

# PROPOSAL OF AN EVOLUTIONARY SCALE FOR POLITICAL AND PARAPOLITICAL REGIMES

Luciano Melo

**ABSTRACT.** This article presents the neoproposal of political and parapolitical regimes evolving according to the average evolution of the consciousnesses involved in their creation and support. It presents a synoptic table of such regimes based on the Evolutionary Scale of the Consciousnesses, and argues that the regime called conscienciocracy is possible to be implemented when the evolutionary average of the consciousnesses involved in a given group is equal or above the evolutionary level of penta practitioners (above 25% of the scale), and it will reach its full development when that average reaches the level of conscienciologist (above 40% of the scale). Finally, it understands the community of Cognopolis, located in the city of Iguassu Falls in Brazil, as a vital place for researching and testing non-conventional regimes based on the consciencial paradigm.

**Keywords:** Parapoliticology; Paratransitology; Political and Parapolitical Regimes; Conscienciocracy.

## INTRODUCTION

Although the international liberal order has been losing power since the beginning of the third wave of autocratization, which started in the late 1990's<sup>1</sup>, democracy is still seen as the best-possible political regime for countries belonging to this system. Yet, despite some valuable features, like offering the population a larger access to political participation, beyond the limits of small groups and elites, democracy has failed to solve the most serious socioeconomic problems of our times and contributed to put leaders in power lacking any respect for democratic institutions or human rights in several places of the world.

Democracy has been the target of criticisms for a long time due to its representative character, which in fact fails to represent the population, empowering, instead, career politicians who are greedy for their continuity in public offices. Nonetheless, even if we consider representativeness as the problem (that is to say,

---

1 Lührmann & Lindberg (2018), of the V-Dem Institute, have structured a model using the Electoral Democracy Index of 178 countries along 116 years (from 1900 to 2016), gathering 17,604 observations. Outcomes confirm the two regressive waves described by Samuel Huntington's classical work *The Third Wave: Democratization by the End of the 20th Century*, of 1991, thus evidencing the development of a third wave of autocratization since 1999.

not the way the power is distributed, but how it is exercised), there are dozens of examples that show how direct democracy brought catastrophic outcomes, like in the case of Brexit in the United Kingdom, or when Venezuelans conceded Hugo Chávez the power of being indefinitely elected, regardless of the number of terms.

This debate is not the result of contemporary thinking alone. Plato (c. 427–347 B.C.) was already worried with voters' immaturity in Ancient Greece and proposed that political choices should be trusted to elders capable of making unbiased decisions. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, John Stuart Mill (1806–1873) suggested to give extra number of votes to educated citizens or professionals involved in highly intellectual activities (Crain, 2016). Nowadays, two American political scientists, David Estlund (2003) and Jason Brennan (2016), have been researching what they called *epistocracy*, or the government by the wisest. This model would include an epistocratic council, gathering professionals with knowledge on economics, politics, education, public health, etc., and excluding votes from most of the population.

Regardless of whether those ideas would help to alleviate the present democratic crisis, political models are the product of materialistic paradigms, and even though there are democratic indices that consider variables concerning human well-being (such as the human development index – HDI), a democratic regime usually focuses on guaranteeing material structures to most citizens of a particular State.

Those structures are, evidently, crucial to the survival of the human being, but they are insufficient when the person is perceived from the standpoint of a less restrictive paradigm. Under the conscientiological perspective, a person is not simply a monodimensional or material being, where socioeconomical or political issues are the only factors that matter or influence their lives. The *conscientiological paradigm* – the central, non-materialistic pillar of the science of Conscientiology – has as its basic premise that every consciousness (the human person) evolves along multiple, consecutive existences, and has access to multiple dimensions through the development of capabilities beyond their five senses, or through lucid out-of-the-body experiences via subtler, yet objective bodies. More importantly, it considers this evolution to proceed through constant self-improvement in maxifraternal, universalistic, and cosmoethical terms<sup>2</sup>, as well as through the accomplishment of an existential program prepared before (re)birth. This existential program is composed by tasks to help other people that correspond to the consciousness tendencies and is associated to other individual programs in groups who share affinities, ultimately designed to renovate the planet.

---

2 Cosmoethics is the reflection about cosmic-multidimensional ethics or morals, beyond intraphysical social morals.

All those pillars are in fact verifiable. Conscientiology is a self-experimental science. When someone undergoes a lucid out-of-the-body experience, maintaining logical reasoning and making decisions, they immediately become aware that the physical body is just another vehicle used to express themselves in the physical dimension. They thus realize they have more than one body and can objectively manifest themselves in more than one dimension. Furthermore, they could meet relatives and friends who have already discarded their physical bodies and are now in-between intraphysical lives, realizing that death itself does not exist. More importantly, they can find who they really are as well as their existential goals since they are no longer restricted by the physical brain.

In this sense, it becomes mandatory to understand possible political models that are a consequence of this framework and more akin to its evolutionary macro-purpose. The current political regimes, even the most advanced democratic ones, when they do not perpetuate small groups in power, they still focus on economic and/or belligerent aspects. Norway is a good example. Even though it always appears in the first positions of the main social and political rankings, including the top place in *The Economist's* democracy index in 2020,<sup>3</sup> it is one of the 20 largest sellers of weapons in the world<sup>4</sup>. In other words, there is a worldwide crisis in terms of coherency regarding ethical principles.

Considering the evolution of the consciousness – the consciential paradigm's main purpose –, no conventional political regime can assure social spaces that are propitious for the accomplishment of existential programs. The non-attainment of what had been planned before rebirth can entail multiple negative consequences. In a minor scope, it can lead someone to the so-called *existential emptiness*, when the consciousness becomes melancholic due to not having access or failing to accomplish something that is fundamental to their own lives. More than that, the non-completion of these assistance tasks eventually has impacts far beyond the ego, since an individual existential program is linked to several others, thus slowing down the evolution of groups and eventually of the entire planet.

This article, thus, focuses on possible models that assure the distribution and exercise of power to construct assistential, cosmoethical, and evolutionary environments. Not only the regimes are introduced, but also their components are explored, along with similarities and differences when compared with conventional regimes, as well as the logical derivations from this perspective.

Methodologically, this paper is a neoproposal aiming at creating an agenda for researchers of this field regarding the existence of parapolitical regimes

---

3 The Economist Intelligence Unit; *The state of democracy around the world*; <https://www.eiu.com/n/campaigns/democracy-index-2020/>

4 The Nordic Page; *Arm Export Increases, Keeping Norway in Top 20 Arms Exporter List*; <https://www.tnp.no/norway/panorama/5498-arm-export-increases-keeping-norway-in-top-20-arms-exporter-list>

and the evolution of political regimes based on the mere fact that consciousnesses evolve. No comprehensive bibliography was therefore intended, and specific sources were cited when necessary. More importantly, this is an extrapolation possible from observation and personal experience, both derived from the decade and a half dedicated to academic research within international relations and comparative politics (especially during the long period of field-research in Russia, Venezuela, and the United States) and over the three decades committed to research and self-research within the science of conscientiology.

## 1. EVOLUTIONARY LEVELS AND POLITICAL REGIMES

Both conscientiology and the field of political regimes / human rights are fundamentally normative, that is, they are clear on what is the ideal scenario to be attained. In the case of political regimes, scales go from totalitarian, such as the regime imposed by the Islamic State or the one found in North Korea, up to the advanced democracies presently found in the Scandinavian countries. In conscientiology, one highly important continuum is the *Evolutionary Scale of the Consciousnesses*<sup>5</sup> (ESC). If the consciousness evolves, one conclusion is that not everyone stands at the same evolutionary level. And this premise directly affects the creation and maintenance of political regimes.

**Table 1.** Evolutionary Scale of the Consciousnesses (ESC)

N	EVOLUTIONARY LEVEL	SERENISSIMUS' PERCENTAGE	HOMINOLOGY
01.	Transmigrated Consreu	10% Serenissimus	<i>Homo transmigratus</i>
02.	Resomated Consreu	20% Serenissimus	<i>Homo sapiens reurbanisatus</i>
03.	Vulgar Pre-Serenissimus	25% Serenissimus	<i>Homo sapiens preserenissimus</i>
04.	Unconscious Bait	25% Serenissimus	<i>Homo sapiens assimilatus</i>
05.	Penta Practitioner	25% Serenissimus	<i>Homo sapiens tenepessista</i>
06.	Conscious Projector	30% Serenissimus	<i>Homo sapiens projector</i>
07.	Lucid Epicon	35% Serenissimus	<i>Homo sapiens epicentricus</i>
08.	Conscientiologist	40% Serenissimus	<i>Homo sapiens conscientiologus</i>
09.	Deperto	50% Serenissimus	<i>Homo sapiens despertus</i>
10.	Semiconsciex	60% Serenissimus	<i>Homo sapiens semiextraphysicus</i>
11.	Self-critical Teleguided	65% Serenissimus	<i>Homo sapiens teleguiatus</i>
12.	Evolutionologist	75% Serenissimus	<i>Homo sapiens evolutiologus</i>
13.	Serenissimus	100% (model)	<i>Homo sapiens serenissimus</i>
14.	Free Consciex (FC)	Evolutionary Infinite	<i>Conscientia liber</i>

Source: Vieira, 2003.

5 The evolutionary scale of the consciousnesses has been proposed for the first time, by Waldo Vieira, in 1986, in the work *Projectology*, and enlarged in 2003 in the treatise *Homo sapiens reurbanisatus*.

The ESC has as its evolutionary model the *Homo sapiens serenissimus* (*Hss*), also known as Serenissimus<sup>6</sup>, the most evolved consciousness still having intra-physical lives on the planet. The *Hss* can be considered the consciousness that reached an evolutionary pinnacle, expressing the highest level of cosmoethics, universalism, and maxifraternity, with capabilities beyond materiality or average skills, such as advanced parapsychism, cosmovision, and the ability to assist considerably sizeable groups. That makes the *Hss* the planet's major benefactor.

In this context, the evolutionary level of any consciousness is measured by contrast with the characteristics attributed to the *Hss*. In this scale, the less evolved human that still inhabits the planet is named *Homo sapiens reurbani-satus*, or resomated consreu. This kind of consciousness has been described in the work of the same name, where Vieira provides evidence of their existence based on over seven thousand articles collected in periodicals from all around the world. One may say that one of the resomated consreu's marked characteristics is the absence of moral and ethical personal code (amorality), making them perpetrate acts contrary to the common well-being and centered around their own ego.

In terms of the planet's evolutionary level, the most accepted hypothesis among conscientiology researchers today situates it at the level of around 25%, corresponding to the vulgar pre-serenissimus. The vulgar pre-serenissimus is the ordinary human being, still unaware of multidimensionality, but possessing basic moral codes. In planetary terms, one can perceive the existence of ethical principles being applied at a global level, while the centrality of the materialistic paradigm is still present, as well as a steep inequality among humans. The fact that one out of each three people inhabits non-democratic places today,<sup>7</sup> the brutal consumerism and the destruction of the planet are inescapable proof of that.

Understanding this evolutionary scale is fundamental to this study, since the conscientiocentric approach assumes that everything is a product of the consciousness. This means, for example, that every expression of the consciousness,

6 The *Serenissimi Theory*, officially presented by Vieira in 1970, grounds the hypothesis of the Serenissimi's existence with two arguments: (1) Considering that below us, human beings, there is a series of sub-humans, without self-awareness, instinctive, from a minor evolutionary level, with which we co-exist since millions of years, why would there not be other consciousnesses at a higher evolutionary level? (2) Considering there are supercriminals, acting anonymously, planning and doing evil things to other beings, why could there not be assistantially supergifted human beings, acting in an anonymous way, helping thousands of people through their wide, brotherly bioenergetical control? See Machado, César de Souza; *Serenões: Consciências Superevoluídas*; <http://www.metaconsciencia.com/>

7 For V-Dem (2018), at least 1 out of 3 people in the world (around 2.5 out of 7.6 billion) do not live under a democratic system. If the Freedom House (2019) evaluation on world liberty were used, only 39% of global population live under a fully democratic regime; over 4 billion (4.39 billion) people live in partially free or not free countries. *The Economist Intelligence Unit's Democracy Index* (2019) has verified that 45% of the countries have full or defective democracies, whereas 55% have hybrid or authoritarian regimes. Finally, Polity (2018) has rated 57% of the countries (with populations of at least 500,000) as democracies of some kind, 13% as autocracies, and 28% as democracies and autocracies.

whatever they think, feel, do, or sustain, intrinsically depends on the evolutionary level that the consciousness finds themselves at the moment. In this sense, regimes and political systems are intertwined to that premise – deriving from consciousnesses' evolutionary levels, whether in a neighborhood, in a city, in a state, in a country or in a society of nations. Nations, States, governments, and regimes can never be born from spontaneous generation: they depend on many consciousnesses for their creation, implementation, and maintenance. That way, the ESC, unlike other scales such as the biological evolution scale, focuses on consensual attributes not applicable only to the material dimension, and which are developed along multiple existences.

Applying the conscientiocentric model changes radically the understanding of regimes and processes of autocratization or democratization. Since everything is a product of consciousnesses and their evolutionary levels, regimes are either autocratic, democratic, or totalitarian due to the pattern of the consciousnesses that formed and sustain that political system. These consciousnesses must possess either autocratic, democratic, or totalitarian traits, respectively. It would be unlikely to find, for instance, a group of dictators with evolved codes of morality and conduct, capable of generating advanced, ethical, and democratic regimes based on human rights. Consciousnesses with a high level of dictatorial traits tend to create dictatorships. The contrary is also valid. It would not be possible to find backward and anticosmoethical systems resulting from a group of *Homines sapiens serenissimi*, the consciousness understood by conscientiology as the apex within this evolutionary cycle.

In this sense, the evolutionary level of the consciousnesses who are part of a group in a particular location must count for the formation of either more advanced or more backwards political regimes; or, in the terms of this article, more evolved or more unevolved systems.

This premise, however, leads to at least two difficult questions to be answered but possible to be hypothesized:

1. *What does really count for the establishment of less or more evolved political regimes: the average of the evolutionary level of all members of a given State, nation, community, or just the average of the evolutionary level of the leaders?*

2. *In the case of democratic elections for the selection of political leaders, do the winner's evolutionary level reflect the average of the population's evolutionary level? In other words, is it true that "each people have the leader they deserve"?*

If it is true that the level of evolution of the entire population must count for the implementation of less or more advanced regimes (not just the leaders' levels of evolution), such assumption would be no problem in democratic en-

vironments. However, in autocratic regimes, that would be the same as to affirm that the evolutionary level of millions of people (over one billion in the case of China), is extremely low. Moreover, in the case of countries under sociopathic leaders like in North Korea, that would be the same as to state that the population has an evolutionary level still worse than the above-mentioned example. Therefore, part of the objective of this proposal is to differentiate who possesses more and who less responsibility.

## 2. POLITICAL AND CONSCIENIOLOGICAL LITERATURE

The great majority of the world's democratic regimes have representative democracies, in which the political participation of the population occurs occasionally, more strongly during elections periods, and political representatives theoretically act on behalf of the people who put them into power. Yet, different social groups affect political directions, especially two: the elites – those actors with a greater influence in economic, social, cultural, or political terms – and the civil society, usually organized under non-governmental organizations and social movements.

Seymour Martin Lipset, a well-known social scientist, when talking about democracy's social requirements in the 1950's, for example, stated that "conflicts between different elites are the system's vital blood" (1959). In classic democratization assessments, O'Donnell & Schmitter (1981) and Przeworski (1986) have articulated that an authoritarian regime can enter its liberalization phase when there is political rivalry between elites with different perspectives. Stepan (1988) has stressed that fissures within another elite group – the military forces – would be essential for potential democratization.

In terms of civil society, in the international sphere, NGOs have become a fundamental tool for the observation of elections in less democratic countries and to assure the non-violation of human rights (Simmons 2009; Hyde 2011; Kelley 2012). In the domestic sphere, there are Putnam's (1993; 2015) classical assessments on the importance of civil associations for the maintenance of democracy, but also the study on how civil society was fundamental for the Nazi regime to rise to power in Germany (Berman 1997). In the social movements' field, Nepsstad (2011), after comparing several revolutions that have been started by the population, has found that their success depended mostly on military fissures and the pressure of international actors. Yet, the mandatory variable was civil society, but only in the cases in which there was a unified internal leadership, and a non-violent discipline.

These discussions are relevant for a deeper understanding on who really holds the power in the construction and continuity of political regimes. Yet, along the vast political science literature, stands out, for this research, Bruce Bueno de Mesquita's & Alastair Smith's (2011) assessment. The researchers affirmed that the notion that individuals govern alone is nonsensical, since not even the greatest dictator or totalitarian leader has the strength to remain in power during long periods of time without the support of several groups.

For them, there are at least three groups (or *selectorates*, people with *selection* power) with major or minor influence concerning the selection and continuity of leaders, as well as on the establishment and maintenance of political regimes over time:

1. **Nominal Selectorate:** all citizens who are legally able to vote and who do not have real power, since the system is representative and not through direct democracy. In this case, the members of the nominal-selectorate group are considered *interchangeable*, that is, they can be replaced or exchanged by other people, with little affect in terms of outcome.

2. **Real Selectorate:** this is the group that in fact select candidates and leaders. In Great Britain, they are the members of the voting parliament from the majority party; in Saudi Arabia, they are the real royal family members; in China, they are the members of the Communist Party with power to vote. In this case, the real-selectorate members are considered *influents*, meaning that they able to influence the selection of leaders.

3. **Victorious Coalition:** the most important of the three groups, known as *the essential ones*. They keep the leader in power, control policy, and are strong enough to overthrow the regime. In the case of dictatorships, they can be small groups formed by the armed force members (such as the group who overthrew Hosni Mubarak in Egypt, in 2011), court members, or members from the religious class (such as in Iran, where the Mullahs control the presidency).

In countries like North Korea, the victorious coalition is formed at most by 200 people supporting the Kim family (Byman, Daniel & Lind, 2010); in the case of Russia, it is the small group of technocrats and oligarchs supporting and benefiting from the regime who are part of the vertical pyramid of power built by Vladimir Putin (Dawisha 2014). In democratic scenarios, the victorious coalition is composed by many people, as expected. In the United States, for example, such group is formed by voters distributed in states, whose support to the candidate is converted into his victory in the electoral college. This group, a large fraction of the nominal selectorate, can control Legislative and Judiciary Powers with 1/5 of the votes, not even close to the majority of the American population.

The result, according to Mesquita & Smith, is that governments and regimes differ according to the dimension of selectorates and victorious coalitions,

either limiting or freeing leaders' actions. Therefore, dictatorships (either civil dictatorships, absolute monarchies or military juntas) are governments based on very few essentials, equally few influents, and a nominal selectorate without any power, because it lacks even the right to vote or participate in elections that are fraudulent. On the other hand, democracies mean many essential ones, and many more interchangeable ones, with a great number of influents.

Although the theory of selectorates and victorious coalitions was proposed to explain leaders' continuity in power, the model is extremely useful to help to construct more accurate answers regarding the two questions above.

It remains clear that, in dictatorships, those who count for the establishment and maintenance of regimes are more the leaders and not so much the population, that is, much more the real selectorate and the victorious coalition. Citizens in general lack real influence, enduring the consequence of small groups, greedy for power and wealth.

In democracies, one may also say that not all the population is responsible for the establishment and maintenance of regimes and leaders, just the nominal selectorates and the victorious coalition. Undoubtedly, this is an immensely larger group in comparison with dictatorships, but hardly composes a country's total population, considering age limits to vote. Furthermore, one must consider that the nominal selectorate has a much weaker influence than other groups.

In consciology, one may use a similar reasoning to think about who are the victorious coalition and the selectorates, and the way of distributing responsibility for the creation and maintenance of more evolutive regimes to everyone. This will be explored in this article ahead.

Yet, every attempt to bridge academic and consciological knowledge, or the use of this paradigm on social, political, or economic phenomena, especially concerning countries or the international system, is utterly complex, and this understanding is still in the beginning. There are dozens of fields that can be utilized, and hundreds of variables that consider a plethora of multidimensional and non-physical elements, especially holokarmalogy, the field that studies personal and interpersonal karmic relations. Therefore, the main purpose of this article is to present a first proposal in order to generate a debate that can help develop this area in a more comprehensive way.

As commented before, considering the field of thosenology<sup>8</sup>, it becomes evident that any fact, parafact, either tangible or concrete, diaphanous or intangible, is a product or derivation, until contrary proof, from the thosene (thoughts +

---

8 Thosenology, one of consciology's specialities, studies the thosenes (a vocable created out of three words: thoughts, sentiments and energies). It considers the thosene as a basic unit of the manifestation, integral and integrated, of the consciousness in any dimension, and represents the indissociable union between thought or idea, sentiment or emotion, and energy, attitude or action, always omnipresent.

sentiments + energies) of one or more consciousnesses. In this context, according to evolutiveology, consciential products are more evolved or less evolved depending on the evolutionary level of the consciousness or consciousnesses that produced them.

Therefore, political or parapolitical regimes – those that consider multidimensional variables and are, in theory, more advanced than the regimes known today – are, in the first place, *thosenic* products established by groups to systemize and organize social or parasocial life. Because the quality of those thosenes depends on the consciousness or consciousnesses that produced them, political and parapolitical regimes can be classified or ranked from less to more evolved. Such ranking is purely normative, as commented before.

Since one of the objectives of this article is the attempt to understand who are less or more responsible for shaping and maintaining regimes throughout this scale, it is important to consider precepts of both holokarmalogy, the field cited before, and seriexology, the science that studies the consecutive lives of consciousnesses.

Holokarmalogy understands that one of the universal laws concerns the mechanism of action and reaction. In this context, actions that are more cosmoethical tend to attract more cosmoethical reactions, thus expanding the free-will and recomposition between people. Contrarywise, actions that are less cosmoethical will attract less cosmoethical reactions, expanding determinism and groupkarmic interprison between people. It is important to stress that this law neither punishes nor rewards anyone, it is based upon a reactive mechanism that involves thosenity and its affinity effect.

Seriexology's main pillar is that consciousnesses, in a general manner, undergo a continuous process involving rebirths, the discard of biological bodies, and periods in which they are in-between-lives. This course, which provides different contexts and challenges for learning, has as objective the qualification of consciousnesses until they reach a more advanced evolutionary level.

It is thus possible to assume that successive lives are closely connected to holokarma. These lives are useful so the consciousness can “pay their debts” with different persons and groups, as well as offering an opportunity for them to gather with other consciousnesses who share similar affinities to accomplish cosmoethical tasks, often planned before rebirth. In this context, conscientiological research has demonstrated that no one is born into a family or even in a country by chance. The connections of affection and disaffection directly affect the formation of groups.

**Table 2.** Evolutionary Scale of the Consciousnesses (ESC) with Sub-scales.

Nº	EVOLUTIONARY LEVEL	PERCENT RATE?
01.	Transmigrated Consreu	10 to < 20%
02.	Resomated Consreu	20 to < 25%
03.	Vulgar Pre-Serenissimus / Unconscious Bait	25%
04.	Penta Practitioner	25.1 to < 30%
05.	Conscious Projector	30 to < 35%
06.	Lucid Epicon	35 to < 40%
07.	Conscientiologist	40 to < 50%
08.	Deperto	50 to < 60%
09.	Semiconsciex	60 to < 70%
10.	Self-critic Teleguided	65 to < 75%
11.	Evolutionologist	75 to < 90%
12.	Serenissimus	90 to < 100%
13.	Pre-Free Consciex	100%

**Source:** Table constructed by the author after the ESC.

The political and parapolitical proposal follows the evolutionary scale presented by Vieira in 2003 but reorganized here to make clearer the intervals contained in each evolutionary level. In the table above, someone with, for instance, 50% of the conscientiality of a *Homo sapiens serenissimus* is just starting the evolutionary level called “deperto”. Since the interval goes from 50% to 60%, this consciousness can consider having attained total deperticity when near 60%. Moreover, an interval has been included for the *Hss* evolutionary level, since there are “junior” and “senior” *Hss*.

### 3. POLITICAL AND PARAPOLITICAL REGIMES BASED ON THE EVOLUTIONARY SCALE OF THE CONSCIOUSNESSES

In the proposal of correlating current conventional political regimes and new parapolitical regimes with the ESC’s levels, one can see that, in a general manner, there are five groups with eight regime types. Except for anomy, which is precisely the absence of any political system, the first group is constituted by regressive, non-democratic regimes – totalitarianism, autocracy/dictatorship, and hybrid regime/pseudodemocracy, corresponding to the evolutionary levels of transmigrable consreu to resomated consreu (20 to < 25% of the *Hss*).

The second group comprehends democratic countries, going from transition to democracy (democratization period), to intermediary democracy, up to advanced democracy. Those three regimes correspond to the evolutionary levels of the resomated consreu and vulgar pre-serenissimus/unconscious bait, or from 22.5 to 25% of the ESC.

**Table 3.** Evolutionary Scale of the Political Regimes Grounded on the Evolutionary Scale of the Consciousnesses.

Nº	Regime	Consciousnesses' evolutionary average	General rating	System type	Synonymy	Serenissimus' percentate
01	Anomy	Transmigrable Consreu	N/A	Anomic	Lawless Land Broken State	< 20%
02	Totalitarianism	Transmigrable Consreu and Resomated Consreu	Politically Backward	Totalitarian	Terror State Police State Gendarme State	< 20 to 20%
03	Autocracy	Resomated Consreu	Politically Backward	Personalist Military, One-party Hybrid Monarchist: Personalist, One-party Personalist, Military One-party, Military Triple-threat	Authoritarianism Dictatorship Theocracy Soviet Communism Fundamentalist State Militarycracy Bellicosecracy Oligarchy	20%
04	Hybrid Regime/ Pseudodemocracy	More Resomated Consreus than Vulgar <i>Pre-serenissimi</i>	Politically Backward	Pseudo democratic	Electoral Authoritarianism	20% to < 2.5%
05	Initial Democracy	More Vulgar <i>Pre-serenissimi</i> than Resomated Consreus	Politically Intermediary	Electoral-democratic	Transition-State toward Democracy	22.5% to < 25%
06	Intermediary Democracy	Vulgar <i>Pre-serenissimus</i> and Unconscious Bait	Politically Intermediary	Parliamentary Monarchy Parliamentarism Presidential Republic Parliamentary Republic Mixed Republic Tripartite Republic	Indirect Democracy Indirect Democratic State	25%
07	Advanced Democracy	Vulgar <i>Pre-sere nissimus</i> and Unconscious Bait	Politically Advanced	Direct Democratic	Direct Democratic State Lawful State Pure Democracy	25%
08	Initial Conscientiocracy	Penta Practitioner	Initial Parapolitical	Penta Practitioners' Collegiate	Pentocracy	25.1 to < 30%
09	Elementary Conscientiocracy	Conscious Projector	Initial Parapolitical	Conscious Projectors' Collegiate	Projectiocracy	30 to < 35%
10	Intermediary Conscientiocracy	Lucid Epicon	Intermediary Parapolitical	College of Lucid Epicons	Epicentercracy Offiexocracy Parapsychocracy Interassistantiocracy	35% to < 40%
11	Settled Conscientiocracy	Conscientiologist	Intermediary Parapolitical	Conscientiologists' Collegiate	Maxiproexocracy Conscientiocentrocacy Cosmoethical Socialism Cosmoethical Communism Groupkarmocracy	40% to < 50%
12	Initial Lucidocracy	Deperto	Advanced Parapolitical	Depertos' Collegiate	Depertocracy Deperto Beings' Era Lucid Consciousnesses' State	50% to < 60%
13	Intermediary Lucidocracy	Semiconsciex	Advanced Parapolitical	Semiconsciexes' Collegiate	Semiconsciexocracy	60% to < 65%
14	Settled Lucidocracy	Self-critic Teleguided	Advanced Parapolitical	Self-critic Teleguided Collegiate	Discernmentocracy State of Maximechanism's Minipieces	65% to < 75%
15	Initial Cosmocracy	Evolutionologist	Advanced Parapolitical	College of Evolutionologists	Evolutiocracy Paralawcracy Cosmoethicocracy	75% to < 90%
16	Intermediary Cosmocracy	<i>Homo sapiens serenissimus</i>	Advanced Parapolitical	<i>Serenissimi's</i> Collegiate	<i>Serenissimi's</i> Era Serencracy	90% to < 100%
17	Advanced Cosmocracy	Pre-Free Consciex	Advanced Parapolitical	Pre-Free Consciexes' Collegiate	Consciential Era Pre-Free Consciexes' Era Pure Polikarmacracy	100%

It is important to highlight that direct democracy has been considered as a synonym for advanced democracy. That is related to the inherent problems connected to representative democracy reported at the beginning of the article, which can eventually be solved by reducing, in the first place, intermediary or professional politicians while enlarging the political participation of the population. One of the main critiques concerning direct democracy, however, regards to exerting it in a large scale. Vasconcelos (2016) has proposed a model named *pure democracy*, where technology is the means through which citizens participate both in terms of proposition and decision processes. In this model, citizens express their ideas through a framework called Score and Habilitation System (SHS), not only presenting but also voting on projects that interest them the most or that are important to their communities, considered from the standpoint of the expected effects of each one. There is also room for direct consultation in plebiscites.

Within the conscientiological community, Vieira has presented the collegiate model, seeking to decrease artificial hierarchies constructed for decision making and for institutional or communitarian objectives. For Vieira, *the collegiate is the directive organ in which members have equal powers (horizontality democratic)* (2013, p. 500). In this proposal, there are no presidents, secretaries, general coordinators, or leaders. All participants have real freedom of expression and the guarantee of possessing the same vote power as any other participant.

Pure, horizontal democracy, through a collegiate, is understood in this context as one of the fundamental elements for the construction of a more advanced political regime. That way, democracy never ceases to integrate every future regime, even if there are other constitutive aspects for a regime to be considered more than just political. That is, pure democracy is necessary but not sufficient.

The three new regimes, now qualified as parapolitical – conscientocracy, lucidocracy and cosmocracy – can exist as soon as people change their own paradigms, understanding and experiencing the sheer reality that they are beings who live, act, and evolve in a multidimensional universe. *Conscientocracy* is associated to evolutionary levels between 25.1 to < 50% of the ESC, *lucidocracy*, between 50 to < 75%, and *cosmocracy*, between 75 to 100% of the evolutionary scale. All three groups are subdivided in phases going from the initial phase, when the regime can regress to the previous level, up to the settled phase, when the parapolitical regime is already mature, and the probability for any regression to the preceding regime is nears zero. More specifically, parapolitical regimes, as a category, begins when the average of the consciousnesses coexisting at a shared territory starts to establish a practical contact with multidimensionality, through interassistance practices like *penta* and lucid out-of-body experiences.

Two immediate conclusions can be drawn: (1) it is still not possible to have a parapolitical regime in any country of the world; (2) groups of less evolved consciousnesses are unable to support more advanced regimes.

#### 4. MEASUREMENT OF POLITICAL AND PARAPOLITICAL REGIMES

In the social sciences literature, there are many proposals regarding how to measure political regimes, and several institutions – such as Polity IV, Freedom House, The Economist Democracy Index, and V-Dem – provide yearly ranking considering practically every country in the world.

Such measurements usually utilize liberal indicators or are connected to elections to measure the level of liberal or electoral democracy. The most accepted minimal definition for a country to be considered as democratic is when it has free and fair elections, and when civil rights and liberties are safeguarded and respected by the State.

These variables can also be applied to parapolitical regimes, although measurement of these systems also need multidimensional indicators. Furthermore, the discovery of what regime or para-regime is possible to be established in some group depends on measuring the evolutionary levels of populations through conscientimetrological instruments applied by the people themselves. Such undertakings in larger populations – in cities or countries – become inviable; but it is possible through heteroconscientimetrological evaluations, often based on “informed inferences.”

One digression is necessary. I do not consider a linear approach of any evolutionary scale the most productive way of measurement. Linearity can mislead researchers to think that, as soon as someone or some regime has attained a certain level, all previous levels had been overcome. Instead, reality is non-linear – characteristics from several previous, even future levels, can coexist. The average is what really matters.

In this non-linear approach, it is important to understand what characteristics and attributes are related to each evolutionary level to obtain a more realistic snapshot. One way of facilitating such measurement is to consider each level as having a 0-100% interval. Someone or some regime can, that way, have different percent rates at each level, eventually generating an average. Someone can, on average, have the evolutionary level of a conscientiologist (between 40 and 50%), for example, but still possess gaps to be filled concerning the lucid projector level.

**Table 4.** Evolutionary Scale of the Political Regimes Applied to a Hypothetical Case

N	TYPOLGY	PERCENT RATE FOR EACH LEVEL										
01.	Vulgar Pre-Serenissimus / Unconscious Bait	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	100%
02.	Penta Practitioner	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	70%
03.	Conscious Projector	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	30%
04.	Lucid Epicon	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	50%
05.	Conscientiologist	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	70%
06.	Deperto	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	50%
07.	Semiconsciex	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	30%
08.	Self-critic Teleguided	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	20%
09.	Evolutionologist	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	20%
10.	Serenissimus	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	10%
	Mean	450/10 = 45% = Conscientiologist										450

Source: hypothetical example constructed by the author.

In terms of regimes and para-regimes, the examples below use the Islamic State (ISIS), Venezuela, and a hypothetical institution grounded on the consciential paradigm as case studies to make the proposal more understandable.

ISIS is clearly an authoritarian group. No election ever takes place, human rights are seldom observed, and law enforcement follows the strictest kind of *sharia* law. Yet, characteristics from other regimes do exist, especially *totalitarian* attributes, since ISIS’ leaders have installed a police State overreaching any conventional dictatorship, interfering in the “citizens” private life, up to the determination of what they should wear and types of haircuts. Despite these most striking characteristics, ISIS has weak institutions, usually incapable of seamlessly implementing a regime that follows a unified set of rules (Filipec & Brtnický, 2016). Thus, anomic characteristics are also present, and many decisions are purely arbitrary.

**Table 5.** Evolutionary Scale of Political Regimes Applied to the Islamic State Case

N	REGIME	PERCENT RATE FROM EACH REGIME									
1.	Anomy										
2.	Totalitarianism										
3.	Autocracy										
4.	Pseudo Democracy										
5.	Starting Democracy										
6.	Intermediary Democracy										
7.	Advanced Democracy										

Source: author’s observation.

In this context, hypothetically, ISIS combines three regimes with different weights. Since anomic and totalitarian elements are important attributes, the regime’s average stays below 20%, that is, a regime formed and sustained by consciousnesses with the lowest evolutionary level possible on this planet.

Venezuela, on the other hand, clearly shows why its regime is considered a hybrid one. The country was a true *avis rara* in Latin America. While most of its neighbors lived under dictatorships and military governments, Venezuela enjoyed a two-party democracy. However, such reality changed after the year 2000, with the country gradually becoming one of the main cases of autocratization, decreasing its democratic level.

These new transitions to autocracy are not so easily perceived today as they used to be in the past. Instead of launching overnight coups as before – the preferred method found in classical studies on democratic collapse – leaders with dictatorial tendencies have learned that keeping an electoral-democratic façade matters internationally. In a context where international electoral observation has become the rule of the game and where “naming and shaming” have gained the instantaneity of a *tweet*, elections are distorted on behalf of candidates or parties in power – never in a flagrant or amateur way – while other democratic elements are undermined from within.

In these countries, the Executive branch concentrates and amplifies power, while the Judiciary and Legislative become gradually constricted. Also, the

opposition realizes that the rules of the game constantly change – with the decrease on the access to the media, funding, and voters – and citizens see their civil and political rights shortening or simply disappearing. In the autocratization world, heads of State become sponsors of intricate political systems recurring to clientelism to buy votes, and to patronage to buy fidelity.

Venezuela today is a combination of at least four regimes. Until 2018, it was a hybrid regime, without fair or free elections and with violations of human rights. In 2018, however, Nicolás Maduro was reelected in an election considered illegitimate by most countries. Nationally, Venezuela is today a quasi-dictatorship, despite having several Venezuelan states with pseudo democratic characteristics, while cities like Chacao and El Hatillo, in the Miranda state, and San Cristóbal, in the Táchira state, still display initial or even intermediary democratic characteristics.

**Table 6.** Evolutionary Scale of Political Regimes Applied to Venezuela's Case

N	REGIME	PERCENT RATE FROM EACH REGIME									
1	Anomy										
2	Totalitarianism										
3	Autocracy										
4	Pseudodemocracy										
5	Initial Democracy										
6	Intermediary Democracy										
7	Advanced Democracy										

Source: author's observation.

In this context, Venezuela's regime, especially under Nicolás Maduro, averages between 20% and 25%, meaning that it was formed and has been supported by a group of consciousnesses with low level of evolution.<sup>9</sup>

Leaving the context of countries to the reality of conscientiocentric institutions – those based on the consciential paradigm and dedicated to research conscientiology's scientific fields – such reasoning can also be made, especially in intentional communities such as Cognópolis Foz, located in Iguassu Falls, in the southern area of Brazil<sup>10</sup>. Processes of distribution and exercise of power are in place and leaders are periodically elected, representing not only a large number of volunteers, but also, in some cases, of many inhabitants. Ulman (2019) has analyzed the experiments associated to direct democracy in the Cognópolis

9 Several factors, assessed for the PhD thesis, affect this average, both nationally and subcontinentally. Venezuela's case was brought to show differences in the democracy level when using a multilevel analysis; analogously, the same happens in the Cognópolis Foz. Anyway, Venezuela's autocracy level today depends much more on, for over 20 years in power, Chavism.

10 The Cognópolis district, named in 2009, occupies a 7 million m<sup>2</sup> area, 1.7 million m<sup>2</sup> of which by 24 institutions, among them the CEAEC — Higher Center for Conscientiology Studies, *Centro de Altos Estudos da Conscientiologia*. Moreover, it has beautiful permanent preservation areas, eleven residence blocks, and 35 self-research laboratories. Today, over 500 people inhabit the Cognópolis in Foz do Iguassu (Year-base: 2021).

district, comprehending the Intercooperation Collegiate and the Council of the 500 (where each person has the right to one vote) and concluded that the democratic level in place is effectively high. This is a seminal work, since political science frameworks that are usually applied to cities, states, or countries are utilized to analyze an intentional community formed by volunteers. Yet, the framework used by the author did not take into consideration all political models that can be happening in parallel and at the same time.

**Table 7.** Evolutionary Scale of Political Regimes Applied to a Hypothetical Case of a Conscientiocentric Institution

N	REGIME	PERCENT RATE FROM EACH REGIME									
1	Anomy										
2	Totalitarianism										
3	Autocracy	■									
4	Pseudo Democracy	■	■								
5	Initial Democracy	■	■								
6	Intermediary Democracy	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
7	Advanced Democracy	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
8	Initial Conscientiocracy	■	■								
9	Elementary Conscientiocracy										
10	Intermediate Conscientiocracy										
11	Mature Conscientiocracy										
12	Initial Lucidocracy										
13	Intermediary Lucidocracy										
14	Mature Lucidocracy										
15	Initial Cosmocracy										
16	Intermediary Cosmocracy										
17	Mature Cosmocracy										

Source: case study constructed by author.

In the hypothetical example above, one can see a clear mix between at least six political regimes, even an initial conscientiocracy. Sometimes the volunteers make decisions based on multidimensional indicators; however, decisions are generally made by leaders without taking into consideration the total number of volunteers, albeit there are cases in which general consultation is used. When questioned, the leadership often states that all decisions are widely democratic, yet there are moments when the presidency make decisions by themselves, sometimes leading the institution to negative situations.

The development of indicators to distinguish autocratic and democratic from conscientiocentric and cosmocratic decisions is a task yet to be accomplished, contributing to qualify transitions towards more advanced parapolitical regimes.

Even comprehending six regimes, *intermediate democracy* is the strongest regime, averaging at 25% on the evolutionary scale, albeit the volunteers themselves have evolutionary levels higher than that sum. There is no paradox at all. Parapolitical regimes are quite new, and there is neither understanding nor con-

sensus about their structural attributes. Moreover, people tend to lean on what they know better and on what generates quicker outcomes.

Regardless, a deeper understanding is needed on who are more accountable for the construction, maintenance, and longevity of regimes that exist in the world. Especially because no one would affirm that all the people who are part of the ISIS's population have an evolutionary level of 20% or less. Conscientiological research show that groups are formed due to common affinities, even if these affinities are unconscious. That means, theoretically, no one would be part of a dictatorial environment if there are not groupkarmic connections between leader and subordinates.

The levels of accountability, however, must be adjusted, contemplating both aggravating and attenuating factors for each specific case. It is logical to assume that the most influent actors, those who could effectively change the course of history in a more incisive manner, ought to be more accountable, in the same way that those without ascendancy over the regime should assumedly be less responsible. Yet, it is important to bear in mind that even the persons with a weaker upper hand do often work in bureaucratic offices directly connected to the government, implementing its policies and guidelines.

Even in these cases, one should not homogenize the level of conscientiality of an entire group by labeling entire populations based on the leaders alone, especially because there is consensus among lucid projectors, for instance, about the insertion of Evolutionologists and *Homines sapiens serenissimi* in dictatorial environments to accelerate, whenever possible, democratic transitions. Yet, the hypothesis of the *Evolutionary Scale of Political and Parapolitical Regimes* depends on the average of the evolutionary level of an entire group taking into consideration more and less influential groups. In this sense, both the worst and best scores are considered generating a common number without forgetting about the weight that certain elites possess.

Mesquita & Smith's theory can also be applied to parapolitical contexts, where the people who are accountable for the formation, maintenance, and evolution of the (para)political regime are the influents and the essential ones, with few interchangeable ones. Yet, in the ICCC, the essential and influent ones are, in the first place, the volunteers who occupy innumerable positions – administrative, intellectual, parapsychic-interassistential – and the voters in decisions that impact the community through direct vote.

Theoretically, the number of accountable people is much higher in this case due to self-awareness about collective program and the most serious decisions, affecting the community, taken by an institutional structure called *Intercooperation Collegiate*, where each volunteer has right to 1 vote, regardless of position. Unlike purely state regimes, lucid volunteers chose to join the evolutionary group, without constraint nor involvement with financial and wage issues, in comparison

with people employed in government offices for subsistence reasons, unaware of possible groupkarmic interprisons underlying the process.

Therefore, accountability for creation, support, and evolution of parapolitical regimes would be shared among all volunteers, not just small groups or elites, although the latter do exist. In this case, the evolutionary average obtained with all volunteers' levels of evolution already permits projecting some possible new regimes.

In the latest census of the ICCC, from 2018, it was found that over 70% of volunteers are penta practitioners (72.12%). It is not possible to know the percentage of those who live specifically in the Cognopolis Foz, but it is safe to infer that the majority of cognopolitans today practice the technique. Moreover, it is logical to think that hundreds of volunteers living in the neighborhood have already surpassed the evolutionary level of penta practitioner (25% – 30%), even more so if we consider that most members of the Council of Epicons live in that area. Therefore, there is serious evidence supporting the real possibility, today, of starting a conscientocracy, if the group wishes so.

One must ponder, however, that the average of the evolutionary level of all volunteers just indicates the *possibility* for the existence of advanced parapolitical regimes. It does not mean saying or predicting in any way that these models would exist or even succeed. That depends on multiple factors: willingness to install them in the first place, besides a profound recycling regarding power. Historically, democracy has been practiced for shorter periods of time when compared to millenary traditional, patriarchal, monarchical, or autocratic societies. Even with all the knowledge and practical experience that the volunteers of the the ICCC have in terms of multidimensionality; even with the existence of shared advanced principles, individuals in the group are very much influenced by their own multi-millenary baggage.

Moreover, a delay may exist between a group's evolutionary level and the regime that is implemented, precisely for the reasons above described. In the ICCC, for instance, only one institutional structure operates as proposed by the principles of collegiatology – the *Collegiate of Conscientiology*. Currently (November 2021), there is not one single conscientiocentric institution (CI) that follows the model of having structurers without directors or area coordinators. If we consider *pure democracy* as one of the foundations of parapolitical regimes, the current context shows how much the group still has to progress to implement a possible conscientocracy.

Even if we keep this conversation around Cis alone, what this proposal makes clear is that any political regime or social system only changes in accordance with the personal changes achieved by the people involved in the maintenance of such structures. Institutions or States are formed by groups of consciousnesses. If no one wishes to give up concentration of power, distributing it in

a more horizontal structure, no conscientocracy will be ever started.

Pragmatically, dictatorships are not likely to become democratic environments overnight through external interventions alone if people do not value change or are conservatist. Nor will democracies become conscientocracies without investment in individual behaviors that positively affect the group.

Any regime change thus depends on self-evolution that ends up positively affecting the group. That means the idea is to increase the practice of principles such as cosmoethics, maxifraternity, and universalism first in personal actions, and then in rules, norms, and in the daily conduct of both government and ordinary citizens. The obvious conclusion is that the ignorance of those factors and the non-reeducation of authoritarian and backward traits, not only prevents collective evolution but also inhibits any substantial and lasting change.

Concerning backward political regimes, research confirms that countries with authoritarian tradition take at least five decades, on average, to establish more effective democratic regimes after the substitution of leaders with the regime change. Such amount of time is usually associated with the period necessary for democratic institutions to gain concreteness, and people to become familiar with civil liberties and political rights. In the meantime, it is still possible that dictatorial leaders and dictatorial groups to return to power, reinstalling previous patterns. Such facts may happen due to the attempt by consciousnesses and groups to regain power (Ostracism Syndrome)<sup>11</sup>, or because the evolutionary average cannot support the aspired changes, among other possibilities.

Note, for instance the situation that occurred in Egypt in 2011. After decades of a dictatorial regime led by Hosni Mubarak, the population effectively forced the overthrow of the dictator from the government with considerable help of the armed forces. Yet, two years later, and after the first free elections, the Islamist leader elected has promised the implementation of the *sharia* law, with personal commitment of freeing terrorists for criminal acts that had killed hundreds of people. Two aspects that, apparently, never brought any concern to the population. On the contrary, they were welcomed by the people.<sup>12</sup>

Egypt's case is relevant, since it hypothetically shows the possibility of a population who still do not possess the necessary evolutionary level, on average, to select truly democratic leaders with higher personal ethical codes. That is, leaders just reflect the (cosmo)ethics code of the society they represent. It is also possible that the population has been effectively tricked by "the same birds with different feathers," and will have to go out to the streets to overthrow once again the latest regime. Nevertheless, the mere fact of having citizens publicly defending their rights is important in terms of collective reeducation, being of assistance

---

11 Haymann, Maximiliano. *Síndrome do Ostracismo: Mecanismos e Autossuperação*. Foz do Iguassu, Brazil: Editares, 2011.

12 Kirkpatrick, David D. *Egypt's New Leader Takes Oath, Promising to Work for Release of Jailed Terrorist*. The New York Times; Newspaper; Section: Middle East; June 29, 2012; New York, USA, p. xx.

of those consciousnesses who are more stubborn to understand the value of new and open-minded ideas, gradually.

In the field of parapolitical regimes, it is possible to hypothesize that changes may happen faster after some level, since the consciousnesses who are involved in the system have higher evolutionary intelligence, besides having access to cutting-edge reeducation resources. The Cognopolis community in Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil – because it is the oldest – may be useful for experiments regarding the study of the evolution of parapolitical regimes and transitional societies. In that community, multidimensional principles and values are being applied with more self-awareness. Moreover, it is a place where there is a larger cosmoethical intersection of a sizable number of extraphysical helpers<sup>13</sup>, who are considered the co-evolvers for the advancement of the consciousnesses involved in the system, as well as the co-authors of the collective existential program.

## CONCLUSION

This article aimed at presenting the initial proposal regarding the evolutionary scale of political and parapolitical regimes using as the foundation the evolutionary scale of consciousnesses. Therefore, debates and counterproposals are highly necessary.

The main conclusions that can be taken from this research are:

1. Political and parapolitical regimes are formed and sustained by the average of the evolutionary level of the consciousnesses belonging to some State, community, or group, *but especially of those who possess stronger influence on the creation and longevity of the regime.*
2. The more backward a regime the lesser equal is the distribution on the responsibility of the sustainability and evolution of the regime, remaining restricted to a small number of consciousnesses.
3. The more evolved the regime the more equal is the distribution on the responsibility of the sustainability and evolution of the regime.
4. The positive transition from a more backward to a more advanced regime depends on the average of the evolution of such consciousnesses.
5. Regime transitions may entail regressive moments.
6. The transition from the political regime of democracy to the parapolitical regime of Conscientiocracy may start when the average of the evolution of the consciousnesses who coexist in a location reaches the evolutionary level of *penta-practitioner* (25 to 30% of the *Homo sapiens serenissimus*) and reaches an advanced level when the average of the evolution of the group equals the evolu-

13 Helper is the consciousness without a physical body, benefiting and helping one human consciousness or several human consciousnesses at the same time, when evolutionarily akin, especially during extraphysical projections, comprehending a beneficial lifetime-influence, even during the ordinary waking state” (Entry 927, Amparador Extrafisico).

tionary level of *conscientiologist* (40% of the *Homo sapiens serenissimus*).

7. According to data gathered from the last census of the ICCC, it is possible to affirm that the current evolutionary level of the group, on average, already allows for the implementation of a conscientocracy in the Cognopolis Foz. Yet, the group would have to progress toward a more profound horizontal distribution of power.

8. The Cognopolis Foz, that way, could be a useful location for researching and testing non-conventional regimes based on the consciential paradigm.

This article also intended to start a research agenda. That way, some points, derived from the discussion presently initiated, can indicate future research:

1. To differentiate and characterize the nature of the political and parapolitical influence.

2. To characterize each parapolitical regime, with its attributes and indicators.

3. To associate the groupkarmic course hypothesis with the consciousnesses' self-responsibility in relation to their bonds with political and parapolitical regimes.

4. To associate the frequency, range, and duration of retrocessions with political or parapolitical regime kind, according to moment in which *the influents* are in relation to the evolutionary scale.

5. To propose indicators associated to the development of each regime, in order to mensurate their transition.

## REFERENCES

- Berman, S. (1997). Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic. *World Politics*, 49(3), 401–429. <https://doi.org/10.1353/wp.1997.0008>
- Brennan, J. (2017). *Against Democracy: New Preface* (New Preface ed.). Princeton University Press.
- Byman, D., & Lind, J. (2010). Pyongyang's Survival Strategy: Tools of Authoritarian Control in North Korea. *International Security*, 35(1), 44–74. [https://doi.org/10.1162/isec\\_a\\_00002](https://doi.org/10.1162/isec_a_00002)
- Crain, C. (2019, 9 julho). *The Case Against Democracy*. The New Yorker. <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/11/07/the-case-against-democracy>
- David. (2012, June 29). Egypt's New Leader Takes Oath, Promising to Work for Release of Jailed Terrorist. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/30/world/middleeast/morsi-promises-to-work-for-release-of-omar-abdel-rahman.html>.
- Dawisha, K. (2015). *Putin's Kleptocracy: Who Owns Russia?* (Reprint ed.). Simon & Schuster.
- Estlund, David; Why not Epistocracy?; In Reshotko, N. (2003). *Desire, identity, and existence: Essays in honor of T.M. Penner*. Kelowna: Academic Printing & Publishing.

- Haymann, M. (2016). *Síndrome Del Ostracismo*. Editares.
- Hyde, S. D. (2011). *The Pseudo-Democrat's Dilemma: Why Election Observation Became an International Norm*. Cornell University Press.
- Kelley, J. G. (2012). *Monitoring Democracy: When International Election Observation Works, and Why It Often Fails*. Princeton University Press.
- Lipset, S. M. (1959). *Some Social Requisites of Democracy*. Bobbs-Merrill.
- Lührmann, A., & Lindberg, S. I. (2019). A third wave of autocratization is here: what is new about it? *Democratization*, 26(7), 1095–1113.
- Machado, César de Souza (2003); *Serenões: Consciências Superevoluídas*; <http://www.meta-consciencia.com/>
- Melo, Luciano. (2015). Paratransitologia; in: Vieira, W. Org.; *Enciclopédia da Conscienciologia*; entry 3471, presented in the *Tertularium / CEAEC*; Foz do Iguaçu, PR, Brazil; 06.08.15; disponível em: <[www.tertuliaconscienciologia.org](http://www.tertuliaconscienciologia.org)>
- Melo, Luciano. (2017); Parapoliticologia; in: Vieira, W. Org.; *Enciclopédia da Conscienciologia*; entry 4328, presented in the *Tertularium / CEAEC*; Foz do Iguaçu, PR, Brazil; 12.12.17; available at: <[www.tertuliaconscienciologia.org](http://www.tertuliaconscienciologia.org)>
- Minero, Luis (2002). Lucidocracy. *Journal of Conscientiology*, IAC – International Academy of Consciousness, Proceedings of the 3rd International Congress of Projectology and Conscientiology, 16-19 May, Vol. 4, No. 15 Supplement, p. 47.
- Mesquita, B. B., & Smith, A. (2012). *The Dictator's Handbook: Why Bad Behavior Is Almost Always Good Politics* (Illustrated ed.). Public Affairs.
- O'Donnell, G., Schmitter, P. C., Whitehead, L., Arnson, C. J., & Lowenthal, A. F. (1981). *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies (English Edition)* (Illustrated ed.). Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Przeworski, A. (1991). *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America*. Cambridge University Press.
- Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6(1), 65–78. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.1995.0002>
- Putnam, R. D., Leonardi, R., & Nanetti, R. Y. (1994). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* (Revised ed.). Princeton University Press.
- Schock, K. (2015). *Civil Resistance: Comparative Perspectives on Nonviolent Struggle (Social Movements, Protest and Contention Book 43) (English Edition)*. Univ. of Minnesota Press.
- Simmons, B. A. (2009). *Mobilizing for Human Rights: International Law in Domestic Politics (English Edition)* (Illustrated ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Ulman, K. (2019). Democracia: Experimentos no Bairro Cognópolis-Foz. CRV.
- Vasconcelos, J. (2021). Democracia Pura (Ciências Humanas e Sociais ed.). Nobel.
- Vieira, W. (1995). *Era Conscencial*; Anais do I Fórum Internacional de Conscienciologia – FIC. IIPC.

Vieira, W. (2004). *Homo sapiens reurbanisatus*. Associação Internacional do Centro de Altos Estudos da Conscienciologia-CEAEC.

Vieira, W. (2013). Colegiadologia. Entry in: *Dicionário De Argumentos Da Conscienciologia*. Associação Internacional Editares.

**Luciano Melo** has been a consciousness researcher for more than three decades. PhD in Comparative Politics by the American University, in Washington, D.C., USA. Master's in international Relations by the City University of New York, in New York, USA. Co-founder of the Institute for Consciousness Research, in 1988, and general coordinator of the CIEC IIPC from 2003 to 2005, both in Porto Alegre, Brazil; co-founder and secretary-general of Comunicons, from 2005 to 2009. Currently volunteer with the CEAEC's Holoteca, the Editares International Association, and peer reviewer of encyclopedia entries associated to politics with the Encyclossapiens. Luciano has presented and published research on parapoliticology and cosmoethicology, as well as has written entries on the field for the Encyclopedia of Conscientiology.

**Translation:** Marcelo Rouanet.

**Revision:** Luciano Melo.