

# Place of science in the human knowledge

Dmitrii Kouznetsov

*Institute for Laser Science, University of Electro-Communications,  
1-5-1 Chofugaoka, Chofushi, Tokyo, 182-8585, Japan  
email: [dima@ils.uec.ac.jp](mailto:dima@ils.uec.ac.jp)*

<http://www.ils.uec.ac.jp/~dima/PAPERS/2010mestoe.pdf> Compiled December 27, 2010

**The simple model for the classification of knowledge is suggested. The four types of knowledge are considered: customs, arts, religions and sciences. The strict definition of science is suggested to distinguish it from other kinds of knowledge and from pseudo-science. This approach is suggested to exclude some concepts from the scientific knowledge by some formal criteria at very beginning of the consideration.**

PACS: 01.70.+w (Philosophy of science), 01.75.+m (Science and society), 06 (methodology).

*Keywords:* knowledge, simple models, falsifiability, Karl Popper, Science, Physics

## Preface to the English version

This research is motivated by the huge amount of pseudo-scientific results, that are sometimes declared as “scientific” in the publications. Especially grave the situation is in Russia. The publications make an impression, that in Russia, there exist the special pseudo-scientific academy, called “Russian Academy of Natural Sciences”, raen (the abbreviation of the transliteration “Rossijskaya Akademiya Estestvennykh Nauk”), and the “academicians” of raen make mainly pseudo-science and use huge governmental foundation for this. The special bulletin [1] collects warnings about the danger tendencies in the development of the Russian science in the century 21, and indicates many cases of the abuse. In order not to criticize that raen, here the purification of the scientific knowledge is suggested instead.

The Russian version of this article [2] provides the definition of science, that allows to qualify some results as non-scientific by the formal criteria, at very beginning of the consideration. That definition is based on the simple exercise [3], which, in its turn, is based on the ideas of refutability of scientific concepts, these ideas had been developed by Karl Popper [4, 5, 6] in the past century. However, the similar phenomena of pseudo-science take place not only in Russia; this motivates me to make this English version.

An additional motivation of this research is to answer questions “how did you guess?” by my colleagues with respect to quantum stability of the optical soliton, or with respect to the divergence of the series of the perturbation theory, or with respect to interpretation of the ridged mirror in term of the Zeno effect, or with respect to behavior of the holomorphic tetration in the direction of the imaginary axis. The section “Importance for physics” offers more examples and the references on the specific cases of such “guessing”. In this article, I open my cards and explain, how did it happen, that I “guessed”. I used the classification of hypothesis since century 20, but only now I formulate this as a self-consistent (and I believe, universal) methodology.

Roughly, the recipe can be expressed in the following way: “avoid pseudo-science, and the Science will advance”. Of course, such a principle does not make the researcher’s job instead of the researcher. But it helps in my case. I hope, it will help to my colleagues too. A lot of various pseudo-sciences may exist. So, the better is to classify not each kind of pseudo-science, but the Science, indicating its place in the Human knowledge. This is topic of this article.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The qualification of concepts and results in terms “science” or “pseudo-science” is very important. Otherwise, the science sinks in the sea of some new “results” that involve the perpetual motion machines, inertial propulsion, astrology and other similar staff; usually, such a pseudo-science pretends to be a new, very modern and revolutionary theory and/or effect.

Often, it is supposed, that the scientific research is true, correct, and the pseudo-scientific research is false, wrong, non-correct; so, for the qualification of any concept, it is sufficient to check it, to verify it, and, if it is

wrong, to reject is. Such a common sense looks reasonable, but the abilities of pseudo-scientists to write the wrong papers and get foundation for pseudo-science greatly exceeds the abilities of scientists to criticize them, to reveal errors and to indicate, that some research is just wrong.

In this paper, the different approach is suggested. The idea is not to criticize each “wrong” concept, but to suggest the narrow definition of term “Science” in such a way, that the concept can be qualified as “scientific” or “non-scientific”, whenever this concept is correct or wrong. This cannot substitute the common sense, mentioned above, but some formal criteria allow to reduce the amount of results that deserve serious consideration.

Many Russian colleagues had to learn concepts that are difficult to relate with natural sciences, for ex.:

1. The observable Universe is infinite in space and time.
2. The gradual evolution of a species with genotype of 48 chromosomes led to the new species with genotype of 46 chromosomes.
3. During the life of the past generation, the principles of the funding of science and all other activities should change completely. (The Communism was declared to occur in the past century, during the life of the generation that already past away.)

Such concepts seem to be not only wrong, but also pseudo-scientific.

The goal of this article is systematization, classification of the knowledge in such a way, that many pseudo-scientific concepts can be disqualified at once. The formalism is constructed for the needs of Physics, but it applies also to other sciences.

In this work, the simple model of the classification of the human knowledge is suggested. This model includes only four categories: **customs**, **arts**, **religions** and **sciences**. The definition of science had appeared first in the short version about non-traditional concepts [3]. Here, knowledge is ability to generalize the experience in a compact form and to transfer it to other individuals. Religions are important kind of knowledge [7], and they should be distinguished from sciences. So, this article deals with both sciences and religions. In order to keep this article similar to the Russian original [2], many examples are related to marxism, widely known among the Russian colleagues graduated in the past century. (In the USSR, marxism was taught in all schools, institutes and universities). In order to indicate the difference between the scientific and the religious knowledge, both scientific and non-scientific publications are cited.

## 2. OBJECTIVITY

Past century, Karl Popper had formulated the criteria that allows to identify the special, extremely efficient kind of human knowledge [4, 5, 6]. He called it *science*, although the term *science* was used before in a different meaning; that meaning included the claim of objectivity: *I frame no hypothesis*, Isaac Newton wrote [9]. Roughly speaking, the science was considered to be a true, that does not need any falsification or refutation. Popper, contrary, suggests the criterion of falsifiability as the key property of science, modifying the meaning of this term.

For Popper, the thing that makes a concept *scientific* is not its *objectivity*, but the possibility to verify it, to falsify it, to criticize it arguably and to refute it [4]:

1. It is easy to obtain confirmations, or verifications, for nearly every theory – if we look for confirmations.
2. Confirmations should count only if they are the result of risky predictions; that is to say, if, unenlightened by the theory in question, we should have expected an event which was incompatible with the theory – an event which would have refuted the theory.
3. Every “good” scientific theory is a prohibition: it forbids certain things to happen. The more a theory forbids, the better it is.
4. A theory which is not refutable by any conceivable event is non-scientific. Irrefutability is not a virtue of a theory (as people often think) but a vice.
5. Every genuine test of a theory is an attempt to falsify it, or to refute it. Testability is falsifiability; but there are degrees of testability: some theories are more testable, more exposed to refutation, than others; they take, as it were, greater risks.
6. Confirming evidence should not count except when it is the result of a genuine test of the theory; and this means that it can be presented as a serious but unsuccessful attempt to falsify the theory. (I now speak in such cases of “corroborating evidence”.)
7. Some genuinely testable theories, when found to be false, are still upheld by their admirers – for example by introducing ad hoc some auxiliary assumption, or by reinterpreting the theory ad hoc in such a way that it escapes refutation. Such a procedure is always possible, but it rescues the theory from refutation only at the price of destroying, or at least lowering, its scientific status.

The requirement of refutability opposes the *believe* in the ability to get some *objective* knowledge [10]:

Objective truth is that part of our knowledge which correctly reflects reality and does not depend upon the subject, i.e. on human consciousness and will. Objective method, therefore, means the method that leads to knowledge of objective truth. For materialism the recognition of objective truth is fundamental; consequently all materialist science must be objective in method.

There were doubts about the humanitarian science, but the *objectivity* of the natural sciences was *believed* to be well established and irrefutable. Many authors pretend that their concepts are *true*, so true, they do not need to allow any refutation (sometimes, the term *falsification* is used in the similar meaning). This creates conditions for the growth of various pseudosciences, which may be extremely efficient in getting foundation but useless in any other application. The identification of pseudoscience versus science is sometimes difficult. It is especially grave in Russia: in the USSR, in its time, even the theory of relativity, quantum mechanics, cybernetics were suppressed as pseudosciences [15]; the genetics and psychiatry were exterminated [16, 17, 18, 19, 20]. Even defenders of the *objectivity* mention the danger of pseudoscience, [22]. Both pseudoscience and the struggle against it are dangerous for science [23], while the development of science should allow the *scientific revolutions* [24]. The distinguishing between science and pseudoscience is necessary. The criteria to identify science should be adjusted; this is one of goals of this article.

The conflict between the interpretation of science by K. Popper and that by the objectivism is terminological: what kind of knowledge do we call “science”. Below, the terminology is adjusted; in this article, the term “science” is used in the Popper’s interpretation; however, even more requirements on the scientific hypothesis are formulated.

The classification suggested below does not refer to the correctness or wrongness of a concept. Even the concept about the existence of the “Mizugadro’s number” [25] (which seems to be completely wrong) should be considered as scientific, if the ways of the verification and the negation are indicated. Then, the classification easily accepts the less radical “scientific revolutions” such as, negation of concepts of the universal time for all observers, or that of trajectory as universal description of movement, or that of conservation of number of atoms of each kind in any isolated system.

### 3. PSEUDOSCIENCE

Pseudo-science can be defined as any knowledge (perhaps, wrong knowledge), that pretends to be science, being no science. Then, the pseudo-science is determined as soon as Science is defined. The pseudo-science may have various forms, like a computer virus. If the operational system has a backdoor, the significant part of the resources is spent to identify the new and new viruses in order to disable them. The more appropriate solution is some “open” operational systems that have internal protection and have no need to be a secret (and may be open to public). Dealing exclusively with such open operational systems, one has no need to fight against viruses. In the similar way, it is vain to identify and classify the pseudosciences one by one. Following Popper, one should accept, that the main property, that distinguishes any pseudoscience from any science is neither an *objectivity*, nor a *truth* of a research or a concept (only God knows the Truth), but the way the concept is constructed and its attitude to other concepts. The scientific concept may be false, but it should provide ways to reveal it.

If Lugio Gavani, after his experiments with the electric excitation of muscles of dead frogs [26] would begin to eliminate and to destroy the colleagues who had expressed doubts in his results (instead of to allow them to reproduce the effect), then, such a “galvanism” should be qualified as pseudoscience, although his experiment is easy to reproduce.

In such a way, in order to identify a pseudo-science, this paper suggests to classify the human knowledge and indicate the place of science there. Then, all the rest will be pseudo-science.

### 4. CUSTOMS

The category of customs should include not only the commonly accepted behavior of humans, but also the habitual semantics of commonly used human languages. For example, the usual meaning of the Bible is custom, widely accepted in the Christian community. The sentence *You shall love your neighbor as yourself* allows various interpretations, including the homosexual orientation of Jesus Christ [27, 28], dependently on the meaning of the word *love* and its Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents. Similarly, the interpretations by Tim Rice [29] and Michael Bulgakov [30] should be qualified not as a custom but as an art.

The semantic of the human languages and their understanding, the meaning of words is the most important part of the human knowledge. Namely this kind of knowledge gives sense to other knowledges considered below.

## 5. ARTS

Art is knowledge that is free from internal rules and is realized in a reproducible form that allow its systematic investigation [8]. Such a definition corresponds to a goal formulated in the introduction, although it slightly reduces the set of things which could be called *art*. Usually a product of art has the following properties:

**A1.** Beauty: Here, the beauty is the extensive ability of any unexpected use. The prehistoric hunter, painting and observing an image of an animal on a rock, may guess how to catch this animal; the reader, laughing on a comedy, may ask himself: *Either I am free from all the evils shown?* – although the primary goal could be just laugh.

**A2.** Structureless. Intents to bring into the arts rules are not efficient. The arts use all other knowledges; the same product may have both artistic and scientific value.

**A3.** Wisdom. Artists with their works say more, than they planned to say, and more, than they understand by themselves. In this sense, the product of art may be wiser than the author.

**A4.** Entirety. Intents to correct, to improve a product of art destroy it.

**A5.** Amoralism. Creatures that have goal to bring some moral to the society, have low artistic value if at all; the creature may violate any taboo.

Aiming the specific application of the classification, the topics of customs and arts are presented here only declaratively.

## 6. RELIGIONS

Religion is kind of the human knowledge based on some (specific for each religion) set of irrefutable concepts, believes, texts, symbols and performances. [7]

Usually, any religion is characterized in the most of following:

**R1.** The existence of at least one God is presumed.

**R2.** There exist canonical sacred text, that allow the humans to guess the will of God(s) and follow it.

**R3.** God like some actions of human, these actions are called Good.

**R4.** God dislike some actions of human, these actions are called Evil.

**R5.** The suggested set of concepts pretends to play an organizing role in the society: The following to namely this religion provides abilities for the kindness, prudence and wisdom significantly wider, than any other religions.

It this article, God is generic term denoting any intelligent subject that in some way (that is not available for humans) has abilities that greatly exceed those of a human. Actions related to these abilities are called miracles.

God may look like a human (Jesus Christ, Buddha, Lenin), but also can be “non-material” (God - Holy Spirit, World Revolution, Marxism). God may be omnipotent (almighty), invincible, immortal and predicts future:

*The Marxist doctrine is omnipotent because it is true.* [31]

*Long live invincible marxism-leninism-mao tsetung tonight.* [32]

*Lenin lived, Lenin lives, and Lenin will live.* [33]

*The generation of those who are now fifteen will see a communist society, and will itself build this society.* [34]

*The immortal beacon of Comrade Stalin will forever illuminate the path on which the Chinese people march forward.* [35]

*And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years.* [36].

*World religions, each in their own way, offer a unique set of moral values and rules to guide human beings in their relationship with the environment* [37].

Often, such rules are presumed to be *truth* without limits and alternatives:

*The law of the LORD is perfect, restoring the soul; The testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple.* [38]

*... he who chooses a religion other than islam, it will not be accepted from him, and in the everlasting life he will be among the losers.* [39]

Some religions do not identify themselves as religions, pretending to be sciences. [40, 41]. The adepts consider their own belief as the only true concept, deny the dogmatic character of their believes [42] and treat any deviant

behavior as crime, heresy and mental illness; the wrong-believers are punished or undergo the forced medical treatment [17, 18, 19, 20, 21]. Some religions justify lies, sacrifices, betrays, massacre, murdering and wars, if they serve God: *You cannot make revolution in white gloves*.

Most of religions avoid any refutable concepts. The concept is called refutable, if (and only if) in terms of this concept, some specific observation can be described that negates the concept. For example, the statement *The Party officially declares: The current generation of the soviet people will live in communism* [43] is refutable: based on such a declaration, the next generation may shame the soviet veterans as liars and impostors. Within few generations after creation of a new religion, it abandons and forgets all its refutable concepts and becomes more stable. Here are the examples of irrefutable concepts: *God blesses America*, or *Imperialism is evil*, or *God gives the immortal soul to everyone*, or *The righteous will be at Heaven*.

The canonic texts describe the marvels, miracles that are specific for each religion. The miracle may refer to the magic conversion of water into wine, to the drastic increase of the efficiency of the production by the inspiration of the Führer, catching of the spies by children, destruction of an army of the enemy tanks by several heroic soldiers launching grenades, etc.

The definition in the beginning of the section does not specify features R1-R5 as necessary; so, many kinds of knowledge falls into the definition of religion. In particular, it includes the *shintoisim* [44] and the *civil religions* [45, 46, 47, 48], although these religions do not pretend to be the “only true” knowledge and Gods in these religions are not omnipotent.

Religions form significant part of the human knowledge and play important role in the human history. While a religion is tolerant with respect to other kinds of knowledge (and in particular, to other religions), it may assist the prosper development of the society. No one religion can substitute other kinds of knowledge, end even other religions, as one specific science cannot substitute all other sciences. The society, where any religion dominates in an aggressive way, becomes barbarian compared to other countries within few generations; the people of such a society loss the ability to analyze the information.

## 7. SCIENCES

As it was mentioned in the second section, the term “science” may have different meanings. Following K.Popper, in this article, this term applies only to a refutable knowledge. In order to distinguish science at the background of pseudoscience and religion, the term *science* should be defined as follows:

**Science is kind of knowledge, activity and notations, based on concepts that have all the six properties below:**

**S1. Applicability:** Each concept has the limited range of validity, distinguishable from the empty set.

**S2. Verifiability:** In the terms of the already accepted concepts, some specific experiment with some specific result, that confirms the concept, can be described.

**S3. Refutability:** In the terms of the concept, some specific experiment with some specific result, that negates the concept, can be described.

**S4. Self-consistency:** No internal contradictions of the concept are known.

**S5. Principle of correspondence:** If the range of validity of a new concept intersects the range of validity of another already accepted concept, then, the new concept either reproduces the results of the old concept, or indicates the way to refute it. (For example, the estimate of the range of validity of the old concept may be wrong.)

**S6. Pluralism:** Mutually-contradictive concepts may coexist; if two concepts satisfying S1-S5 have some common range of validity, then, in this range, the simplest of them has priority.

All the six properties are compulsory. For example, if the range of validity of a concept is the *full set* (id est, the concept is valid every time and everywhere), then it does not satisfy S1, and there is no need to check properties S2-S6 to qualify such a concept as non-scientific.

Scientific concepts are built on the base of observations, experiments, axioms, hypothesis, theorems and theories.

Observation means identification of some phenomena which are in some sense similar.

Definitions allow to use compact notations, making the description of scientific concept shorter and simpler.

Axioms are statements that are considered as initial at the building-up of some concept. Concept with commonly accepted axioms is called “paradigm”.

Theorems are statements that are proven on the base of axioms and definitions. Sometimes this term is used even in those cases then the proof of the statement is not yet constructed but is expected to be constructed in

future. In such cases the term “hypothesis” or “Conjecture” is more suitable.

If the hypothesis is deduced from the postulates and other, already proven theorems, it becomes theorem. If a hypothesis had predicted some non-trivial results of observations or experiments, it becomes theory.

Activity, related with development of new concepts is called research. The most important classification of sciences is based on the subject of the research, the goal and the methods, that dominate in the research: humanitarian — natural, fundamental — applied and theoretic — experimental.

Not all sciences are developed sufficiently to allow the use of the full scheme above. Before Hooke and Newton, the deduction was prerogative of mathematics and was not so often in physics, if at all. Before the quantum mechanics, the deduction in chemistry was not possible. Until now, many concepts in biology and the humanitarian sciences are built up on the base of guesses and the verification rather than on the base of the deduction.

Mathematics makes the basis of other sciences. No one science dare to contradict mathematics. The computational mathematics and cybernetics provides a bridge between mathematics and other knowledge. The general physics and theoretical physics relates mathematics with other sciences, although some sciences (even humanitarian ones) may use, for example, the statistical methods without to refer to physics.

If some science, concept contradicts the basic paradigms of mathematics of physics, then, according to S5, there should be indicated a way to see that they are wrong. To avoid the confusions, the term *science* should be used only in the sense of the definition above. In all other cases, the terms *pseudoscience*, *sovietscience*, *christianscience*, *quasiscience* may be used to specify that an activity or a knowledge looks similar to *science* or a scientific research.

## 8. SCIENCES AND THE SOCIETY

Usually the sciences, and especially the fundamental ones do not give a fast benefit. The spending of the budget funding to support the satisfaction of the personal curiosity of researchers requires justification. There were intents to submit the development of science to other goals (creation of facilities of the modernization of the industry, or increasing of the military power of a country, etc.). Some researches, especially applied ones, can be motivated in such a way; and sometimes the results have the scientific value. However, often the results of such a research are just fake. During the human history, there was not developed more efficient motivation for science, than curiosity of researchers who do it. Yet, there is no other way to make the deep science. However, the needs of industry can be mentioned as motivation for the financial support of the curiosity of researchers.

The distribution of funds assigned for the development of science is serious problem. Administrators of funds cannot drill deeply into the research they finance. The funds are distributed on the base of the formal criteria: publications, citation, participation in the conferences. The ability to write the grant applications and good relations with colleagues and the distributors of funds become important, if not dominant, factor in the success in the getting of the financial support. For the same reason, the spectacularity of the new effects is important for their promotion.

Especially non-efficiently the funds are sent in the countries with corrupted bureaucracy; and not only because the significant part of foundation is spent for bribes and the private security. The government being unable to keep the growth of the technology of the country at the international level begins to secret the scientific achievements in order to enable the monopolistic use in the military industry. Often, the results are fake: the secrecy protects them from critics and opens wide field for both wanted and unwanted errors.

In a totalitaristic country, some sciences may be not only left without foundation, but crashed by the physical repression of researchers, as it happened in the USSR with the theory of relativity, quantum mechanics, cybernetics and genetics. [14, 15, 16, 23]. Previously, in Europe, in the epoch of the Holly Inquisition, the similar phenomena took place with respect to astronomy.

The properties 1-6 allow to separate scientific concepts from others without fighting the pseudosciences.

## 9. ABOUT THE TERMINOLOGY

Often the errors are caused by a smooth, fussy definitions of terms and the concepts. The most crying examples refer to the humanitarian science.

In 2009, Dmitry Medvedev had announced the setting up of a commission to counter the falsification of history [12, 13]. This makes the Russian concept of history *unfalsifiable* and disqualifies it as science. There is still hope, that this is just terminological confusion, and that commission does not have aim to destroy the

historic science. The aim of this paper is not to provoke conflicts, but to mitigate them. Therefore, I suggest not to use words “falsification”, “falsifiability”, at least in the scientific texts. Such terms are ambiguous, they may mean either the negation of a concept for the contradiction to observations or the misinformation.

Any term that has two opposite meanings should not be used at all. With respect to historical texts (whenever they scientific or not), the terms *revisionism*, *opportunism* and *reformism* appear in the similar (ambiguous) meaning [51, 52], but the term *refutability* does not seem to be used in such a way.

In this paper, the term “refutability” is used. However, if refutation of the Russian official version of history will be also prohibited, then will be no way to attribute the confusion to terminology, and that concept should be qualified as non-scientific.

## 10. IMPORTANCE FOR PHYSICS

The author would not like to teach colleagues, what to write and how to write, but just indicate, what properties make the research scientific. This section explains, why I boil up so old question, and why it is important for physics.

The author used to meet several “strange” concepts that pretended to be scientific. The examples are: quantum annihilation of the optical soliton [53],

extrapolation of the quasi-optical approximation in the atmospheric physics [55],

the “radius of convergence” of the primary series of the theory of perturbation [56],

quantization of the magnetic flux in a free space [57],

violation of the McCumber relation for the cross-sections of emission and absorption in laser media [58],

Violation of the Kramers-Kronig relation for the active laser materials [59],

non-equivlence of the van der Waals potential to the index of refraction in paraxial atom optics, [60, 61],

“proportional” increase of the power of a disk laser at the increase of of the size of the active element [62],

the immanent impossibility of the analytic extension of the tetrational [63],

the square root of factorial (which was delcared to have no sense) [64],

and the itentioids (that violate the law of conservation of momentum) [3, 65].

The author had participated in the discussions on very similar topics in various branches of physics. The common feature of these cases is that colleagues do not indicate a way to refute their concepts.

I cannot write a separate erratum or article on each of such topics. I suggest to adjust the criteria that the scientific results are supposed to satisfy. This does not mean to make the requirements harder, but to soften the struggle between the authors and reviewers, that sometimes takes the strange form: the authors try to hide the cases when the concept fails while the reviewers are supposed to reveal these cases. In particular, the criterion S1 strongly suggests that the researchers estimate, until where their concepts are valid. In the similar way, the criterion S3 invites the authors to indicate, which result of which experiment would indicate that they are wrong. Such indications and estimates greatly simplify the refutation of concepts, making them scientific.

This approach will help to deal with strange phenomena like observation of the “torsion fields” or the “cold nuclear fusion”; either to reveal the error of the concept at very early stage or to turn the research into the scientific methods, making them different from a circus trick. The definition of science suggested should allow this without to struggle against pseudoscience; such a struggle is dangerous for the science, especially in the countries where the abilities to the critical analysis were persecuted.

## 11. ABOUT TECHNOLOGIES

Technologies are older than sciences. First, Homo Habilis, and then - Homo Sapience. Technologies are close to both sciences and arts. On the one hand, technology uses the scientific achievements (and in this sense is close to science). On the second hand, any good technological solution is product of art. The margin between science and technology is determined by the the definition of Science. Technologies have no need to demonstrate the evidences of correctness of their concepts; the proof of technology is the efficiency in business. The intents to boost the technology with governmental support are not efficient; they boost the pseudo-science and the corruption. I consider the governmental foundation of technologies as fraud.

The classification of the human abilities and the analysis of the foundation of technologies fall out from the scope of this article and may be subject for the independent research.

## 12. CONCLUSIONS

The strict definition of science with criteria S1-S6 is suggested. These criteria are based on the idea of *falsifiability* developed by K. Popper [4, 5, 6]. By itself the term *falsification* causes confusions; in particular, it disproves the Russian concept of history [49, 50]. This problem may come to other sciences, for example, into physics. The term *refutability* is better.

According the definition, the scientific results should include all the properties S1-S6. Recognition of these six conditions as compulsory is necessary to save physics and other sciences from profanation. I suggest that all the civil organizations and the courts consider as fraud any governmental foundation of any research that does not satisfy the criteria S1-S6. I suggest that the editorials of the scientific books and journals and the chairs of the scientific seminars accept S1-S6 as the main requirements for the scientific results. This applies not only to Russia, but to all countries.

### Acknowledgment

Author is grateful to Shoko Okudaira for her help with references and to Kirill Velikanov, Alexander Kaminskii, Andy Blunden for the discussions and critics and to Margarita Kallistratova for her help with the text.

- 
- [1] E.P.Krugliakov. Introdution. Bulletin in defence of Science. **1**, p.3-10. (In Russian) (2006) ; <http://www.ras.ru/digest/fdigestlist/bulletin.aspx>
  - [2] D.Kouznetsov. Role of Science and physics in the human knowledge, in Russian. (Russian version of this article). <http://www.ils.uec.ac.jp/?dima/PAPERS/2010mestoe.pdf>
  - [3] Kouznetsov D, Support of non-traditional concepts. Far East Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Physics, **1**, Issue 1, p.1-6 (2010) ; <http://pphmj.com/abstract/5076.htm> or <http://www.ils.uec.ac.jp/~dima/PAPERS/2010support.pdf>
  - [4] Karl R. Popper. Science as falsification. Karl Popper, Conjectures and Refutations. London: Routledge and Keagan Paul, 1963, pp. 33-39; [http://www.stephenjaygould.org/ctrl/popper\\_falsification.html](http://www.stephenjaygould.org/ctrl/popper_falsification.html)
  - [5] Karl Popper. Science: Conjectures and refutations. – 'Philosophy of Science: a Personal Report', in British Philosophy in Mid-Century, ed. C. A. Mace, 1957.
  - [6] Popper, Karl R. The logic of scientific discovery. Oxford, England: Basic Books. (1959). 480 pp. <http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/1961-02882-000>
  - [7] D.Kouznetsov. Religion. Samizdat, 2010. [http://zhurnal.lib.ru/k/kuznecow\\_d\\_j/religion.shtml](http://zhurnal.lib.ru/k/kuznecow_d_j/religion.shtml)
  - [8] D.Kouznetsov. Art. Samizdat, 2010. [http://zhurnal.lib.ru/k/kuznecow\\_d\\_j/artr.shtml](http://zhurnal.lib.ru/k/kuznecow_d_j/artr.shtml)
  - [9] Isaac Newton. Principia mathematica. London, 1803. <http://www.thenagain.info/Classes/Sources/Newton.html>
  - [10] Telpov V.M. The objective method in psychology, Sovetskaja pedagogika, 1952,7, 66-86. (in Russian) <http://www.questia.com/googleScholar.qst?docId=105592910>
  - [11] Martin Gardner. A Skeptical Look at Karl Popper. Skeptical Inquirer, **25**(4):13-14,72 (2001) [http://www.stephenjaygould.org/ctrl/gardner\\_popper.html](http://www.stephenjaygould.org/ctrl/gardner_popper.html)
  - [12] Medvedev V.A. Commission to counter attempts to falsify the history to the detriment of Russia. (in Russian) <http://document.kremlin.ru/doc.asp?ID=052421> <http://www.vbvbv.narod.ru/Lgenauka.htm>
  - [13] James Rodgers. Russia acts against 'false' history. BBC News, 24 July 2009, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8166020.stm>
  - [14] Korukin V.I. Pseudoscience – what is behind the word? (in Russian) <http://www.vbvbv.narod.ru/Lgenauka.htm>  
Zastyretz A. Meeting of the Presidium. (In Russian). Science of Ural, N2 (830), January 2003. [http://www.uran.ru/gazetanu/2003/01/nu02/wvmmu\\_p1a\\_02\\_012003.htm](http://www.uran.ru/gazetanu/2003/01/nu02/wvmmu_p1a_02_012003.htm)
  - [15] Sonin A.S. Sad jubilee of one company. (in Russian) Bulletin of the Russian Acacemy of Sciences, 1991, **61**, 8, .96-107. <http://russcience.euro.ru/papers/son91vr2.htm>
  - [16] Soyfer V. N. The consequences of political dictatorship for Russian science. Nat Rev Genet. 2001 Sep;2(9):723-9. <http://tracerkinetics.engr.iupui.edu/Ethics%20Course%2009/Journal%20articles/lysenko-nature-rev-genetics2001-nrg0901.723a.pdf>



- [17] Alan A. Stone, MD. Psychiatrists on the side of the angels. *J Am Acad Psychiatry Law* **30**, p.107-11, 2002. <http://www.jaapl.org/cgi/reprint/30/1/107.pdf>
- [18] Richard J. Bonnie, LLB. Political abuse of psychiatry in the Soviet Union and in China. *J. Am Acad Psychiatry Law* **30**, p.136-44, 2002 <http://www.jaapl.org/cgi/reprint/30/1/136.pdf>
- [19] Stephen F. Psychiatry and political repression in the Soviet Union. *American Psychologist*. **37**(10), 1982, 1105-1112.
- [20] Merskey H and Shafran B. Political hazards in the diagnosis of 'sluggish schizophrenia'. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* **148** 247-256 (1986) <http://bjp.rcpsych.org/cgi/content/abstract/148/3/247>
- [21] Thomas Stephen Szasz. *The Manufacture of Madness: A Comparative Study of the Inquisition and the Mental Health Movement* Oxford, 1970. <http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/1970-08540-000>
- [22] Anojhin D., Krugliakov E. Pseudoscientists and pseudoscience may convert Russia into country of barbarians. *Common Sense*, 2008, N3 (48). (in Russian) <http://www.atheismru.narod.ru/humanism/journal/48/kruglyakov.htm> Eneining Moscow, N43 (24821) from 14.03.2008. <http://www.vmdaily.ru/article.php?aid=53826>
- [23] Ginzburg V.L. About the pseudoscience and the need to fight it. (In Russian) *Science and Life*, N11, 2000. <http://www.nkj.ru/archive/articles/5372/>
- [24] T.S.Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd. ed., Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1970 <http://www.des.emory.edu/mfp/Kuhn.html>
- [25] D.Kouznetsov. Mizugadro's number. *Samizdat*, 2010. [http://zhurnal.lib.ru/k/kuznecow\\_d\\_j/mizugade.shtml](http://zhurnal.lib.ru/k/kuznecow_d_j/mizugade.shtml)
- [26] Marco Piccolino. Luigi Galvani and animal electricity: two centuries after the foundation of electrophysiology *Trends in Neurosciences*, **20**, 10, 1997, Pages 443-448
- [27] Elder Don Eastman. *Homosexuality; not a sin, not a sickness*. Los Angeles Universal Fellowship Press, 1990. <http://www.valleyministries.com/resource/NotSin.pdf>
- [28] Robinson B.A. *Homosexual passages from the Christian Scriptures*. Ontario Consultants on Religious Tolerance, 2008-SEP-23, [http://www.religioustolerance.org/hom\\_bibc2.htm](http://www.religioustolerance.org/hom_bibc2.htm)
- [29] Ben Brantley. Superstar or not, 'Jesus' returns. Published: Apr. 17, 2000, page E1.
- [30] Paul Sonne. Russians Await a Cult Novel's Film Debut With Eagerness and Skepticism. *New York Times*, December 19, 2005, <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/12/19/arts/television/19mast.html>
- [31] Lenin V.I. *The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism*. Lenins Collected Works, Progress Publishers, 1977, Moscow, Vol.19, p.21-28. <http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1913/mar/x01.htm>
- [32] Hua Guofeng. Memorial speech. September 18, 1976. Hua Guofeng Internet Archive, January 2004. <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hua-guofeng/1976/09/18.htm>
- [33] Sergei Boukhonine. Gods 'R' Us. *LewRockwell*, 2006. <http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig7/boukhonine2.html>
- [34] Lenin V.I. *Tasks of the Youth League*. Speech delivered at the third all-Russia congress of the Russian young communist league, Oct. 2, 1920. <http://www.yclusa.org/article/articleview/71/1/35/>
- [35] Mao Tse-tung. Telegram to the USSR on Stalin's Death. *People's Daily*, March 7, 1953; [http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-7/mswv7\\_296.htm](http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-7/mswv7_296.htm)
- [36] Old Testament, Genesis, chapter 15, song 13 <http://www.bible.com.ua/bible/r/1/15>
- [37] Dwivedi O.P. Satyagraha for Conservation: Awakening the Spirit of Hinduism. In book: *Ethics of Environment and Development*, ed. J.R. Engel and J.G. Engel (London: Bellhaven Press, 1990) <http://www.bishnoism.com/uploadPDF/DwivediHinduEcol.pdf>
- [38] David. Psalm of God. *New American Standard Bible*, Psalm 19. <http://nasb.scripturetext.com/psalms/19.htm>
- [39] Quran, AL-E-IMRAN Chapter 3, song 90. <http://www.parsquran.com/data/show.php?user=eng&lang=eng&sura=3&ayat=84>
- [40] Mary-Barbara Zeldin. The religious nature of Russian marxism. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, **8**, No.1 (1969), pp. 100-111 <http://www.jstor.org/pss/1385258>
- [41] Klaus-Georg Riegel. Marxism-Leninism as a Political Religion. *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions*, **6**, No.1, P.97126, June 2005 [http://svonz.lenin.ru/articles/Klaus-Georg-Riegel-Marxism-Leninism\\_as\\_a\\_Political\\_Religion.pdf](http://svonz.lenin.ru/articles/Klaus-Georg-Riegel-Marxism-Leninism_as_a_Political_Religion.pdf)
- [42] Lenin V.I. *Certain Features of the Historical Development of Marxism*. - Lenin Collected Works, Progress Publishers, [1974], Moscow, Volume 17, pages 39-44. <http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1910/dec/23.htm>
- [43] *Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, 1961. <http://www.archive.org/details/ProgramOfTheCommunistPartyOfTheSovietUnion.150>
- [44] Ingazo Nitobe. *Bushido*. Tokyo, 1989.
- [45] Fujihara Masahiko. *The dignity of the nation*. Tokyo. 2007.
- [46] Mathisen J.A. Twenty Years After Bellah: Whatever Happened to American Civil Religion? Journal article by

- James A. Mathisen; SA. *Sociological Analysis*, **50** 1989, pp. 129-146 . <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=97821251>
- [47] Carolyn Marvin and David W. Ingle Blood Sacrifice and the Nation: Revisiting Civil Religion *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, **64**, No.4, Thematic Issue on "Religion and American Popular Culture" (1996), pp. 767-780. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1465621>
- [48] Robert N. Bellah, Phillip E. Hammond. *Varieties of Civil Religion*. New York: Harper & Row. 1980.
- [49] Medvedev D.A. residential Commission for Prevention of Falsification of History to the Prejudice of Russia's Interest. (In Russian), Cite of President of RF, 15 May 2009, N 549. <http://www.rg.ru/2009/05/20/komissia-dok.html>
- [50] Oleg Kozlovsky. Medvedev Imposes Control Over Russian History. *Huffington Post*, May 19, 2009 [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/oleg-kozlovsky/medvedev-imposes-control\\_b\\_205349.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/oleg-kozlovsky/medvedev-imposes-control_b_205349.html)
- [51] Editorial. O Proletariado. (Organ of the Revolutionary Communist Party of Brazil). Deepen the Struggle Against Revisionism and Opportunism Raising The Banner of Marxism, the Party and the Revolution. May, 1997, <http://www.mltranslations.org/Brazil/revis.htm>
- [52] Lenin V.I. Marxism and Revisionism. *Lenin Collected Works*, Progress Publishers, 1973, Moscow, Volume 15, pages 29-39. <http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1908/apr/03.htm>
- [53] Kouznetsov D.Yu. Quantum fluctuations do not annihilate the optical soliton. *1992 Quantum Optics*, **4** 221-227 <http://www.iop.org/EJ/abstract/0954-8998/4/4/003>
- [54] A. I. Kopylov, D. Yu. Kuznetsov, T. S. Fetisova, V. F. Shvartsman. Possible inhomogeneities in the Universe on scales of 200 - 300 Mpc from observation on the 6-m telescope. - J. Audouze et al.(eds.), *Large structure of the Universe*, IAU, 1988, p.129-137. <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1988IAUS..130..129K>
- [55] V. V. Voitsekhovich, D. Kouznetsov, D. Kh. Morozov. Density of turbulence-induced phase dislocations. *Applied Optics*, 1998, **37**, No.21, p.4525-4535. <http://www.ils.uec.ac.jp/~dima/PAPERS/1997density.pdf>
- [56] Garcia-Valenzuela A., Bruce N.C., Kouznetsov D. Perturbation theory for surface-profile imaging with a capacitive probe. *Appl.Phys.Lett.* **77**, (2000) p. 2066-2068. <http://ojps.aip.org/journals/doc/APPLAB-ft/vol.77/iss.13/2066.1.html>
- [57] Ley-Koo E., Villa-Torres G., Kouznetsov D. Aharonov-Bohm effect on Landau states in annular Cylindrical Boxes. *Chinese J. of Physics*, **40**, No.2, p.130-141 (2002). <http://psroc.phys.ntu.edu.tw/cjp/v40/121.pdf>
- [58] Kouznetsov D. Broadband laser materials and the McCumber relation. *Chinese Optics Letters*, 2007, **5**, p.S240-S242 <http://col.org.cn/abstract.aspx?id=C0L05S1S240-3>
- [59] J.-F.Bisson, D.Kouznetsov. Comments on "Study of the Complex Atomic Susceptibility of Erbium-Doped Fiber Amplifiers" *Journal of Lightwave Technology*, v. 26, No.4, p. 457-459 (2008) abstract: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/search/wrapper.jsp?arnumber=4451260> reprint: <http://www.ils.uec.ac.jp/~dima/PAPERS/2007jltwt.pdf>
- [60] D.Kouznetsov, H.Oberst, Scattering of waves at ridged mirrors. *Phys.Rev.A*, **72** 013617 (2005). [http://www.ils.uec.ac.jp/~dima/PAPERS/PhysRevA\\_72\\_013617.pdf](http://www.ils.uec.ac.jp/~dima/PAPERS/PhysRevA_72_013617.pdf)
- [61] D.Kouznetsov, H.Oberst, A.Neumann, Y.Kuznetsova, K.Shimizu, J.-F.Bisson, K.Ueda, S.R.J.Brueck. Ridged atomic mirrors and atomic nanoscope. *J. of Physics B*, **39** p. 1605-1623 (2006) <http://stacks.iop.org/0953-4075/39/1605> or <http://www.ils.uec.ac.jp/~dima/PAPERS/nanoscope.pdf>
- [62] Kouznetsov D, Bisson J-F, Ueda K, Scaling laws of disk lasers. *Optical materials*, **31**, Issue 5, p.754-759 (2009) <http://www.ils.uec.ac.jp/~dima/PAPERS/2009optmat.pdf>
- [63] Kouznetsov D, Solution of  $F(z+1)=\exp(F(z))$  in complex z-plane. *Mathematics of Computation*, **78**, No.267, p.1647-1670 (2009). <http://www.ils.uec.ac.jp/~dima/PAPERS/2010superfar.pdf>
- [64] D.Kouznetsov, H.Trappmann. Superfunctions and square root of factorial. *Moscow University Physics Bulletin*, ser. 3, Issue 13, p.8-14(2010) <http://www.ils.uec.ac.jp/~dima/PAPERS/2010superfae.pdf>
- [65] [http://en.citizendium.org/wiki/Reactionless\\_propulsion](http://en.citizendium.org/wiki/Reactionless_propulsion)

(end of file)