

Editorial

Our society – Collegium Internationale Activitatis Nervosae Superioris (CIANS) – is unique in the sense that it is indeed an interdisciplinary (perhaps a trans-disciplinary as well) society bringing together graduated people, who are engaged in the study of the human brain functions and their regulatory mechanisms from various points of view. In my Presidential Address in 2003 I reminded our members to keep in mind that our colleagues from science should plan their experiments in such a way they can fulfil also the needs of our members involved in an everyday care of patients and vice versa our colleagues from the praxis should approach in some way the scientific demands as well. It was really only a reminding in the time when we were restoring the position of the CIANS among the existing multiple international societies, which are designed uni-disciplinary mostly. Also the truth is we have never had problems with some rivalry between the members working at the basic science research institutes and members working at clinics and other medical institutions. Our older members can remember many CIANS events to confirm this. As a very illustrative example from a recent time is the workshop on Behavioural Modifications organized as a part of the CIANS Conference 2005 bringing together the scientists and those who use the scientific results in a common praxis.

Therefore, it was for me a big surprise that at the recent European conference on the mental health promotion in Berlin one of the key lectures was entitled: *Evidence and good practice in mental health promotion – an area of conflict between scientific and practical demands?* The lecture evoked quite a large discussion concerning the role of the scientific evidence-based knowledge versus the validity of the results presented by the colleagues from the daily praxis. Even more surprising was the presentation of one of the quotations from Popper in this context that the *scientific theories are only hypotheses and may be falsified and replaced any day* as an example of the attitude of some practitioners. It was really very strange to hear some arguments that the policy makers are listening to the scientists only and the needs of practitioners arising from their sometimes comprehensible empirical knowledge are in some way abandoned. On one hand, such a situation is in some way alarming because it points to the contemporary not very good relations between researchers and those who should take in to account the evidence-based knowledge. One reason could be that the scientific perspectives and programmes are discussed on a level of specified committees of the European Commission and the practical demands of medicine by the committees of the Directorate-General for Health and Consumers (DG SANCO). Such situation could be wrongly assumed by several practitioners and clinicians as decisions on a lower level, which is really not the case. On the other hand, we can be really proud that our Collegium is joining all of us together in order to find out and to offer new knowledge – on the basis of our common effort – a knowledge which is not for scientist only, not for practitioners only, but knowledge as such, knowledge respected by all of us. It was and it is the vision and mission of the CIANS. Our journal, the *Activitas Nervosa Superior Rediviva*, will serve and help to keep them.

Fedor Jagla