

PLANETARY INTERPARADIGMOLOGY: PARAEPISTEMOLOGICAL BASE AND POSSIBLE PARAECOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES

ALEXANDRE ZASLAVSKY

VOLUNTEER AT THE *UNION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONSCIENTIOCENTRIC INSTITUTIONS* (UNICIN)
zaslav.alexandre@gmail.com

LUCIANA RIBEIRO

VOLUNTEER AT THE *INTERNATIONAL UNION OF CONSCIENTIOLOGY WRITERS* (UNIESCON)
lucmribeiro@yahoo.com.br

ABSTRACT: Interparadigmology studies the process of paradigm transition and shifting. One of the main features of scientific knowledge is secularism, the absence of religious, mystic or mythological beliefs. Secularism became intrinsically attached to materialism, along Western history, leaving human parapsychic abilities in the realm of the non-secular or religious. Conscientiology introduced, in the late 20th century, the logical and experiential possibility of a secular parapsychism. Conscientiological knowledge requires secular parapsychism in order to allow access to the multidimensional reality of consciousness. Paraecology studies the network of multidimensional interactions of the consciousness with themselves, one another and energies, that is, the paraecosystem. Through secular parapsychism is possible to obtain such knowledge by doing self-experimentation, instead of traditional practices in the context of religious paradigms. This essay proposes that secular parapsychism and its paraecological consequences might be key elements to a planetary paradigmatic transition and shift.

Keywords: Interparadigmology, Paraepistemology, Paraecology, Secularism; Reurbex.

INTRODUCTION

The phrase ‘paradigm shift’ has become very popular since it was published by Thomas S. Kuhn (1922-1996) in the early sixties. Its meaning is simple to state yet not so easy to grasp: a paradigm shift is an entirely new way to conceptualize and understand a field of knowledge, which is based on a new individual standpoint or worldview. Kuhn was very innovative and ingenious to link both sociological and psychological perspectives concerning the creation of scientific knowledge (Kuhn, 1970, p. 8).

A paradigm, in turn, signifies a theoretical and methodological model which instructs a community of scientists about how their scientific field is made, what to look for and how to do that. The paradigm is the bond of a scientific community, it is a shared worldview. And that is why a paradigm shift becomes quite dramatic: it represents a shift of this shared worldview. “(...) paradigm changes do cause scientists to see the world of their research-engagement differently. (...) after a revolution, scientists are responding to a different world” (Kuhn, 1970, p. 111).

Projectology was first introduced by Waldo Vieira in the 1980s as a disruptive approach to parapsychology. The science which studies projections of the

consciousness outside the human body is based on a first-person or participative method. The experience of partially or totally leaving one's body, and then returning, could be seen in the scope of the design of a self-experiment research. It is like anthropological field research, except the field is oneself, as a consciousness (first-person), and not society (second-person). The projector designs their own projective self-experiments, monitors and registers them following their protocol's rules. But those procedures do not make the projector a materialist. Just the opposite, parapsychic knowledge becomes more grounded and stable, because it trains the projector's accuracy to distinguish imagination and perception (Lopes, 2015, p. 42 to 51), and it allows validation by peers. The advantages of scientific method can also be applied to the study of projectological phenomena. But parapsychology would not accept this contribution, because it meant renouncing the goal of a “definitive demonstration” of the extraphysical reality, which would immediately shift the predominant materialistic paradigm. It would have required a paradigm shift which parapsychology was not yet willing to make: a first-person or participative epistemological and methodological turn (Vieira, 2014, p. 742, 854 and 1134).

Conscientiology was first defined in 1992 and then formally developed in 1994. *Projectiology's* first-person method had its scope broadened to the internal reality of the consciousness' attributes and traits, or intra-conscientiality. Putting oneself in the centre of the field of research could be extended beyond projective to self-evolutionary ends. Projections of the consciousness were thus reframed as a means for the consciousness to self-evolve. And this new understanding of consciousness, adequate for a new scientific discipline, gave rise to a new paradigm - the consciential paradigm. What began as a contribution to parapsychology (Vieira, 1986, p. 2), ended up as an independent field of knowledge with an entirely different paradigm.

Interparadigmology is the transdisciplinary, systematic, theoretical and practical science, applied to the study of the act, effect and process of a gradual transition towards the complete shift between cognitive models of reference, collective or personal (self-paradigms). It also acts to strengthen the dialogue between the collectives, intra- and extraphysical, which constitute such models. On one hand, there are some initiatives in conventional scientific institutions which try to include a parapsychic element with a participative approach. Conscientiology could assist those initiatives by offering some solutions already developed outside the scientific mainstream. On the other hand, conscientiology also gains by receiving feedback from researchers who can pinpoint important topics or issues from their external perspective. So, interparadigmology holds conversations between the consciential paradigm and other paradigms, akin in that they share some elements, in order to synergize the transition and shifting processes, ultimately towards the consciential paradigm.

The transition process to the consciential paradigm has a deeper meaning though, that is not restricted to the scientific realm. It has to do with a greater planetary consciential transformation, designated with the expression 'extraphysical reurbanization' or simply reurbex. "The reurbex, or extraphysical reurbanization, is the change for the better of anticosmoethical unhealthy degraded environments and extraphysical communities, sponsored by *Serenissimi*, aiming to cleanse the intraphysical holothosene of the Intrapysical Societies' areas where antievolutionary and deleterious influence on Humanity is exercised" (Vieira, 2003, p. 246; Wojslaw *et al.*, 2018, p. 132).

This essay will analyse the planetary interparadigmatic transition and shifting process in light of paraepistemology and paraecology. The main idea is that knowledge based on secular parapsychism and its

paraecological consequences could constitute a main axis of the planetary paradigmatic transition. This text will explore this idea in an initial way.

The first part will highlight the central role of secularism as a metaparadigmatic trait, working as a guide to the Western civilization project, until it recently gained the new feature of parapsychism, and thus entered a new phase. Admission of the recent logical possibility of secular parapsychism opens a new sphere of knowledge, overcoming the limiting assumption *to be scientific, it must be materialistic* (Zaslavsky, 2013, 2019).

In the second part, the role of paraecology in planetary interparadigmology, as an application and consequence of secular parapsychism, will be shown. Considering paraecology as a science of interactions, which are derived from thosenity (Bassanesi, 2018; Carvalho, 2028; Namiuchi, 2021; Ribeiro, 2018; Vieira, 2018), it is relevant for the reurbex to qualify relations by deepening understanding of the nature, extent and type of bonds derived from the act of producing thosenes and the choices resulting from them.

The methodology used was an exploratory reflection, based on deductive inferences from conscientiological theories, about the role of the secular parapsychism in the paradigmatic transitions and shifts' acceleration in the context of the reurbex.

1. Paraepistemological Base

Western civilization is characterized by the conception of science and rationality, which was born in ancient Greece as philosophy. This form of knowledge appeared as an alternative approach to reality, as compared to mythology. Myths are narratives where divine forces explain the phenomena which human beings experience in the material world. The philosophers began trying to explain the world without those divine forces, in one word, they have been trying to explain it secularly.

Plato stated this criterion in his *Allegory of the Divided Line*: there is a line dividing the knowledge field in two parts - science (episteme) and opinion (doxa). Science's main feature is justified truth, while opinion is characterized by the absence of justification. In the course of time, justification would get attached to secular, and the secular to the material. Plato clearly assigned parapsychism to the opinion side, since he considered, in the spirit of his time, the contents stemming from it unjustifiable. And, despite historical attempts to make it scientific, parapsychic knowledge continued to be considered opinion, until now, because of its attachment

to oracular and shamanic practices, and therefore non-secular.

A secular approach means it is more than a belief because it is justified by a method and refers to something which belongs to Nature (temporal beings), and not to a divine realm (atemporal beings).

So, the development of Western knowledge exhibited, for a long time, a tension between Philosophy as a source of secular knowledge, and beliefs as alleged non-secular knowledge. Religious institutions accumulated great material powers from belief systems based on pure faith. And those institutions interfered in the pursuit of secular knowledge by imposing severe restrictions.

In the High Middle Ages development of secular logic accelerated amid these religious institutions. And that, in addition to many other historical factors, led to the modern scientific revolution in the 17th century, the industrial revolution that began in the same century, and the republican revolutions from the 18th century on. So, the advent of modern science and modern republics, all over the world, reflected secularism gradually overcoming traditional beliefs.

Secularism is akin to universalism. Only what is secular can be universalized. Because it depends on faith, that is, the will to believe, a religious belief can only be imposed. Secular knowledge is not a matter of belief, precisely because it is never absolute, but always limited. Its foundations are transparent to whoever has the educational background to understand them. One could disagree with such knowledge, though at the cost of offering an alternative.

Thanks to secular knowledge, material but also cultural development of a great part of humanity was possible. For example, the fields of Science & Technology, Pharmacology and Surgery. Of course, there were negative consequences, such as environmental problems, and also failures, such as persistent social inequality. A central example is the Industrial Revolution, which was possible because of secular knowledge, nevertheless caused air, water and soil pollution, deeply impacting the health of humans and other organisms. It also promoted exploitation of workers, a rural exodus, and urban violence. Despite all that, the gains from secular knowledge, on a larger scale and over the long run, are undeniable when compared to the restricted possibilities of traditional beliefs. We need to consider this issue in a transitional logic, which carries often intermingled positive and negative elements.

So, we would like to suggest here that secularism worked as a major evolutionary guideline or axis for this

planet and represented the principal preparation for the reurbex. While *Homo sapiens* appeared 300,000 years ago, the emergence of philosophy only took place 2,500 years ago. It seems reasonable to say that secularism was a boost to human development, generally speaking (Harari, 2016).

At this point it is necessary to distinguish two levels of secularism. The first, identified with materialism, is necessary to develop and attain sufficient intellectual and intraphysical requisites in order to move to the next level. The second secularism, encompassing both multidimensionality and parapsychism, is the key element in order for planetary interparadigmology to gain momentum.

The consciential paradigm, introduced by conscientiology, makes secular parapsychism, or multidimensional secularism, possible. Conscientiology defines consciousness as “one of the two basic cosmic components - the other being energy - in constant evolution, utilizing specific vehicles to manifest in diverse dimensions, through self-awareness and rationality with which ideas and self-thosenic actions are processed” (Vieira, 2003, p. 77; Wojslaw et al., 2018, p. 49). Locating consciousness at the centre and defining a self-experimentation based scientific method, secularism reaches beyond matter and breaks the seemingly unavoidable identification, explicitly, secularism does not have to be materialistic. If science requires secularism; and secularism can go beyond matter and include extraphysical dimensions; scientific knowledge of extraphysical realms therefore becomes possible.

Secular parapsychism allows an actual breakthrough by including in the field of science what once were thought to be divine forces. From the conscientiological perspective, those divine forces are not divine, but extraphysical, multidimensional, and can be perceived, investigated and known by rational means, without renouncing parapsychism. Just the opposite, such knowledge requires parapsychism to be used in the scope of a self-experimentation method.

Considering the disjunction between scientific-secularism and parapsychism in the Western paradigm, the logical and practical possibility of secular parapsychism is a major conscientiological breakthrough. We consider parapsychic self-experimentation, with consciential self-evolution in the background, as an Archimedean point in the planetary paradigmatic transition. With this it becomes possible to include parapsychism in secular Western universalism, reconciling this project with transcendence, so to speak,

but leaving religion aside. Conscientiology includes the transcendence of consciousness to multiple extraphysical dimensions and the subsequent increase of self-knowledge in the Western secular paradigm. While reconciling parapsychism and secularism, the consciential paradigm allows a universalistic and multidimensional approach to the consciousness and, therefore, becomes essential to the reurbex.

Secular parapsychism allows for a new kind of self-knowledge including, for example, past lives, the existential program, major personal evolutionary guidelines, holokarmic accounts, among many other accomplishments. And that generates an entirely new paradigm shift, the first since Plato established the line between science and opinion. As this dividing line boosted the development of the planet, to include parapsychism on the side of science, through the secular feature of the latter, would have planetary paradigm shifting consequences.

2. Paraecological consequences

Parapsychism, experienced under a secular perspective, becomes an ability to be developed just like many others, and is accessible to whoever is interested to exercise it. However, the all-encompassing character of this ability leads to the reinterpretation and re-signification of life phenomena and processes. This is because it adds dimensions and connections, not previously perceived, to the functioning of consciousness and its manifestation, and also to the social and biosphere's dynamics. Such abilities, no longer seen as a privilege of initiates or gifted, nor an illusion of the naive and believers, simultaneously broadens both one's worldview and self-view.

A pillar to constructing scientific knowledge of reality through parapsychism is application of the principle of disbelief, whose classical formulation is: "Do not believe in anything, not even in what we present in this text. Experiment. Have your own experiences." Far from an invitation to empty scepticism, the principle of disbelief invites the practice of an epistemological-methodological posture, fundamental to parapsychic self-experimentation. That is, to realize tests and explorations of the functioning and relationships of consciousness in time (holomemory, holokarma) and space (multidimensionality, holosoma), stemming from its bioenergetic-thosenic manifestation.

By realizing the thosenic nature of consciousness it is possible to re-observe the world and the logic of the relationships between its parts, perceiving them as

constituted by energetic affinization of intentions, ideas, and emotions. The analysis of thosenity reconfigures the understanding about oneself and establishes one's relationship with oneself on new foundations.

If relationships between ourselves and other beings, environments and consciousnesses, in the most diverse dimensions, occur through thosenic interactions, then we are stating that thosenity structures the world of forms and relations. The field of study covering multidimensionally, interconsiential interactions including with extraphysical environments is paraecology, a conscientiological specialty.

In synthesis, Paraecology is the science applied to the study and research of a consciousness' interactions with the paraecosystems in the cosmic universe, approached from the perspective of the Consciential Paradigm (Namiuchi, 2021; Ribeiro, 2021). Bassanesi (2018, p. 9,126) adds, about the topic of paraecosystems, "From the perspective of conscientiology, the study of ecosystems encompasses, far beyond physical-chemical and biological factors, the multidimensional interactions of the consciousness with the social, parasocial (paraecosystems), economic and ideological environments, in which it manifests itself subject to the laws of Cosmic Moral and to the influence of holothosenes generated by intra and extraphysical communities, human and prehuman, of the present and from the past".

Philosophically, it is possible to talk about mental ecology, deep ecology, ecology of being, transpersonal ecology, emotional ecology, among many other adjectives. Within the biological sciences, the territory where this science originated, Ecology has many ramifications according to the analysis of its applications. It is worth highlighting the fields of self-ecology (organism-environment), synecology (communities), ecology of communities (population dynamics) and human ecology (individuals and groups, public health and environmental quality). These approaches incorporate environment, health, economy and territory planning and resource management. Paraecology also considers every kind and scale of interactions, however, it differs from ecology as *thosenity* is the organizing element of those interactions. Therefore, the relationship between organisms, populations, communities, ecosystems is considered through energetic affinities, in terms of intentions, ideas, emotions and actions, which set holothosenes and relational streams, assigning a certain type of environmental quality, and assessed multidimensionally.

To make it more explicit, we can compare ecological and paraecological relations. Ecological relations are

defined as interactions, harmonic or disharmonious, between **living beings** in a certain environment. Under the perspective of the consciential paradigm, we can say that paraecological relations are multidimensional and multiexistential, harmonic or disharmonious, between **consciousnesses from different evolutive levels** (including non-humans) determined by thosenity and its consequences. Therefore, from the viewpoint of ecology living beings are the basis of the analysis of relations, while in paraecology consciential evolutionary levels play this role.

It is possible to propose more analogies between ecology and paraecology, as follows. In ecological terms, relations can be classified in types. The relationships between individuals of the same species can be of society, colony, cannibalism, or competition. From the paraecological perspective, it is possible to analyse the existence of these kinds of relations between consciousnesses of the *same evolutionary level*. Concerning relations between distinct species, ecologically they can be of mutualism, cooperation, inquilinism, competition, predation, parasitism, amensalism, or slavery. Approaching it paraecologically, these same cited relations can occur between consciousnesses of *different evolutionary levels*.

In order to extrapolate relations, paraecologically, one could ask: does the multidimensional ecosystem (or paraecosystem) sustained by you, express harmonic or disharmonious relations? Of which kinds? Which is the most frequent kind of relationship established by you? In which contexts? What is your performance in order to qualify disharmonious relationships? Does your thosenity still echo competitive, predatory, parasitic, or pro-slavery remnants? What are your practical actions aiming to overcome such tendencies?

According to Vieira (1994), "Conscientiology fights self-corruption, exalting inter- and multidimensional paraecology" (p. 519), considering "The essential pollution of planet Earth (ecology, paraecology) is the megaproblem" (Vieira, 2003, p. 254), and "(...) is, first of all, a thosenic pollution or generated and sustained by anticosmoethical and ill holothosenes" (2008, *Projeciologia*, p. 606).

Many paraenvironments emerge, intimately related to intraphysical environments, because of the thosenity of the intraphysical inhabitants (Tornieri, 1996, 2020; Vieira, 2003, p. 245-247). The opposite is also true, intraphysical environments form according to the thosenity of extraphysical consciousnesses. To be more precise, it is not possible to talk about organisms, populations, communities and ecosystems without

understanding their inevitable correlations with extraphysical realities, that is, paraorganisms, parapopulations, paracommunities and paraecosystems. Going further, those complex and multiple interactions form paraecological networks, agglutinating different extraphysical pockets which influence each other. Such interrelations happen in different intensities, proportions, frequencies and coverage.

In other words, the paraecological network is a complex and dynamic system of multidimensional *interactions*, intertwining environments and consciousnesses, through continuous holokarmic and multiexistential reverberations of thosenity, choices and personal positions. It is a paraecological perspective of the evolutive dynamic. Some logical implications follow from this:

- 1) Thosenity is related to a microsystem, although its effects are macrosystemic.
- 2) Understanding the functioning of the network broadens the possibilities of reach, extent, and assistential effectiveness.
- 3) To act assistentially, either through deintrusion or by empowering the network's stronger bonds, that is, leaders or hubs, contributes more assertively to the processes of the reurbex, allowing it to spread a new para-environmental quality throughout the entire network via a halo-effect.
- 4) It is possible to identify the level of personal influenceability, exercised and received, upon one's insertion into a paraecological network, for example, via a project or job. Such information allows one to study their own multiexistential and holokarmic reverberations and promote necessary evolutionary adjustments.
- 5) Mapping a variety of interrelations' qualities (homeostatic, neutral, pathological) defines the interassistential priorities with greater confidence.

The paraecological networks seem to function in an ecosystemic way, forming paraecological holothosenes which connect groupkarmic pockets. To better understand this ecosystemic functioning in practice, one can resort to apparently prosaic daily life situations, like what you consume and the projects accomplishment.

The act of buying something, for example, immediately links the buyer to the production chain of the purchased item and the respective paraecological pockets and interactions. This includes the process of raw material extraction, transformation, distribution and, after purchase and use, the disposal. This chain involves labour relations, community relations, socio-environmental impacts, waste generation, infrastructure and logistics,

water consumption, energy, minerals, and soil. How does fabrication of the product affect the ecosystems' homeostasis? And the paraecosystems' homeostasis? Which holosomatic and holokarmic repercussions does it generate for conscins and non-human beings? Does it improve life and evolutionary conditions or make them worse? Does that fabrication support the reurbex or impede it? Ignorance about those processes does not excuse omissions.

The same could be asked about the relations involved in the accomplishment of any project. How is the environment and paraenvironment affected? What about interconsciential relations? What kind of paraecological relations does the project foster? What holothosenes, pockets and paraecological networks is it affiliated with? Who is able to be assisted and what recins are necessary in order to assist them?

The identification of relations, their interconnections and quality, may initially be the result of logical reasoning when studying the history of the situations and consciousnesses involved in the purchase or project. But in-depth and more realistic understanding requires the use of parapsychism. Clairvoyance, psychometry, expansions of consciousness and other phenomena can help. The practice of penta is a very assistantial tool available to get in and understand the interassistential processes of the diverse paraecological networks we are linked with. It is possible to intentionally adopt a paraecological approach to penta, expanding the assistance provided.

Penta, with a paraecological approach, can be useful to assist problematic contexts from the socio-environmental point of view, focusing on the unravelling of intrusive connections and in the qualification of the paraecological networks involved in the process of assistance.

To acknowledge the paraecological functioning of evolution ultimately leads to the cosmoethical necessity of qualifying every direct and indirect relationship, and also the choice of how to experience them. That cosmoethical qualification simultaneously feeds back into the extraphysical reurbanisation and planetary ecological regeneration. It is also a fundamental condition for the proexists' health and to create a reeducational environment for consreus (Vieira, 2003, 488 to 497). Considering the microcosm-macrocosm synergism (Bassanesi, 2018) and the perspective of conscientiological environmental health (Carvalho, 2018), paraecological quality reflects in holosomatic and parapsychic health (microparaecosystems); it generates repercussions in the energetic quality of environments and paraenvironments (macroparaecosystems),

especially considering the integrity and availability of immanent energies; and reverberates karmically, affecting the Personal Evolutive Record (PER) and orienting due retributions and reparations (Ribeiro, 2018).

The freedom to learn from parapsychic self-experimentation, as occurs with penta, within a paraecological approach, provides the discovery of unheard of realities; it strengthens the connection with teams of helpers and with the commitments made in the personal intermissive course; it expands the assistantial capacity; it gives relations new meaning; it causes greater autonomy, self- and intercomprehension; it directs evolutionary priorities; and builds cognitive and relational conditions in order to understand the need of interassistential self- and hetero-relay. From the intraconsciential perspective, it stimulates criticity, secularity, self-confidence, meticulousness, connectivity, mental flexibility; expands the person's cognition as a new source of knowledge; and it promotes the overcoming of multisecular conditionings of dependence and dogmatic beliefs in approaching reality.

Furthermore, beyond the direct benefits to the experimenting consciousness, the collective use of parapsychic self-experimentation also has epistemological consequences. While treated as a scientific-methodological tool, secular parapsychism drives the collective construction of knowledge, in a way unparalleled in history. Knowledge acquired from parapsychic self-experimentation is self-convincing while being simultaneously, admittedly, relative. While confronting one's perceptions with other self-experimenter's, complementarities and eventual contradictions are observed, but also hypotheses and co-validations arise. The singularity of each consciousness points to the need of relativisation, showing that, more than right or wrong, perception happens from different perspectives. Such a situation helps learners get used to doubt and uncertainty, which are generators of hypotheses and new experiments.

The experience of secular parapsychism via conscientiology's scientific approach is liberating for the expression of the consciousness, in all its vehicles. Self-persuasion, different from belief and dogma, is free of the interest in proving realities and of the need for other people's approval.

Beside the epistemological, methodological, intraconsciential and assistantial consequences, secular parapsychism also has paraecological effects. While constituting itself as a source of knowledge, structuring an entirely new paradigm - the consciential paradigm -

secular parapsychism causes the formation of a new epistemic community, whose focus is to catalyse personal and collective evolution. Individual and group thosenity (of the epistemic community), renovated by secular parapsychism, affects the paraecological networks of every volunteer.

The existence of such a community promotes the synergic potentialization of recins and assistential acts of each participant. An example of a multidimensional effect of the conscientiological community functioning is the installation of the communex Interlude, showing the close interdependence between intra- and extraphysical actions. In this case, the holothosene of the intraphysical community subsidized the structuring of the extraphysical community, both of which assisted each other. Therefore, it's possible to say that the epistemic community rooted in Cognopolis Foz do Iguaçu contributed to the formation of a new paraecosystem and qualification of the kinds of relationships between each conscin and the consciexes related to them.

If this is true of Cognopolis, Foz do Iguaçu, one can assume the effects of the installation of new cognopolises around the planet. It is expected that evolutionarily healthier paraecosystems will gradually multiply from those intraphysical roots and the qualification of their volunteers' paraecological networks. This eventual renovation of intra- and extraphysical environments derived from the neoparadigmatic experience, exemplified in cognopolises, may catalyse reurbanization processes. After all, the multiplication of pro-evolutionary environments amplifies intermissivists' assistential reach in relation to consreus.

At the same time, lessons learned from experience with the consciential paradigm, through scientific secular parapsychism, are registered in gescons, which reinforce the recins and the intraconscential process of self-paradigmatic transition. Which in turn reverberate in the interconscential and (para)environmental relations. Besides those more immediate paraecological effects, the verpons published in gescons contribute to the development of the consciential paradigm and consequently the very use of the secular paradigm around the world. One can assume that the accumulation of verpons and the stimulus to the paraecological qualification of the terrestrial population's lives tends to foster the self-paradigmatic transition of more consciousnesses and, therefore, the paradigm shift of the planet, inaugurating the Consciential Era.

Still, the understanding of the paraecological functioning of the evolutive process expresses the crescendo thosenology-paraecology-parareurbanology,

favouring the use of secular parapsychism in the cosmoethical qualification of relations in multiple scales and dimensions, contributing, ultimately, to the sanitation of the planetary holothosene and installation of interconscentially restorative and reeducational pro-evolutionary environments.

Final considerations

We said at the beginning of this article that knowledge founded in secular parapsychism and its paraecological consequences could constitute, among others, the main axis of the planetary paradigmatic transition. Let us summarise this affirmation in parts.

First, **what kind of knowledge does scientific, secular self-parapsychism facilitate the production of?** Knowledge about the nature of the manifestation of consciousness (thosenic and holosomatic) and underlying derivations, such as the existence of multiple dimensions, evolutionary cycles, seriality, and holokarmality. In summary, conscientiological knowledge, whose purpose is proevolutionary and whose self-experimental structure shifts the perspective of understanding the world and oneself, qualifying relations from there.

Second, **what are the paraecological consequences of secular parapsychism?** A better understanding of the multidimensional, multiexistential, holokarmic, and bioenergetic interrelation of the functioning of consciousness; a mapping of the quality, types and implications of personal relations in its paraecosystemic functioning; a contribution to intra- and extraphysical sanitations concerning the reurbex; the identification of the self-paraecology and with it the possible proexological priorities, specially gesconographic ones; the emergence of new cognopolises and pro-evolutionary communexes; and consolidation of the consciential neoparadigm on a planetary level.

Third, **what paradigmatic transition are we talking about?** Evolutionarily, from a hospital-planet towards a school-planet, through the reurbex. Epistemologically, from materialistic science towards multidimensional science developed by the application of secular, self-experimental parapsychism.

Fourth and last, **why does secular parapsychism and its paraecological consequences constitute the primary axis of a planetary paradigmatic transition?** A paradigm shift is an inner shift, a cognitive, thosenic act, that is, a reconfiguration of the *self*-paradigm, which happens through successive transitions. The perception of oneself, the world, the reality and, consequently, the definition of purpose and personal lifestyle are

determined by the self-paradigm. This, in turn, is formed by the thosenic and behavioural investment in certain paradigms along the personal evolutionary history, forming a singular amalgama of paradigms - the self-paradigm. Therefore, it involves relations developed with the world, its inhabitants and parainhabitants, which organize themselves according to the paradigm(s) fed.

In this sense, when seeking paraecological qualification of the personal manifestation, a consciousness will also be investing in their own self-paradigmatic transition while contributing to the collective construction of conscientiological knowledge, a new paradigm, as well as to intra- and extraphysical reurbanization.

How can we affirm that? Real understanding of the paraecological condition of existence, in the current evolutionary moment, requires application of secular parapsychism. It is through pentalogical and/or projective self-experimentation or, in any case, always from a state of greater or lesser discoincidence, that one can verify their own personal paraecological situation, the paraecological networks they are inserted into, and one's own paraecological influence in the qualification of relations and their reverberations in the reurbex. To employ scientific, secular self-parapsychism is a new cognitive act in terms of intraphysical knowledge and probably unprecedented for the evolutionary average of the planetary population and parapopulation, if considering the need for the existence of extraphysical reurbanisation.

That said, one can ask the reader: how do you act in your paraecological networks? Are you aware of them? What is the quality of your paraecological leadership? Which paraecological networks are you assisting? How can you potentialize the evolution of the paraecosystem? Which self-paradigmatic transitions are you making? In which ways have you been contributing to the construction and consolidation of the consciential paradigm?

Fraternal qualification of paraecological networks leads to polykarma, to an environment of consciential reeducation, and to the development of the consciential paradigm on the planet.

REFERENCES

Bassanesi, C. (2018). *Ecossistema and Sinergismo Microcosmos-Macrocosmos*. In: Vieira, W. (Org.) *Enciclopédia da Conscientologia*, verbets No. 3,584 and 4,528, EDITARES, Foz do Iguaçu. Brazil, p. 9,126-9,132 and 20,844-20,848.

Carvalho, P. (2018). *Saúde Ambiental*. In: Vieira, W. (Org.) *Enciclopédia da Conscientologia*, verbet No. 2,466, EDITARES, Foz do Iguaçu. Brazil, p. 19,984-19,991.

Kuhn, T. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (2nd Edition). The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, USA, p. 8 and 111.

Lopes, T. (2015). *Desenvolvimento da Projetabilidade Lúcida* (1st Edition). EDITARES, Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil, p. 42-51.

Namiuchi, F. (2021). *Holopensene Higienizador, Verpon Paraecológica*. Transmitted on Jan 15 and Mar 19, 2021. Retrieved from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8FeDkz0uMHo&list=PLlm7NhaCHIF3YDFT_w_RJi6rc-gFltQ52&index=4, accessed on 23 May 2021.

Ribeiro, L. & Zaslavsky, A. (2014). Interview with Waldo Vieira: Alexander Herbert Imich (1903-2014). *Interparadigmas*, EDITARES, Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil, p. 177-184.

Ribeiro, L. (2018). *Responsabilidade Planetária*. In: Vieira, W. (Org.) *Enciclopédia da Conscientologia*, verbet No. 4,335, EDITARES, Foz do Iguaçu. Brazil, p. 19,590-19,598.

Ribeiro, L. (2021). *Redes Paraecológicas*. Transmitted on Feb 19, 2021. Retrieved from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GyoevNBvmqc&list=PLlm7NhaCHIF3YDFT_w_RJi6rc-gFltQ52&index=2, accessed on 23 May 2021.

Ribeiro, M. A. (2015) *Ecologizar, uma abordagem holística*. <<http://www.revistaea.org/artigo.php?idartigo=219>>, accessed on 28 Dec 2020.

Ribeiro, M. A. (2015). Noodiversidade. *Rev. UFMG*, 22 (1,2). <<https://periodicos.ufmg.br/index.php/revistadaufmg/article/view/2746/1611>>, accessed on 28 Dec 2020.

Tornieri, S. (1996). A Paraecologia Consciential. *Jornal da Invéxis*, São Paulo, Brazil, 2 (4), p. 18. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B8kUVHLM8eVHQmlGUkRxcXJOV3c/view>, accessed on 23 May 2021.

Tornieri, S. (2020) *Paraecologia e Poluição Pensênica*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HZptm7_zo6w&list=PLlm7NhaCHIF07340a16RQN06QEwyWWX6W&index=4, accessed on 23 May 2021.

- Vieira, W. (1986). *Projeciologia: Panorama das Experiências da Consciência Fora do Corpo Humano* (1st Edition). IIPC, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, p. 2.
- Vieira, W. (1992). *Miniglossário da Conscienciologia*; IIPC, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, p. 13. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1QmLJQQF72Ii7Xl6ACV1FYjilw-5am7Kl/view>, accessed on 23 May 2021.
- Vieira, W. (1994). *700 Experimentos da Conscienciologia* (1st Edition). IIPC; Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 1994.
- Vieira, W. (2003). *Homo sapiens reurbanisatus* (1st Edition). CEAEC, Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil, p. 77, 245, 246, 247, 254, 488 and 497.
- Vieira, W. (2008). *Projeciologia: Panorama das Experiências da Consciência Fora do Corpo Humano* (10th Edition). EDITARES, Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil, p. 606.
- Vieira, W. (2014). *Dicionário de Argumentos da Conscienciologia* (1st Edition). EDITARES, Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil, p. 742, 854 and 1134.
- Vieira, W. (2018). *Vida Ecológica*. In: Vieira, W. (Org.) *Enciclopédia da Conscienciologia*, verbet No. 1,369, EDITARES, Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil, p. 22,736-22,739.
- Wojslaw, E., Cowen, J., Lloyd, J. & Alexandre, L. (2018). *The English-Portuguese Glossary of Essential Conscientiology Terms* (1st Edition). EDITARES, Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil, p. 132.
- Zaslavsky, A. (2013). Da Dúvida Metódica ao Princípio da Descrença: Para uma Ciência da Autoconsciência. *Interparadigmas*, EDITARES, Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil, 1 (1), p. 25-39.
- Zaslavsky, A. (2019). Autoexperimentação Conscencial: o Método Científico Conscienciológico. *Conscientia*, CEAEC, Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil, 23 (9), p. 147-158.
- Zaslavsky, A. (2020). *Cotejo Parapsiquismo Religioso–Parapsiquismo Laico*. In: Vieira, W. (Org.) *Enciclopédia da Conscienciologia*, verbet No. 5,284, EDITARES, Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil. <<http://encyclossapiens.space/buscaverbete>>, accessed on 28 Dec 2020.

Alexandre Zaslavsky is a philosophy teacher in high school, doctor in Education, editor of the journal *Interparadigmas*, conjoint coordinator of the INTERSCIENTIFIC – *Council of Technical-Scientists of the Science Conscientiology* from UNICIN, co-author of the book *Inversão Existencial* (Existential Inversion) and several articles and conscientiological verbets.

Luciana Ribeiro is graduated in Biology, has a master and a doctor degree in Education, and is a professor at the *Federal University of Latin American Integration* (UNILA). She has been a volunteer of conscientiology since 1997, instructor of conscientiology since 2003, verbetographer of the *Encyclopaedia of Conscientiology*, author of conscientiological articles and co-author of the book *Boa noite, Universo!* (Good night Universe!).