

Therefore, the parascientific phenomena existence is not a unique feature of the modernity, but its wide adoption and actualization indicate the internal crisis of the

modern postindustrial society connected, on the one hand, with the cognitive demands of the informational society and the axiological demands of the consumer society, on the other hand. The increasing creation role in the different social spheres and information and communication technologies' development can be viewed as a guarantee of the stability of the parascience in the close future. At the same time, the problematics of the parascience demarcation is still a subject of the open discussion that does not yet have a final solution.

> Scientific supervisor: Abysova M.A., PhD, Associate Professor

UDC 008.2 (043.2)

Sopizhenko L.A. National Aviation University, Kyiv

INDUSTRIAL CIVILIZATION: PREDICTIONS AND DEVELOPMENT

The problem of future is one of the main problems of the present time. Nowadays no one can accurately say what will happen with our world through 20-50 years and what will occur with humanity. Only futurology can answer on such questions. Futurology is a science of prediction of future with a help of extrapolation of technological, social and economic tendencies or attempts to foresee the development of these tendencies.

All futurology can be divided into two groups: convergent and industrial. Supporters of the theory of convergence are trying to forecast ways of social development by means of two opposite conceptions: conception of Futurology and conception of Marxism-Leninism.

One of the biggest "futurological booms" happened in 70-s. Sociologists, economists and especially philosophers were actively trying to predict the future. A lot of organizations such as "Resources for a future", "Committee of next 30 years", "Daedalus" and lots of European and American universities also took part in that.

Among futurological organizations is notable the so-called, "Club of Rome" – an international non-governmental organization established in April 1968 at a meeting of thirty Western scientists, businessmen and public figures in the Italian capital, who gathered to informally discuss prospects of mankind development. Today, 47 countries have their representatives in the "Club of Rome". The Club members have different philosophical concepts, but they share the concern for the future of humanity and their interest in solving global problems through cooperation of all countries.

The brightest futurology representative of all times is an American sociologist A. Toffler. He states the existence of crisis phenomena in the industrial system.