PARALAW: ANTONYM OF NATURAL LAW

Adriana de Lacerda Rocha

ABSTRACT. The primary objective of this article is to show the limitation of positive law in facing the challenges of the contemporary world and it demonstrates that the authors` attempt to integrate Natural Law with Positive Law to meet the challenges of this proposal is insignificant before the consciential paradigm, and specifically paralawology. Therefore, this text aims to analyze some aspects of Natural Law considered relevant and compares them with the concept of Paralaw.[1] The intent is to raise general aspects of jusnaturalism (Natural Law theory) aiming to demonstrate that they are contrary to the definition, characterization, and application of Paralaw, a leading edge relative truth of Conscientiology, which is based on the consciential paradigm. It is not the intent of this text to deepen analysis of the various philosophers who form the Natural Law school, but to use relevant topics from this line of thought of the science of law to show that Paralaw is not a continuation of the Natural Law concept. Paralaw is the discipline of Conscientiology that proposes a radical change of paradigm with an inevitable transformation of our theoretical and practical understanding of the current Law. Considering the principle of disbelief as one of the pillars of the consciential paradigm and the real application of Paralaw, it is possible to define the limits between both lines of thought of the science of law , notably through the use of lucid parapsychism.
Keywords: Paralaw; Natural Law; Consciential Paradigm; Lucid parapsychism; Paralaw as an opposite of Natural Law.

INTRODUCTION

In this work we aim to highlight aspects of the theory of Natural Law, whose design has changed throughout history, in order to demonstrate that its resumption would be a step backwards, and present nuances of Paralaw as a new perspective for an updated understanding of legal science.

We want to show the contribution of Paralaw to broaden the understanding of challenges and emphasize their effective contribution to the overcoming of contemporary dilemmas.

Throughout this text we seek to identify principal items that are counterpoints between jusnaturalism and positivism, and call attention to ideas for the future while always bearing in mind the principle of disbelief as a guiding light for the understanding of this theme and the use of lucid parapsychism as the main tool to differentiate both concepts of the new reference proposed by Paralaw.

1 In this article, Paralaw is used in a sense of synonym of paralawology, the science which studies Paralaw. In this aspect, however, it has a comprehensive sense – being a specialty of Conscientiology – and not a restrictive sense meaning something subjective: Paralaw meaning subjective Paralaw

We aim to insert analyses into the context of the parajuridical epistemology, widening the approaches of Law scholars who are unhappy with the direction of today's Legal Science, which is predominantly positivist, and are prone to changing its directions.

We aim to show that Paralaw is a reference, a foundation to understand Law, since Paralaw, if applied routinely, is an instrument of the jurist`s intraconsciential change, who already carries in themselves non-explicit principles and norms.

The Paralaw will contribute to the cosmoethical experience of law and lawyers need to use the norms of Paralaw, through the experience of the consciential paradigm, in order to qualify their attitudes and manage to change the Law. This qualification will be achieved through the cosmoethic conduct of openness and without dogmatism. The technique capable of contributing to this is the psychic experience, since it opens the consciousness to the parareality, which leads to cosmovision.

Therefore, in order to face current challenges, this analysis will be developed under the focus of the consciential paradigm and on new epistemological bases that allow advances in legal science, which today remains predominantly positivist. In this way, the principle of disbelief is of primary important and needs to be re-emphasized.

The principle of disbelief is a fundamental pillar of the consciential paradigm and establishes that the (self) researcher, man or woman, should not accept any idea aprioristically, dogmatically or mystically, without reflection on facts they have experienced. It challenges (self) researchers not to believe anything, but to have their own experiences. Based on this principle, the person replaces belief with knowledge based on their rationality and personal experience.

In this context, criticalness has been the starting point and self-experimentation the way taken in the present analysis.

This article turns, therefore, to those who strive to break with the *status quo* and the subjacent dogmatism which underlies any scientific production in the area of Law, and who are determined to face the maelstrom of complaints that are still to come upon assuming a new paradigm, as well as recognizing the lucid interassistantial psychic abilities as a determining condition that distances Paralaw from Natural Law. It intends to return to those who are determined to violate the silent pact involving the scientific production in this area, focused on reproducing and stimulating the dominant ideology (BOURDIEU, 1982) that colludes with legal positivism.

Among others, the cause of the maintenance of this positivism is the lack of interest or openness consider the object of Law beyond the positive law – produced exclusively by the State. Any path that widens the object of Law is typically denied by thinkers in the area and by academia.

Despite this predominance, some try to disrupt this atmosphere through productions that once more introduce Natural Law as a hermeneutic way out from programmatic norms and/or represent more flexible, malleable norms.

Assuming the paradigm of classical Natural Law as represented by Aristotle, Falavigna (2008, p. 6) admits it as an interpretative key to the type of rule inserted in the Brazilian Civil Code of 2003:

> It is in this sense that, for the correct interpretation of legal texts, one shall find in the other what there is in ourselves, acquiesced to respect individualities, understood as an identification, in which the other is not reified, but continues so human as if recognizing himself.
>
> As an interpretative method that allows differentiation of the institutes, validating the process of revealing the law, the phenomenological approach has been opted for, because the return of things to themselves, not as they manifest, but if manifesting is not just what it seems and is not something in itself, raises to awareness that justice is the intention of the interpretation, the reason why this essentiality shall be revealed.

Today, along with the critique of legal positivism, one sees that the law is held in low regard as is the Kelsenian model (1979) of legal security based on coherent, logical, and comprehensive planning of all possible cases. The legal formulas and their hermeneutics also do no longer meet most of the gaps of this orderly system. With this a review of the theory of sources appears that is reflected in a reformulation of the interpretation and application of the Law.

Corroborating this critique of the epistemological model of absolute truths – applied to legal science of the kelsenian positivism – Bachelard (2000) proposes the possibility of error in the construction of the scientific spirit. For him, scientific knowledge is built from the rectification of errors. These do not need excising, as they are part of the very construction of scientific knowledge.

Bachelard (2000) defends diverse historical truths able to generate credibility and trust since, according to his vision, there is no single truth.

According to the author (*apud* ROCHA, 2012) science does not reproduce a truth, whether it is the truth from facts or from the faculties of knowledge. Each science produces their truth and organizes the criteria for examining the veracity of its knowledge with logic that is tied to the current science and not with the logic of a permanent truth, because a truth is always temporary.

It is in this spirit of Bachelard's disillusion that the author has experienced the consciential paradigm since 1996, including the development of lucid parapsychism in several areas, especially in the exercise of legal and consciential teaching and in the *pro bono* advocacy exercised in several conscientiocentric institutions.

Opposed to theories prevailing in Law today, this work seeks to bring the concept of Paralaw (VIEIRA, 2010) as a new form of legal and paralegal scientific knowledge, in this case, theoretical, practical, exemplary, and corroborated through the criticalness, self-discernmentology and self-experimentology present in the principle of disbelief (VIEIRA, 2011), its guiding principle.

For these reasons, the goal here is to detail some aspects of Natural Law to align it with Paralaw in order to draw the attention of intermissivist lawyers who are aware of the existence of this new paradigm for the Law and wish to work for the amendment of the legal science in force today and considered outdated.

1. THE DEBATE NATURAL LAW / POSITIVE LAW

Faced with the common position which has transformed the positivism/ Natural Law debate, a critical jurist (self- and heterocritical), aware of this reality, plays a fundamental role in enhancing legal science.

In academic discourse it is usual that the contemporary philosophy of law has overcome the juspositivist/jusnaturalist[2] dichotomy (MAIA, 2005, p. 399), exemplified by the labels that characterize "this new era […]: 'postmodern law', 'postpositivism', 'principiologic non-positivism'... ", but this academic debate is not fruitful, because it keeps the discussion tied to the dogmatic, retrograde, positivist epistemological model, besides warding off the possibility of inserting any other paradigm, especially if this paradigm aims to include self-experimentation, self-research, and admit paraperceptions.

Aspects raised in this part are recovered – predominantly geared to justify the inclusion of Natural Law in legal science – along with a brief description of approaches presented here, aiming to demonstrate its incompatibility with Paralaw and the failure to overcome the epistemological crisis the Law has lived in (STRECK, 2003).

Generally speaking, the notion of Natural Law is ancient, having been treated by thinkers throughout the ages, as in the examples of Aristotle (384-322 BC), Cicero (106-43 BC), St. Augustine (354-430), Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), John Locke (1632-1704), Rousseau (1712-1778), Del Vecchio (1878-1970), and more recently, Lon Fuller (1979) and Ronald Dworkin (1985).

Generally, it is stated that Natural Law means the existence of a Law founded in reason or in the depths of human nature, be it in an individual or collective condition, or even in the relationship of man with God. This Law pre-exists the given Law (that produced by men or by the State) and shall always be respected.

2 Positivism or Legal Positivism are terms that, in the 19th century, only admitted positive law as an object of study and scientific of Law, in contrast to the natural law school that admitted the duality natural law /positive law.

More than an approach on where to find the source of the Natural Law – nature –, it reflects a paradigm of the philosophy of consciousness, from which the essence is in the things themselves, and not on intersubjectivity as with the philosophy of language Law will project itself as a construction.

Various epistemological paradigms have discussed Natural Law, whether under the religious-theological perspective or through the classic-profane perspective (with Aristotle), or even through the bias of the post-jusrationalism of modernity.

Thus, jusnaturalism has many supporters and thinkers, depending on the author's epistemological perspective. One of them is St. Thomas of Aquinas who developed the typology of law structured in the relationship between human beings and the Creator. Yet Lon Fuller claims that there are pre-existing principles to the positive Law that should be considered in any legal system.

Historiography (LOPES, 2002) refers to Sophocles as the first reference to the evocation of a Natural Law, before a written law, as a source of the law: but not just any law, but a fair law (PLATO, 1991).

In the same line, Socrates evokes a Natural Law by accepting his death, in a resigned manner. This is observed in the work of Plato (1997) *Crito*, in the dialogue that happened prior to Socrates drinking the poison. In in this work it is noticed that Socrates links Natural Law to something considered fair.

Aristotle, in turn, understands that Natural Law and positive law complement each other, since the legislature drafts laws observing nature.

Later, the classic Roman law absorbed the Aristotelian theory of Natural Law when assigning meaning to science, by defining law, jurisprudence and justice, as well as classifying phenomena, institutions, and legal concepts.

Further on, with Cicero, distortion of these classical notions of Roman law took place, once individualism is introduced.

Despite this, he sought a single basis for law and justice in defending the idea that everyone should be entitled to citizenship: this justified the defense of a Natural Law unified with the law of nations [*jus gentium*] and the civil law.

Even in the French Revolution there is an appeal to Natural Law when trying to break away from the models of the existing social structure by evoking the maxims of equality, liberty and fraternity: understood by the universal ideals later consolidated in international declarations.

Synthesizing the various currents of Natural Law, Bittar (2002) states that there are three senses to it: a) one arising from the constitution of the world itself; b) the other derived from the rational nature of man; c) and another as a consequence of the socio-political nature of man.

Natural law and its schools have great influence in Western Law. Basically it is founded on the concept that human beings are part of a natural order of things and shall act in harmony and consonance with this order. Modern versions of

the theory of Natural Law establish that, whilst humanity's relationship with the world is due to a natural order, the relationship among humans is a matter of social contract.

In counterposition to the conception of Natural Law legal positivism, in spite of various lines of thought, has some tendencies, such as: normativist, co-decist, analytical jurisprudence, and decisionism. Some thinkers represent the main lines of thought and influence the direction of Law as known today, among others: Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), John Austin (1790-1859), Hans Kelsen (1881-1973) and H. L. Hart (1907-1992).

While jusnaturalism seeks to legitimize Positive Law through the respect it has for principles and absolute values, positivism is solely concerned with inquiry of the formal-logical presuppositions of its force. The Law is positive, because it is a creation of man.

To support philosophy in the realm of positive law, modern authors of the philosophy of law attempt to justify their scientific content from the study of works on Natural Law. In this sense, Reale (1965, p. 278) states:

> ...If as with Pufendorf and Thomasius, in the second half of the 17th century, the *doctrine of Natural Law* already tends to be conceived in autonomous representations separate from *theology and from the moral*, it is undoubtedly in the work of Kant and Fichte that it is claimed not to mention the idea of a *special* philosophy of law, but that the problem of law is susceptible to autonomous philosophic speculation. Since then, it can be said that the prior theme of all the philosophizing about law [...] is reduced to the philosophy of positive law, as in Gustavo Hugo's statement, or that it transcends the sphere of legal positivity […] [italics from the original text].

In turn, Farrell (1998, p. 121-128) warns of the permanent discussion about the dichotomy between Natural Law and positive law: "Indeed, controversy between jusnaturalists and positivists about the concept of law appears inexorably in the very heart of the philosophy of law".

The author continues to state that this cleavage is wrong and misguided, because it is important to cut this separation off for an effective Law.

On this theme, Perelman (1996, p. 386) states: "the antithesis 'positive law-Natural Law' opposes respect of the law to the respect of justice, designed otherwise than in accordance with the law". He reminds that this analysis emerged in the 19th century, because before this there wasn´t the thought that "the facts of talking the law and administering justice were not synonymous."

Perelman (1996, p. 389) well sums up the idea of positivism and its inability to account for the effective and efficient resolution of conflicts, therefore, insufficient to be fair, on highlighting the attempt of positivist authors to solve the problems of the gaps or antinomies in the given law:

> For legal positivism, justice according to the law is the law as defined by the legislature. But what to do when the law is insufficient for one reason or another? The first solution, which strengthens the primacy of the legislature, was the implementation, in 1790, of legislative appeal. But, before the drawbacks of this, the obligation of judging was adopted. Not being possible to arbitrarily decide the cases on the agenda, the judge should [...] turn to the Natural Law, considered a supplementary law. [...] By examining 'the criteria to solve antinomies', a kelsenian positivist, such as professor Norberto Bobbio, is led to the conclusion that, 'despite the system of rules that protects the jurist's work from the danger of direct assessment of what is fair and unfair', when lacking criteria for resolving the conflict of criteria, the criteria of criteria is the supreme principle of Justice.

After the great wars, especially World War II, the world, mostly Europe, found itself needing to resort to an order that could contain the excesses of positivized systems, mainly those of national socialism.

Thus, after World War II, there was a resurgence of jusnaturalism in the thoughts of some authors, like Gustav Radbruch (1878-1949) and Bobbio (who recuperated jusnaturalism as an ideology of the law, removing it from the scope of theory, to which it was condemned since the criticism of Hegel (1770-1831), early in the 19th century).

So, instead of evoking rights based on man's nature, it started to appeal to fundamental principles of our civilization.

As a defender of the approach between positivism and jusnaturalism, Norberto Bobbio (1999) points out that separation between both lines of knowledge seems misguided.

As we have previously noted out, the tradition of Western law used to distinguish (and it still does) the class of general principles (ethics and rationality) – which were not characterized by rules or laws – from the Natural Laws (natural rights). In this tradition, it is still possible to find a third class of law, the positive law, as it is considered to be a set of norms effectively designed for practical use. These norms are those addressed and applied to human conduct.

Differentiating the thought of jusnaturalist and positivist philosophers, Bobbio (p. 26 and 45) synthesizes both currents by mentioning that for the jusnaturalists Natural Laws have precedence over human laws and if there is any disagreement between them the law of nature prevails:

> [...] the theory of Natural Law, as the jusnaturalists maintain and defend, i.e. a right based on nature as opposed to the right based on authority. […] to classify a theory as jusnaturalist, there are two issues: 1) assuming the Natural Law as a right; 2) affirming the Natural Law as superior to the positive law. There is no known case of

> an author who accepts the existence of the law of nature and who places it below the human law.

Resuming the possibility of a relationship between both lines, Farrell (1998, p. 122) notes that there is an exaggerated way to address the conflict between Natural Law and positive law:

> [...] in a given case moral is related to law, while in another there are two totally separate regulatory systems. From this, other, also dramatic, consequences normally follow: if the positivist version is accepted, there is no way to morally evaluate law. A fair and an unfair, correct and incorrect law, regardless of the level of immorality makes no difference.

Briefly, one can classify the jusnaturalists in two lines (NINO, 1999, p. 28):

> 1) A thesis of ethical philosophy which holds that there are moral principles and justice that are universally valid and accessible to human reason;
>
> 2) A thesis about the definition of the concept of law, according to which a normative system or a norm cannot be qualified as 'juridical' if they contradict or do not pass through the demands of such principles.

Currently, seeking to defend compatibility between positivism and jusnaturalism from universal principles, a third stream can be extracted namely that of "the moral obedience to law on behalf of judges and legal subjects" (MAIA, 2005, p. 400).

> After all, if universally valid moral and justice principles exist and can be known, and if law shall necessarily identify these moral principles (the strong version of the jusnaturalist thesis), or at least do not contradict them (the weak version of the jusnaturalist thesis), then it would not be reasonable, for jusnaturalists, that judges and citizens did not have a moral obligation to obey the law. For jusnaturalists the expression 'fair law' is a redundancy, and the expression 'unjust law' a contradiction. The obligation to obey the law follows from the moral content of legal norms themselves (or at least from the non-occurrence of immoral content, in the weak version). Therefore, the third thesis held by jusnaturalists can be posed as follows:[...]
>
> 3) both judges and legal subjects have a moral obligation to obey the law.

Not even the various jusnaturalists agree with the meaning and the origin of universally valid principles of moral and justice, diverging on its "supposed 'nature' from which the principles of Natural Law emanate" (MAIA, 2005, p. 401).

The attempt to resume natural Law shows how it fits any ideology that can be defended by the use of Natural Law (ROSS, 2000).

In fact, the foundation of Natural Law lies in the particular and extremely individual understanding as well as in intuitive contemplation.

According to Ross (2000, p. 305):

> Evidence as a criteria of truth explains the fully arbitrary character of metaphysical assertions. It places them above all force of inter-subjetive control and leaves the door open for unlimited imagination and dogmatism.

Consubstantiating the possibility of Natural Law coexisting with positivism, Farrell (1998) determines that the possibility of inserting moral analysis in the debate on the applicability of norms is present in both lines, for the two thoughts assess norms under a moral point of view: what differentiates them is the moment of the evaluation.

From this convergence the resumption of the power of jusnaturalism to overcome the failures of positivism is today seen. Currently, both lines of thought acknowledge the moral analysis of norms, but under these norms, the jusnaturalists evaluate them to decide whether they can be classified as legal norms. In contrast, the positivists conceptually identify the legal norms to then evaluate them from the moral point of view (the moment in which they decide whether they should or not be applied or followed).

Maia (2005, p. 413-414) summarizes the positivism-jusnaturalism dualism in force today in the legal world:

> The difference in the moment the evaluation occurs is not meaningful, since the practical consequences of its occurrence at one moment or another are the same: the jusnaturalist concludes that immoral or unjust norms should not be obeyed, because they are not rights, while the legal positivist concludes that an immoral or unjust norm, even if it is legally valid, should not be obeyed, precisely because it is immoral or unjust. In the words of Farrell:
>
> The *dedramatized* version shows that the discussion between Natural Law and legal positivism has lost its importance: this is not a discussion about whether moral has anything to do with the law, but a discussion about when to study the relationship between morality and law, a relationship that neither party denies. And the consequences of studying this relationship at one moment or another are the same.

We sought to outline the main points about Natural Law and positive law and how legal science still seeks to resolve gaps arising from the epistemological

crisis that exists due to becoming an innocuous science regarding the achievement of a broader and peaceful justice through the discussion between both models of understanding the object of law.

This whole "circumlocution" only shows that the maintenance of both models does not solve the problem and solely stimulates endless academic debates.

From now on, it will be shown that a paradigm shift is crucial to overcome the problems of the crisis and that the paralawlogic neoscience completely modifies the understanding of the topic.

More than anything, it is necessary to understand that Paralaw is not a new way to denominate Natural Law. This what it is demonstrated in the following pages.

2. CONSCIENTIOLOGY, CONSCIENTIAL PARADIGM AND PARALAW

References to the philosophical lines of Natural Law and positivism have been made, now it is necessary to introduce the neoscience Conscientiology along with the consciential paradigm, proposed as a way to analyze consciousness, aiming to understand Paralaw as a renovating reference for legal science that revolutionizes its understanding and correspondent lines of philosophy and thought.

Conscientiology is a science publicly proposed by researcher Waldo Vieira in 1981, when the book "Projections of Consciousness" was published.

It is dedicated to the study of consciousness, ego, being, individual essence, the priority reality to be understood and researched (self-research and heteroresearch). Synonym for consciousness can be ego, spirit, essence, I, individuality, personality, person, self, being or subject.

According to Vieira (1996), the core of Conscientiology is the study of consciousness from the virus (the simplest form of consciousness) to the *Serenissimus* – the most evolved consciousness that exists on our planet.

Conscientiology has the theory, among others, that consciousness manifests itself through various vehicles, specifically: the soma, psychosoma, energosoma, and mentalsoma, which together compose the holosoma.

The object of study, consciousness, is approached in an integral manner, considering the holosoma, multidimensionality, bioenergy, and the possibility of the consciousness self-lucidly projecting itself out of the human body.

In this model, consciousness uses the soma (physical body) to manifest itself in the intraphysical dimension and other vehicles to manifest in other dimensions. From this, we have three states of consciential manifestation: the intraphysical state of consciousness (conscin), the extraphysical state of consciousness (consciex), and the state of a projected consciousness (projector).

Furthermore, consciential manifestation occurs through its basic unit of manifestation, that formed by the *thosene*, which is a manifestation involving *tho*ughts, *sen*timents and *ene*rgy.

Conscientiology aims to collaborate to dynamize consciential evolution, which occurs in multiple dimensions (multidimensionality considers that each vehicle of manifestation vibrates at the specific frequency, allowing the consciousness to act in different dimensions, depending on the frequency).

Multiexistentiality is tied to these previous conditions: a consciousness has a long line of existences, switching between intra and extraphysical states over the course of their evolution.

The above aspects are some of the components of the consciential paradigm: one very different from the Newtonian, Cartesian paradigm, which is in force in conventional sciences, including in the studies of Law.

Due to this traditional paradigm we are today experiencing a crisis of understanding in legal science and the resumption of the approach between Natural Law and legal positivism. The scientific paradigm adopted in academia and in the professional life of Law is dogmatic and myopic, even when it seeks to expand its exercising through the principled hermeneutics.

In contrast, the consciential paradigm, the leading theory of Conscientiology, uses specific procedures and techniques to research consciousness, which is simultaneously the subject, the object, and the instrument of research.

Conscientiology has 70 basic specialties (VIEIRA, 1996) to study the consciousness and the complexity of its microuniverse, and nowadays it already has other specialties, including Paralaw and Cosmoethics, which is responsible for studying ethics or the reflection on multidimensional cosmic moral, situated beyond the human moral.

It is worth mentioning that the multidimensional nature of consciousness is evidenced during the phenomenon of out-of-body experience, a projection of consciousness. At this time it can manifest lucidly in other dimensions, beyond the physical dimension.

As such, in any dimension or evolutionary moment that it manifests itself, the consciousness can apply this consciential model of study and research. Thus being able to search for theoretical-practical knowledge (theactical) of any specialty.

The experience of multidimensionality is, therefore, a condition for the qualified exercise of Law, that is, of its understanding from a multidimensional perspective.

This applies to the understanding of Cosmoethics and Paralaw.

In addition to projection, paraperceptions are an essential consciential attribute for both self-research and rapprochement and the maximum understanding of Cosmoethics and Paralaw. Psychic ability is an "interdimensional megadoor" and "interconsciential supercommunication" (VIEIRA, 2009).

Consciousness is governed by cosmoethics, which permeates the entire universe. Cosmoethics is not limited to the concepts of right and wrong, but is driven by the evolution of consciousness in any dimension of manifestation.

Through cosmoethics, it is not questioned whether the idea or action is correct, but rather, if it is in favor of the evolution of consciousnesses.

Conscientiology and this paradigm are not to be solely theoretically studied, as is the case in conventional science, but rather, tried and experienced in all of its specialties by a consciousness interested in evolving. Having evolution as a goal, the consciousness should develop their lucid psychic abilities in order to better understand the branches of study of conscientiological science.

This also happens in relation to Paralaw (VIEIRA, 2010, p. 5148):

> Science applied to technical and paratechnical studies, **theactical** researches and pararesearch of the set **of rules, principles and paralaws of consciential manifestations or just, healthy and straight thosenes**, according to the **cosmoethical** and synchronic flow of the Cosmos, from the correct application of immanent energy (IE), in the experience and paraexperience of megafraternity. [our emphasis]

It is through lucid self-experimentation that the consciousness begins to better understand Paralaw. In this another pillar of the consciential paradigm is implied, the leading edge relative truth.

This truth contradicts dogmatism and absolute truths as it implies a multidimensional life in regards to the lucid employing of the holosoma in the search for consciential self-mastery, the lucid experience of energies and in being eager to evolve and for consciential maturity.

This truth also needs to be known and experienced. It is not the idea of only one person, but the maximum consensus obtained through much research and analysis performed by various consciousnesses regarding the conscientiological specialties in which they were willing to perform theactical investigations.

This investigative mode is impregnated with the principle of disbelief (VIEIRA, 2010).

> The *principle of disbelief* is the fundamental and irreplaceable proposition of Conscientiology's approach to the realities, in general, of the Cosmos, in any dimension, the consciousness researcher refusing and questioning any concept of an a priori and dogmatic mode, without practical demonstration or lengthy reflection, logic confrontation of causation and the fullness of personal rationalization. [author's emphasis]

It is in this evolutionary movement that consciousness' can improve themselves: employing the most advanced and mature principles, for the consciential paradigm leads the researcher-experimenter to the application of leading edge relative truths.

To qualify this cosmoethical manifestation and according to cosmic, multidimensional and multiexistential laws, the animic-mediumistic development of paraperceptions favors the rapprochement with the extraphysical helpers and reveals the intraconsciential and interconsciential reality.

Energies do not lie. A lucid parapsychic paralowlogist[3] is able to see the consciential reality in any dimension and, from this perspective can understand the underlying conflicts and act to pacify disagreements by donating the best energies loaded with cosmoethical and clarifying intentions.

In the condition of the leading edge relative truth of Conscientiology, the researcher interested in experiencing and understanding the Paralaw also needs to adopt the nuances that the consciential paradigm requires, and employ parapsychic abilities present.

The deepening of the understanding of the Paralaw inevitably leads the researcher to qualify their thosenity to make it continuously straight and integral. Ultimately this process leads to self-knowledge as it draws attention to its own manifestation and attitude, triggering an increase in self-awareness, cosmovision and the understanding of interpersonal, social, family, professional, multidimensional and multiexistential relationships.

The consequence of this attitude is the reduction of conflicts and their solution: the purpose of Paralaw.

Among other functions the Law seeks to resolve conflicts. Similarly, one of the goals of Paralaw is to collaborate to end interconsciential conflicts. Where there is conflict, there is intrusion.

One can say that for us not to have conflicts it is important to understand the other. From this understanding, the relationship improves and the incidence of external norm to resolve a deadlock becomes unnecessary, for this is resolved by the parties through mutual agreement.

Among other factors, it is usual the appearance of conflicts arising from some pathological emotions: anxiety, competitiveness and frustration.

These feelings change emotional behavior, generating conflicts and sickness, since interests, values, traditions, habits, personality and different desires of people involved lead them to disagreements.

The establishment of dialogue helps in minimizing conflicts and in self and hetero-deintrusion, the first step for the installation of thosenic imperturbability and consciential serenity, conditions indispensable to experience the extraphysical law of the *Serenissimi*, which is the full experience of Paralaw.

For Vieira (2006) self-deintrusion:

> *[...] is the state or condition of the lucid intraphysical consciousness regarding the* theactical experience of tactics, strategy and logistics

3 Scientist who studies and applies the Paralaw.

> of interconsciential, intra and extraconsciential, intra and extraphysical self-defense, in a multidimensional way, for the maintenance of personal, intimate and full balance, the whole time, discarding the spurious and intrusive interference of pathological exothosenes of whoever it may be. [author's emphasis]

Having experience of the consciential paradigm leads consciousness to discover cosmoethics and embrace it in all its manifestations. By observing ones' thosenes it is possible to detail where the base of any pathothosenes are, the main cause of intraconsciential and interconsciential conflicts.

Among others, in practice the experience of the Cosmoethics and the Paralaw represents – for a motivated person – the following effects (VIEIRA, 1996, 2010):

- Elimination of self-deception and self-corruptions – the person ceases to justify their immaturities;
- Identification and elimination of unsound negative thoughts (about oneself and about others);
- Respect for the evolutionary level of all the consciousnesses;
- Expansion of the sense of humanity: experience of megafraternity and universalism;
- More interest in interassistantiality;
- Prophylaxis of cynicism, of trickery, of dishonesty, and of other weak traits, obstacles for consciential evolution.

Considering the consciential paradigm described above, with its practical intraconsciential implications, it becomes impossible to affirm that Paralaw is synonymous with Natural Law.

Paralaw means applying the principle of disbelief and the development of lucid interassistantial parapsychism in the practice of the researcher-jurisconsult, the agent of self and hetero-deintrusion.

In the following topic, we present the antithesis between Paralaw and Natural Law.

3. COUNTERPOINTS BETWEEN PARALAW AND NATURAL LAW

In addition to the points highlighted so far in this article, other characteristics will be address to point out differences between Paralaw and Natural Law.

Generally speaking, the main difference that illustrates that Paralaw is not the same as Natural Law, nor even an update or recuperation of certain features of it, is that Natural Law has always been linked to its original design, regardless of the historical moment, an abstract entity higher than the human will: be it divinity or the very notion of God.

It is reinforced, therefore, that, behind any theoretical construct about Natural Law, there is a religiosity sustaining it. For a long time Natural Law has been linked to religious foundations.

This is the case of theological jusnaturalism that was consolidated in the Middle Ages under the strong influence of Christianism.

Under the paradigm of the Christian doctrine, the question of Justice remains characterized by a religious idea of Justice: human justice is a transitory justice, subject to temporal power. The truth, to Christianity, is in the law of God, which acts in an absolute, eternal and immutable form. Here, there is a revolution of subjectivity, as the attitude or willingness to be fair prevails over the aspiration of having a precise idea of justice. However, the idea of Justice continues to be viewed in a superior frame of ideas, now subject to a theological vision from the principle of a Creator God, from which the harmony of the universe emanates.

Therefore, in this respect jusnaturalism presents theological content, because its foundations were intelligence and divine will, through the force of religious creed and the predominance of faith.

In the approaches previously made there is no possibility of questioning and self-experimentation thru the principle of disbelief, as it occurs with the consciential paradigm – which is relative and scientific.

In this way then, there are differences between Paralaw and Natural Law that make them irreconcilable, even today when the possibility of universal and inalienable Natural Law is admitted and fills in the gaps and inconsistencies of positive law, as is the case with the concept established in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen.

As presented in the text, the table below presents distinctions that separate Paralaw from Natural Law:

NATURAL LAW	PARALAW
Natural Law, which has reason as a bias, considers the human being a clean slate [*tabula rasa*], a machine that works via mathematical formulae.	It considers the consciousness to be unique, multiexistential, because it has a series of intraphysical lives and in these resomas it brings its past experiences in the holomemory and holobiography, therefore, it is never a clean slate.
In Aristotle`s classic assumption, it is featured as an immutable reference to human beings.	It is not based on a divine reference whose underlying ideology is dogmatic, inculcating and limiting religiosity. Its epistemological base is scientific, relative and assumes the self-research and self-experimentation of the consciential paradigm that sustains it. The issue is that the reference is something experienced that expands cosmovision to the maximum.

It is an abstract idea of law based on superior and prior justice – a hypothetical and fundamental legal norm from which positive law originates. This Natural Law derives from something immaterial or divine.	Its paralaws are not linked to religiosity, for the scientific paradigm of consciousness does not assume any divinity in anything. The new model of consciential research is grounded on the evolution of consciousness realized in various lives and dimensions. Therefore, the one who is considered more evolved in the evolutionary scale is also a consciousness that has various vehicles of manifestation (somas) and as an intraphysical consciousness is subject to the cosmic laws. The point is the experience of multidimensionality and cosmoethics through experiences gained along the multiexistences.
In Greece, in Sophocles` Greek theatre ("Antigone"), there is a mention of disrespect of the King's order, for eternal unwritten laws were obeyed, since they came from the divine. Also in Socrates there is mention of Justice attached to the will of the Gods. In other words, there was always religiosity behind the superior and prior order in the order of humans on Earth.	It correlates with Cosmoethics, which is multidimensional and has the conduct of megafraternity working in any consciential manifestation (VIEIRA, 2005) – which is unique, though relativized by the consciousness – and is applied to consciousnesses and consciential principles, regardless of the dimension where they manifest as an intraphysical or extraphysical consciousness.
It assumes the presupposition of what is correct and fair, pertaining to the moral, ideal or value, but which is born with a human (only considering intraphysicality).	Paralaw is not prepared by the divine, because, as already mentioned, that does not exist. Paralaw is tightly coupled to the experience of lucid interassistantiality and is developed through consciential self-determination.
It is provided with superior and supreme justice, and as such, is divine (or natural according to some). It is independent of law produced by humans.	Paralaw is the "extraphysical law" also applied to consciousness that have deactivated their soma (discarded the body) and to the projected consciousnesses as well.
It is understood as a superior and prior justice – hypothetical law – that inspires positive laws and is used as an interpretative inspiration for filling in gaps, cases of equanimity, but never related to extraphysical experiences – regardless of whether a projected or extraphysical consciousnesses.	Paralaw can be experienced in the intra and extraphysical day-to-day, from the self-critical experience of parapsychic abilities.
It assumes what is right and fair and presumes to exist as a common right to all humans, which is a right born with all human regardless of the given Law. It considers, therefore, that it is applied only from the intraphysical life, again excluding any continuation of the consciential evolutionary process.	Through the thosenic signature the consciousness imprints in its manifestation – regardless of if intra or extraphysical –, determinations applied by Paralaw occur, considering the destinations established by the consciousness itself.

The words of Vieira (2005) are conclusive in the differentiation of Paralaw:

> intraphysical and extraphysical consciousnesses are intertwined through the principles of the *Ius*, of jurisprudence and basic rights. This is pure cosmoethics. It has not yet been addressed efficiently and lucidly in theoretical treatises, for example, that of the International Law, and theactically in the forums of the United Nations (UN). [...] It is the consciousness that decides its fate. It extends its free will through Paralaw.

4. PRACTICAL PARALAWLOGICAL PARAPERCEPTIOLOGY

Through self-experimentation it is possible to experience Paralaw, a condition not even envisaged by jurists of the past and present who attempt to justify the inclusion of Natural Law in legal science.

Paralaw, in this and other considerations, is analyzed through the jurist`s consciential maturity, that which is necessary to face the challenges of the activity.

In this section, a list of examples of parapsychic manifestations, experienced in the exercise of Law by the author, over the course of 16 years, has been established, which highlights the presence of the Paralaw and corroborates her separation from the concept of Natural Law.

Three assumptions were used in this self-research:

1. The study of the thosenes through careful and constant analysis of self-thosenes in order to understand how they are manifested in professional volunteering work, with the intention to replace self-thosenes with lucid orthothosenes (the basis of Paralaw).
2. Exercise of intraconsciential recycling to overcome weaktraits and optimize strongtraits, with a focus on holomaturity, supporting the assistantial and intrusionfree cosmovision that consciential *pro bono* advocacy required and the contact with pathological environments demanded.
3. Seeking to overcome self-corruptions to increasingly experience Cosmoethics, the base of Paralaw (that helps its consolidation). It is understood that Cosmoethics is the backbone of daily, interactive work with Paralaw. Many conflicts have as their genesis a clash of personal cosmoethical principles (or in the personal codes of cosmoethics) – intrinsic megavalues (VIEIRA, 1994) – and the ethical principles to which one submits in this dimension.

Performance in several professional areas of Law presents constant compliance with bureaucratic requirements that can generate holosomatic consciential tiredness (burnout) due to a lack of effective energetic deassimilation. Among others, the causes are as much a lack of lucidity regarding the interactions and

multidimensional implications of the work, as to negligence in the use of bioenergetic exercises.

In this condition, professionals get carried away by the steamroller of intraphysical anxiety, obnubilating themselves in their multidimensional conviviality of everyday life.

Another present function is the unarchiving of past issues through the requirement of certificates, identity documents, birth certificates, marriage certificates, etc. These documents represent the biographical record of the consciousness referred to in them. As such, they get impregnated with the holothosene of those who hold them and also foster an evocation of the intra and extraphysical consciousnesses involved (not always the most lucid and intrusionfree ones).

By handling these documents a rapport is made (even if unconsciously) with the intra and extraphysical consciousnesses linked to the people, institutions, and departments. This evocation attracts both intruders and helpers involved with that group. With lucidity it is possible to take advantage of this interaction to make assistance and deintrude the consciousnesses involved, and consequently also the work, in order to produce the assistantial and cosmoethical results expected.

The interaction with these consciousnesses will more or less depend professional's health. Inclusion in Penta is an efficacious technique for the effectiveness of Paralaw.

The Law works with issues from the past and this requires attention and lucidity from lawyers-paralawyers, always working with balanced energies in order for a team of helpers to be engaged.

Giving more pragmatism to projections (a projectiological-paralawlogical public utility), the professional in this area becomes increasingly motivated to master the out-of-body experience and acquire more extraphysical lucidity, as well as improving the understanding of parapsychic phenomena experienced in carrying out the advocacy-paradvocacy work.

As a result of these experimentations, 14 phenomena correlated with Paralaw's work are highlighted below. Paralaw is identified with a consciential qualification through which the legal professional improves their job performance:

01. Precognitive projection: this favors serenity in the face of adversity, an increase of lucidity to find the appropriate solution to the problems (which have already been oriented by the team of extraphysical helpers), and firmness in decisions due to having foreseen the events extraphysically.
02. Projective *déjà vu*: recognizing intraphysical places, people and situations due to having previously experienced them. This allows better rapport with everyone and intrusionfreeness.
03. Travelling clairvoyance: vision of remote locations to be visited via the paraperception of characteristics of the individual and group holothosenes, favoring the subsequent interaction.

04. Telepathy: mental communication with colleagues, employees of public and private agencies with whom the work requires contact, besides communication with helpers on the directives to be followed.
05. Intuition: obtaining information about the best solution according to the cosmoethical principle which seeks "the best for everyone".
06. Psychography: auric coupling with extraphysical teams, interacting in the writing of legal papers aiming at the prevention and avoidance of conflicts that may arise.
07. Psychometry: capturing, detailing and discrimination of peoples' holothosenes in reading of official documents, doctrine, jurisprudence. This psychometry favors the most intrusionfree choice to be taken.
08. Retrocognition: remembrance of information from the intermissive course, recognition of people from other lives and colleagues from the intermissive course who volunteer together.
09. Intentional energetic assimilation: the decoding of the thosenes of other consciousnesses in order to optimize assistance by seeking to help the other in their self-discernment, increase their lucidity and improve the personal and professional manifestation.
10. Autoscopy: fostering of self-diagnosis by identifying aspects of the soma to be treated for prevention of the disease, using for this both the intensification of bioenergetic work, routine checkups, healthy eating, respect for the number of hours of sleep and other resources that will help in the continuity of the work with the extraphysical team.
11. False arrival: intensification of the ability to perceive beforehand the approach of intra and extraphysical consciousnesses, including information about the subject being treated, such as problems to be resolved and potential solutions.
12. Clairaudience: recognition of a functional helper`s voice and the necessity to change strategy every time the phenomenon happens.
13. Joint projection: thosenic alignment triggered by the work and mental saturation with certain subjects, questionings and searches for solutions, repercussions from joint projections with intra and extraphysical collaborators, as well as remembrances of the work continued during the projection, bringing the best solutions and also intrusionfreeness fostered by the team itself.
14. Panoramic view: the personal record of events facilitates the panoramic retrospective of the current existence, permitting that the aspects to be improved are seen to aim at the qualification of the work. This access to holomemory, in the process of paralawlogical parapedagogy, triggered together with the helpers, makes intimate recycling happen sooner, assisting in the detachment of unnecessary intimate aspects – linked to the millenary ego defense mechanisms – which, ultimately, will trigger an improvement in the teamwork.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In this paper, thoughts on Natural Law and Paralaw were developed based on the consciential paradigm, specifically the principle of disbelief and the use of parapsychic abilities, models of theactical scientific production of Conscientiology.

From this standpoint, the aim was to compare Paralaw to concepts present in the Natural Law, regardless of the historical line it was linked to.

In this work aspects that strengthen the idea that Paralaw is a *new leading edge relative truth* applied by curious intermissivists interested in changing the prevalent direction of legal science today, which is a result of millennia of Law history tied to religiosity, to Canon law and to positivism. All these obfuscate the opportunity to access a broader Law, one cosmic and accessible through positive, straight thosenity.

While the illusory self-reliance of written Law and the arrogance of the thinkers of Law remains, the overcoming of unjust law, unable to meet the conflicts inherent in our multidimensional living, will be distant, and a lucid professional of this multimillennial, multidimensional and multiexistential reality will be lacking.

This posture of total independence of legal science transpires in their inability to solve consciousnesses' inherent problems.

Attempting to overcome this shortcoming, principiological Natural Law aims to be recuperated as it is considered timeless, absolute, fixed, and with content capable of meeting cultural contingencies, since its variability expresses that of values linked to life.

Another failed attempt for a possible return of Natural law lies in its recognition through constitutional principles, consequently, characterizing it as a positive law.

A *paralawlogist* jurist values and seeks to expand self-perception about their profession based on self-experimentation of the consciential paradigm focused on the application of self-abnegation, on the achievement of self-sacrifice in favor of all, on the practical understanding of the principle that may what happens be the best for all and not only the best for me (VIEIRA, 2005). Such a professional substitutes concern about their performance with an interest in defending the universal good proposed by Paralaw.

An intermissivist jurist, committed to Paralaw, needs to reinforce their commitment by assuming lucid self-conscientiality in order to act for the concretization of Paralaw in the area and to substitute logical fallacies about the resumption of Natural Law which are now reemerging.

REFERENCES

AMARAL, Luiz Otavio de Oliveira. *Teoria Geral do Direito*. Rio de Janeiro: Forense, 2004.

BACHELARD, Gaston. *O novo espírito científico*. Trad. Juvenal Hahne Júnior. 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo brasileiro, 2000.

_____. A formação do espírito científico: *contribuição para uma psicanálise do conhecimento*. Trad. Estela dos Santos Abreu. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto, 1996.

BOURDIEU, PIERRE. *A reprodução*. Trad. Reynaldo Bairão. 2 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves, 1982.

BITTAR, Eduardo C.B; ALMEIDA, Guilherme Assis . *Curso de filosofia do Direito*. São Paulo: Atlas, 2002.

BOBBIO, Norberto. *El problema del positivismo jurídico*. México: BEFDP, 1999.

_____. *Locke e o direito natural.* 2a ed. trad. Sérgio Bath. Brasílias: Editora UNB, 1997.

DWORKIN, Ronald. *A matter of principle.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985.

FALAVIGNA, Maria Clara Osuna Diaz. *Os princípios gerais do Direito e os standars jurídicos no Código Civil.* Tese de doutorado. Programa de pós-graduação em Direito. São Paulo: USP, 2008.

FARELL, Martín D. In: *Doxa.* V. 22, n. 2, 1998.

FULLER, Lon. *The morality of law*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

GROSSI, Paolo. *Mitologias Jurídicas da Modernidade*. Florianópolis: Fundação Boiteux, 2004.

GUSMÃO, Paulo Dourado. *Introdução ao Estudo do Direito.* 34. Ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense, 2004.

JUNIOR, Goffredo Telles. *Iniciação na Ciência do Direito*. São Paulo: Saraiva, 2001.

KANT, Immanuel. *A paz perpétua e outros opúsculos*. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1995.

_____. *Crítica da razão prática,* trad. Rodolfo Schaefer. São Paulo: Martin Claret, 2005.

KELSEN, Hans. *Teoria pura do Direito*. Coimbra: Armênio Amado, 1979.

_____. *A justiça e o direito natural,* trad. João Baptista Machado. Coimbra: Armenio Amado, 1963.

KUHN, Thomas S. *A estrutura das revoluções científicas*. Trad. Beatriz Vianna Boeira e Nelson Boeira. 8. ed. rev. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2003.

LOPES, José Reinaldo de Lima. *O direito na história*. 2ª ed. São Paulo: Max Limonad, 2002.

MAIA, Antonio Cavalcanti et alii. *Perspectivas atuais da Filosofia do Direito.* Rio de Janeiro: Lumen Juris, 2005.

NINO, Carlos Santiago. *Introducción al análisis del derecho.* Barcelona: Ariel Derecho, 1999.

PLATÃO – *Críton*. Clássicos gregos e latinos. Trad. Manuel de Oliveira Pulquério. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1997.

_____ - *O banquete*. Os pensadores. Trad. José Cavalcante de Souza et alli. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 1991.

PERELMAN, Chaïm. *Ética e Direito.* São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1996.

REALE, Miguel. *Lições preliminares de Direito*.São Paulo: Saraiva, 1998.

_____. *Filosofia do direito*. São Paulo: Saraiva, 1965).

ROCHA, Adriana de Lacerda. *A legal outlook on Cosmoethics.* Journal of Conscientiology. v. 2. n.6. outubro 1999. pp. 101-111.

_____. O professor reflexivo e o professor de Direito: *uma pesquisa de caráter etnográfico*. Curitiba: Editora CRV, 2012.

_____. Trabalho voluntário: *instrumento de aprimoramento pessoal*. Anais da III Jornada de Autopesquisa Conscienciológica. Foz do Iguaçu: IIPC, 2004.

RODRIGUES, Francisco Hudson Pereira. *Direito natural X Direito positivo.* Monografia. Curso de especialização em administração judiciária. Fortaleza: Universidade Estadual do Vale do Acaraú, 2007.

ROSS, Adolf. *Direito e justiça.* São Paulo: Edipro, 2000.

STRECK, Lenio Luiz. *Hermenêutica jurídica e(m) crise.* Porto Alegre: Livraria do Advogado, 2003.

VIEIRA, Waldo. Verbete: *Paralaw*. Enciclopédia da Conscienciologia. Foz do Iguaçu: Editares, 2010.

_____. Verbete: *Princípio da Descrença*. Enciclopédia da Conscienciologia. Foz do Iguaçu: Editares, 2011.

_____. Verbete: *Descrenciologia*. Enciclopédia da Conscienciologia. Foz do Iguaçu: Editares, 2011.

_____. Entrevista. Paradireito: *megalei cósmica*. Jornal do Campus CEAEC. Ano 10. n. 119. Foz do Iguaçu. Junho, 2005.

_____. *700 Experimentos da Conscienciologia*. Rio de Janeiro: IIPC, 1996.

_____. *Manual dos megapensenes rivocabulares*. Foz do Iguaçu: Editares, 2009.

_____. Verbete: A*utodesassedialidade*. Enciclopédia da Conscienciologia. Foz do Iguaçu: Editares, 2011.

VILLEY, Michel. *Filosofia do Direito – definições e fins do Direito. Os meios do Direito*. Trad. AGUIAR, Márcia Valéria Martinez.

Adriana Rocha is a post-doctorate student in Law in the Federal University of Santa Catarina – UFSC and has a PhD in Law, State and Society by the same institution. Researcher and teacher of Conscientiology since 1996. Pro bono consultant for the International Organization of Conscientiotherapy – OIC. Member of the National Council of Research and Graduation in Law – CONPEDI and of the Brazilian Association of Law Teaching – ABEDI. Scientific consultant ad hoc for the University of the North of Paraná – UNOPAR. Ad hoc referee of the Journal Emerging Rights in Global Society – REDESG/UFSM. Counsellor of the International Council of Juridical Assistance to Conscientiology – CIAJUC/UNICIN. Author of entries for the Encyclopaedia of Conscientiology. Author of the books The reflective teacher and the Law teacher: a research of ethnographic carachter and Municipal legislative autonomy in the Brazilian and the foreigner Law. Organizer of the book Annotated constitution of the state of Rio de Janeiro. Researcher of the Invisible College of Paralawlogy and of the Invisible College of Cosmoethicology. E-mail: adriana.rocha@kiwiocas.net

Translation: Mário Luiz de Sá.
Revision: Alexandre Zaslavsky and Jeffrey Lloyd.