**Международный конкурс на лучший перевод**

**«*В науке нет границ*»**

**Конкурсное задание - *Английский язык* (РКИ)**

**Task 1. Translation work.**

**Drawing the line between science and pseudo-science**

*By Janet D. Stemwedel*

There are strategies for distinguishing sound science from attractively packaged snake-oil. A fair number of scientists (and non-scientists who are reasonably science-literate) are of the view that this is not a hard call to make - that astrology, alternative therapies, ESP, and the other suspects fall on the wrong side of some bright line that divides what is scientific from what is not. The clear line of demarcation keeps the borders of science secure. If we want to compare science and pseudo-science, we should work out precisely what is missing from the latter.

Scientific methodology is well-suited for building reliable knowledge and avoiding false beliefs. Under the assumption that science has this kind of power, one of the problems with pseudo-science is that it gets an unfair credibility boost by so cleverly mimicking the surface appearance of science.

The big difference between science and pseudo-science is in attitude. While a pseudo-science is set up to look for evidence that supports its claims, a science is set up to challenge its claims and look for evidence that might prove it false. Pseudo-science seeks confirmations and science seeks falsifications.

Scientific claims are falsifiable, while pseudo-scientific claims fit with any imaginable set of observable outcomes. You could do a test that shows a scientific claim to be false, but no conceivable test could show a pseudo-scientific claim to be false. Sciences are testable, pseudo-sciences are not.

The scientific attitude involves taking risks: making bold claims, then gathering all the evidence that might knock them down. If they stand up to your attempts to falsify them, the claims are still in play. So you keep that hard-headed attitude and keep your eyes open for further evidence that could falsify the claims.

We can find evidence to establish that a claim is false. However, we can never find evidence to establish that a claim is true. So the scientist realizes that her best hypotheses and theories are always tentative while the pseudo-scientists are sure that their theories have been proven true.

The important difference seems to be in which approach gives better logical justification for knowledge claims. A pseudo-science may make you feel like you've got a good picture of how the world works, but you could well be wrong about it. If our scientific picture is wrong, the hard-headed scientific attitude means the chances are good that we'll find out we're wrong and switch to a different picture.

But once a claim has been falsified, the right thing to do is let it go and move on to a different falsifiable claim. Once the observations show this claim is false, scientists retire it and replace it with a different falsifiable claim. The scientific attitude is aimed at locating and removing the false claims -- something that doesn't happen in pseudo-sciences.

A theory is simply a scientific account about a system or a piece of the world. Typically, a theory will contain a number of hypotheses about what kind of entities form the system and how those entities behave. Theories can be rather speculative or extremely well tested -- either way, they're still theories.

**Task 2. Sense prediction - *Complete the sentence in your own words.***

***Part A***

1. Большая разница между наукой и псевдонаукой заключается в том, что ...
2. Псевдонаука может создать ложное впечатление понимания того, как …
3. Научные утверждения могут быть опровергнуты, а псевдонаучные утверждения ...

***Part B***

1. ... хорошо подходит для того, чтобы отказаться от ложных убеждений.
2. … для того, чтобы определить ложность утверждения.
3. … в то время как псевдоученые уверены в том, что их теории могут быть подтверждены.

**Task 3. Creative writing**

Guess the key message of the following saying: *Кто много знает, с того много и спрашивается*.Write a short *essay* (120-150 words) on the offered topic.