

# APPROXIMATIONS BETWEEN PHILOSOPHICAL ETHICS AND COSMOETHICS<sup>1</sup>

Alexandre Zaslavsky

*Approximation among people and concepts is the basis of interconsciential assistance in this dimension. (VIEIRA, 2003, p. 338)*

**Abstract:** This paper deals with the interparadigmatic field that is a result of the encounters between philosophical Ethics, within the conventional paradigm, and Cosmoethics, in the consciential paradigm. Universalism is the *transversal theme* which articulates the approximations. Isomorphism, the similarity of form, and isology, the similarity of meaning or content, are considered in the approximations, with emphasis on the latter. Three universalistic philosophical streams of Ethics are mentioned: Immanuel Kant and the categorical imperative; Lawrence Kohlberg and the scale of moral development; and Jürgen Habermas and communicative Ethics. Central characteristics of their universalistic thinking are compared with aspects of Cosmoethics, simultaneously highlighting the points of potential connection and the differences as well. The objective is to reflect about the evolutionary transition from philosophical ethics towards Cosmoethics, their continuities and discontinuities, aiming, ultimately, to better understand and deal with the arguments produced by both parts, while focusing on interassistentiality.

**Keywords:** Philosophical Ethics, Cosmoethics, universalism, approximations.

## INTRODUCTION

Cosmoethics is a specialty of Conscientiology studies. The accumulation of parapsychic experiences, for example lucid out-of-body experiences, gives rise to reflections about the practical rationality implicated in such experiences. The well known need to rationally justify actions, whether in the name of rightness, good, justice, etc., makes even more sense when the interrelationship between human beings or intraphysical consciousnesses (conscins), and also, above all, the interrelationship involving extraphysical consciousnesses (consciexes), is not at stake. The reality of consciexes changes the ethical scope being considered, because, for example, the avoidance of death is not a theme

---

<sup>1</sup> Expanded version of the article published in the Anais do Colégio Invisível da Cosmoeticologia 2002-2010 (2011).

relevant to them, when a little more lucid, as they know their physical body has been deactivated. From there begins the search for a wider set of principles, ones that allow reflection on and criticism of morals in the multiplicity of consensual dimensions, that is, the cosmos, and not only the intraphysical dimension. Hence the expression Cosmoethics or Cosmic Ethics.

Cosmoethics or Cosmoethicology studies make use of terminological and thematic appropriations from philosophical Ethics or the theory of morals. The definition of Cosmoethics itself makes this evident, being an extrapolation of the consensual definition of philosophical Ethics as reflection on and criticism of morals. Nevertheless, there is a notable theme that calls attention in the intersection between Ethics and Cosmoethics – Universalism. So this is the specific focus here.

In the first part, the concept as well as the difficulty in the approximation between conceptions and paradigms is presented. In the second part, relationships between aspects of Cosmoethics and the conception of Ethics are established, being articulated by the transversal theme of universalism, and based on the propositions of three authors, namely Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), Lawrence Kohlberg (1927-1987) and Jürgen Habermas (1929-).

## **1. INTERPARADIGMATIC APPROXIMATIONS: FROM ISOMORPHISM TOWARDS ISOLOGY**

The comparison of distinct theories, conceptions or paradigms always brings difficulties and tends to be deceptive. The main mistake in this activity is taking terminological similarity, or form (isomorphism), as denoting similarity of content (isology). Vugman (1999) already warned about difficulties regarding the use of the word ‘energy’ by Conscientiology, pointing out the inexistence of an analogy with Physics, the field of knowledge where the origin of the expression is found. This is a case of terminological sameness without any similarity in meaning. Yet Lima (n/d) seeks to identify similarities between the concepts of energy from Conscientiology, and those from contemporary Psychology and Physics. Considering, according to Kuhn (1992), that the connection of scientific theories with a disciplinary field of research and given groups and research traditions, it could be said that a concept or theory comes accompanied by an entire context, within which it has meaning. The area of knowledge which is occupied with interpretation according to the contexts is Hermeneutics, and it is this discipline that forms the referential background for this present work. The interrelationships between Ethics and Cosmoethics will be woven considering the encounters and misses of the paradigms they refer to.

The comparison of paradigms takes into account, in the first place, the similarities or resemblances. The similarities of form are the equal terms, used in distinct paradigms, this is called isomorphism. The term is only the form,

an external aspect. The similarities of content are the meanings or ideas shared by the paradigms, this is called isology. The content is what is within the form, what really matters, namely, the meaning attributed to these terms. In this sense, the similarity of content matters far more than the form in the search for affinities between paradigms.

Conscientiology proposes the consciential paradigm as the basis of its scientific propositions, this is radically distinct from the conventional paradigm to which the current or official sciences refer. While the conventional paradigm operates in the dichotomy between mind and matter, and assumes the theoretical premise of atomism, the consciential paradigm considers consciousness and its energetic projections, based on the practical premise of the lived experience<sup>2</sup> of interdimensional parapsychism. There are many similarities of form in the propositions of both, but similarities of content are harder to establish. The present article aims to ponder the similarities and dissimilarities existing between Ethics and Cosmoethics, from approximations specific to the theme of universalism. It attempts to avoid simplifications resulting from the similarity of form (isomorphism) – the very term *universalism*, for example – to the detriment of the content – the meaning of the term in the considered context. The comparison of paradigms using a focus on one term can bring better elucidation of the semantic limits of it and, hence, also of the effective possibilities of articulation or interparadigmatic transversality. In the case of universalism, this term is used by both paradigms, in Ethics and Cosmoethics. The philosophical ethical conception whose meaning more closely approximates that of Cosmoethics will have greater similarity of content. Not every universalistic ethic is similar to Cosmoethics, just because of a mere similarity of form, that is, due to the presence of the term ‘universalism’.

According to Vieira, a “*simple approximation* is the act or effect of approximating some thosene or concept to another, aiming to deepen consciousness research” (2003, p. 348) and “*complex approximation* is the act or effect of bringing more than 2 thosenes or concepts closer together, aiming to deepen consciousness research” (2003, p. 352). It’s possible to say that the starting point of this article is the simple approximation expressed in the binomial Ethics-Cosmoethics. Does use of the term ‘universalism’ by Ethics and Cosmoethics, a similarity of form, allow the affirmation that both attribute the same meaning to the term? And, to the contrary, does it authorize the affirmation that they attribute antagonistic meanings?

Next, the main theme of the paper, involving Ethics and Cosmoethics will be addressed, with which it will be possible to offer an answer to questions raised above.

---

<sup>2</sup> The portuguese word ‘vivência’ is translated here by the composed expression ‘lived experience’ and corresponds to the german word ‘Erlebnis’. (Translator’s note.)

## 2. APPROXIMATIONS BETWEEN PHILOSOPHICAL ETHICS AND COSMOETHICS

At first sight, for an Ethics reader, Cosmoethics brings a series of alike themes, for example, reflection over morals, values, codes and, principally, the relationship with universalism. Universalism is an ethical approach that dates back to the philosopher Immanuel Kant. So one could ask: is Cosmoethics (and Conscientiology) Kantian? This is, as has been shown before, a simple approximation based on isomorphism or similarity of form.

According to Vieira (2003, p. 1018), “*Cosmoethics (cosmo+ethics)* is the specialty of Conscientiology applied to the study of Ethics or reflection about multidimensional, cosmic morals, that define consciential holomaturity, located beyond social, intraphysical morals, or any presented under a human label, as the maximum, moral, emotional discernment, stemming from the intimacy of the microuniverse of each consciousness”. This citation presents “universalistic ethics” as a synonym of Cosmoethics, making the intrinsic relationship between Cosmoethics and universalism clear. The quoted definition has an evident kinship with the more consensual definition of Ethics, of a Kantian and formalist origin, which states that it would be a reflection and critique of morals. This is another approximation, also simple, anchored in the expression ‘reflection on morals’.

Following are the authors of universalistic Ethics, mentioned previously, and respective approximations to Cosmoethics are made, aiming the move from aforementioned isomorphism to isology or similarity of content.

### 2.1. Immanuel Kant and categorical imperative

The German philosopher Immanuel Kant is considered the formulator of universalistic Ethics in works such as *Groundwork for the Metaphysic of Morals* (1785) and *Critique of Practical Reason* (1788). Universalism, for him, refers to the universal validity of maxims or moral norms when submitted to the rational procedure of categorical imperative. Categorical imperative, for Kant, is the form of moral reasoning, which consists in the test of *universalization* of the maxim in question and verification if it remains possible after this test. Here is a formulation of the categorical imperative: *Act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law without contradiction*. As a person that reasons morally is a part of humanity, if the maxim being judged provokes any damage to the whole of humanity, then the will to convert it to a universal law is not possible. Kant exemplifies with the cases of the lie and suicide as guided by maxims that, if universalized, would annihilate humanity, therefore, it being impossible to be rationally desired.

For Kant, therefore, universalism comes from the universal character present in the reflection on morals, with ‘universal’ referring to humanity as a whole, independent of any particularity such as nationality, ethnicity, culture, religion among others. What is moral, for him, is universal or, more precisely, *universalizable* without damage.

Approximating this to Cosmoethics, it’s possible to identify isology in the pretension to transcend and unify frontiers. Kantian universalism is for humanity as a whole, not being relative to groups, but it also is not absolute, because, for Kant, human reason operates within limits, therefore, it is finite.

On the other hand, perhaps the main dissimilarity between the universalism of kantian and Cosmoethics addresses the restricted intraphysical character of the former and the multidimensional character of the latter. This difference gives rise to others, for example, the virtual impossibility of rationally anticipating the universalization of norms for other dimensions – what is universalizable for one dimension may not be for another, because while rational thinking for Kant is only a private subjective act, from the perspective of Cosmoethics it manifests objectively throughout energetic exteriorizations (thosenes), that is, rationality will not be only in a certain theoretical “imagination”, but also in the corresponding emotion and energy. For instance, through Cosmoethics the categorical imperative, if formulated mentally with a repressive or heteronomous bias, despite its conceptual adequacy, the energies that are multidimensional connections will not be assistantial, on the contrary, will be intrusive. So the mere ethical operation of universalization does not guarantee the cosmoethical effect of harmonization and deintrusion of consciousnesses. Within the conventional paradigm, Habermas (1993) addressed a similar critique to the categorical imperative, pointing out its monological and egocentric character. These are two dissimilarities of content stemming from the main one. In a certain sense, the categorical imperative introduces the principle of “the best for all” (similarity), but with dissimilarities both in the meaning of “best” as in the meaning of “all”. In Cosmoethics, universalism is not categorical as in Kantian ethics, because it’s not determined *a priori*, that is, independent of experience. The rationality in Cosmoethics, also considering the extraphysical, has to have a theoretical and practical character (theatical), hence *a posteriori*, dependent of experience; that’s why cosmoethical universalism, in the Kantian vocabulary, is hypothetical and, nevertheless, also a duty. But at this point the approximation collapses, so to speak, because in the Kantian table of categories a hypothetical duty is a contradiction in terms, it’s impossible; duty is categorical, as rationally *a priori*, or it is no duty at all. The point of enclave or the core in the meeting of these paradigms, is the transformation of the formal and abstract of the conventional paradigm into the substantial and concrete (lived experience) in the consencial paradigm.

In this case, *the evolutionary transformation from the categorical imperative* (formal and abstract) *to the orthothosene* (substantial and concrete), the unit of measure of Cosmoethics (VIEIRA, 2003, p. 468). It would be a task for Cosmoethicology to elucidate the proper universalism of the orthothosene, in approximation and evolutionary extrapolation compared to the one of categorical imperative. Such an operation would be complex and not simple, achieving isology, going beyond isomorphism.

It's worthwhile to observe the importance of detailed analysis in inter-paradigmatic comparisons aiming at approximations. To understand the similar and the dissimilar points, whether in form or in content, helps to formulate better elaborated positionings, observing the gradation of resemblances and differences between diverse paradigms. If done like this, the interlocution, in principle, becomes more prolific and with less conflicts, because the similar and dissimilar points can be identified with greater precision and exhaustivity, allowing more pondered positionings and not simply antagonistic or completely equal. In synthesis, it is possible to establish quantitative and qualitative degrees of interparadigmatic approximation, going beyond isomorphism, many times only superficial, and thus achieving isology.

## 2.2. Lawrence Kohlberg and Universal Ethical Principle Orientation

Psychologist Lawrence Kohlberg is considered a continuator of the genetic psychology of Jean Piaget (1896-1980), from the perspective of moral development. While the latter dealt with the theme in just one work from his youth, with focus on children, the former studied it exhaustively and prioritized teenagers.

Piaget, in his work *The Moral Judgement of the Child*, from 1932, shows the moral development of children from heteronomy to autonomy. Kohlberg, in the book *The Philosophy of Moral Development*, from 1981, takes that work and continues it, proposing elaborations and details of the process in a typology of stages and levels.

According to Kohlberg, there are three levels of moral development: pre-conventional, conventional and postconventional. The pre-conventional level is characterized by an egocentric reference concerning right and wrong, in terms of what generates concrete repercussions in the person. The moral justification here is in what the person gains or losses in such an action. The conventional level takes social expectations as a parameter, right being what conserves conventions or normality and wrong being what goes against it. And the postconventional level identifies the moral right or wrong, in a formal and abstract way, considering all humanity and not only the position of individuals.

Each level unfolds in two stages. Within the pre-conventional, the first stage is about avoiding punishment and, the second, obtaining personal advan-

tages. At the conventional level, the first stage is characterized by seeking what is considered good behavior, and the second, by the conservative maintenance of social order. The last, and primarily, the postconventional level encompasses the first stage as oriented by the idea of a social contract, which can be modified, and the second stage as based on universal ethical principles adopted by each's consciousness. Kohlberg's universalistic formulation is encountered in this last stage.

Kohlberg's typology of moral development can be represented as follows (KOHLBERG, 1981, p.17-18).

I – Preconventional Level

1. The Punishment and Obedience Orientation
2. The Instrumental Relativist Orientation

II – Conventional Level

3. The Interpersonal Concordance or “Good Boy-Nice Girl” Orientation
4. Society Maintaining Orientation

III – Postconventional Level

5. The Social Contract Orientation
6. The Universal Ethical Principle Orientation

Kohlberg's universalism is primarily present at stage 6, which needs, therefore, to be better developed here, given its importance for this text. Kohlberg affirms that a universal ethical principle wouldn't be a concrete rule like a religious commandment, but “universal principles of justice, of the reciprocity and equality of human rights, and of respect for the dignity of human beings as individuals” (1981, p. 19). The earlier stages take the value of human life under certain conditions, while in the last it has an unconditioned value. For example, Kohlberg asked groups of young people if it would be correct to protect fugitive slaves in a country with an economic system based on slavery. Among many negative and positive answers, few were affirmatives that justified the unconditional value of human life, attached to the universal human right to freedom. In this context he cites the pacifist civil disobedience of Martin Luther King, as an example of orientation within stage 6.

An approximation between Kohlberg's theory and Cosmoethics has to consider the following starting point: does the universalism of stage 6 possess isology with cosmoethical universalism?

Isomorphism, in the identification of universalism with the expression ‘postconventional’, calls ones attention, as Cosmoethics is situated in a paradigm which opposes itself to the conventional and, because of that, could possibly also be called postconventional. Considering the evolution (*crescendo*)

from conventional toward postconventional, it is possible to assert that some isology exists here too.

The level of moral autonomy involved in stage 6, to the point that the person does not conform to society, or even determined laws in totalitarian states, presents isology with the necessary predisposition to the fulfilment of the maxiproexis<sup>3</sup> (maxi-existential program). Assistance through clarification task, going further than the mere consolation task, demands a postconventional moral positioning, that is to say, independent of the present conventional morality, which is reflected in the boldness and daring of positionings that, even if not illegal, assume the risk of receiving social disapproval. It's what characterizes stage 6: a difference positive in relation to the social average, literally more developed to the point to be misunderstood by the majority. Hence, the effective fulfilment of the maxiproexis possibly presupposes the morality of stage 6, but evidently the reverse isn't true, that is, the psychological moral development of stage 6 alone does not guarantee the commitment of the consciousness to a maxiproexis. On the other hand, there is still the chance for Conscientiology researchers to make moral judgments belonging to stages prior to the 6<sup>th</sup>.

Stage 6 implies Cosmoethics, but the reverse doesn't apply. Cosmoethics does not imply stage 6, although it does include it. The universalism of the principles adopted by who is in that development stage stands on the universal character of human dignity, as expressed in human rights. The dignity of human life is independent of culture, hence the possibility of making moral judgements about cultural habits in this stage.

The similarity of content between Kohlberg's stage 6 and Cosmoethics, in a very generic sense, is in the exceptional and even singular attitude that subjects assume in relation to the others, in order to promote them or assist them, generally because of some clarifying gain.

The dissimilarities between both conceptions, as those concerning kantian Ethics, has their main point in the restriction of Kohlberg's model to the intraphysical dimension and humanity, to the detriment of extraphysical multidimensionality, parahumanity or communities of extraphysical consciousnesses. The base of this would be in the difference between human rights and consciential rights. Kohlberg's universalism stands on human rights and Cosmoethics' on consciential rights. Every human being (conscin) is a consciousness, but not every consciousness is a human being; they may be in the extraphysical condition. The broader reach of consciential rights, as compared

---

<sup>3</sup> Existential program – The specific program of each intraphysical consciousness, in his/her intraphysical existence.

Maxi-existential program – The maximal existential program having a wholesale approach, or targeting the execution of tasks of applied universalism and maxifraternity with polykarmic bases. (VIEIRA, 2002, p. 1103)



to human rights, emerges from there. Human rights prescribes a minimal baseline of equality of existential conditions, in respect to the intrinsic dignity of material human life. On the other hand, under the perspective of Cosmoethics, the dignity of human life or energosomatic existence is also affirmed, although this existence is a function, in the first place, of the dignity of the consciousness or, more precisely, conscienciality. And consciousness is in a more approximate state to its intrinsic reality when extraphysical, that is, without the energosoma and soma, without the materiality of human life. This is what extends the assistance of the person with an existential program to the practices of the personal energetic task (penta), which involve not only the intraphysical dimension but also the extraphysical, understanding and living the impact of wholesale assistance in the intraphysical dimension toward the extraphysical dimension.

This interdimensionality of cosmoethical universalism, when taking into account the primacy of the extraphysical dimensional in relation to the intraphysical dimensional, can bring actions that are apparently justifiable from through the lower stages of moral development, in accordance with the understanding of may the best happen for all involved in the multidimensional evolutionary situation in question. It is the principle of the economy of evils or the lesser of two evils (VIEIRA, 1994). In a given situation, it is possible that the more cosmoethical and universalistic is to act at stage 5 or 4, because it is what will do more assistance to the average development of the group. This is the paradox of the universal ethical principle implicating the eventual need of action at less developed levels. The economy of evils, from the intraphysical point of view, reconciles determined instrumental logic with universalism, which does not encounter isology with stage 6. The inclusion of the extraphysical in universalism seems to collapse the conceptual structure of stage 6, as it adds certain conditionality from the intraphysical perspective. Someone oriented exclusively by the morality of stage 6, due to the intraphysical restriction, could consider someone oriented by the universalism of Cosmoethics as excessively conventional or prudent. This is a serious dissimilarity of content between the universalism of Kohlberg and that of Cosmoethics.

### **2.3. Jürgen Habermas and the Ethics of Discourse**

The German philosopher Jürgen Habermas is considered an inevitable reference in Philosophy and contemporary Social Sciences. He is the proposer of the theory of communicative action (1988), developed in his 1981 work of the same name. According to this theory, human beings define themselves by the capacity of language and action that they can develop, that is, the capacity to use the language whether to change the material world through labor, or to obtain understanding or consensus with others. But the primary use of

language, for Habermas, is communicative; its finality or *télos* of language is intersubjective understanding.

He calls the capacity of making use of language in order to achieve understanding with others communicative competence, an adaptation of the expression 'linguistic competence' coined by Noam Chomsky. Communicative competence involves alternating between speaking, listening and observing, the three perspectives implicated in language, respectively, first person (I), second person (you) and third person (he/she). Alternating between the linguistic perspectives is a prerequisite to communication because it's necessary to put yourself in the place of the interlocutor to understand what they say and the way they listen to what is being said. This process has two forms of connection with ethical universalism: the communicative competence is a universal competence of the species; the intersubjective understanding about moral themes involves a universalistic argumentative procedure, so to speak. In order for us to mutually understand what is morally correct, it is necessary to consider every possible angle involved and this is only possible if they actually participate in argumentation as interlocutors. A more developed level of communicative competence is necessary in order to enable participation in discussions about morality and to motivate one's own actions with moral reasons; argumentation itself represents this more developed communicative level.

Habermas called the Ethics of discourse the area of studies about procedures to achieve understanding about moral problems. And this procedure is universalistic, because it must consider the whole universe of people possibly involved in the issues. Ethics of discourse has its principal approach detailed in the book *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, from 1983.

Seeking isologies between both universalisms, it is possible to say that argumentative competence is related to mentalsomatic attributes, those belonging to the consciousness' mental vehicle or mentalsoma, which are necessary for cosmoethical self-discernment, as positioning in relation to multiple arguments is in play. The ethical need to listen to the other involved and consider their reasons shows a connection with assistance, in the sense of receiving and interpreting the other's needs. Openness to the participation of whoever is concerned by the issue is interesting as it is not necessarily restricted to conscins. A moral issue logically involves conscins and consciexes; hence its solution should involve all concerned and produce some kind of outcome based on understanding. The idea that a solution of moral issues without the effective participation of those concerned is a pseudo-solution represents relevant isology to Cosmoethics (and universalism). It adds an *a posteriori* element to the ethical judgement, whereas the universalist tradition goes back to the kantian *a priori*. It is as if the moral issue does not exist only as a thesis, without the subjects concerned by it; the problem is inseparable from the

consciousnesses in conflict because of it. Solving a moral issue is solving an interpersonal conflict.

An important contribution of Habermas and also the main isological point with Cosmoethics lies in the connection between abstract thinking and concrete reality: the approximation between the concepts of action and theorice (theory + practice). Habermas develops the pragmatic theory of the speech acts of the English philosophers Austin and Searle, according to which this act has a double dimension: performative and propositional. The speech act articulates the meaning of the actor's *performance* and the meaning of what is being said. In this sense, action, just as practice, doesn't have a radical rupture with theory, because it possesses content within itself, this is what internally connects it with theory. So action, so to speak, is a theory in practice, this is the synthesis of the two factors. This is the isology between action (Habermas) and theorice (Cosmoethics), the intertwining of the concepts of universalism. The universalism of Habermas' Ethics of discourse presupposes the participation of all concerned in the reflexive and critical resolution of moral issues, that is, it is action. Ethics already extrapolates mere moral theory and intrinsically integrates with practice. Isologically, cosmoethical universalism is theorice, integrative, interassistential and interdimensional action. Although the basic dissimilarity of dimensional reach continues (intrapysical vs. multidimensionality), just as in the other conception studied, the Ethics of Discourse, despite saying nothing about it, because of its interactive character seems to be less limited in this case. Therefore, it can be considered more advanced in the evolutionary process between Ethics and Cosmoethics.

## FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The present article intended to contribute to comprehension of the evolutionary process, or mentalsomatic transition, from Ethics to Cosmoethics. In order to do that, it used the concept of universalism, as a transversal theme, making approximations between three conceptions from the conventional paradigm and Cosmoethics from the consciential paradigm. The approximations consisted of conceptual comparisons, distinguishing similarities of form (isomorphisms) from similarities of content (isologies). This distinction allows deepening of the processes of interparadigmatic approximations, dissociating form and content; there can be similarities of form without similarities of content as well as the reverse, besides both similarities at the same time.

The first conception presented was associated with Kantian Ethics, according to which universalism is a property of the categorical imperative. To Kant, morality is in the purely rational judgement, that is, *a priori*, being thus the nature of duty. There is an isology with Cosmoethics in the trivial sense of

the application to humanity as a whole, but when comparing the categorical imperative and the orthothosene, the latter undermines the conceptual bases of the first, because the duty has to be articulated with the contingent circumstances, being *a posteriori*.

The second conception was the psychology of moral development, of Lawrence Kohlberg. That author understands universalism as the maximum stage of development, in which the actor would make judgements oriented by universal ethical principles. He brings the example of Martin Luther King, the civil rights leader who was arrested in the name of a greater cause, one not foreseen by US legislation at the time – the racial equality of civil rights. The so called stage 6 relativizes the legislation in the name of the universality of human dignity, expressed in the code of human rights. Cosmoethical universalism, as it encompasses extraphysical dimensions, can imply certain cosmoethical strategizing or calculability in which the assistantial protagonism of the universalistic leader will not necessarily intraphysically appear in the way Kohlberg proposed it.

The third conception was the habermasian Ethics of discourse. This universalism is different from the prior, because reflection and criticism of moral issues happen in an intersubjective ambit that demands the participation of those concerned. Because of its approximation with theorice, the aforementioned differential puts it ahead of the others, despite it also being restricted to the intraphysical.

The starting point for this work was the interparadigmatic isomorphism involving the expression ‘universalism’. Dissimilarities of content were pointed out due to the unidimensionality of the conventional paradigm. On the other hand, the main similarities of content result from valuing the human being as an end in itself, relativizing differences in the name of the idea of humanity. In Habermas’ approach this idea extrapolates the abstract character of the previous two, to become the action of seeking understanding with others, which attributes a differential to it in terms of isology with cosmoethical universalism.

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

HABERMAS, Jürgen. *Teoría de la Acción Comunicativa*. [Theory of Communicative Action.] Madrid: Taurus, 1988. 2 vols.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. *Consciência moral e agir comunicativo*. [Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action.] Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1989.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. Para o uso pragmático, ético e moral da razão prática. [On the Pragmatic, Moral and Ethical Employments of Practical Reason.] In: STEIN, E. & DE BONI, L. A. *Dialética & Liberdade*. [Dialectics & Freedom.] Rio de Janeiro: Vozes e Ed. da UFRGS, 1993.

KANT, Immanuel. *Cimentación para la metafísica de las costumbres*. [Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals.] Buenos Aires: Aguilar, 1964.

KOHLBERG, Lawrence. *The philosophy of moral development*. New York: Harper & Row, 1981.

KUHN, Thomas. *A estrutura das revoluções científicas*. [The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.] São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1992.

LIMA, André Abs de. *As ciências e as bioenergias*. [The Sciences and the Bioenergies.] S/d. *Mimeo*.

VIEIRA, Waldo. *700 experimentos da Conscienciologia*. [700 Conscientiology Experiments.] Rio de Janeiro: Instituto Internacional de Projeciologia, 1994.

VIEIRA, Waldo. *Projectiology: a Panorama of Experiences of the Consciousness Outside the Human Body*. Rio de Janeiro: Instituto Internacional de Projeciologia e Conscienciologia, 2002.

VIEIRA, Waldo. *Homo sapiens reurbanisatus*. Foz do Iguaçu, PR: CEAEC Editora, 2003.

VUGMAN, Ney Vernon. Conscientiology and Physics: a desirable couple? *Journal of Conscientiology*, Vol. 1, Issue 4, p. 289-304, 1998-1999.

**Alexandre Zaslavsky** teaches Philosophy at the Federal Institute of Paraná, Foz do Iguaçu campus. Bachelor in Philosophy, Master and PhD in Education (UFRGS). Volunteer of Conscientiology since 1999 and Conscientiology teacher since 2003. Author of several conscientiological articles and verbetes. Co-author of the book “Inversão Existencial” [Existential Inversion] (2011).

Translation: Alexandre Zaslavsky.

Revision: Jeffrey Lloyd.