

LAW, TRANSDISCIPLINARITY AND HYPERCOMPLEXITY

Paulo Roney Ávila Fagúndez
Adriana Rocha

ABSTRACT. Transdisciplinarity is a challenge. Science removed emotion from knowledge, isolated man from life and created closed systems devoid of ethics. One major consequence of this fragmented worldview is the destruction of the environment. Someone who deals with the law faces human drama, and increasingly has to give answers to extremely complex issues for which there is, for the most part, no safe answers. This article brings considerations about scientific bias in transdisciplinarity, and concludes by providing some perspectives from Conscientiology, specifically the consencial paradigm and the disbelief principle, which are seen to assist when considering the paradigmatic crisis raised here.

Keywords: Law; transdisciplinarity; politics; paradigm shift.

“The finding that emotion and consciousness are not the same thing shows that we do not necessarily have to be controlled by emotion. Before each of our actions there needs to be a space to evaluate alternatives and freely choose the best way of acting. Clearly, until we learn to discipline our minds, we will have difficulty exercising that freedom. It is how we react to events and experiences that determines the moral content of our acts. In a few words this means that our acts are ethical if we react positively, aiming at the collective good and not our personal and unique interests. If we react negatively, neglecting others, our actions will be unethical.”

Dalai Lama

INTRODUCTION

This paper proposes to formulate more questions than to offer responses. The insensitivity of scientists, the environmental destruction and the divorce from ethics in different sectors of society triggers an interesting debate in the so-called post-modern society. There was, in modern times, an undisputed material progress. But with the advent of public politics dissociated from reality was it possible to humanize man? The old patriarchal State brought answers to citizens needy of bread and circuses? Socialism managed to match the socially unequal? Where was the utopia sought by earlier social movements?

In trying to understand them science oversimplifies phenomena. There is a preoccupation with merely establishing causal relations between elements of life, as if that was enough to understand the multidimensionality of universal events. This is why

scientists continue to desperately investigate vaccines for thousands of cataloged diseases, or drugs to overcome diseases produced by antibiotics.

Politics has been restricted to the vacant theatricality of empty promises. And now, the political act, as regards freedom, education, and health, or in other words, the most important issues affecting human beings, has only been presenting innocuous measures. In every electoral process the patriarchal power structure, based on the control of classes, offers what is requested by a starving people. According to the paternalistic conception, the clientele is the electorate that exchanges its vote for some benefit, whether it be employment or a material good. As long as the current power structure is maintained we will not get anywhere. If only because who does not follow this way does not manage to get elected.

The problem lies where after all? In the patriarchal system, which persecutes us since Antiquity and that, through excessive rationality, is based in the violence of control and in the imposition of economic groups' interests. The overcoming of the current model will only occur when sensitivity is rescued, creativity valued, and the masks of the economic system of domination dropped, this system being one divorced from ethics.

The crisis is one of perception, affirms Capra (1996). Man has no commitment with the life of the planet. What he wants is to attend his immediate economic interest.

Ethics was banned from politics. Science, for a long time, has only produced knowledge to generate more profit. There is a need to establish a bioethics¹ law, concerned with the multidimensionality of life. The crisis that leads to an ethical debate contributes to the establishment of a discussion in all sectors of human activity.

It is the intention of this broad discussion to address, at the end, the new scientific paradigm proposed by Conscientiology. One capable of contributing to a new theoretical and practical view of the scientific crisis, of the world, and of the human being, one adequate to overcome and establish an effective change if the concerned person lucidly decides to apply this neoparadigm.

1. Transdisciplinarity

Transdisciplinarity is, in fact, the commitment to life that the researcher assumes. Human phenomena are inextricably connected to a natural, integral ethics, that sees no boundaries between knowledge.

The operator of Law faces a dilemma. Law says that a judge will freely form their conviction from the elements inserted in the records. However, every Law professional receives, in the universities, fragmented knowledge. The judge, according to Taoists, is

¹ The UNAM (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico) and the University of Paris held in the city of Mexico, in September 2007, a major event to bring forward a convention to America on Bioethics, in which we participated addressing the theme "Latin-American and biodiversity".

formed to perform the impossible, which is to judge. There is much talk, in scholarly environments, about laws and rights. It is forgotten that effective justice is that which “means truth”, and “generates peace”, and that “requires courage” (VIEIRA, 2009, p. 226). Legal professionals are trained to fight, to beat the opponent, and to use, if necessary, a thousand and one devices. In this context, a judge becomes a “theoretical executioner”, a “lawful punisher”, a “gowned policeman” (VIEIRA, 2009, 225).

In this professional formation removed from its cosmoethics, cosmovisiological function, advocacy becomes a “professionalized cleverness” and the lawyer a “professional complicater” (VIEIRA, 2009, p. 225).

The process became an instrument to deceive, formalize injustice and consolidate controls over issues that are considered crucial to maintain the *status quo*.

Very little leads to peace and reconciliation. Only recently have laws emerged that stimulate agreement, chiefly in the criminal area. The law suggests that the practitioner has a multicultural education. However, in reality, what happens is a mere transmission of dogmas, that imprisons the minds of jurists and hinders that right is expressed in the profession.

What does transdisciplinarity seek? To become a new science? Ubiratan D’Ambrosio (1997, p. 80) says that:

Transdisciplinarity is not a new philosophy. Not even a new metaphysics. Nor is it a science of sciences and, much less, as some say, a new religious stance. It is not, as some insist on representing it, a fad. The essence of transdisciplinarity lies in a recognition where there is no privileged cultural space or time that allows judgment and putting into a hierarchy – as more correct or true – complexes of explanations and living with the reality that surrounds us. It rests on an open attitude, of mutual respect and humility toward myths, religions, explanations and knowledge systems, rejecting any kind of arrogance or prepotence. In essence, transdisciplinarity is transcultural. Transdisciplinary reflections navigate through ideas coming from all regions of the planet, from different cultural traditions. They rest on the individual’s ideas from training and the most diverse professional experiences.

Transdisciplinary is a challenge. It does not seek to bring ready answers. It wants to form increasingly important questions for people who remain in search of their essence. So, ultimately, they are freed from the shackles of classist historicity and science that simplifies the richness of life.

Transdisciplinarity allows you to dream, to open up new paths, to establish a link between religion, art and science, in short, to break the juridical dogmatism, after all, “all dogmatism manipulates” and “expresses ignorance” (VIEIRA, 2009, p. 169).

2. THE WHY OF DRAMA

Man, since the first moment, thought to solve their problems with magical formulas. Technology has made existence easier and also brought serious problems and profound reflections. Even today, one sees the tragedy of starvation. Some throw food out, foods are refined and sold as *fast food*. Fibers and precious elements are given to animals, because they are judged worthless for man and fundamental to the preparation of foods. And people have to go to the pharmacy to get them, in the form of vitamin pills, protein and minerals. Much of humanity is hungry for food. Many grains are produced in Brazil for exportation. The meat we produce, at a high ethical and environmental cost, feeds Americans and Europeans.

Most calls for freedom, suffer from a lack of justice. The most drastic hunger is for justice, and freedom, and essentially for life. It is necessary that we reflect over the right and particularly the “duty of freedom” (VIEIRA, 2009): it is representative of most of civilization, which educates us, brings happiness, in short, is an “evolutionary megapleasure”. The artificiality of humans in another fact that contributes to the deepening of crisis. We absorb many chemical substances so symptoms of disease can be relieved. Additives are generously thrown into our food. There is an abuse regarding the use of hormones. Cancer rates increase alarmingly, and this is beyond the iatrogenic diseases produced by Medicine itself. Insecurity generates astronomical profits for private security companies. The State leaves open a strategic space for disease to enrich the “health” of entrepreneurs. Thus, citizenship is no more than an empty expression, in the jungle of concrete of capitalism in the regime “bankolatric” (VIEIRA, 2009, p. 128).

What do the rest of us wait for, when, in fact, our enemies are in power, as Cazusa writes in the lyrics of one of his most known songs. Furthermore, people feel increasingly alone, closed off within themselves, in short, unhappy, traumatized and in pain, along with all the promise of low cost happiness. People run away from life and, as a result of this, lose the sense of an ethical existence. Racism is due to the Manichean vision and separation that operated between the good and bad, black and white, civilized and primitive, finally, between the superior and inferior. It is said that Law aims for equality. If equality is aimed for it is because inequality is recognized and the objective is to correct it. Is it possible?

If there is a recognition of rights it is because a serious doubt exists about its existence. According to Baudrillard (1990),

Individual rights lose sense as soon as one stops to be an alienated being, private to their own being, a stranger to themselves, as it was in exploitative and miserable societies, but where it became, following the self-referential, self-

performative, post-modern formula. The system of human rights becomes completely inadequate and illusory in such a conjecture – the mobile, flexible individual, of variable geometry is no longer a subject of law, but a tactical promoter of their own existence; no longer refers to any instance of the law but only to the quality of their work and performance.

Rights oversee those incapable, which were and continue to be the women and children taught. There seems, truly, to be unanimity regarding the defense of human rights. But what rights are these? Who shall be preserved by them? And animals, are they too to be defended?

Krishnamurti (1973) says that the man needs to be free from all cultural impositions in order to attain simplicity. And the master issues a warning: “What creates the problem of war are the nationalist, linguistic, geographical divisions; are the religious differences – you Hindus, me Muslim, you with your dogmas and limitations, me with mine”.

Life cannot be divided. Life is a totality. All beings are inserted in it, along with their joys and sorrows. And life is the greatest expression of all. There is a life that is total and transcends the poor perception we have of it.

“We live multiple lives” (VIEIRA, 2009, p. 345) and should dignify all of them and all forms of life, from the virus to the serenissimus (VIEIRA, 1994), as it is “consciousness acting” (VIEIRA, 2009, p. 345).

It is like Krishnamurti says, “You see a fragmentary life, and with these fragments hope to find a solution. But through fragments no solution can be found to the agonies of life.”

Fragmentation produces specialists. Weighs down nations. Proliferates religions. In short, draws man away from his intrinsic nature, his original truth. We have always been one. And will continue to be.

According to Conscientiology (VIEIRA, 2009), the complete consciousness is the conscex (extraphysical consciousness), our true, multidimensional, multiexistential legitimate reality: our intrinsic nature. An intraphysical person, a conscin, is transitory, ephemeral.

Man tried chaos, or rather, had the role of accelerating it, because he is still on the other side of order, muzzling dreams and the prison of life. What the human being has done is to forget life. Being drunk with desire. The values of the capitalist system are the drugs. Transdisciplinarity with its view of integrity, before bringing answers, proposes a challenge. And wants to question all knowledge, before simply denying it.

A post-modern man is even more distressed, because he could not find the answers to his questionings using the technique.

The objects do not and will not satisfy him. Money and power do not fill the existential emptiness. The human being is a victim of uncertainties. He is responsible for this, and is suffering its consequences.

This is a reflex of the “man-animal”, which kills, has unsatiated desires, that errs (VIEIRA, 2009). World rulers are only interested in attending the interests of bankers and multinational companies.

Why do we have to pay to maintain a system of political control in which the president is a puppet in the powerful hands of international financial capital? It is completely irrational to maintain a power that has no power, a government that does not govern. Is society aware that the governments of various countries only serve to attend a privileged few? The globalized world is governed by economy. Man does not even verify the impact of his steps on the environment.

3. THE BIOLOGIZATION OF LIFE

The humanities lost space to Biology. Everything was biologized. Genetics has explanation for everything. What is perceived, in each historical moment, is that we have a science that wants to explain everything. In each historical moment, especially after the advent of modernity, we find a science that wants to have supremacy. In ancient society there was science, although anthropologists do not consider religion a science of the ancients. With the advent of method, and especially with the rise of mechanical physics, science would have to, necessarily, have the ability to explain their findings. Until the emergence of exact sciences there were a number of restrictions on the existence of a social science. Positivism, undoubtedly, contributed to the recognition of sociology as a science. Marx, in turn, put economics on a pedestal. The legal phenomena, to him, stemmed from the economic structure. In addition to establishing, according to Popper², a historical determinism. To Marx, the world would inexorably move to socialism. The Goddess of History did not confirm his predictions. Perestroika and the fall of the Berlin Wall show that socialist systems present several deficiencies. In our time we have the Goddess of Genetics that, according to Steven Rose (1997), in his work on neurogenetic determinism, affirms that everything is sought to be explained in light of genetics. People are criminal because they have the criminal gene. An individual is alcoholic because they received the gene of drunkenness and someone contracts a disease because they have the gene that contributes decisively to the outbreak of the disease. Thus, science employs simple thought to explain phenomena that are, naturally, multifactorial. With Marxism we have the attempt to rescue dialectics. However, it is a reductionist dialectic in relation to the Hegelian dialectic. To say that economics is the determinant factor, although very important, is an exaggeration. Nevertheless, one cannot ignore the relevance of Marxian thought for an adequate reading of reality. One cannot juridicize nor biologize life. Rationality is as important as intuition. Science cannot live without art. Nor can we dispense with

2 POPPER, Karl. *Conjectures e Refutations*. Coimbra: Almedina, 2000.

science, but we cannot put it to serve the market. It has to be committed to life. That is why the exorcism of anthropocentrism is imposed. The new world wants solutions that transcend the politic-economic arena. Science has an important role, it is up to art impose a philosophy that will humanize man. It is no longer possible to justify, especially in the twenty-first century, dictatorships, whether political, economic or scientific. Solutions to problems should result from a wide dialogue within society. It is necessary that the patriarchal-paternalistic model give way to the broad participation of all in the political process. Democracies are servants of economic conglomerates. The democracy in the United States (or narcodemocracia) is the greatest example of this. Only two major parties attain power. The minor parties never come to power. It is a game of marked cards.

The revolution cannot only occur in the economic system, but in every sphere of life. The imposition of a model is insufficient to account for the entire reality. All models should be analyzed and respected. The dictatorship of science is imposed when one wants to impose a certain kind of knowledge as true. Humanity is still in search of a concept of science. Can one say that Genetics is the latest attempt of science to explain everything? The more serious is that any attempt to impose a dictatorship in science enjoys the support of the media, motivated by economic power. Marxists have wanted to highlight the economic aspect of life, explaining everything with an economic bias. With the advent of Freud's thought, was the desire to psychoanalyze knowledge. Medicine would, in turn, pathologize life, just as Criminal Law criminalized conduct considered prejudicial to the interests of groups in power. However, what was seen, in the repressive system, was the criminalization of the poorer sectors of society. There is no science that actually overlaps another. All contribute to the progress of humanity. And we cannot put aside common sense and waste the experience, as Bonaventure (2000) wishes. And, we cannot, at any time, fail to mention aesthetics and recognize the indispensable role of ethics in today's society and for future generations. The United States biologist James Wattson, in an interview given to *Veja* magazine, states that there should be no restriction on the survey of genes. He says that in ten years all crops will be transgenic³. The discussion has recently started, by virtue of the precautionary principle. If there is no scientific evidence that GM harms health, then there will also be no evidence that they are beneficial to humans. However, some of the previous studies made in USA attest allergic reactions to transgenic products, as well as a clear negative action over the immune system. In a few years we will have an idea of what transgenics represents to human health and the environment. And it may be too late.

After all, when does life start? What is meant by death? Was brain death a scientific construction made to enable transplants?

A new science must be attentive to human freedom. Bioethical principles must always be attended. We can no longer accept the dictatorship of science, the imposition

³ VEJA. The radical of genetics. *Veja Magazine*. São Paulo, n. 1919, p. 11, August. 2005.

of treatments by physicians. A patient, if they do not want to undergo further treatment, has the right to die. The patient, if they want, can undergo “alternative” treatment.

The doctor’s paternalistic view is not consistent with the information of the third millennium.

But none of this accounts for the complexity. Through conscientiology, bioethics still does not reach cosmovisiology. Below are listed some counterpoints between bioethics and cosmoethics:

Bioethics	Cosmoethics
Global: preoccupied with the destiny of humanity	Universal: preoccupied in favor of and with helping improve the consciousness
Analysis of ethical values and biological facts	Analysis of universal ethical values
System of human values	Knowledge of the value system of the being and universe
Based on the principle of non-maleficence	Principle: “may what happens be the best for everyone” (anti-egoism)
Peripheral or periconsciential renewals	Intrapersonal renewals (intraconsciential, profound)
Anthropocentric	Conscientiocentric
Principle of human self-determination	Multidimensional free will

4. THE SCIENCE OF COMPLEXITY (OR OF HIPERCOMPLEXITY?)

An analytical view of traditional science cannot address complex issues. Science addresses human problems, and they are complex. There is no simple phenomenon. Reducing phenomena to elements was a strategy adopted in Physics to formulate theories and laws that could explain Nature’s functioning. The so-called hard sciences promised to solve all the problems and present all the answers. The advent of Quantum Physics and certain social sciences contributed to the construction of a new model of science, more focused on the whole and in subjectivity. Man becomes, with the emergence of Medicine, an object of knowledge. We no longer have the separation between the knowing individual and object that is known. Similarly, Psychoanalysis creates categories (id, self, superego) to better analyze the human being who happens to be, thus, studied in their thinking and behavior. The challenge is to study the human mind. Freud and Lacan undertook an extraordinary project to understand the unconscious part of the human being and the effective psychic structure. Finally, that there is also a conscious and an unconscious part. The brain still constitutes a major unknown to unravel. Neurology however will not overcome the psychological knowledge. But most importantly in the science of complexity is what it recognizes as a mystery. It requires more sensitivity from the scientist. The science of complexity is post-modern science. The Law of Complexity is the Law of Postmodernity. It is the Law that does not reduce human drama to its legal compartments. The science of complexity

does not see a disease, it sees a sick man. No person gets sick the same way as another. There are no two equal beings on the face of Earth. There are no two similar problems. The legislator wants to make them equal. The science of complexity revolutionizes science because it does not see frozen objects. It sees relations, social and political facts that become scientifically relevant. Science brings an ideology, an economic commitment and, in turn, contributes to the consolidation of dogmas. In fact, this is not its role. Science should be committed to social interests. For this to occur it has to be critical and deconstruct its knowledge as it advances research.

5. INTUITION AND THE LAW

This is the title of the book published by Professor Rizzatto Nunes (1997), by Editora Del Rey. I always supposed that intuition played a crucial role in the law. It is the first step out of stagnation, intuition, though an extraphysical *insight*, is still primary self-discernment, far from lucid self-parapsychism. (VIEIRA, 2009).

A judicial ruling does not result from a formal operation of logic. There is an undeniable charge of subjectivity in a court's decision. The judge is included in the judicial decision. It is they who are there exposing their feelings. The judge does not recognize themselves in the court's decision because the model is based on the irresponsibility of the judge. There is an autocratic model, which is said to be scientific, based on the pseudowill of the law. It is as if a judge could reveal the truth through a political-legal act. No case is like another nor a decision like another, although we insist on turning human dramas into legal provisions. To recognize the process of intuition means bringing a poetic hermeneutic to the harvest of the law, which goes beyond the scope of objective elements found in the record. And so, we win the fantasy world that insists on building on the field of law. What is not in the records is also in the world. There is a high probability that the truth of the matter is not in the records, as the law is a great reducer of complexity. The judicial ruling is endowed with unquestionable subjectivity, because the judge inserts their own sentiments into the court decision. The sentence brings an undeniable ideological load. Is not the process a scientific method to discover the truth. A juridical actor should be, each day, more sensitive and open to new experiences. Rationality does not live without intuition, taking into consideration the very structure of the brain and action of the neurons, in a truly networked system, that communicates through electromagnetic waves, every cell needing to touch the other. Bergson ensures that intuitive knowledge is extremely important (1950, p. 1272-3).

The intuition of which we speak is engaged, above all, the internal duration. It comprises a sequence that when entering in juxtaposition to an intimate growth, promotes seamless extension of the past into the present that invades the future. It is the direct view of the spirit in the spirit. No intermediary; no refraction through a prism where one face is space and the other language. Instead of situations adjacent to situations that will become words juxtaposed to words, we have the

undivided continuity, and for this so substantial flow of internal life.⁴

Intuitive law is more sensitive, humane. For Bergson (1994, p. 67), "With their applications, which only seek the comfort of existence, science promises us welfare, and the most pleasure. Philosophy, however, could already give us happiness".

For Bergson, intuition involves varying degrees of intensity and philosophy many degrees of depth. However, a spirit that has come to real life will live the intuitive life, and his knowledge of things is then formed in philosophy⁵.

6. CONSCIENIOLOGY IN THIS CONTEXT

In the counterflow of the crisis of scientificity existing in conventional science, conscientiology proposes a new methodology for the consciousness and phenomena research that goes beyond any aspect of human knowledge proposed to this day.

As a neoscience, conscientiology studies the individual, in its various forms, in the various dimensions in which it manifests.

In this aspect, it studies the consciousness (the Self) in an integral manner, considering its various bodies, dimensions and existences.

It does not compartmentalize its object of study and does not consider the being as a physical body or by-product of the human brain. According to the hypothesis of the objective body, through conscientiology, the consciousness is able to manifest beyond the human body, therefore, also beyond the physical brain. A fact that can be proven through conscious projection.

Aiming to study the self out of the conventional Newtonian-Cartesian paradigm, conscientiology establish a new model of study - the consciencial paradigm - that allows scientific study of a being in an integral and broad way.

Using this paradigm, any person and fact correlated to the manifestation of the consciousness can be studied through the following pillars:

- Self-Research – there is no separation between the object of study and the individual (the researcher and the object of research are inseparable);
- States of manifestation – intraphysical (the ordinary, physical waking state); extraphysical (state of the extraphysical consciousness, after discarding the physical body); and projected;

4 Author's translation.

5 Apud CABALLERO, Alexandre. Philosophy through the texts. São Paulo: Cultrix, s.d., p. 233.

- Holosoma – the consciousness has 4 vehicles of manifestation;
- Multiexistentiality – the consciousness had several existences and will have many more.
- The base of the consciousness' manifestation is the thosene - any consciousness always emits ideas that are joined with emotions and infused with energies.
- Disbelief Principle – allows the constant evolution of science and the scientist's criticality, where all ideas must be experimented and should not be believed: it is necessary to be tested by oneself. From there, science is based on leading edge relative truths (verpons), without dogmas and without the absolute and incontrovertible truths as seen in conventional science (which says it is able to change the "truths" but, in fact, they remain undisputed and absolute, generating stagnation and preventing renewal and the ability to meet human necessities).

In order to facilitate its study, Conscientiology has more than 70 specialties for analysis, all interrelated, and has 6 logic orders for research (different than the unidisciplinary analysis of conventional science).

Conscientiology, a multidisciplinary and multidimensional science, requires detailed analysis of its specialties and subspecialties. Thus, it is impossible to have a compartmentalized study of the being. This alone already overcomes the problem of conventional science and other lines of human knowledge.

For a more comprehensive analysis of the Law and the legal phenomenon, Conscientiology has the specialties of Cosmoethics and Paralaw that provide space for a universe of multidimensional and multiexistential analyses:

- the first studies universal ethics, the cosmic moral, using the consciential paradigm;
- the second studies the extraphysical Law through theoretical research of the set of standards, principles and paralaws of consciential manifestation.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Undoubtedly there is a need to promote an epistemological rupture. This is urgent, otherwise life will not be understood in its multidimensionality, in its fullness. We can no longer just split to understand. One necessarily needs a global, holistic, ecological view, enabling the glimpse of the connection that exists between all of life's phenomena. The subjects were established so that there could be control over certain areas of knowledge. The methods were considered, especially those of Bacon and Descartes, as safe havens or pre-established paths so that it would be possible to know the definite results, coming, finally, to the truths of nature. Apprehend to understand was the rule. However, the methods had the virtue of simplifying life's phenomena. You

cannot separate life from death, simplicity from complexity. The effort made by science to simplify the complex was in vain.

It is experiencing a crisis of methods and at the same time, a reunion of the essence of life. The life we look at, or the science shown to us by traditional methods, is it real? Or are we faced with stars that cast their light in millions of light years ago and that are no longer actually there? How can one safely separate illusion from reality? Are the stars real in your utopia? Can we trust our senses? What does science know about itself? Is science aware that it is escaping from life when it extirpates organs and replaces them? Is it aware that the war against bacteria and viruses is a titanic and inconsequential struggle against life itself? Is the jailer aware that they imprison their own life? Does the legislator know they are imprisoning their own hatred? Does the legislature know about the crimes they are committing? Is there bad faith or incompetence? Is there ingenuity or the man who effectively intends to destroy everything? Where does the *Homo demens* want to get to? Why do we keep punishing the poor? All the State's anger is turned on the already marginalized sectors, to justify the maintenance of state power that provides so many privileges for bureaucrats. We need to rediscover the meaning of life, and seek an ethically harmonious coexistence between all beings. Or has love lost its meaning?

Transdisciplinarity can contribute to overcoming the crisis. Without a doubt, it comes to humanize man. The creation of an irresponsible scientific model, compromised by politics and intrinsically attached to the Economy, generated very serious problems in all sectors of human life. The fragmentation of knowledge has produced devastating effects.

The law has moved away from ethics, and particularly from cosmoethics. And juridical operators are unaware that they are dealing with the drama of life in its entirety. There is a living Law, which requires professional awareness of Law. There is a Law of bioethics and of cosmoethics they has to say what life is, what death is and, above all, listen to the people because they have autonomy of will. It is worth noting and looking after a law that will rescue ethics and justice, but , principally ,cosmoethics and paralaw.

REFERENCES

BAUDRILLARD, Jean, A transparência do mal. Ensaio sobre os fenômenos extremos, São Paulo: Papyrus, 1990.

BERGSON, Henri. La pensée et le movant. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1950.

BERGSON, Henri. Intuição Filosófica. Lisboa: Edições Colibri, 1994.

D'AMBROSIO, Ubiratan, Transdisciplinaridade. São Paulo: Ed. Palas Athena, 1997.

- CABALLERO, Alexandre. A filosofia através dos textos. São Paulo: Cultrix, s.d.
- CAPRA, F. A Teia da Vida. São Paulo: Ed. Cultrix, 1996.
- DALAI LAMA. Uma ética para o novo milênio. Rio de Janeiro: Sextante, 2000.
- FAGÚNDEZ, Paulo Roney Ávila. Direito e holismo. São Paulo: LTr, 2000.
- FAGÚNDEZ, Paulo Roney Ávila. O direito e a hipercomplexidade. São Paulo: LTr, 2003.
- FAGÚNDEZ, Paulo Roney Ávila. Direito e Taoísmo. São Paulo: LTr, 2005.
- FAGÚNDEZ, Paulo Roney Ávila. O novo (em) Direito. Brasília: Editora da OAB, 2006.
- KRISHNAMURTI, Jiddu. Sobre conflitos. São Paulo: Cultrix, 1999.
- KRISHNAMURTI, Jiddu. Viagem por um mar desconhecido. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Três, 1973.
- NUNES, Luiz Antonio Rizzatto. A Intuição e o Direito: um novo caminho. S/l: Ed. Del Rey, 1997.
- POPPER, Karl. Conjecturas e Refutações. Coimbra: Almedina, 2000.
- ROSE, Steven. A perturbadora ascensão do determinismo neurogenético. Ciência Hoje. Rio de Janeiro, v. 21, n. 126, p. 18, 1997.
- SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa. A crítica da razão indolente: contra o desperdício da experiência. São Paulo: Cortez, 2000.
- VEJA. O radical da genética. Revista Veja. São Paulo, n. 1919, p. 11, ago/2005.
- VIEIRA, Waldo. Manual dos Megapensenes Trivocabulares. Foz do Iguaçu: Editares, 2009.
- VIEIRA, Waldo. 700 Experimentos da Conscienciologia. Rio de Janeiro: IIPC, 1994.

Paulo Roney Ávila Fagúndez is a professor of the undergraduate and master's degree at UFSC. He has a Post-doctorate in Special Rights from the Lusíada Universities of Lisbon and Porto, Portugal; he holds a Doctorate in Law from the Federal University of Santa Catarina; has a Masters in the Theory and Philosophy of Law from UFSC; and is an Education specialist. He is the Procurator of the State of Santa Catarina, Brazil, a Member of the Skepsis Institute of Semiotics and Law and is trained in Psychoanalysis. An author and co-author of several juridical works.

Adriana Rocha has a Doctorate in State and Societal Law from UFSC and a Masters in Legal Sciences from PUCRJ. She is a Conscientiology researcher and teacher and acts as a pro bono lawyer for Conscientiology. Councilor of CIAJUC. Associate of the ABEDI – Brazilian Association of Law Teaching. Ad Hoc referee of REDESCG – UFSM. Author of several juridical and conscientiological works. In this article, contributed knowledge from the conscientiological area.