

## Editorial

### Interparadigmas

Scientific knowledge is inevitably referenced to paradigms, i.e. normative and theoretical models that establish limits regarding what and how to investigate. A paradigm represents the cognitive universe of a scientific community. Thomas Kuhn, the main propounder of this approach, even compares the paradigm to a *gestalt*, or in other words, a form given to a subjective perception. Kuhn touches on a delicate scientific point, that related to subjectivity and, shortly thereafter, objectivity. The Cartesian method extracts objectivity from subjectivity, as there is no other source possible beyond human thought.

The history of science, in this respect, narrates the transition process in which one paradigm is succeeded by another. The new paradigm, initially, is considered absurd, contradictory and impossible; and not without reason; the premises of the old paradigm are incompatible with the new. But precisely the reason why a new paradigm emerges is the failure of the old to solve certain problems, it is at this point that certain groups suspend it and open themselves to previously unsuspected possibilities.

On the other hand, the history of science, not differing from other historiographical modalities, tells the history from a certain perspective, generally that of the victorious part, in this case, the paradigm which prevailed. Therefore, the paradigm abandoned is exposed to the light of its successor's victories, which were not absolutely clear among the crisis between the paradigms, when the old was already in check, however there were still many candidates to be the new paradigm. In short, the instability typical of controversies between different paradigms is not a common object in history, whose narrative perspective is, generally, the *normal science*, in Kuhnian terms. To tell the history of a certain discipline is part of the jigsaw puzzle of normal science. The time and space between distinct rival paradigms is not desirable, for if the paradigm is essentially normalizing, then who regulates the area between the paradigms? The dispute is precisely over this regulation and a paradigm does not accept another paradigm's regulating parameter. The tension between paradigms is especially hard because it is anomic and requires meta-reflection exercises and constant translations, because each paradigm is as if it were a different language. Kuhn defended the *immeasurability* between paradigms, but not the *incommunicability* between researchers of distinctive paradigms. The interparadigmatic debate is, essentially, an exercise of translation, in the words of Habermas a search for comprehension.

*Interparadigmas – the Journal of Conscientiology's Doctors* emerges with the intention to locate itself precisely in the midst of this controversial field between paradigms. In this case, between the paradigm proposed by Conscientiology and other

paradigms raised from the premise that every reality is material and, therefore, that every object and every method must refer to matter.

Conscientiology arises from the Disbelief Principle, the theme of this first issue:

*DON'T BELIEVE IN ANYTHING. NOT EVEN IN WHAT  
IS PUBLISHED IN INTERPARADIGMAS.  
EXPERIMENT.  
HAVE YOUR OWN PERSONAL EXPERIENCES.*

The Disbelief Principle presents an advantage in relation to the conventional questionings of science: the final sieve of knowledge is the individual's discernment, which is formed through the accumulation of experiences. These experiences happen in multiple life situations, provided they are systematically and methodically addressed. Conscientiology involves an object and method beyond material references; human experiences, in their diversity and complexity, especially when including the parapsychic, can be objectively investigated and submitted to a consensus within the scientific community. Solely materialistic conventional science does not have an adequate epistemology to investigate experiences formulated in the first person. Contrarily, conventional epistemology historically presupposes, referring to scientificity, the denial of subjectivity.

This first issue of *Interparadigmas* focusses on the Disbelief Principle, aiming to explain its central role in a paradigmatic change implied by a science of consciousness, such as Conscientiology. Each paper aims to clarify the issue in a certain interparadigmatic field, according to the area of expertise of each specialist-author.

In the article *Between a conventional science and the neoscience of Conscientiology*, professor Ney Vernon Vugman, physicist from UFRJ, offers an ample historical panorama of science, indicating, since ancient times, precursor elements of Conscientiology. Also, he discusses the Popperian issue of falseability, delimitating criterion of science and pseudoscience. The main issue concentrates on the interparadigmatic controversy among scientificity.

In *Methodical doubt to the Disbelief Principle: towards a science of self-consciousness*, I seek to problematize the basic Cartesian idea, which is today part of social common sense, that science questions all and can investigate all. The Cartesian method, in which the skeptical procedure of doubt is a prominent metaphysical construction, is more a logical and conceptual structure than it is properly empirical. Thus, I explore the possibility of changing a rationalist concept of questioning, into one of methodical doubt, through the conscientiological construct of the Disbelief Principle. I suggest that such a modification could represent a new (para)epistemological condition that could scientifically investigate self-consciousness, including extrassensorial perceptions or parapsychism. The core involves the interparadigmatic transition in the concept of scientific questioning.

In *Disbelief factor in the attribute of coherence*, professor Rosa Nader, a mathematician from UFF, elaborates counterpoints focusing on the concept of mathematical and conscientiological coherence. The article clarifies the interparadigmatic *gap* when demonstrating that consciential coherence allows and even requires ambiguities, contrary to the logical-mathematical coherence, restricted to solely formal, ideal constructions. The central point of this paper is the interparadigmatic issue concerning the concept of logical coherence, so vital to the entire history of science.

In the article *Disbelief Principle and contemporary challenges*, professor Márcio Alves, agronomist from UFPE, directs a critical argument, with social-political emphasis, on the mechanism involved in various beliefs, as well as the adverse consequences of the beliefs to human development. In opposition, he presents possibilities, scientific as well as social and political, open to the application of the Disbelief Principle. At its core this work approaches the interparadigmatic issues involving the concept and process of *belief*.

In *Impostor Syndrome and academic life*, professor Adriana Kauati, biomedical engineer at UNIOESTE, offers a simultaneously theoretical and practical collaboration on the central omission of the conventional scientific paradigm: the disregard of the person of the researcher in scientific investigation. The Impostor Syndrome, with an ample bibliography from the field of Psychopathology and Psychotherapy, affects professionals from the academic world with sensations of fragility, insecurity and low self-esteem, which is irrational when considering the real preparation over many years to which the researcher has submitted themselves. The author indicates the beliefs feeding this pathology and, assertively indicates an incoherence between the, least expected, posture of disbelief of the researcher and the beliefs of the particular person. This paper also indicates therapeutic techniques for this issue. The central point of this article is the interparadigmatic issue of the limits in a *researcher's* role in the production of scientific knowledge.

In the essay *Conscientiological evolutive dynamic*, professor Tania Guimarães, a chemist from UFF, develops a rich panorama, with several enumerations and counterpoints, clarifying the difference between the conventional and the conscientiological paradigms. She emphasizes the inevitably present element of the researcher's evolution, a element historically neglected in conventional science, yet one assumed in Conscientiology. Foundations of the consciential paradigm are presented as well as casuistry of the author's recyclings which seal the arguments elaborated. The essay concentrates on the interparadigmatic issue of *self-evolution* implied in the production of scientific knowledge.

In *Law, transdisciplinarity and hypercomplexity*, professor Paulo Roney Ávila Fagúndez, a lawyer from USFC, and Adriana Rocha, of CIAJUC, develop a critical broad spectrum argument, indicating the institutional, ethical and political incoherence of the contemporary juridical system. The paradigmatic exhaustion of Law entails new approaches, themes such as intuition, Taoism, until arriving at Conscientiology. The article

concentrates on the interparadigmatic issue of principles and procedures involving the realization of *justice*.

At the end, the reader will find *Interparadigmas*' Regulations, as well as a call for papers for the next issue.

*Interparadigmas* has the posture of only publishing papers written by specialists with solid academic backgrounds, in our society those accredited with a doctorate. Far from any elitism or even ingenuity, there are two intentions:

1. To establish an effective interlocution with Academia, in other words, universities and research institutes, based on technical mastery of *state of the art* scientific discussions.

2. To certify, *a priori*, the solidity and professionalism of investigations and reflections published on controversial, polemic and even *taboo* themes, such as a consciousness' extrassensorial experiences.

*Interparadigmas* will attain its goal by the movement of the energies of the academic community in debating the proposal of the consensual paradigm. The contributions sent to the journal will be indicators of this, whether in the form of articles, essays, reviews or even critical correspondence. We will be pleased to publish papers that nourish the controversy, provided they are within the scope of the editorial policies defined in the Regulations. It is a requirement that, beyond having a doctorate, the approach used utilizes the terminology of both paradigms, one of them necessarily being the consensual paradigm.

We thank Professor Waldo Vieira, for the evolutionary opportunity; *Reaprendentia* for the total and unrestricted support; UNICIN for the space to meet; and UNIESCON for the authorization to republish the interview.

The institutional email is [interparadigmas@interparadigmas.org.br](mailto:interparadigmas@interparadigmas.org.br). We look forward to your contributions.

Alexandre Zaslavsky

Editor in Chief