

or as morally-positive “nice, kind, peaceful, beautiful, easy, etc.”. The game could be assessed as immoral, but at the same time as one which is able to induce a state of optimal excitation due to its possibility (impossibility) to realize man's socially disapproved needs.

The second axis of the semantic space reflects the complex semantic category that allows an individual to determine a degree of man's involvement into the virtual world. The presence of this semantic axis in the everyday consciousness allows a player to differ the games with the experience of full involvement into the virtual world (“complex, long, exciting, unusual, close to reality”), from those, which do not have such an effect (normal, primitive, simple).

The base of the game categorization using the third axis of semantic space, indicates motivational mechanisms of player's passion for game activity: the ability to get some new, unusual experience and the ability to compensate the lost contacts as a result of steady atomization of modern life.

Computer games are not games in the traditional sense of the word as they don't suit to all specifics of a game. The categorization of computer games is based on cognitive structures and motivational mechanisms of man's predisposition to computer gaming activity. Both compensatory type of game's passion and full involvement in virtual life, providing an opportunity of realization of socially-reprehensible behavior, indicate a high degree of player's addiction to computer game. While the motivation of gaining the new experience with the simultaneous interconnection with the virtual as well as real world, indicates a low-leveled probability of a player's addiction to computer games.

References

1. Осгуд Ч. Приложение методики семантического дифференциала к исследованиям по эстетике и смежным проблемам / Ч. Осгуд, Дж. Суси, П. Танненбаум // Семиотика и искусствовеетрия. – М.: Мир, 1972. – С. 278-298.

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

UDC 1:5:6:001 (043.2)

Mironov Yu.H.

National Aviation University, Kyiv

SCIENCE OR MYTH?

Despite a huge impact on a community progress, science, as stated by I. Kant, has always had two major issues: narrow-mindedness and a lack of a decent particular goal. As a result, science needs an oversight of philosophy. A rapid development of science at the beginning of the XX-XXI centuries and increase of its influence over all

the spheres of man's life prove the actuality of a thorough research of the place of science in the system of the modern culture. In this scope, philosophical-epistemological ideas of Paul Feyerabend gain a huge amount of meaning.

Researches of Paul Feyerabend promote many ideas of the postpositivism movement (anticumulative model of science development, idea of paradigm incomparability, theoretical load over facts etc.). Moreover, P. Feyerabend radicalizes them, debating the significance and value of the former cumulative paradigm of scientific knowledge. He criticizes it, relying on the principles of proliferation and counter-induction. Feyerabend assumes that T. Kuhn has mistaken two simultaneously existing tendencies for two different stages: an urge for stability and an urge for proliferation. The major point of Feyerabend's philosophy is a statement that there is no apriori clear prescribed explicit empirical and logical parameters of an objective estimation of various scientific theories. The aforementioned assumption leads Feyerabend to a principle of anarchism in a scientific methodology. The philosopher himself characterizes the key idea of his principle like this: "The only principle that does not prevent progress is an "everything goes" principle" [2, p. 153]. At a scope and context outlined by this principle, any criteria of scientific knowledge verification or falsification simply make no sense. "Any methodology – even the most obvious – has its limits..." [3, p. 164-165].

Science, from a philosophical standpoint, has no absolute priority over religion or magic in context of explanation of a world order. Moreover, science looks more and more like mythology. In myths: core ideas are declared to be sacred; any attempt to question them are unwelcome; facts and events that do not correspond to the central ideas of a myth are suppressed or misinterpreted. Ideas that do not correspond to that core are eradicated (sometimes, with the authors of these ideas). Absolute dogmatism, monism and intolerance identify a myth. And Feyerabend tries to show that classical science possesses all these traits when one speaks of the background of basic theory, and at the same time everything that fails to be explained in terms of a classical science is discarded. Science is dogmatic and intolerant to criticism. Sanctioned by the government, it is depicted as the only true model of reality description. But from the philosopher's standpoint, it is just a part of a culture, equal to religion, art, mythology etc.

So, Feyerabend's famous call to debate a mandatory science learning at schools is a protest against a privileged position of science in culture and its potential to be a brainwashing weapon. Secondly, he states that in terms of organization science has turned into a new church with arrogant scientists-preachers. Thirdly, Feyerabend protests against bureaucratization, ideologization and monopolization of science, calling for maximum pluralism and freedom of thought ("Do what you want!" is a principle borrowed by him from an anarchist utopia of a Theleme Abbey by François Rabelais).

A principle of anarchism in science by P. Feyerabend introduces a principle of

critics as a fundamental methodological requirement, that grants not only a variety of rival scientific theories, but also multiple gnoseological systems. Given gnoseological situation is closely related to major postmodern epistemological principles: defundalism (criticism of fundamental knowledge essentials), contextuality of the truth, fragmentarily of knowledge, constructivism (knowledge consists of constructions built on the basis of non-interpretable schemes).

References

1. Касавин И.Т. Поль Фейерабенд в поисках «свободной теории познания» // Историко-философский ежегодник '86. М., 1986. – С.207-226.
2. Полани М. Личностное знание. На пути к посткритической философии. Пер. с англ. – Благовещенск: Изд-во БГК им. И.А. Бодуэна де Куртене, 1998. – 344 с.
3. Фейерабенд П. Против метода. Очерк анархистской теории познания / Пер. с англ. А. Л. Никифорова. – М.: АСТ; Хранитель, 2007. – 413 с.

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

UDC 14:111.852 (043.2)

Monastyrova D.V.

National Aviation University, Kyiv

PROBLEM OF BEAUTY IN POSTMODERN CONDITIONS OF UGLINESS AESTHETIZATION

Aesthetics exists not by itself, but in aesthetical properties of objects in the form of reflection of aesthetic categories. Aesthetical category of beauty is the central concept of any aesthetic system. In European philosophy, originated in Antique philosophy, the concept of beauty has been analyzed through the prism of dialectical pairs: “measurability – immeasurability”, “utility – idleness”, “absoluteness – relativity”.

The discussions on quantitative (general) or qualitative (individual) nature of beauty were extremely long. In the first case one supposed that the beauty formula is the accurately computed relation of computable measures, proportions, symmetry, and so on. Only one standard of the beauty of any object became an inevitable consequence of such an attitude. In the second case, beauty was considered as something individual, incognizable and invariable. Naming objects and phenomena “beautiful”, one should presuppose that they have nothing in common, except the fact of their existence. So, if the beauty is only something individual, it does not exist. The solution has been found not in absolutization of one of the extremes, but in the ability to see measurability and