INTER-CONSCIENTIAL ETHICAL CHALLENGES AND COSMOETHICS

Leuzene Salgues

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this article is to raise reflections on the implicit, subjective content in the comprehension of ethics or the lack thereof, expressed both in interpersonal relations and in relations between societies, creating coexistential difficulties in the world. It also proposes a dialog between the different conceptions of ethics and the concept of Cosmoethics, bringing the possibility of elaborating one's Personal Code of Cosmoethics (PCC) and applying the Evolutive Intelligence (EI) in interassistantial strategies as key factors to improve the planetary holothosene.
Key-words: Cosmoethics; Ethics; Interassistance.

I. INTRODUCTION

Acceleration. One of this article's starting reflections concerns the world's present condition, where scientific progress and technological acceleration, originated from man's dominion and control over nature, have promoted direct, intentional impacts on humanity and things, mainly in the last centuries.

Threat. Despite the intense technical-scientific transformations of the present time, with huge progress in the field of specializations, large ecological unbalances need urgent remediation, considering this limit situation: either life extinction or life continuity in the planet.

Helplessness. The 20th century was exceedingly confident in technology, which despite fulfilling humanity's past needs, has shown to be helpless in face of the several accidents caused by sophisticated instruments, demonstrating the fragilities, not the supremacy of technological advancements.

Creativity. There is a lack of discernment in the use of creativity to develop terror instruments and lethal weapons able to damage any form of life in our planet.

Risks. Those creations show that despite the benefits and quality of life provided by the advancement of science, there is no absolute triumph of rationality before the world's uncertainties and the extermination risks against any life manifestation on Earth.

Anti-life. There is also a culture of power struggle and competition – an anti-life culture permeating all instances of the social life, even individuals' leisure times, reproducing the competitive model in millions of war and combat toys and games, with endless championships contaminating children, teen-agers, even adults.

Unawareness. The fragmented, unarticulated view, lacking any cosmovision, has troubled the perception of general, planetary-scale problems, weakening the responsibility for individual and collective acts, as well as solidarity toward other people's difficulties.

Time. One of the afflictions human beings face in the contemporary world is their relation with time, managing minutes to accomplish wishes, dreams, obligations, and needs. Minutes, hours, days, years pass, and time is spent between choices made and what remained unaccomplished by simple lack of time and/or prioritization.

Fugacity. The fugacious prevails, meaning *the impermanence of things* through the swiftness both of production and consumption of superfluous products, fast food, imperatives of market laws; also with the prevalence, unfortunately, of superficial and fugacious relationships, with a continuously decreasing intolerance in face of any difficulty (CHAUÍ, 1992, p. 347).

Immediateness. Telecommunications and electronics provide lives to be lived like the ever-late, despairing Alice's Rabbit[1], as time is a synonym of speed. The same happens whenever we experiment virtual spaces, pressing buttons for immediate satisfaction, whether to check bank balances or to terminate some virtual relationship.

Ruptures. There is also an imperative movement in the world calling for social, economic, politic and cultural changes that demands ruptures with exhausted or stagnated models, making eventual transformations possible in all knowledge areas.

Mistake. Doubtless, science has greatly contributed to enlarge our knowledge about things, elucidating issues put by the humanity about themselves and the world. Nonetheless, fragments from the past, when man fought to survive, have originated the predating culture over the planet's ecosystem, misinterpreted as limitless property.

Prioritization. We watch the emergence of a *new time* (SERRES, 2003), when research results, resources from biotechnologies, and top technological instruments can be used to benefit mankind, minimizing starvation and the suffering of many people. This is not so because man prioritizes profit and power.

Living. This way of being and existing in the world, and the incapacity of assisting the human indetermination, keep unanswered a big question: *how to live, both individually and collectively?* (PUIG, 2007, p. 70-1). By seeking to answer that question, one learns how to live and, despite uncertainties, the answers are directed towards the protection of life itself.

Free-will. No person is born with a predetermined life and, much less, ready as a person. With social, cultural, contextual opportunities, each one

---

1 Lewis Carrol's book, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland,* first published in 1865 and translated today into more than 50 languages.

knows, learns and makes co-existential choices. We can decide entering, remaining or leaving some collective-norms systems and exerting our free-will to either use or refuse their operative dispositions (GIANOTTI, 1992, p. 241).

Change. Rejection or permanence of some system (systemized collective norms) entail the choice to offend, or not, the rules and be sanctioned for it. However, refusing and escaping a normative system generally mean entering and involving oneself with another system because of transgression and abandonment of the former *(loc. cit.).*

Participation. Peaceful permanence in a normative system occurs by the collective acknowledgment of each individual's participatory capacity. Everyone can be fully oneself and see oneself as *someone worthy for themselves, regardless of their social-agent face* (GIANOTTI, 1992, p. 242), allowing mutually respectful relationships, requiring preparation and improvement of one's capacity to act socially.

Purpose. In such a context, what is intended with the present paper, is to raise reflections about the subjective content, implicit in the understanding of ethics or lack thereof, expressed in interpersonal relationships and between societies, generating the world's co-existential difficulties.

Cosmoethics. The presented ideas also propose experiencing Cosmoethics as a verification possibility about the insufficiency of conventional, materialistic, scientific paradigm in the discussion of today's ethical dilemmas before the complexities of the evolving consciousness.

Organization. The present article initially presents the concepts of ethics and Cosmoethics; ethical and cosmoethical challenges in the relations between individuals, between individuals and the environment, between nations, societies and cultures are discussed next; it concludes that the cosmoethical example is an achievable, interassistantial goal.

II. ETHICS AND COSMOETHICS

Anti-ethics. Today (2016) information can be obtained, with all technological sophistication, about the part of humanity that die of starvation or because of wars. At the same time, there are countries with plenty resources, increasingly investing in weapons to destroy other nations, in defense of the interests of those same nations. When we think about humanity and their planetary condition, a lack of cosmovision and solidarity is observed among the peoples, besides the anti-ethical destruction of other people and of the environment.

Definition. Ethics is the part of the philosophical studies that investigates personal and social principles, able to motivate, discipline or orient human behavior, reflected in values, norms, prescriptions or set of moral precepts from some social group or intraphysical society (VIEIRA, 2003, p. 1018).

Exclusion. Ethics, an old theme, is strongly emerging, and catching the attention of different areas of knowledge. Consulting a *browsing site*[2] about academic works referring to ethics, around 1,560,000 references were found, among citations, books, papers, monographs, dissertations and theses. The Web consultation brought up several themes from the publications, like the following 25, exposed in alphabetical order:

- *Ethics* and bioethics
- Business *ethics*
- *Ethics* and citizenship
- *Ethics* code
- *Ethics* and deontology
- *Ethics* and education
- *Ethics* and environment
- *Ethics* and management
- Medical *ethics*
- *Ethics* and moral
- *Ethics* and organizations
- *Ethics* and philosophy
- *Ethics* and physical education
- *Ethics* and politics
- Professional *ethics*
- Public *ethics*
- *Ethics* and relationships
- *Ethics* and social responsibility
- *Ethics* and society
- *Ethics* and work relations

Historicity. The concept of ethics evolved along history, determined by customs, laws and moral values from several epochs, whose milestones are here presented in chronological order (FRANKENA, 1975; VALLS, 2004; SANTOS, 2012):

1. **Ancient times.** In Greek civilization, the cradle of ethical reflections, the public character is stressed, along with issues on values, politics, and social organization. *Polis* was the place where men practiced citizenship, discussing the public thing and the common good. The thoughts of Socrates (469–399 B.P.), Plato (427–347 B.P.) and Aristotle (384–322 B.P.) stood out. The bottom-line lays in the man that uses their knowledge in the practical and theoretical quest for the idea of social well-fare and happiness based on orderly lives of the society's members.

2. **Middle Age.** In medieval times, because of the Church's power, ethical reflections were linked to inner, private virtues, good intentions and efforts

---

2 Google, a multinational American on-line services corporation, founded in 1998, last access in 8/28/2016.

to reach out the good in order to get nearer to God. This change of finality splits ethics and politics. Ethics, resulting from rational free-will, appears as obedience to divine laws. It stands out the ideas of Augustin (354–430) and Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274), claiming that happiness was only possible when the individual meets God. Men were to know, love and serve God.

3. **Renaissance.** Between the 15th and the 18th century, humanism returns. With the appearance of the bourgeoisie and the transition from feudalism to capitalism, a philosophic and artistic European movement starts, the Renaissance, a product from rediscovery and revalorization of references from classic ancient times. Great works of Machiavelli (1469–1527), Spinoza (1632–1677), Rousseau (1712–1778), and Kant (1724–1804), are published, among others. Ethics evolves, comprehending any rational being, applicable to all human beings. It focuses on the individual's moral autonomy, who seeks to act according to their natural reason. The autonomous, rational man lives according to their personal liberty and acts according to reason.

4. **Contemporary times.** Rationalist thought marked the 19th century, along with technological advancements and evolution of science, industrialization, with the exaltation of immediate, material values. Stand out in this period thinkers like Hegel (1770–1831), Marx (1818–1883), and Nietzsche (1844–1900). In the 20th century, with the contribution of several authors, along with the *Frankfurt School* (a social research institute founded in the 1920's), philosophic materialism expands, reconfiguring Marxism with the addition of elements as culture (Gramsci, 1891–1937), sexuality (Marcuse, 1898–1979, and Freud, 1856–1939), sustainability (Habermas, 1929–), consumerism and modern passivity (Adorno, 1903–1969), among others.

Integration. Contemporary ethics, with its various exponents, incorporates old principles and go beyond traditional certitudes, thus integrating past acquisitions, without which today's conceptions would be inconsistent; but "… We enter a period where the science of liberty is required as control of control and power over power. Contemporary ethic thought confounds itself with that wisdom demand" (RUSS, 2006, p. 172).

Experience. The study of ethics means more than just say what is right and wrong with our way of living; as theory and practice, it is about assessing human experience, seeking to explain or understand it within some reality, thus avoiding to reduce ethics into something with a mere normative or pragmatic character.

Perspective. For Singer (2002, p.24-28), ethics is a perspective based on reason applied to ethical decisions; it is thus more than actions motivated by someone's personal interests. It does not justify itself as a personal principle corresponding to any local group; thence the universal viewpoint adopted in technical judgments, demanding abstraction efforts regarding the "I" and the "you" to reach the viewpoint of an impartial spectator.

Specificities. Any reductionism can prevent us to see that everyone carries their origin and background along, expressed in their way of seeing, existing and being in the world, with attitudes originated from different understandings, different ways of receiving messages emanated from the supposed reality.

Limitation. Many of today's ethical issues (2016), like euthanasia, wealth and poorness, ends and means, refugees, bioethical limits, abortion, genocide, violence, terrorism, war, ecology, religion, suffer with the limitation of the materialist paradigm, which does not satisfy subtleties of Earth planet's humanity's and para-humanity's evolutionary, dynamic, multidimensional process.

Paradigm. We know, think, feel and act according to the paradigms culturally inscribed in us. This happens because the paradigm, even unconsciously, feeds and controls the way of thinking about things and reality, eventually dissociating and separating, or installing a cosmovision about all things in the Universe, that is, a *paradigm that can at the same time elucidate and blind, reveal and hide* (MORIN, 2000, p. 27).

Absence. Conventional, materialistic science restricts ethics assessments, hiding more than revealing or elucidating the great contemporary ethical dilemmas, showing itself unsatisfactory before the consciousness' complexity. Deepening those issues neither is instinctual, automatic, nor, rigorously, what would be considered a 'normal' activity in our society. It demands from us reflection and dialog towards the understanding of the relativity of social ethics kinds, and absence of a *cosmoethics* in the world.

> *Cosmoethics* is the area of conscientiology that studies multidimensional ethics, or the cosmic moral that defines consciential holomaturity. Cosmoethics goes beyond the social, intraphysical moral or that which is presented under human labels. It arises from the intimacy of one's consciential microuniverse as maximum, moral and emotional discernment (VIEIRA, 1998, p. 61).

Unit. Cosmoethics' measurement unit is *incorruptibility*.

Leading-theory. The Consciential Paradigm is the leading-theory that studies the consciousness in an integral, wide manner in order to provide a cosmovision about its manifestation vehicles, dimensions and ambiances where it can manifest, and the interactions that are possible with consciousnesses from different evolutionary levels.

Bases. The comprehensive assessment of the consciousness under the conscientiological approach requires a specific, pro-evolutionary methodology, founded on 7 constitutive bases of the consciential paradigm:

1. **Self-experimentation.** The consciential paradigm makes possible to the interested consciousness to be, at the same time, researcher and study object, making the very consciousness responsible for self-verification of its own anti-cosmoethical postures still manifested, mainly the subtler ones, like thinking poorly about oneself or others;

2. **Bioenergetics.** The bioenergetical approach makes possible to study living beings' different energy kinds (people's, animals', plants'), as well as to distinguish the influences of energies and assess the effects of anti-cosmoethical thoughts (nosological pool of thoughts, sentiments, and energies) over persons, environment, and societies;

3. **Cosmoethics.** The understanding of Cosmoethics as cosmic moral, on behalf of all consciousnesses, makes possible to verify the limitations of intraphysical conceptions about ethics so far;

4. **Holosomatics.** Considers the existence of 4 consciential manifestation's vehicles that can, through cosmoethic self-experimentation, be used and improved regarding their functioning mode. They compose the holosoma, a set of integrated bodies: soma (biological body), energosoma (energy body), psychosoma (emotional body) and mentalsoma (mental body);

5. **Multidimensionality.** The conscious projection experience, or out-of-body experience, makes possible to the consciousness to manifest itself in dimensions beyond the physical dimension, becoming aware of intraphysical life's restrictions, and to check the existence of sound, evolved extraphysical ambiances, where the leading-edge relative truths discussed are far more comprehensive and deeper than all that has been discussed in the planet – about ethics or any other theme;

6. **Multiexistentiality.** Consciential paradigm admits the continuity of the consciousness after death and the reality of its successive lives. Cosmoethics helps in the understanding of karmic law, of cause and effect, action and reaction, positive or negative, resulting from mature or immature postures along the existential series;

7. **Universalism.** According to Vieira (2003, p. 836), proposer of the consciential paradigm, universalism is "the set of principles, in a cosmoethical sense, derived from the basic laws of the universe, opposed to the individualism of the person submitted to some community, be it State, people, nation, planetary humanity or any egotistic trench taken as the navel of the Cosmos, of the intraphysical consciousness capable of treating men, women and peoples equally".

Thosene. The consciousness manifestation unit is the thosene, **tho**ughts, **sen**timents and **ene**rgies, 3 non-dissociable elements. The energies of one consciousness are impregnated with information about what that consciousness thinks and feels.

Holothosene. The consolidated set of consciential energies (CEs) permeated by thoughts and sentiments forms the holothosene of some ambiance. The essential characteristic of any holothosene is the aggregation and accumulation of thosenes, which can be sound, positive, or nosologic, pathologic. There are personal, group, environment, local and epoch holothosenes.

Challenges. In face of the ideas so far exposed, the following reflection is worthwhile: can the consciential paradigm contribute to minimize co-existence

difficulties between persons, nations and environment? What outcomes can be expected from ethics assessments after this new paradigm?

III. DIALOG BETWEEN ETHICAL AND COSMOETHICAL CHALLENGES

Rejection. In confrontations, whether intra or intercultural, the ethics of those who innovates will be rejected because there is a mismatch between the innovator's behaviors and the expectancies of the collectivity. This is the impact that the change of someone's or some group's values generates, thus leading to new social practices.

Plurality. In the multicultural ambit, according to Demo (2005, p. 17), one cannot talk about a unique ethic, since ethics is plural, although sharing aspects that are common to every human co-existence. This conception contributes to understand, not only to describe human behavior in its social and historic process. For this very reason, no judgment is made about the value of the practices of some societies or of different times in the name of some absolutistic or universalistic ethics. It is the exercise to look for the understanding of plurality and transformations in different, even opposite social practices.

Clarification task. Under the consciential approach, both diversity and cosmoethical level of each society and culture are respected. However, a universalistic, fraternal, wide and cosmoethical discernment is used in the clarification task whenever possible, thus contributing for a more comprehensive understanding of facts, concepts, attitudes, and anti-cosmoethical proceedings.

Amplification. The informed intraphysical consciousness can consider the cutting-edge relative truths a hypothesis, looking for self-experimentations to verify the truthfulness of the multidimensional reality. Possibly, after crossing across that condition, the intraphysical consciousness will be able to renovate their personal values and develop cosmovision about several evolutionary aspects, amplifying in a natural way the conventional paradigm's limits.

Marginality. The ethical dimension proceeds along an "understanding" line, that is to say, the discussion between dogmatisms and relativisms orienting the persons' acts. Each society creates social and cultural apparatuses conditioning the understanding of their members. However, the individual can present behaviors of *consideration* or *negation* of social rules, of the conduct expected from everyone. Those that do not reach the *understanding line,* affronting social imperatives, succumb to marginality, walking around the margin of behaviors that are considered normal (GHIGGI, 2003, p. 93).

Counterflow. The cosmoethical dimension proceeds through Universalism towards evolution, allowing all consciousnesses to transgress antievolutionary social-cultural apparatuses, on the counterflow of any social imperative that is anticosmoethic without needing to remain marginal. On the contrary, evolutionary autonomy is reached, towards higher levels of discernment.

Transcendence. One of those behaviors allowing one to remain on the understanding line is a product of the expectation of the transcendence experience, a promise of the religious kind making someone's action undergo choices and decisions of transcendental origin. Only the person can open themselves to transcendence, following their personal beliefs. Therefore, it is not possible to force anyone to be ethic following some transcendent call. (ZANOTELLI, 2003, p. 122–124).

Justification. Religious transcendence invites man and stimulates them towards a self-justified ethics, bringing them to even discard the soma (to desomate, die), which is the case of the kamikazes and *bomb-people,* looking for acknowledgement by peers by saying no to the societies that do not understand their transcendental motives.

Honor. Another immature aspect, *honor ethics,* ennobles one's egotism (MORIN, 2005, p. 99). Its bottom-line is the defense of the image someone wants to preserve, like the Japanese general who in the Second World War has committed harakiri, an honor suicide, after his defeat.

Homicide. By the conscientiological approach, this destructive, insane force, causing both intentional suicide and intentional homicide, evidences the suicidal person's pathological intensity of ideas, thoughts, sentiments and energies.

Intercommunication. The needs system of an individual is open, complex and unique. Sharing those open systems strengthens social coexistence. They allow criticism about what is put as an individual or collective necessity.

Necessities. Not all necessities are ethical. The human being may have either cosmoethical or anticosmoethical necessities, for man or other beings, like the necessity of somehow oppress someone or help others as in a fire.

Solidarity. It is possible to build up a new coherence in the world that incorporates human values to be understood and shared, a coherence that considers as well the advancement of science, bringing a political message of human solidarity and respect for nature.

Government. Peter Singer, a contemporary philosopher, denounces in the globalization the wealthy nations' mistake for not assuming any global ethical viewpoint, considering the necessity brought by the 20th century of thinking on an appropriated government form for the world. "It is a moral and intellectual challenge, with monumental proportions, but we must accept it. The world's future depends on our efficacy to face it" (SINGER, 2004, p. 257).

Convergence. The planet demands such coherence from its inhabitants, looking for the convergence of all nations in a democratic, pacific, universal, consensual government system, overcoming warlike immaturity: The Cosmoethic World State. (PEREIRA, 2013, p. 141).

> The conception of a World State is a universalistic policy of cooperation, interchange, and integration between the nations, an achievement that the technological advancements make possible, where the consensus or the gradual homogenization of the laws and rules of

that regime, respecting the individual rights or the cultural rights of some population (VIEIRA, 2003, p. 838).

Limits. Social dramas like Chernobyl's (a nuclear-plant accident - 1986) and AIDS, illustrate very well the technical-scientifical power limits affecting humanity. *It is evident that a rather collective responsibility and management are mandatory to orient sciences and techniques in more humane finalities* (GUATTARI, 1997, p. 24).

Coexistence. Even if it is hard to believe that the several movements dispersed in the world could build up a new society, it is possible to think and act at the personal ambit, evaluating the effects of our actions on the people we live with, on the environment, and on society as a whole, creating *new forms of coexistence and social organization, based on solidary responsibility* (SUNG & SILVA, 2004, p. 113-116).

Transversality. After what has happened in the last decades, more than in any other moment in history, one can no longer think inarticulately, separating the planet from the cosmos, the country from the planet, us from the others, us from nature, nurture from culture, and so onwards, keeping a restricted, partial view about things. It is necessary to learn to think in a transversal way, articulating different eyes and knowledge kinds, about oneself and the world.

Citizenship. This orientation leads not only to knowledge, but to awareness of the condition of all human beings, in their *rich and necessary diversity* (Morin, 2000, p. 61) (as individuals, peoples, cultures), thus developing a feeling of mutual belonging, making us Earth citizens, or, still better, citizens of the Cosmos.

Estrangement. Each of us can rebel against, disagree with the values of things around us, live *the estrangement experience* when facing reality, feeling oneself outside 'normality' before society functioning mode or someone's behavior.

Indignation. Whenever that existential experience happens in opposition to some unfair or inhuman situation, it is called 'ethical indignation'; when in accordance to it, as the situation denies the other, the indignation is called anti-ethic. *It is the insight of the difference between what is and what should be: the fundamental ethical experience* (Sung & Silva, 2004, p. 14).

Self-corruption. A cosmoethic, useful coherence is indispensable. It is the only quality able to dynamize the evolution of the consciousness. However, the consciousness could succumb before self-corruptions, acting anti-cosmoethically, seeking to defend incoherence, promiscuity, anarchy, entropy, and so many other gross immaturities.

> *Anti-cosmoethics* is the immature procedure in which the consciousness transgresses, whether consciously or unconsciously, the evolutionary, correct and universal principles of multidimensional Cosmoethics, acting in a base, anti-fraternal, marginal or criminal way, with intentional, pathological effects. (VIEIRA, 2003, p. 1036).

Prioritization. Cosmoethics is developed out of the necessity of intra-consciential renovation (intraconsciential recycling), when the consciousness deepens its self-criticism about its multidimensional manifestations, thus identifying immature personal traits, egocentric postures, evolutionary hindrances, among other aspects that difficult consciential evolution.

Recycling. Intraconsciential recycling means cerebral renovation of the intraphysical consciousness, who undoes old ways of thinking through the constitutions of synapses or inter-neural connections. Intraconsciential recycling prepares the intraphysical consciousness to existential recycling, keeping positive aspects and reorienting life by breaking with old patterns of personal conduct, even those considered ethic in some culture or society.

Exemplariness. With the intraconsciential recycling consolidated, supported by self-research, the consciousness starts recycling the once deep-rooted immature behaviors, eventually awakening for inter-assistance and becoming a pro-evolutionary, cosmoethical example following a personal code of conduct in its multidimensional manifestations, minimizing conflicts and amplifying the discernment of everyone around.

Code. For Demo (2005, 34), *any co-existence, not only human and not only for the good, implies a code of conduct,* although not every code of conduct can be considered ethic if it is just an agreement for a fair co-existence between peers, like in the mobs, who have a co-existential code, *almost an ethics, followed in a canine way.*

CPC. In the consciential paradigm, the Cosmoethics Personal Code – CPC – is the spontaneous code, inside each consciousness, developed along the millennia in thousands of existences. CPC enables each consciousness to live together in harmony, with due respect to the rights and interests of the other consciousnesses, multidimensionally, within intraphysical and extraphysical societies. *Everyone shall have as a goal the general welfare.*

Self-analysis. The application of ethics selfward comprehends the recurrent practice of self-analysis, conceived as a watchful state, possible only through self-criticism, *consciential hygiene,* minimizing self-deception, lies to oneself, preventing egocentric illusions hindering the openness to the other. Ethical recurrence vaccinates against the tendency to inculpate others for our own mistakes. (MORIN, 2005, p. 95-96).

Self-research. In the consciential paradigm, the researcher is the study object itself, self-critically assessing the variables found in order to deepen the understanding about her or himself, thus proceeding the reeducation of thoughts and sentiments and developing sound, evolutionary postures, habits and routines.

Communication. In our inter-relations, even all communication means and communication techniques available do not guarantee the understanding of what one thinks and communicates, no matter how intelligible the communication can be, because the inter-subjective process goes beyond the objective, intellectual aspect, in other words, there are several variables that either approximate

or distance the perception and identification of our complex human condition in the other.

Validation. The validity claims concerning what is stated and the way it is stated are implicit in the communication process, that is, what is stated is right and the feeling that permeates it is sincere, because in the world we lay hands on three intertwined validity claims: truth, rightness and sincerity. (ROUANET, 1992, p. 158).

Closeness. Generally, each of us tends to consider our own way of thinking the right one, unaware that such closed posture feeds back the misunderstanding leading to conflict; consequently, misunderstanding raises.

Hypotheses. In that cosmoethical interlocution exercise, each interlocutor explains and justifies her own intentions and tries to understand the argumentative construction of the other, revisiting his starting intentions and exerting *radical suspension of the validity belief on what had been stated* (ROUANET, 1992, p. 158). Replacing beliefs by hypotheses, until a consensus is possible to corroborate or not what had been enunciated or justified.

Disbeliefology. One of the conscientiological principles, the *Principle of Disbelief* – PD, instigates the reader or interlocutor to not believe in anything that is being proposed and stated, keeping instead a posture of experimentation, reflection, criticism and analysis in order to check for oneself if there is logics in it, if it makes sense, if it can be validated. Therefore, there is no previous validation.

Argumentation. The intersubjective understanding and validity of what is being proposed happens through a consensus founded in argumentation, where all have the right to enunciate their speeches, either presenting or refuting arguments so that everyone can freely scrutinize the issue until a common denominator is reached.

Binomial. Co-existence demands the application of the admiration-disagreement binomial, posture of the consciousness mature about consciential evolution, who knows already how to live together in peace with some other consciousnesses that that consciousness admires, but without full agreement between them all the time regarding viewpoints, opinions and positions.

Cooperation. Dialog – and consensus – dynamics are permeated by a determinant value: cooperation, necessary because cooperating means *operate with, operate together*. Therefore, cooperation strategies in cooperative co-existence make apprenticeships possible.

Solidarity. Cooperation evolves through a solidarity ethics exerted by each of us who strives for collective life. Solidarity constitutes social life, and ethics is necessary to the cohesion of a complex society.

Relativity. Respect for someone else's uniqueness and, particularly, for human diversity, is one of the biggest challenges social life imposes us. Past efforts tried to found that gesture on *transcendental, logical or divine mechanisms* (DEMO, 2005), but today this is sought on a natural relativity inhering mankind's history.

Obstacles. There are many obstacles to the understanding of the other, of the sense of their ideas and words, worldview, especially when they are distant from the subjective references of those who wish to understand. Words' polysemy, multiplicity of interpretations, and ignorance about socio-cultural values lead to the misunderstanding of others' subjective, ethic principles.

Level. Each consciousness is in a specific evolutionary level and has therefore some cosmoethical level of manifestation. For the understanding to occur, with hindrances removal, it is necessary to know the other's multifaceted consciential background. *It is impossible to judge what we ignore.*

Effort. *It is the art of living that demands from us, in the first place, to understand in an uninterested way* (MORIN, 2000, p. 99). This means effort to understand others, since reciprocities may not happen, let alone acknowledgment. An example is the effort to understand a fanatic who threatens to kill us, even if we know that he or she is incapable to understand us. An effort to understand life particulars that lead someone to despise what we represent.

Evolution. Cosmoethics puts brotherhood before our judgments, considering that each consciousness is meant to evolve, sooner or later. The dynamization of this process depends on how much evolution is valued, without having to wait for errors and mistakes saturation, seeking to identify as soon as possible the stagnating, intimate hindrances.

Values. For Aguiar (2002, p. 46), *values have not come from nowhere,* they have been constructed along our lives and keep present in the way we cope with:

i) nature (water spare/waste, forests preservation/devastation, waste dumped in the world/undergoing selective collection, and so onward);

ii) in the inter-relationships (respect/exploration, listening the other /ignoring what is being said, admitting/negating, and so onward);

iii) self-relation (respecting own personal limits/exacerbated self-demand, self-commitment /self-neglect, and so onward).

Determinant. If internalization of socio-cultural values were determinant, we would have a society with values and behaviors homogeneity, which is very distant from the observable reality, both in the context of some society and in the planetary context.

Experiences. Values are built not only out of the projection of positive or negative sentiments someone has about things or people; in fact, they result from *complex life experiences* (ARAÚJO, p. 28-34), permeated by sentiments, reflections, and motivations.

Self-knowledge. For Vicenzi (2001), courage is needed to analyze the influence of established values in interacting contexts, along with the stereotyped social values. Only self-knowledge, according to the author, allows differentiating one's own values from those of the milieu one lives in.

Types. There are several types of values: those established by the milieu, cultural, learnt; the idealized values, those values one wishes to have; the actual, manifested ones, appearing in someone's behavior, a product of what is really val-

ued by the consciousness. All of them can be ethical or not. Those distinctions do not prevent values to become real, to be idealized and then learnt.

Evolutionary. For the evolution of the consciousness, what really matters are evolutionary values, propelling one's own evolution. These may be idealized, then actualized whenever there is an investment from the interested, composing the consciousness' manifestations in any dimension.

Collectivity. Evolutionary values neither prevent co-existence nor propose to live in isolation. All consciousnesses have material, affective and cognitive needs pushing them towards collectivity, since they cannot think, feel or produce all the things they need. Therefore, co-existential necessity becomes mandatory.

Understanding. The *understanding ethics* asks for the understanding of incomprehension, for argumentation and refutation instead of excommunication. It asks to avoid the irremediable condemn by the recognition of our potential for weaknesses and errors. It is an ethics comprehending and humanizing inter-relationships because it is the 'well-thinking', self-including mode of understanding the human behavior through critical, prophylactic self-scrutiny, avoiding the position of 'judge of all things' (MORIN, 2000, p. 99–100).

Uncertainty. It is impossible to be sure that good intentions will always generate good actions; the answer to that uncertainty lays both in the bet about what is uncertain and in the strategy permitting to correct action whenever it goes astray.

Disconnection. Non-intentional effects show that disconnection may happen between intention, action, and unexpected outcome; therefore, recognizing that possibility demonstrates the *necessity of not reducing ethics issues to people's intentions* (SUNG & SILVA, 2004, p. 20-21), understanding that there are inter-connected, complex mechanisms interfering both in our acts and in our life.

Intention. Intentionality demonstrates that the willing consciousness can define possible crossings for human destiny. But good intention alone is not enough: evolutionary choices demands discernment, and lucidity is only acquired with cosmovision. Intention is a thosene that can be either cosmoethic or anti-cosmoethic.

Intentionality. The understanding of someone else requires knowledge about the other's intraconsciential reality, which is not completely revealed in the co-existential opportunities. Intentionality qualification, focusing inter-assistance, associated to bioenergetical control, predisposes to parapsychic development, which is fundamental to access, in a cosmoethical way, someone other's intimacy and help them to evolve.

Clarification. Cosmoethics is more than thinking about incomprehension, possibility of co-existence, or cultural diversity. It implies reflection and pro-evolutionary multidimensional action from the very planet with its consciousnesses. Acting with thoughts, sentiments, and energies on behalf of the clarification task about the multidimensional reality and the necessary implications for the paradigmatic renovations leading to general maturation.

Intentionality. According to Vieira (2014, p. 1276), *put, whenever you can, clarifying assistance first, with your consciential energy, and cosmoethical intentionality will hold intact.*

IV. CONCLUDING ARGUMENTS

Universe. To conclude the reflections presented here, the universe of discussions is reduced to the closest ambit of each consciousness. It is the restricted, peculiar demonstrative of everyone's personal context to help understanding what happens in the wide, cosmic ambit.

Differences. Handling consciential differences, with possible conflicts and disagreements, is an everyday challenge, whether on the street, at work, in the school, at the university, in the family, among friends, neighbors, in the neighborhood, in the city, in the country, in the world. Overcoming that situation does not mean endeavor to appear calm in order to cover up disagreements.

Holothosene. Planet Earth has a holothosene, a set of thoughts, sentiments and energies produced by the whole humanity and para-humanity. The average holothosenic standard, from what has been thought and felt, gives away anti-ethic, egocentric postures. Only a minority have awake to mature postures of solidarity, ethics, and interests for the general well-fare.

Conflict. In order to deal with the conflicts around it, it is worthwhile the effort to minimize belligerence, inwardly first, intraconscientially, then in inter-relations. That will teach living imperturbably and fraternally, developing one's evolutionary intelligence in increasingly altruistic acts.

Karma. The law of cause and effect, action and reaction, is understood through cosmoethics. We are responsible for unavoidable reconciliations and apologies because of past conflicts tying interprisional karmic bonds. Our commitment and responsibility is to evolve here, now, immediately.

Inter-assistance. Before a so wide universe, with so many galaxies, the evolution opportunity in this evolutionary moment lays in planet Earth. Each consciousness here has the direct responsibility to become a better consciousness, qualifying their own energies and using them in the most cosmoethic way possible, in interassistantial actions.

Intermissivists. Whenever dialog is possible, there is the possibility of inter-assistance, clarifications, mutual teachings and amplification of reflection horizons. Nonetheless, even silently it is possible to emit the best thosenes (thoughts, sentiments, and energies) to someone. Intermissive courses provide the consciousnesses with accurate teachings needed for the development of inter-assistance on this planet.

Exemplariness. Self-efforts are thus worthwhile to develop cosmoethics, to qualify one's own temperament and inter-assistantial manifestations, becoming a mirror for other consciousnesses' evolutionary dynamics. Cosmoethical exemplariness from evolutionary travel mates can benefit individuals and groups.

Disbeliefology. Following the *Disbelief Principle,* it is important to register that nothing written here must be believed. May each interested consciousness research further about oneself. And have, with greater autonomy, their own holo-somatic and multidimensional experiences.

Questions. Have you, reader, ever thought ill about someone in this life? Do you consider the possibility of elaborating your own *Cosmoethics Personal Code?* Let be registered here the invitation thereto.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AGUIAR, José Romão Trigo de. **Considerações Éticas**. In: ZAUHY, Cristina; MARIOTTI, Humberto (ed.). Acolhimento: o pensar, o fazer, o viver. Associação Palas Athenas. São Paulo, Brasil, 2002.

ARAÚJO, Ulisses F. **A Construção Social e Psicológica dos Valores**. In: ARANTES, Valéria Amorim (ed.); Educação e Valores: pontos e contrapontos. Summus. São Paulo, Brasil, 2007.

CHAUÍ, Marilena. **Público, Privado, Despotismo.** In: NOVAES, Adauto (ed.). Ética. Companhia das Letras. São Paulo, Brasil, 1992, 10th pr.

DEMO, Pedro. **Éticas Multiculturais: sobre convivência humana possível**. Vozes. Petrópolis, Brasil, 2005.

FRANKENA, William. **Ética.** Zahar. Rio de Janeiro, Brasil, 1975.

GHIGGI, Gomercindo. **Ética, autoridade e Liberdade em Freire**. In: VECCHIA, Agostinho Dalla & ANDREOLA (ed.). Ética: Diversidade e Diálogo na Produção de Referências para a Educação. Seiva. Pelotas, Brasil, 2003.

GIANOTTI, José Arthur. **Moralidade Pública e Moralidade Privada**; In: NOVAES, Adauto (ed.). Ética. Companhia das Letras. São Paulo, Brasil, 1992, 10th pr.

GUATTARI, Félix. **As Três Ecologias**. Tr: Maria Cristina F. Bittencourt. Papirus. Campinas, Brasil, 1997, 6th ed.

MORIN, Edgar. **O Método 6. Ética**. Tr: Juremir Machado da Silva. Sulina. Porto Alegre, Brasil, 2005.

_____. **Os Sete Saberes necessários à Educação do Futuro**. Tr: Catarina Eleonora F. da Silva & Jeanne Sawaya. São Paulo: Cortez; Brasília, DF: UNESCO, 2000, 2th ed.

PEREIRA, Jayme. **Princípios do Estado Mundial Cosmoético**. EDITARES. Foz do Iguaçu, Brasil, 2013.

PUIG, Josep Maria. **Aprender a Viver**. In: ARANTES, Valéria Amorim (ed.); Educação e Valores: pontos e contrapontos. Summus. São Paulo, Brasil, 2007.

ROUANET, Sérgio Paulo. **Dilemas da Moral Iluminista**. In: NOVAES, Adauto (ed.). Ética. Companhia das Letras. São Paulo, Brasil, 1992, 10th pr.

RUSS, Jacqueline. **Pensamento Ético Contemporâneo.** Tr. Constança Marcondes Cesar. Paulus – Col. Filosofia em Questão. São Paulo, Brasil, 1999.

SANTOS, José Reus. **Apontamentos sobre a História da Ética.** Journal Géfyra. São Miguel do Iguaçu, Brasil, vol. 1, n. 2, jul./dec. 2012.

SERRES, Michel; **Hominescências: O Começo de uma Outra Humanidade?** Tr. Edgard de Assis Carvalho, Mariza Perassi Bosco. Bertrand Brasil. Rio de Janeiro, Brasil, 2003.

SINGER, Peter. **Um Só Mundo: A Ética da Globalização.** Tr.: Adail Ubirajara Sobral. Martins Fontes. São Paulo, Brasil, 2004.

SUNG, Jung Mo; SILVA, Josué Cândido da. **Conversando sobre Ética e Sociedade**. Vozes. Petrópolis, Brasil, 2004, 13th ed.

VALLS, Álvaro. **O Que É Ética**. Brasiliense. – Col. Primeiros Passos. São Paulo, Brasil, 2004.

VICENZI, Luciano. **Coragem para evoluir.** Instituto Internacional de Projeciologia e Conscienciologia. Rio de Janeiro, Brasil, 2001.

VIEIRA, Waldo. **Conscientiology Research Areas.** Quarterly. IIPC, jul. 1998, p. 61.

_____. *Homo sapiens reurbanisatus.* Associação Internacional do Centro de Altos Estudos da Conscienciologia. Foz do Iguaçu, Brasil, 2003.

_____. **Dicionário de Argumentos da Conscienciologia.** EDITARES. Foz do Iguaçu, Brasil, 2014.

ZANOTELLI, Jandir. Ética e Desenvolvimento. In: ANDREOLA, Balduino & VECHIA, Agostinho. (ed.). **Ética: Diversidade e Diálogo na Produção de Referências para a Educação**. Seiva. Pelotas, Brasil, 2003.

Leuzene Salgues is civil engineer (UFPE) and pedagogist (UFRN). Master and PhD in Education (UFRN). Volunteer of conscientiology since 1995; instructor in conscientology since 1996; author of papers and entry-writer for the Conscientiology Encyclopedia. She is presently a volunteer of Intercampi – International Association of the Conscientiology Research Campuses.