

Distrust of Science in "Don't Look Up"

Ali Ghasemi

Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman

Abstract:- The postmodern perspective on science has been shaped as an ignorant of disinterested search for objective knowledge. Postmodernism contains two destructive definitions of science. firstly, science is powerless to produce objective reality being universally applicable and authentic. secondly, science has not been seen as the free interest of local restrains, but it is generated from a hidden hegemonic ideology. Postmodernism is responsible for the prevalent anti-science tendency. The present study seeks to investigate the elements of distrust of science in the movie.

“Don’t Look up” directed by Adam McKay in 2021. The film “Don’t Look up” is a satire of scientists’ endeavors to awakening society’s inaction to climate breakdown. By focusing on postmodern troubled relationship with science and its anti-scientific mindsets, this study seeks to explore the hidden ideology behind the rejection of science. To illuminates these economic, political, scientific hegemonic ideologies, the film “Don’t Look up” is the most accurate replica of the challenge of science in postmodernism for being investigated.

Keywords:- *distrust of science, don’t look up, postmodernism, denial of science, postmodern condition.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Postmodernism is the realm of assaulting thoughts on the scientific worldview and it undermines objective truth having been universally applicable. By the emergence of postmodernism, there was a distrust on science has been trended by the majority of scientists.

Scientific knowledge is revealed to be nothing more than the beliefs of a coterie (Bereiter, 4). Prior to such rejection, science attempts to interpret the world independently of any political ideology. Its fundamental instruments were experimentation and observation. in other words, whatever is perceived through our sensory impression was potential to be verified as objective truth. As Jean-Francois Lyotard mentioned in his book “the postmodern condition”, “Science does not expand by means of the positivism of efficiency. The opposite is true: working on a proof means searching for and “in venting” counterexamples” (Lyotard, 54).

The postmodernist school of thought endeavors to challenge these presumptions, rendering the premises about the existence of a real world, the knowledge of which is attainable as an objective truth. (The postmodern assault on science, par.1). Postmodernism is basically defined as the destroyer of universal truth. According to Hendricks “Postmodernism is “anti” everything we hold dear” (Is postmodernism really anti-science? par.1). what postmodernists try to construct is a problematic situation of rejection of any grand narrative or overarching narrative.

Some critiques attempt to look down the science as a social construct or political and ideological authority. The mainstream of science is unmasked as being without foundation. moreover, if there is any change in the field of science brought by scientific war among competing groups.

The film "Don't Look Up," directed by Adam McKay, takes viewers on a gripping journey through the eyes of astronomy graduate student Kate Dibiasky, portrayed by the talented Jennifer Lawrence, and her esteemed professor Dr. Randall Mindy, played by the incomparable Leonardo DiCaprio. Together, they stumble upon a mind-boggling revelation: the existence of a comet, ominously dubbed a "planet killer," hurtling towards Earth with an alarming 99.7% probability of impact. This staggering statistic, backed by rigorous scientific research, places humanity on the brink of imminent catastrophe. However, as Kate and Dr. Mindy strive to communicate the gravity of their findings to the world, they find themselves confronted with an overwhelming sense of isolation. In a reflection of the postmodernist era, where scientific experts often grapple with a sense of detachment from society, the film poignantly captures the emotional turmoil experienced by these scientists. Despite possessing knowledge crucial to the survival of humanity, they are met with indifference and disregard. To exacerbate matters, their meeting with the President, who initially seemed receptive to their hypothesis despite its technical certainty falling just shy of 100%, ultimately unfolds as an ideological rejection. This distressing encounter serves as a microcosm of the prevailing skepticism and disbelief that plagues society when faced with inconvenient truths. Adding fuel to the fire, the film highlights the powerful role played by the media, which finds itself in the grip of those in positions of authority. The media's reinforcement of the public's dismissal of the scientists' dire warnings further solidifies the disheartening sense of marginalization and powerlessness experienced by Kate, Dr. Mindy, and their fellow scientists. In "Don't Look Up," McKay skillfully weaves together a gripping narrative that not only serves as a cautionary tale about the perils of willful ignorance but also sheds light on the mental and emotional struggles faced by scientists in an increasingly post-truth society. Through compelling performances and a thought-provoking storyline, the film invites viewers to reflect on the importance of scientific expertise, the consequences of societal indifference, and the influence wielded by those in positions of power.

This paper delves into the challenges that objective science faces in the postmodern era, particularly examining the film "Don't Look Up" as a parodic representation of science. It explores the ideological, economic, and political hegemonies depicted in the film, shedding light on the underlying reasons for the growing distrust of science in contemporary society. The first section delves into the

nature of science in postmodernism, discussing how postmodern concepts challenge traditional notions of objective truth and rationality, thereby influencing public perception of scientific authority. The second section focuses on "Don't Look Up" as an exemplar of postmodern parody, uncovering the hidden ideological, economic, and political forces at play. It analyzes the manipulation of scientific information for political gain, the influence of economic interests on scientific narratives, and the complicity of media in perpetuating skepticism towards scientific consensus. By synthesizing these insights, this study aims to deepen our understanding of the complex dynamics that hinder the dissemination and acceptance of scientific knowledge in a postmodern society, ultimately fostering a more nuanced and informed public discourse on science and its role in addressing pressing global challenges.

II. DISCUSSION

A. *Science in postmodernism:*

The idea that science should be our dominant source of authority about empirical matters about matters of fact is one that has prevailed in Western countries since the Enlightenment, but it can no longer be sustained without an argument. (Naomi Oreskes, 13).

In postmodernism anti-scientific tendency, science, endeavoring to describe objective facts in a disinterested way, was reevaluated to be the target of a postmodern critique questioning what it does and how it is doing it. Accordingly, some thinkers have tried to examine how the sociology and politics of science affects the facts scientist discover. (Is postmodernism really anti-science, par.7).

The history of scientific inquiry has revealed that power structures and societal dynamics can exert a significant influence on the subjects of study. As articulated by Foucault, there exists a complex interplay between power, knowledge, and the construction of truth. In his work, he elucidates how the passage of time and the convergence of bodies challenge established norms and identities, ultimately enabling the emergence of alternative truths that were previously concealed or marginalized (Foucault, p.197). This recognition prompts us to question the notion of objective science and its capacity to embrace diverse perspectives and alternative paradigms.

Indeed, an objective science should, in theory, actively seek out and consider various viewpoints and alternative frameworks. By doing so, it would foster a more comprehensive understanding of the subject matter under investigation. However, even within the realm of scientific inquiry, the pursuit of pure objectivity can prove elusive. The influence of external ideologies and interests is pervasive, even among academic scientists who aspire to uphold rigorous scientific standards. Scientists, as human beings embedded within society, are not immune to the external forces that shape their worldview. Whether consciously or unconsciously, they may be influenced by the prevailing ideologies, political climates, and economic interests that surround them. These external factors can subtly shape the questions they ask, the hypotheses they

formulate, and the interpretations they derive from their findings. Consequently, the objectivity of scientific inquiry can be compromised to some extent. The acknowledgment of this inherent entanglement between science and external influences does not undermine the importance of scientific research. Rather, it serves as a call for critical reflexivity within the scientific community. Scientists must be aware of their own biases and be open to questioning their assumptions and methodologies. Embracing a plurality of perspectives and encouraging dialogue across different paradigms can enhance the integrity and robustness of scientific inquiry.

Accordingly, John Ziman mentioned, "academic scientists cannot be forbidden to do research that directly furthers their personal material or ideological interests in other ways than success in the rat race for communal esteem" (Ziman, 170). Thereby, it is noticeable the increasing intimacy of scientific knowledge to corporate and political interests that do not put a high value on the production of knowledge for the benefit of society at large, but a science on the behalf of certain sinister groups.

According to Gale M. Sinarta and Barbara K. Hofer who wrote in their book written entitled "Science Denial" the gap exists between scientific knowledge and the public understanding and acceptance of science. Over 98% of climate scientists concur that humans are causing climate change, but only 57% of the US public think climate change is mostly caused by human activities. (p. 3).

The stark disparity between scientific findings and public perception is a palpable issue in contemporary society. A clear manifestation of this gap can be observed in the widespread resistance to childhood vaccinations, a phenomenon that puts not only the unvaccinated individuals at risk but also jeopardizes public health as a whole. This disjunction underscores the urgent need for the public to have access to accurate and reliable scientific information. In order to bridge this gap and promote informed decision-making, it is imperative for individuals to know where to find valid scientific facts. Navigating the vast landscape of information can be challenging, as misinformation and pseudo-science abound. Recognizing credible sources of scientific information, such as peer-reviewed journals, reputable scientific organizations, and experts in the field, is essential to ensure that one is accessing accurate and up-to-date knowledge. Moreover, the issue extends beyond simply finding reliable sources; it also necessitates identifying trustworthy individuals and institutions to rely on when it comes to matters of science. Discerning which scientists, researchers, and institutions to trust requires a nuanced understanding of their track record, expertise, and adherence to scientific principles. Building trust in the scientific community requires transparency, open communication, and a commitment to the ethical conduct of research. Valuing science is not only a matter of recognizing its importance but also understanding its intrinsic value in addressing societal challenges. Science provides the foundation for evidence-based decision-making, policy formulation, and technological advancements. By valuing and supporting scientific endeavors, society can harness the transformative

power of science to tackle pressing issues, from climate change to public health crises. Resolving conflicting points of view in science is an essential aspect of the scientific process. Science is an ongoing and self-correcting endeavor, with researchers engaging in rigorous debates and critical analysis to refine and expand our understanding. Acknowledging that scientific consensus may evolve over time allows for a constructive dialogue that moves beyond polarization and embraces the complexity of scientific knowledge. Encouraging open discussions, interdisciplinary collaborations, and public engagement with scientific debates can foster a more nuanced and informed understanding of complex scientific issues.

The hegemonic political system and media bubbles intensify the rampant of scientific misinformation. As a result of this spread of disinformation, the skeptical situation provides a distrust on science. Moreover, "Social media can amplify our existing beliefs, and people tend to create echo chambers in their media use, hearing more of what they already believe" (Gale M. Sinarta and Barbara K. Hofer, p.13).

By the emergence of postmodern wake of 1960, there were the abundance of new critics who identified science as an ideological tool of the establishment and this movement has been trended till today. to describe the very accurate reason of such disturbance in the realm of science, Andrew Jewet wrote:

To fully explain today's distrust of science, we must account for the long-standing fear that it authorizes false and damaging understandings of who we are and how we behave. Often this response has focused on broad philosophical frameworks associated with science, but the methods and findings of the social sciences have also drawn considerable criticism, as have extrapolations from biology to human behavior. (p. 3).

As a whole, the objectivity of science is just an illusion, and it is regarded as an ideology as other forms of human being's knowledge. Science is not any more examined through observation and experiment. It is a paradigm rejecting the rationality that fostered modern science itself. According to Richard C Brown in his book entitled "Are Science and Mathematics Socially Constructed?", "no experiment can falsify a scientific theory, that science consequently is the product of political negotiation" (p.15). Thereby, science essentially could be utilized for good and bad purposes but it does not any inherent moral quality. In other words, today's globalized world is recognized as "the ideological zoo of contemporary science studies". (p.10).

Science now is not given through natural world, but it is manipulated in the hand of ideology as an instrument for extending the realm of globalization. Science is an instrument which is socially determined. It does not possess any inherent moral quality to be pursued. As Andrew Ross in his essay "the Challenge of Science" Mentioned, "it is

demonstrated that scientific knowledge is not given by the natural world but is produced or constructed through social interactions between/among scientists and their instruments". (P. 296). the nature of science reveals its inherent contextual specificity. Scientific knowledge is not a universal and absolute truth but rather emerges within specific fields of inquiry, shaped by the particular modes and methods of analysis employed within those disciplines. Science, therefore, can be seen as a constructed and manipulated instrument that operates within its own "discursive formation," where the discourse is influenced by the interaction between scientists and the social acceptance of their findings. In the postmodern domain of knowledge, uncertainty, discontinuity, and chaos become defining characteristics. Postmodernism challenges the traditional notions of stable and objective knowledge, emphasizing instead the fragmented and contingent nature of understanding. Scientific knowledge, with its claims to objectivity and universality, is subject to scrutiny and deconstruction within the postmodern framework. The uncertainty inherent in postmodernism highlights the limitations of scientific knowledge. Scientific theories and hypotheses are always provisional, subject to revision and refinement in light of new evidence or alternative interpretations. The discontinuity arises from the recognition that scientific knowledge is not a linear progression of cumulative truths, but rather a series of paradigm shifts and ruptures that disrupt established frameworks. The chaotic nature of postmodern knowledge reflects the complex and multifaceted reality that resists reduction to simple, deterministic models. Within the postmodern perspective, science is viewed as just one among many discourses that shape our understanding of the world. It is a discursive practice influenced by social and cultural factors, and its acceptance and authority are contingent upon the interactions between scientists and society. The social acceptance of scientific findings is influenced by various factors, including power dynamics, political ideologies, and economic interests. This recognition challenges the idea of science as a purely objective endeavor and highlights the interplay between knowledge production and societal influences.

According to Jean-Francois Lyotard, Postmodern science by concerning itself with such things as undecidable, the limits of precise control, conflicts characterized by incomplete information, "fracta," catastrophes, and pragmatic paradoxes is theorizing its own evolution as discontinuous, catastrophic, non-rectifiable, and paradoxical. It is changing the meaning of the word knowledge, while expressing how such a change can take place. (p.60).

In this postmodern understanding, science challenges traditional notions of knowledge by redefining its meaning. It recognizes that knowledge is not a fixed and static entity but a dynamic process influenced by various factors, including social, cultural, and historical contexts. Science acknowledges the limitations of its ability to achieve complete and definitive understanding, emphasizing the

presence of gaps, uncertainties, and contradictions within its own framework.

Furthermore, postmodern science explores the possibilities of change and transformation within the field itself. It acknowledges that the meaning and interpretation of scientific knowledge can evolve and shift over time. It recognizes the potential for paradoxes and contradictions to emerge, questioning the idea that scientific knowledge is always consistent and coherent. Through this exploration, postmodern science challenges the traditional notion of scientific progress as a linear and cumulative advancement of knowledge. By engaging with these concepts and embracing their implications, postmodern science offers a critical reflection on the nature and boundaries of scientific inquiry. It recognizes the complex and contingent nature of knowledge production, highlighting the need for reflexivity and critical self-awareness within scientific practice. This approach encourages scientists to acknowledge the inherent limitations and uncertainties of their work while also fostering a deeper understanding of the ways in which scientific knowledge is constructed, shaped, and transformed. In summary, postmodern science not only investigates phenomena such as undecidability, fragmentation, and paradoxes but also theorizes its own evolution as a discontinuous, catastrophic, non-rectifiable, and paradoxical process. It challenges traditional notions of knowledge and emphasizes the dynamic and contingent nature of scientific understanding. By exploring these concepts, postmodern science offers a critical perspective on the nature of scientific inquiry and encourages a more reflexive and nuanced approach to knowledge production.

B. Hidden ideology behind "Don't look up".

The Netflix film "Don't Look Up" presents a captivating yet poignant narrative that delves into the crucial issue of trust in scientists and the pervasive spread of distrust towards science in society. The movie introduces us to the protagonists, Kate Dibiasky (Jennifer Lawrence), a doctoral candidate in Michigan, and her astronomy professor, Randall Mindy (Leonardo DiCaprio), who make an alarming discovery of a "planet killer" comet hurtling towards Earth. The gravity of this impending catastrophe is overshadowed by the apathy and indifference exhibited by society and the White House. From the outset, the film highlights the challenging task of navigating an inconvenient truth. Despite the profound implications of the approaching comet, the urgency of informing people about this existential threat falls on deaf ears. The prevailing indifference towards scientific warnings underscores the underlying issue of trust in scientific expertise and the unfortunate prioritization of political and self-serving interests over the preservation of humanity. Mindy and Dibiasky's valiant efforts to communicate the impending comet impact to the President are met with disillusionment. The President, played by Meryl Streep, and her son are preoccupied with the upcoming midterm elections in the United States, dismissing the existential crisis looming over humanity. This depiction serves as a critique of the prioritization of short-term political gains over the long-term survival of the planet. The film further illustrates the challenges faced by scientists when attempting to

communicate scientific findings to society. As Mindy and Dibiasky strive to raise awareness about the dire consequences through scientific evidence, they are met with a barrage of immediate critiques. This reception highlights the prevalent skepticism and resistance towards scientific consensus in the face of inconvenient truths. It reflects the broader trend of public discourse being swayed by misinformation, vested interests, and a lack of faith in scientific authority. By juxtaposing the urgency of an impending global catastrophe with the callous disregard for scientific expertise, "Don't Look Up" sheds light on the critical need for society to reevaluate its relationship with science. The film serves as a cautionary tale, emphasizing the importance of trust in scientific knowledge and the detrimental consequences of dismissing scientific warnings for short-term gains. It calls for a collective awakening to the urgent challenges posed by global crises and the necessity of embracing evidence-based decision-making to safeguard our future. "The scientists in the film also want to simply share the data and the evidence, but they are repeatedly pressured to become storytellers, celebrities and counselors." (How 'Don't Look Up' plays with the portrayal of science in popular culture, par. 4).

Scientists, often conduct particular terminology to share their finding within their discursive field. These jargons are not easy enough to be understood by society. Don't Look Up showcases demonstrates how it is a problematic situation for scientists to communicate to politicians and the general public, and how much being able to do so matters in today's world. As Naomi Oreskes rightly describes, "scientific analysis conducted or funded by an agency headed by political appointees buffeted by political pressures should be viewed ex ante as any more authoritative than that originating from." (P. 16). By his idea, we can conclude that the domain of science is doomed to a political authority. Otherwise, the only way to validate scientific finding is through its discursive formation which is intensified and funded by political agency. "This defining of the question for scientific advice, then, is very much a political matter: it is up to the minister, the agency, or the congressional committee chairperson to formulate requests for study" (Wiebe E, et al, p.26).

Manizer, an astronomer and professor of planetary science at University of Arizona spoke to *Newsweek*, "It's a movie at its core that really speaks to the importance of science based decision making in our society, in our daily lives". Yet the nutshell of the movie illustrates how White House, (representative of political power), trusts the authority of elite scientific institutions, billionaire donor (Mark Rylance), over the rigorous scientific publication process of peer review that professor Mindy represents. Sir Peter Isherwell, the character Isherwell in "Don't Look Up" represents a complex interplay between financial power, science, and the dissemination of antiscientific sentiments in the postmodern era. The portrayal of Isherwell's uneasy interaction with the world resonates with the ambivalent relationship that figures like Mark Zuckerberg and Elon Musk exhibit towards scientific knowledge and its societal implications. By examining the behavior of Zuckerberg and

Musk, we witness a pattern of involvement that transcends the boundaries of their respective industries. They are not merely successful entrepreneurs but individuals who have become influential voices in shaping public discourse, including that which pertains to scientific issues. This influence, however, is not without its drawbacks. The comparison between Isherwell and Zuckerberg reveals a shared tendency towards an audacious and often fantastical approach to problem-solving. This can be seen in Musk's proposal to build a submarine for the Thai cave rescue, which exemplifies a disregard for practicality and a penchant for overstepping the boundaries of expertise. Such instances raise questions about the motivations behind these interventions and the implications for the credibility of scientific knowledge. In the context of postmodernism, where truth and knowledge are understood as socially constructed and contingent, the involvement of wealthy figures like Isherwell, Zuckerberg, and Musk introduces a complex dynamic. Their financial power affords them a platform and influence that can shape public perceptions and attitudes towards scientific inquiry. However, this influence is not necessarily aligned with the ideals of objective and evidence-based science. The presence of figures like Isherwell in positions of influence highlights a potential distortion of scientific discourse. Their interventions can overshadow the rigorous process of scientific inquiry, leading to the spread of antiscientific sentiments and the erosion of public trust in scientific expertise. When financial interests and personal agendas come into play, the pursuit of scientific truth may be compromised, and the credibility of scientific findings may be called into question. Furthermore, the portrayal of Isherwell and his ilk serves as a critique of the power structures that underpin contemporary society. It raises concerns about the influence of wealth and privilege in shaping public discourse, particularly when it comes to matters of scientific importance. The commodification of knowledge and the ability to control narratives through financial resources can undermine the integrity and objectivity of scientific inquiry. The character Isherwell in "Don't Look Up" serves as a philosophical commentary on the complex relationship between financial power, science, and the dissemination of antiscientific sentiments. By drawing parallels between Isherwell and influential figures like Zuckerberg and Musk, the film invites critical reflection on the implications of their involvement in scientific discourse. It highlights the potential for distortion and the erosion of public trust in science when financial interests and personal agendas supersede the pursuit of objective truth. Ultimately, it underscores the need for vigilance and critical engagement in navigating the intersection of wealth, power, and scientific knowledge in the postmodern era. Remember when Elon offered to build a child-sized coffin submarine to facilitate the Thai cave rescue? We do" (Mark Rylance in 'Don't Look Up' Reminds Us of These Billionaires, par. 5,6). It is concluded from Isherwell's characteristic that when it comes to the correlation between the financial situation and science, the only thing reminded is the spread of antiscientific sentiments, the spread of distrust on science as an unstable criterion in postmodernism.

Naomi Oreskes justified this tremendous condition in which "the science as a means to protect their economic interests and political commitments." (Oreskes, p. 100). Many people reject climate science, qua science, but because it conflicts or is seen as conflicting with their interests, their religious views, their political ideology, or their economic interests.

The mainstream media seems a defensive of misinformation and it advocates the political ideology behind science. "It's a story of what could happen in our political and media-driven world" (How 'Don't Look Up' plays with the portrayal of science in popular Culture, par.1).

In addition, Gale M. Sinarta and Barbara K. Hofer describes why it does matter the public essentially understand science. They wrote, "The spread of misinformation and disinformation about science, magnified by a divisive political system and media bubbles, is creating skepticism and mistrust" (p. 8). In today's globalized world, the recognition of the importance of scientific knowledge extends to various realms, including politics, economics, and societal issues. Whether it is understanding and addressing climate change, preparing for potential cosmic threats like comets, or managing pandemics such as Covid-19, relying on scientific facts and expertise becomes imperative for achieving favorable outcomes. The interconnectedness of our world necessitates a comprehensive understanding of the scientific foundations underlying these challenges. Climate change, for instance, requires a multidisciplinary approach that integrates scientific research, data analysis, and informed decision-making. By acknowledging the weight of scientific evidence, societies can develop effective strategies to mitigate the impacts of climate change, protect vulnerable ecosystems, and promote sustainable development. Similarly, in the face of potential cosmic threats like comets, the application of scientific knowledge becomes essential. By relying on rigorous scientific investigations and astronomical observations, we can assess the risks associated with celestial events and devise appropriate strategies for monitoring, prevention, and response. Scientific insights enable us to evaluate the potential consequences of such threats and develop contingency plans to safeguard human life and minimize destruction. The ongoing Covid-19 pandemic exemplifies the crucial role of science in managing public health crises. From the identification and characterization of the virus to the development of diagnostic tests, vaccines, and treatment protocols, scientific research and expertise have been at the forefront of the response. Trusting in the rigorous scientific process and heeding the advice of experts has proven pivotal in mitigating the impact of the pandemic and saving lives. Embracing scientific knowledge empowers us to tackle global issues with greater resilience, adaptability, and long-term sustainability. As we navigate the intricacies of our interconnected world, the role of science in shaping our future cannot be underestimated. By valuing scientific facts, relying on expert opinions, and fostering a science-informed society, we can make informed decisions, implement effective policies, and work towards a better future for all.

III. CONCLUSION

Through an examination of the film "Don't Look Up" from a postmodernist perspective, this study sheds light on the intricate challenges that objective science faces in the context of postmodernity, particularly regarding the theory of "distrust of science." The paper delves into how political ideologies and economic interests raise questions about the impartial nature of science in the postmodern era. It argues that the scientists in the film are compelled to communicate their data and evidence while constantly facing pressure from political ideologies, dominant forces, and defensive social media. The notion that science is merely influenced and funded by political agencies, as depicted by Adam McKay in the film, is subject to critical examination. "Don't Look Up" effectively demonstrates the urgency of spreading science-based decision-making in our globalized and post-ideological world. Failing to do so would lead to the proliferation of anti-scientific sentiments, exacerbated by the growing connection between financial considerations and scientific endeavors. In light of these observations, this study supports the idea that the dissemination of distrustful and misguided scientific information, fueled by influential political powers and reinforced by social media bubbles acting as defenders of ideological science, presents a significant challenge. The only means to counteract this perilous spread of misinformation, driven by economic and political interests, is to rely on scientific facts. Failure to do so would result in catastrophic consequences that loom on the horizon. In conclusion, the analysis of "Don't Look Up" offers valuable insights into the complex interplay between science, politics, and societal influences in the postmodern world. It underscores the importance of disseminating accurate scientific information to counteract the manipulation of facts for vested interests. By embracing scientific knowledge and resisting the pervasive influence of ideology and misinformation, we can navigate the challenges of our time and strive for a more informed and enlightened society.

REFERENCES

- [1.] Bereiter, Carl. "Implications of Postmodernism for Science, or, Science as Progressive Discourse". *Educational Psychologist*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1994, pp.3-12, DOI: 10.1207/s15326985ep2901_1.
- [2.] Brown, Richard C. *Are Science and Mathematics Socially Constructed?* World Scientific publishing, 2009.
- [3.] DiLillo, John. "Mark Rylance in 'Don't Look Up' Reminds Us of These Billionaires". Netflix, 21 Jan 2022, www.netflix.com/tudum/articles/mark-rylance-in-dont-look-up-reminds-us-of-these-billionaires.
- [4.] Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Random House, 1995.
- [5.] Hendricks, Scotty. "Is postmodernism really anti-science?". *Big Think*, 15 Oct 2018. www.bigthink.com/the-present/is-postmodernism-really-anti-science/.
- [6.] Jewet, Andrew. *Science under Fire: Challenges to Scientific Authority in Modern America*. Harvard University Press, 2020.
- [7.] Kuntz1, Marcel. "The postmodern assault on science". *MIH*, 18 Sep 2012. www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3463968/.
- [8.] Lyotard, Jean-Francois. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis, the University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- [9.] Oreskes, Naomi. *Why Trust Science*. Princeton University Press, 2019.
- [10.] Ross, Andrew. "The Challenge of Science". *The Cultural Studies*. Edited by Daring, Simon *The*. 2nd ed, Taylor & Francis e-library, 2001. pp. 292-304.
- [11.] Simpkins, Kelsey. "How 'Don't Look Up' plays with the portrayal of science in popular culture". *Colorado*, 10 Jan 2022, www.colorado.edu/today/2022/01/10/how-dont-lookplays-portrayal-science-popular-culture.
- [12.] Sintara, M Gale, and Barbara K. Hofer. *Science Denial: Why It Happens and What to Do About It*. Oxford University Press, 2021.
- [13.] Wiebe E, et al. *The Paradox of Scientific Authority: The Role of Scientific Advice in Democracies*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2009.
- [14.] Ziman, John. *Real Science What it is, and what it means*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.