

AUTHORS' PREFACE

Upon delivering the final texts of our work to our publisher, we feel obliged to explain the reasons we *had* to write this book.

Some people objected to our views, or they smiled in irony when they read it. Many had the impression that through these texts we tried to knock and open doors entirely different than the doors of scientific research and expression.

Some others had the impression that we wanted to flatter certain people and reprimand others in order to foster our social position in the context of wider sociopolitical correlations and rearrangements.

We were not indifferent to these expressed opinions. The debates that followed were intense but essential, since once again the question was posed of whether we should publicize our views by having this book published.

The questions raised in vivid discussions in friendly cycles had to do with the deeper reasons that led us to record the particular views, our methods and our aims.

We would like here to record some of these thoughts, but also our pursuits.

First of all, at a personal level, what we want to declare is that our aims are totally scientific and instructive. Whoever teaches at a university cannot “hold two watermelons under the same arm.” The role of the scientist is the search for truth in all fields of knowledge, as he or she understands it, without any social, political or religious dogmatism, without any fear, but also without expectations about his or her personal recognition or a material reward for the social success of his work.

A second, equally important role of the scientist is the communication of his or her views to the wider public.

The basic question posed to us was: “Why do you mess with social or religious issues and not with the more narrow frame of the science you were specialized on?”

The answer is simple. Science, theology and the social structure form a single unbreakable entity, within which each component influences and is influenced by the two others. This unified entity is called “Civilization”.

Science is not directly connected with production and the everyday human needs. Science, as a component of the human civilization advances knowledge, without this knowledge serving necessarily immediate survival needs, or the so-called “economic production”. Thus, the scientific knowledge is essentially a basic component of the civilization or culture of a society.

The deep understanding of scientific knowledge leads to the “know-how” and technology, which transform part of this knowledge into actions of social necessity or destruction.

This way the scientist, to the extent he or she produces scientific work, willingly or not constitutes a shaping factor of the civilization, by exerting an influence, to the measure of his or her power, positive or negative, on the evolution of both the religious and the social structure.

Realizing this truth, the scientist cannot hint to or appeal to the neutrality of science in order to stay out of the formation of the theological or social developments. The avoidance of expressing his or her opinions upon subjects that influence or are influenced by science serves in most cases the conservation of a personal social status, as a necessary pedestal for his or her individual climbing towards higher positions, in the context of a dogmatic system of social values.

The notion of ethics or morality for the scientist has a special meaning. Ethical is whatever does not oppose and does not disturb the wider “Cosmic Law”, which is articulated only by a universal “Mind”. Thus, scientific ethics can’t be differentiated

according to the time or place, but only to the extent that new extensions, possibilities or restrictions of the “Cosmic Law” are revealed, which had not been perceived up to that point.

What human societies usually call “ethics” or “morality” is nothing but a set of rules of social coexistence, which are bound to be different from place to place and from one time period to another. The social rules of conventional ethics are not parts of a dogma, but rules that can be changed, for better or worse, when the social factors that set them change.

According to this logic, it is unethical to destruct the environment, while theft, murder and violence are social deviations that must be condemned and punished. Of course, each local social structure tries, or hints to be trying, to legislate through social rules the Cosmic (universal) Ethics, however it does so in a way serving the interests of the specific society.

Then, however, the scientist stands between two often incompatible attitudes. On the one side he or she has to obey to the Cosmic Ethics, while on the other he or she has to avoid confrontations with the social rules of coexistence, set by his or her particular society.

The position of the scientist is precarious.

As an example, we mention the developments in the field of genetics. While science has reached a level of life reproduction with non-traditional methods, the social and theological-religious structure, not being at a corresponding level of development, restrains, decelerates and often disorients scientific research. What should a scientist do in this case? Will he or she advance knowledge as a factor of universal ethics, or bury it obeying to the social necessity?

The advancement of knowledge outside or at the margin of the social structure creates scientific “priesthoods”, which in time evolve into power structures with destructive results for the society.

On the contrary, the restriction of the right to produce new knowledge is an ethical sin in terms of the Cosmic Ethics.

There is a single solution: The religion and the social structure must adapt and transmute in such a way, so that they will become good receivers and users of the new scientific discoveries, which cannot remain forever at the margin.

What the historians of science know very well is that “the end of a major scientific revolution signals the beginning of major social and theological re-orientations”, and this is the main problem.

The major scientific revolution that took place during the 20th century approaches to its end, however it dogmatically remains out of the knowledge framework of the average citizen, as being dangerous for a social and a religious structure that do not persuade people anymore about their intentions.

More or less, we all realize by now that we speak of democracy while we experience non-democratic situations, and that we have the impression that we are Christians while we are taught that “Christian” is anything opposite to the teachings of Jesus Christ.

The civilization pillar of science suffocates. The times can't wait anymore. The scientist at the moments of major crisis of civilization, as well as in other similar periods, must *dare* to be the strong arm for overcoming the crisis, by *expressing freely himself or herself, regardless of the social or professional cost, which sometimes is unbearable.*