

## *Afterword*

No better modern example of the growing shift in defining enlightenment by the mystical instead of the scientific might exist than “the environment.” A greater emphasis on intuition and emotions, rather than intellect, has gained popularity in many influential institutions and cultures. Relativists argue that viewpoints other than scientific are equally valid and deserve respect. The scientific community can probably expect this trend to continue.

As several of the authors have shown, conflict arises as one principle pulls one way and another pulls the other way. Wars are fought—personal and political, petty and important—over which principle takes precedence. The process of truth-seeking is made difficult by sorting through what is known, what is not known, and what is believed.

These statements are not meant to espouse one viewpoint but to stimulate the reader to investigate the source of a stakeholder’s position. Without passing judgment, we might consider working out a theory of the meaning and justification for belief systems and actions in the dilemmas encountered. What belief system is guiding a stakeholder’s principles? Is it rationalism, empiricism, expertism, monotheism, pantheism, polytheism, or something else altogether? Are the stakeholder’s actions those of tactical deceptions, intellectual dishonesty, willful ignorance, or good will? From these beliefs and actions, what are the results? Are they misconceptions, fallacies, media hype, or heightened understanding? By asking ourselves these questions, we can confront our own “paradox of power.” Ultimately, perhaps we can find the most effective and meaningful passage to serving society and our profession well.

MG