

The Navidean Philosophy

Zordial Qulog (zordial.qulog@mailfence.com)

June 24, 2023

THIS IS A WORK IN PROGRESS

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	The New Idea	3
1.2	Channeled Written Work	4
1.3	Personal Background	5
I	Preliminaries	8
2	Belief Systems and Knowledge	9
2.1	Making rational sense of this book	9
2.2	Justified True Belief	11
2.3	Subjective vs Objective aspects of knowledge	12
2.4	The Scientific Method	15
3	The Basilio Scientific School Association (BSSA)	19
3.1	Spiritist organizations	19
3.2	The dawn of the BSSA	20
3.3	Mediumship and knowledge from higher spirits	21
3.4	Jesus's guidance	22
3.5	BSSA official public launch	23
3.6	Blanca's death	24
3.7	BSSA re-launch and spread	24

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 The New Idea

The Navidean Philosophy means *the philosophical system of The New Idea*.

“Navidean” is a novel English word *coined up* to express “New Idea” by combining the expression “Nav”, which means “new” in **Aramaic**, with the English word “idea”.

As you probably know, Aramaic is the language of **Jesus of Nazareth**.

The Navidean philosophy, introduced in this book, is indirectly derived from Jesus’ teachings. However, and to your surprise (I’m sure of that) these teachings are *not* the ones written in the Christian Gospels.

It is a fact (quite easy to check on the internet) that there exist many non-biblical references to Jesus’ life and mission. For instance, the many writings from early Christians that were left out of the New Testament ¹. But the teachings of Jesus re-presented in this book do not come from any ancient written source at all. They all come from a special process known as **channeling**.

Channeling is the new age term used to refer to *knowledge that comes from a spirit guide through a (psychic) medium*.

If you are familiar with new age spiritualism, you already know about channeled knowledge from the spirit realm. But you may not be so familiar with the fact (also simple to check on the internet) that Jesus’ teachings has been channeled by mediums, all around the world, since most likely the ancient time when Christianity wasn’t even a religion. There are several non-biblical and non-Christian books about Jesus life and mission based on channeled knowledge, as well as plenty of online material on the internet.

One of the many such sources is a new *spiritualist* organization founded in *Buenos Aires, Argentina* on November 1, 1917, named “**Asociación Escuela Científica Basilio**” (“**Basilio Scientific School Association**” in English). Over the years, it grew and expanded into several countries, with hundreds of church branches and about half a million members worldwide.

The acronym **BSSA** will be used throughout this book to refer to this organization. You can learn all about the BSSA on its official website https://www.basilio.org.ar/public/_html/

¹A very good source of historical accounts of early Christianity is the work of Bart D. Ehrman. You can learn all about it in his YouTube channel: <https://www.youtube.com/@bartdehrman>

(or from the official USA branch: <https://www.basiliouusa.com/>).

According to the BSSA, Jesus himself referred to his Teachings as the “New Idea”. Thus, the doctrine of the BSSA is known within the church as the Spanish expression “La Idea Nueva”.

Since the philosophical system that is presented in this book is derived mostly from the contents of that doctrine, I dubbed it “**Navidean**”.

1.2 Channeled Written Work

Books like this one are typically called **channeled written work**. That refers to the case in which the *writer* is not himself the *author* because the author is a *discarnate spirit* (or a group of spirits). There are direct and indirect forms of this kind of written work.

Direct forms of channeled written work are when the writer is a **medium**—someone with the ability to interact and communicate with a discarnate spirit—who is *directly* channeling a spirit author, typically through a form of *mediumship* known as **automatic writing**.

There are many, many books written in that way. Some popular ones are (to name just a couple of examples):

the works of **Chico Xavier** (<https://spiritist.us/chico-xavier/>)

the works of **Edgar Cayce** (<https://www.edgarcayce.org/>)

the famous book **A Course In Miracles** (<https://acim.org/acim/en>)

and the **Silver Birch Series** (<https://www.silverbirchpublishing.co.uk/books.php>).

Indirect forms are when the writer is using mediumship to obtain novel information from the spirits, but the medium is someone else. In this case the writer takes the knowledge from the medium(s) and writes it down using his own words, worldview and interpretation.

The most significant example of *indirect channeled written work* is the so-called **Kardecian Spiritism**, which is the largest, most studied and most taught spiritualist doctrine in the modern world.



You can learn about Kardecianism in the movie **Kardec**: <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt9213932/>. But here is a brief summary: **Hippolyte Léon Denizard Rivail** (writing under the pen name **Allan Kardec**) was a French scientist and professor who stumbled across spiritism in his early 50s. As a scientist, he initially set out to show that spiritist séances were nothing but mockery, but he ended up conducting the largest and most comprehensive *scientific* research on spiritism, leading to a series of 5 books that became the basis of modern spiritism. The contents of his books are all “channeled” in the sense that the *source* of the books’ contents are discarnate spirits, but Allan Kardec himself was not a medium. Instead, he “interviewed” the “spirit authors” through *hundreds* of different mediums. The books’ contents are structured as a sequence of questions, formulated by Kardec, with the responses obtained from the spirits through the mediums, then written down by Kardec. He was very careful in distinguishing the responses as provided by the mediums and his own analysis and discourse.

The BSSA material is another perfect example of indirect channeled written work. Since its founding in 1917 and throughout the years, some dedicated mediums within the BSSA organization obtained information from the spirit sources and wrote it down in different ways

(magazines, books, conferences, courses, etc.).

This book is a bit of a special case.

It might be regarded as a *proxy* channeled written work. It is all written by me directly, from what I've studied throughout all these years, yet I am *NOT* myself a medium, nor have I directly worked with mediums (as Allan Kardec did).

Yet the *contents* of this book is *sourced* in the channeled written work of other writers (both directly and indirectly).

Most likely, there is nothing in this book that has not been already written elsewhere, whether in the official bibliography of the BSSA, or in the several other sources from which I've learned and developed the philosophical system presented in this book.

Yet my intention here and the reason for writing this book is to re-present “*God, Jesus, his work and his teachings*”, as free from conflicts and contradictions with our well-established and trusted body of contemporary, canonical, human knowledge as I can make it.



This book is not directly from the Basilio Scientific School Association, and as such, it does not necessarily reflect its official doctrine.

*I am a member of the BSSA (though now rather inactive) but these here are all my own words, and I am writing and publishing this freely, by myself, *without any express support or endorsement from the Basilio Scientific School Association.**

1.3 Personal Background

My grandfather was one of the initial members of the BSSA. A generation later, my mother followed his footsteps (but only when she was already an adult). And yet another generation down the road, so did I.

By the time I was 5 or 6 years old, my mother was an active member of the BSSA, which required her to give service in one of the local church branches, about two times a week. Every time she went to the church, she had no choice but to bring my younger sister and me along with her. At that age, we would mostly just play in the hallways to kill time (between 2 and 3 hours); for me, it was always a lot of fun and I loved going there.

Eventually, I became interested in knowing what was it that they did in that place. Kids were not allowed to enter the *Main Room*, so it was all quite a mystery to me back then.

Since my family has been a BSSA member for three generations, my house had *a lot* of written material (mostly books and magazines), and I began to read them all, starting around the age of 8 or so.

The BSSA has an official educational program (currently with a duration of 3 years, plus another 2 or 3 years of advanced studies). Its official learning material is composed of several short books. Throughout the history of the BSSA, this educational material evolved and was even rewritten from scratch a few times. Being the 3rd generation in the BSSA, I had in my family house pretty much every book that was ever written by the BSSA up to a certain time. That included *old and discontinued* books, plus some *discontinued special studies*, covering a wide range of topics that were not directly a part of the official curricula any more.

By the time I was a young adult, I had studied pretty much every book, magazine, and booklet that my family had since the early days, when my grandfather was one of the first

BSSA members. Eventually, I became a very active member of the BSSA, lecturing at public conferences and teaching some courses myself.

At some point in my mid-twenties, however, I decided to reach out and study, not just the doctrine of the BSSA, but other spiritualist and new age doctrines as well. Especially, the so-called Kardecian spiritism, which is the largest spiritualist organization in the world. Kardecianism was highly influential in the early years of the BSSA.

Many—if not most—members of a spiritualist church like to keep it to themselves. But that was never the case with my family. I’m used to talk about the spiritualist doctrine every time I have a chance (I even totally ruined first dates because of this). More often than not, however, the conversations have been one-sided, with me just boring the hell out of the poor, shocked, uninterested or skeptical listener. Naturally, then, I started writing about these things instead, mostly in conversational settings like Internet discussion forums, and such. I also *started* (but never finished) quite a few blogs, articles, and even totally unfinished books.

Science, engineering and spiritualism brought together

In parallel to growing up as a dedicated member of the spiritualist BSSA, I fell in love with science (already as a kid) and computer programming (as a teenager), so I went to College to study Biochemistry, and, ever since I finished High School, I have been working as a computer programmer. A direct consequence of such an odd combination (spiritualism, science, engineering and computing) is that I always tried really hard to frame the doctrine of the BSSA into a rational and scientifically friendly belief system.

Attempting to connect—reasonably—spiritualism, philosophy, science and engineering requires at least 3 majors elements:

- Carefully studying, understanding and reviewing the method and techniques used in the formation of a spiritualist doctrine (such as—but not limited to—the one of the BSSA).
- Scientifically investigating the tools and processes that are used to build such a doctrine (which in this case is the phenomena of *mediumship*).
- Digging deep into the nature and extent of knowledge and its correlation with the facts of the world and the so-called truth.

Instrumental Transcommunication research

On that journey, I eventually came across a very interesting field known as Instrumental Transcommunication (or ITC in short) [3].

Transcommunication refers to communication between *incarnate and discarnate* spirits (that is, the living and the dead). The most popular form of transcommunication is **Mediumship**, which refers to the transcommunication process in which the discarnate spirit, from the etheric side, works through a person known as a *Medium*.

Instrumental transcommunication is—allegedly—a process in which the spiritual entity produces some sort of “subtle energy physical process”. This process can in turn transmit a signal containing a message from the discarnate spirit.

Electronic Voice Phenomena (or EVP in short), is the most popular form of ITC.

Because of the *instrumental* nature of it, ITC/EVP is regarded as a far more *objective* form of transcommunication than traditional mediumship. It is a field of very active, high quality scientific research, and because of its potential objectivity, I eventually became an ITC researcher, joining a prolific international ITC research group known as **Varanormal** (<https://www.varanormal.com/>).

Interestingly enough, however, neither this book, nor anything on its contents, is related or sourced on ITC/EVP. It was my involvement in the Varanormal team that quite *indirectly* lead me to write this book. Let me elaborate:

A reference to **Jesus** came out—and repeatedly—in our internal discussion channel, and I felt obliged to mention a few things about him (and his work) according to the doctrine of the BSSA. My initial intention was to do as I had always done, which is simply to start some causal conversation about it, as opposed to *setting it in stone* by writing it down formally in an article or some such.² But some of the things that I was saying in the chat room brought out a lot of interest among some team members, so I decided to write something down more formally. I wrote a first quick draft of about 10 or so pages and presented it to the team. The reception was so good that eventually, the 10 or so pages that I had initially written just for the Varanormal research team had grown into 30 pages or so, this time with a larger audience on target. But it was quite a mess. It had passages on Jesus’s mission (the main topic), mixed up with digressions about an assortment of different topics, such as the nature of free will, or the elements of the afterlife. It was at that time that I decided to write a full-blown, properly structured *book* instead of a poorly organized essay. And it was then that I realized I could write about pretty much everything I had ever learned about spiritualism, everything that I had ever talked about, all of it within one single comprehensive unit.

Although this all started with a few pages on Jesus (according to the BSSA), this book spans a pretty wide range of “spiritual” topics. From the so-called Astral planes to *the spiritual counterparts of subatomic particles*, just to mention a few examples.

²The famous Greek philosopher Socrates never wrote a word, because he felt that doing so trapped the ideas into a static, unchangeable form. He just *talked* about it instead. Everything we know about his ideas was written down by his direct student Plato.

Part I

Preliminaries

Chapter 2

Belief Systems and Knowledge

2.1 Making rational sense of this book

This book introduces a philosophical system which, for the most part, adopts the teachings of **Jesus of Nazareth** according to the **Basilio Scientific School Association**—as well as other spiritual teachings—as a foundation.

Quoting from OpenAI, ChatGPT:

A philosophical system refers to a comprehensive framework of ideas, concepts, and arguments that are developed to explore and explain various aspects of reality, knowledge, existence, and human experience. It provides a coherent and interconnected set of beliefs and principles that are used to examine fundamental questions about the nature of reality and the human condition.

In the case of the teachings of Jesus, they often encompass profound ethical and moral teachings, metaphysical beliefs, and perspectives on human nature, purpose, and the relationship between individuals and the divine. These teachings offer guidance on how to live a virtuous life, promote compassion, forgiveness, and love for others, and provide a framework for understanding the human condition.

It is probably evident that the **ideas, concepts and even arguments** written in this book, are all from my individual point of view as the writer. And it is also probably just as evident that a reader would naturally adopt or reject, partially or fully, as written or adapted, any of these elements.

For example, the argument made in these pages that *forgiveness* is the most practical, cost-effective and beneficial response to any wrongdoing, of any degree, and under all circumstances, is debatable. And quite likely, only some would *fully* agree with it.

And that is perfectly fine.

Neither this book, nor its writer, is intended to be authoritative in any way, form or extent.

Even the fact that it is the teachings of Jesus—and other Guides—which lay at the very foundation of this book, doesn't provide it with the least amount of authority.

You may argue, or at least wonder, if this explicitly stated complete lack of authority, doesn't work, actually, entirely against the mission of a book such as this. How could any teaching

be left to the judgment of the student? For sure, our understanding of the way education is required to go is strictly vertical and hierarchical in all of its forms, whether it is in a home from parents to children, or in a school from teacher to pupil, or even in the usual publication of a philosophical treatise.

Additionally, you may argue that the authoritative nature of any educational process is an obvious necessity. That the certainty, the veracity, the correctness of any position, claim or argument has to be transmitted alongside the lesson itself. Without it, the student is left to build a certainty, discover the veracity, and prove the correctness entirely on its own. Yet that is just not possible except for the simple, trivial cases.

For example, how could “us, normal people”, possibly verify that, indeed, atoms are made of electrons, protons and neutrons? We couldn’t, so we seem to be left with no other choice but to accept that this is so, because that’s what “Science” tells us.

Fortunately though, there is a subtle fallacy in that reasoning... or maybe I should say position, for it might not be a reasoning at all:

The key ingredient that is really required for a proper lesson is **assertiveness**, not authority. These are entirely different things.

As it turns out, I happen to be reasonably confident in the “*sufficient epistemic value*” of the several ideas, concepts, arguments and even straight up beliefs that are *asserted* throughout this book. Yet, at same time, I hold *no claim of their truth*. To do so would only be the result of a misunderstanding of the nature, value and process of knowledge.

And to try to push on to you such an empty—honestly speaking—claim of truth would be authoritative.

There is no need for that.

A claim of truth is not required for a lesson to be properly taught.

In fact, despite popular opinion, Science, for example, *is not a collection of truths* (that would be rather irrational), it is a collection of claims, each with a dependable, comprehensive and systematic *epistemic value*.

Even though—for entirely accidental reasons, due to our peculiar human nature—Science just happens to be taught the same way as anything else: authoritatively; Science students don’t really need to be Scientists in order to learn a scientific claim rationally, pragmatically and reliably. They don’t really need to verify, all by themselves, that an atom is, indeed, made of subatomic particles. Yet, they don’t have to just take the word of Science for it either. There is a working epistemic process both for scientific knowledge construction as well as transmission.

Trying to adopt a reasonable epistemic position, this book attempts to frame and present *the Navidean philosophical system* within a special epistemic framework. Even though this framework is not remotely as polished, solid, and most importantly, reliable as the Scientific Method, it is nonetheless intended to provide the reader with a way to rationally adapt, integrate and adopt, into her or his worldview belief system, the philosophy asserted within this book.

But what is an epistemic framework? what is the epistemic value of a proposition? Doesn’t knowledge depend on the truth? How can a fact be asserted, but not claimed as the truth? Or an argument be defended but not claimed as correct? Or a guideline be prescribed as reliable

but not claimed as infallible?

All of these are complex matters and they all need to be address properly. And they need to be addressed *now*, before the facts are asserted, the arguments defended, and the guidelines prescribed in the rest of this book.

Therefore I invite you, dear reader, to bear with me as I walk you through the following sections of this preliminary chapter.

These sections are rather technical, formal, and even intense. They are not an easy read. But it would frame the rest of this book in such a way, that will allow you to make a rational sense of the rest of it.

To accept or reject, partially or fully, as given or adapted, the contents of this philosophy.

To rationally integrate and adopt it into your own worldview belief system.

Without having to do a full research and analysis of every single bit of it; nor take my word for it, nor trash it all as inconclusive at best.

Applying a rational and systematic belief system updating procedure as you go.

2.2 Justified True Belief

There are several types of knowledge and even several views on which those types are. **Knowing-how** to ride a bike, for instance, is fundamentally different from **knowing-who** is that girl, or **knowing-which** way is up. And all of those are fundamentally different from knowing what is water made of, or how much is $2 + 2$.

The latter type of knowledge is known as declarative, propositional, or theoretical, *knowledge*. The distinctive characteristic of this type of knowledge is that it can be true or false.

The ancient Greek philosopher **Plato** defined (declarative) knowledge as *Justified True Belief* [7]. This definition is known as "**The JTB account of knowledge**", and it has been the most widely accepted and most studied definition of knowledge ever since. It is not perfect, and now we know that it has its subtle problems [1], but it is still the perfect starting point for a discussion about the nature of knowledge.

We have all sorts of *beliefs*. There are many definitions and views on what a belief is [14], but here in this book let us roughly, and informally, **define a belief as something we consider to be possible and probable to a certain degree**. An assertion that we don't consider to be unquestionably true, but which is truthful enough to be believed.

For example, I believe that the Sun is a star made of really hot gas. I also believe in God. And I might additionally believe that there is a red sock in the first drawer.

In this view, our beliefs have a *level* of certainty.

Typically, we regard some of our beliefs as *probably true* and some others as *certainly true*. To these special True Believes—the ones which we regard as certainly truth—we *grant* the status of **Knowledge**. We give them **Veracity**.

The status of knowledge (the Veracity) is said to be granted in the sense that a belief is usually not true in its own right. Some are, such as the belief that "*red is a color*", which is true "a priori" based on the sole meaning of the words in that sentence. But most are not, such as the belief that there is a red sock in my first drawer. I might very well believe that, but, it is only after I verify that the sock is actually there, "a posteriori", that I can "promote" the mere belief to knowledge.

There are, therefore, *mere* believes and *true* believes. The former are the ones that we think *might* be true, and the latter are the ones that we are certain to be true.

In the JTB account, according to Plato, a piece of knowledge is a **True** Belief. But True is not really the same as a *Certain*. That is, it is the *actual veracity* of the belief that promotes it to the level of knowledge, not our *certainty* about it.

That is an important but subtle distinction. So much so that the whole *problem of knowledge* can be considered to be centered around the correlation between our certainty and the veracity of our True Beliefs.

The attribution of the *status* of knowledge to a particular certain belief is intended to grant the certain belief some *correspondence with the truth* [5].¹ That is when I assert that I *know* something, I am explicitly stating that I consider that the something which I believe, and of which I am certain, *is actually true*.

As it turns out, however, that correspondence between any given certain belief and the truth is a really complex issue. As experience often shows, I can be completely certain to know something, yet be completely wrong nonetheless. Certainty is definitely a component of knowledge, and it is *a part* of the "True" in "Justified True Belief". But the biggest part of "True" in JTB refers to the Veracity, not the Certainty, of the Belief.

But, what *makes* a belief *True*? This question is not trivial to answer. Let us pick the position that the Truth value of a belief is simply **granted** by the believer (which is highly debatable, but it is the position adopted by this author). That is, when I hold a belief of which I am certain, I hold also the claim that the belief is true.

While **The Truth** is objective, and the facts of the world are external, the correspondence between those facts and my beliefs (about them) is not externally, nor automatically, given; it is subjectively, and purposely, *made*. Hence, it is the believer the one making the correspondence, and granting the status of truth to the belief.

From this point of view, a True Belief is **true by claim**. Yet, in Plato's JTB account, it is **true by correspondence**.

These two aspects of the truth of a belief: the subjective claim by the believer and the objective correspondence with the facts are connected using a **Justification**.

That is, when I have a belief, of which I am certain, and to which I attribute the truth, I am required to be justified in *both* the certainty and the attribution of truth.

Hence, for Plato, when we have a **Justified True Belief**, we *Know*.

That adequate justification of the connection made between the claim of a belief and the actual correspondence to the facts is far from trivial. And it is the job of a body of Philosophical inquiry known as *Epistemology*. Epistemology is the attempt to figure out how can we tell that what we think is true (what we *think* we know) is actually true (we *really do* know).

2.3 Subjective vs Objective aspects of knowledge

The study of knowledge is formally based on the study of propositions. A *proposition* is, roughly speaking, the **objective, externalized statement of a belief**. Something which is *proposed* (and as such put out there) to be true. For example, the statements "*I like roses*", and "*Some cells, named Eukaryote, have a nucleus*", are propositions [11].

All beliefs are *subjective* (it is each one of us who holds them); we have whatever degree of certainty about them, and we claim the ones we think correspond with reality. A proposition, on the other hand, is an objective, externalized expression of a belief. It is an external object that can be used as such, regardless and independently of the person whose belief might have sourced the proposition. Some propositions, in fact, come into existence *derived* from other

¹There exist several 'Theories of Truth'. The Correspondence Theory is the most popular and accepted one, but there are others.

propositions and do not originate on a belief at all (but they do construct, in turn, a belief once a person internalizes them).

Propositions *externalize* our beliefs. As such, they can be *shared, formalized, translated, analyzed, evaluated, etc.* They can also be *connected and correlated*. Propositions can be reasoned with, and derived one from another, in a purely objective, external system: **Logic**.

Logic is the study of propositions and their relationships, from which inferences and demonstrations can be derived. In logic, propositions are not seen as subjective beliefs, but as *impersonal, "truth-bearing"* statements.

The truth value of a proposition is independent of the fact that the originating belief is, normally, a truth claim. That is, I claim that God exists. I am certain of it, and it knows that from the point of view of my belief system. But when I make the proposition "*God exists*", it doesn't carry my claim with it. The proposition, externalized as it is, holds its own truth value, regardless of my certainty of it.

Once a belief is externalized as a proposition, its claim is merely *implied*. The **attribution of the truth of a proposition**—unlike that of a belief—is external and objective, and it is independent of the subjective truth attribution of the belief that might have originated it.

From the point of view of this distinction between subjective claims and objective propositions, knowledge has two aspects.

There is the **subjective aspect of knowledge**, in which every piece of knowledge is a personally claimed, subjective, Justified True Belief.

And there is the **objective aspect of knowledge**, in which every piece of knowledge is an objective (externalized and/or internalized), proposition.

We hold a **Personal Belief System**, which is the set of all the things that we believe. Within that system, we have **mere beliefs and true beliefs**. A mere belief is something we think is likely true, but we are not really sure about. A true belief (to follow Plato's wording), on the other hand, is the things we are certain to be true. The true beliefs in our personal belief system are *personally justified*, and they are personally selected as pieces of (subjectively claimed) knowledge. We all have, then, the things we subjectively claim to know.

Some justified true beliefs in any Personal Belief System (the things we subjectively claim to know), can be **externalized** and become objective propositions. The set of *externalized* justified true beliefs, that is, propositions, form a **Body of (declarative) Knowledge**.

Both a subjective *Belief System*, and an objective *Body of Knowledge*, contain pieces of "knowledge", but these are slightly different in nature and characteristics.

The pieces of subjective knowledge found within a (personal) Belief System are Justified True Beliefs, claimed as such. We are personally certain of them, we personally regard them as the truth, and we are personally justified in doing so.

Yet the pieces of objective knowledge on an externalized Body of Knowledge are formal propositions. While they originate on a personal Justified True Belief (usually but not necessarily), they are evaluated in their own right, regardless of the attribution of truth that can be found in the source.

The subjective and objective aspects of knowledge form a *dynamic system* in which Justified True Beliefs and Propositions are permanently interacting. Beliefs become **externalized** as propositions, and propositions become **internalized** as beliefs.

For example. . .

Scientists go out to investigate the facts of the world. They follow the scientific method to make sure they get the highest correspondence to the truth possible. In their research process, they construct a number of beliefs with different degrees of certainty. Some of them become pieces of knowledge in their personal belief systems and are externalized as formal propositions.

Those propositions, once formally presented by the scientists, are integrated into the Body of Scientific Knowledge. This integration process involves the rest of the scientific community,

and the propositions, which once originated in their personal belief systems, now get processed and transformed. Some are rejected, and some are approved. Some are modified.

At this point, we have, on the one hand, *formal propositions that exist as objective pieces of knowledge within Science*, and on the other hand, *personal claims that exist as subjective pieces of knowledge within the belief system of the scientists* that originated the propositions during their research.

Furthermore,

Those objective pieces of scientific knowledge get taught in school. The students then *internalize* the formal propositions, constructing with them personal subjective pieces of knowledge within their own belief systems.

Scientific knowledge, then, is multidimensional. There are the subjective pieces of knowledge within the researcher, there are also the objective pieces of knowledge within Science, and there are, as well, the subjective pieces of knowledge within the student. And they are all interrelated. A particular piece of knowledge from the researcher becomes externalized as a formal proposition which in turn becomes internalized by the students (and other researchers, etc.).

Any piece of (declarative) knowledge is then split into separate dimensions or aspects.

We have an objective, shared and **external symbolic expression** of any given piece of knowledge, such as the scientific statements in a physics book, the mathematical equations in a math book, or the historical accounts in a history book.

But we also have any number of **internal semantic expressions** of the same piece of knowledge.

A formal proposition, such as "*the atomic number of Oxygen is 8*", has one symbolic expression but as many personal semantic expressions as people who know it. They are all correlated, and they are all interdependent.

This split is fundamental in the analysis of knowledge because all these different expressions of any given piece of knowledge (the internal semantic expressions within all those who know it, plus the one objective symbolic expression that formally states it) are all correlated, but they are not the same and have different qualities. In particular, and most importantly, they have different *epistemic values*.

The epistemic value of a belief, or a proposition if externalized, is, roughly speaking, the value of its justification for both the certainty about it and the veracity granted to it.

For example. The scientific proposition "*energy can only increase or decrease in a discrete amount known as a quantum*" has *complete* epistemic value because it is observationally true. In this case, the justification for such a correspondence with the truth lies in the details of quantum mechanics.

The personal justified true belief of anyone knowing that, on the other hand, might have any epistemic value depending on the details of the internalization process followed by the believer. And all of these differ from the epistemic value of the proposition itself.

The justification for knowing that particular piece of knowledge is not at all the same for Max Plank, who discovered the quantum in 1901 as it is for a person simply hearing about it on an internet video. They both know that *but for entirely different reasons*, hence, their beliefs have entirely different epistemic values, even though both refer to the same fact, and both are true. Similarly, the epistemic value of the belief within a science student having read about this, formally and in some detail, in a textbook, is also not really the same as that of a scientist having gone, for instance, through the mathematical quantization process that Plank first applied to the two pre-existing, but incomplete, equations of black body radiation, after having got the incredible insight that maybe the flow of energy was not continuous but in packets.

The epistemic value of a formal, external proposition, that is, how much it is stated to

correspond to the truth and why, is derived from a procedurally objective evaluation. That is, we judge, for example, if energy really flows continuously or in discrete packets using a systematic, formal procedure that is intended to be as unbiased, and impersonal, as possible.

But any such external proposition, along with its objective epistemic value, is a mere symbol, an abstract representation, that is *used* to construct the internal justified true belief that each and every “knower” makes out of it. And the epistemic value of these, in you, me, Max Plank and the physics teacher, are all different.

If I were to construct a claim out of systematic experimental research, backed up by evidence, my knowledge of that is of a different nature than the same knowledge but in someone else who I just taught it. Or even in someone else who challenge it experimentally and, maybe, confirmed it.

The significant difference between the epistemic value of an external, objective expression of a piece of knowledge and the individual, internal, subjective expressions of it, is highly relevant in the analysis of what knowledge is, what we know, how certain we can be, and how does our knowledge correspond to the truth.

2.4 The Scientific Method

According to 18th-century philosopher **Immanuel Kant**, propositions can be separated into two main groups: analytic and synthetic [13].

Analytic propositions are true or false based solely on their meaning (such as if I say, “Red is a color”). Mathematics is the perfect example of a body of analytic propositions: a mathematical statement, such as an *axiom*, can be determined to be true or false without having to look at the outside world at all. In contrast, *synthetic propositions* are those whose truth depends on the existence (or not) of some correspondence between the meaning of the proposition and the facts of the world.

This distinction between analytic and synthetic propositions is quite intuitive but is not without problems. One important part of the problem lies in the language we use to state propositions. For example, to state that “*electrons revolve around the nucleus of the atom*” is not entirely right, but is not entirely wrong either. This uncertainty is only due to the complete lack of *precision* about what is being said about the electron.

Therefore, to determine the veracity of a piece of knowledge, it has to be, first and foremost, correctly expressed in a **sufficiently formal language**. Only then it is possible to determine if it effectively corresponds with the truth. Formality is the very first requirement of *Epistemic Justification*.

In the case of *factual knowledge* (as opposed to knowledge whose truth depends only on its meaning, such as mathematical, logical, semiotic, etc.), establishing a correspondence with the facts of the world (the truth) is the hardest part. It is so hard that it is accepted that **ALL FACTUAL KNOWLEDGE IS ULTIMATELY INCONCLUSIVE**. That is, every single piece of contemporary factual scientific knowledge (within physics, chemistry, biology, astronomy, etc.) is subject to be eventually found incorrect—and get corrected—as science progresses.

The difficulty of establishing the *veracity* of a claim does not simply lie in the *procedure* that one might follow to establish such a correspondence (by conducting an experiment, for example). It lies also in the very nature of the claim, of the facts it refers to, and of the correspondence that we intend to find. For example, suppose that I claim “*to love someone*” and that I am completely certain of that. What *can* be determined about the veracity of such a claim, when we don’t even understand the very fact that it is referring to, nor do we have a

clue about how such a fact could be observed? ²

We most definitely require a reliable method to grant the status of knowledge to a factual claim (a belief that is thought to be true, and which has some form of justification). Our best attempt so far is the so-called *Scientific Method* [6].

The world can be divided into two large groups: the abstract and the concrete. Mathematics, Software, Aesthetics, etc., for example, belong to the abstract.

The concrete, in turn, can be subdivided into at least 3 major categories: Natural, Social and Psychological. ³

We form beliefs on any of those. For example, that "*the square root of -1 is an imaginary (not a real) number*", or that "*any computer can be modeled as a Turing Machine*", or that "*photons carry electromagnetic energy*", and so forth. Any such belief might be something we know (and not merely believe).

The Scientific Method is the recipe of *Science*, and science is the systematic study of the *world* through the application of such a method. Science can study the abstract (for instance, Computer Science) and the concrete: the Natural (for instance, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Neurology, Astronomy, etc.), the Social (Economics) and the Psychological ⁴

A *pseudo-science* would be the systematic study of facts but without the proper application of the scientific method.

The development of this method has taken quite a long time, and it was not as straightforward and *linear* as we would now think it has been. There have been several views Rationalism, Empiricism, Inductivism, hypothetico-deductivism, etc. and approaches, each with its pros and cons, that slowly converged, through heated debates [10][3], into the modern version of the method as used in modern scientific disciplines.

The construction of *systematic and rational factual knowledge* can be roughly summarized as a process that mainly follows these core steps:

1. The *production of a formal proposition* (such as, "*The Sun is made of gases*"). The formality of the proposition, that is, the language in which it is expressed, is most important for it allows, or prevents, the integration and verification that is done afterward.
2. The *integration* of the proposition into a "Body of knowledge" (such as "Mathematics" or "Physics", etc.)
3. The *verification* of the integrated proposition (for example, by experimentally testing predictions based on the proposition).
4. The *attribution of a Value of Truth, or Veracity*, based on the success of its integration and verification.

The scientific method can be viewed as an improvement and specialization of the fundamental procedure outlined above. By following the scientific method, scientific knowledge can be distinguished from any other form of systematic and rational factual knowledge.

There is an expectation, debatable and debated, about a **Unity of Science**, which is the idea that any systematic and rational study of the world, both abstract and concrete, whether

²We can observe the so-called *neural correlates* of emotions or the trace of chemical processes in the body, but those are observations of the neurological and chemical *effects* of love, not of love itself.

³It can be debated whether psychological facts are concrete or abstract. Here we chose to consider them as concrete because of the way in which they are affected by, and produce an effect on, the concrete, such as neurological and chemical processes in the human body.

⁴Psychology is usually considered to be a part of the Social Sciences, but here we choose to consider it as a category on itself; not only because of the interdisciplinary nature of its field of study, which incorporates elements of the natural sciences (especially neurobiology) but also because it studies **the individual as an isolated subject** and not just in its relationships with others.

natural, social, psychological, etc., should be constructed under the wide umbrella of "Science", even if the elements under that umbrella are separated into areas of study [4]. From this view (still somewhat debated) there is just "THE" Scientific Method, as opposed to a method of physics, a method of economics, a method of psychology, and so on.

The main ideas and approach of the modern, *unified*, scientific method can be traced back to the work of Francis Bacon [9]5], who can be regarded as one of the fathers of modern Science.

Within the field of *factual* scientific disciplines, this approach contains two interdependent *key* conditions:

1. A hypothesis must come from **observation**.
2. The hypothesis must be verified **empirically** by conducting experiments.

The first condition is central to the nature of scientific knowledge. Every scientific proposition is *required* to be **observable** and **testable**. Such a proposition is known as a *Hypothesis*. For example, I can formally propose that a particular phenomenon is real based on having witnessed it, yet, even if it just so happens that the phenomenon is, in fact, real, unless there is a way to validate the observation (to test it), then this proposition is not a hypothesis and this piece of "knowledge" is not scientific. It might very well be a valid, even truthful, piece of declarative knowledge, but it is not scientific.

A scientific proposition must refer to an *observable*. An observable is something that can be "observed" in the general sense. That is, *a fact for which there exists an empirical procedure to access and verify it*.

For example, the proposition "there is a red sock in the top drawer" is a proper scientific hypothesis because it is quite possible to go look into the drawer to check whether it actually contains a red sock.

Whether it has been checked or not is irrelevant here. The hypothesis is *valid*, even if *uncertain* until the verification is made.

The exact nature of the empirical procedure that *might* be used depends on the field of study. In physics, for instance, an observable is a physical quantity that can be measured with a physical device (such as a balance, a thermometer, etc.). In psychology, on the other hand, the observable is the behavior of the person or persons under study.

Not every postulate about the world, even if rational, formal and maybe very well integrated into the existing body of scientific knowledge is an "Observable". Such a postulate might be considered to be valid from the point of view of a certain epistemic framework, but it would not be considered to be *scientifically* valid.

A very well-known example of this "problem" is String Theory. Roughly (and informally) speaking, String Theory proposes that the fabric of the Universe is composed of multidimensional "strings" whose vibrations produce matter and energy. Sort of how an ocean wave is a thing in itself, with a shape, and that moves, but underneath it is really just vibrating water. This theory is controversial because we don't know of a way to verify it experimentally. Some claim that String Theory is not scientific enough, others say that it is.

The requirement that a scientific proposition must refer to an "observable" leads to the additional requirement that *the proposition must be derived itself from observation*. That is, the *red sock* proposition in the example above is scientifically valid because it can be tested, however, if I had made such a proposition out of thin air (for instance because I just guessed it), then it would have not been scientifically valid.

I could have, however, made the proposition after being *told* about the red sock in the drawer. In this instance, the proposition is perfectly valid scientifically because there is an originating observation that sourced the proposition, even if the one proposing it has not directly made it.

Every properly scientific hypothesis must refer to an observable, for which it must have originated in an observation.

A very interesting feature of this requirement is that it refers to the qualities of the procedure to **construct** the hypothesis *in the first place*, but no more. For example, Galileo Galilei made, around 1590, his observations about falling bodies by dropping balls of different masses from the *Leaning Tower of Pisa*, to conclude that their falling time was independent of their masses. And we know today that, indeed, such a time is derived from the force of gravity, which impules an object on free fall with an acceleration of roughly 9.8 meters per second, which is effectively independent of the mass of the falling object. But we don't know any of that from Galileo himself, nor are any of us witnesses of his observations. The originating observation that becomes a part of our current knowledge about free-falling bodies *is there*, granting the scientific validity to this hypothesis, but only indirectly in the traces of the historical development of our physics knowledge.

Chapter 3

The Basilio Scientific School Association (BSSA)

3.1 Spiritist organizations

Any spiritualist organization (such as the BSSA) follows a so-called *spiritualist doctrine*. While there are a few varieties of such a doctrine, they all have in common the following central ideas:

- There is an **Etheric Universe** (or *spiritual world* as it is often called).
- The **Physical Universe** (or *material world* as it is often called) is only a part of that.
- The natural inhabitants of the Etheric universe are the so-called **Spirits**.
- Spirits are conscious, *eternal* beings.
- A human is an **incarnated spirit**, that is, a spirit temporarily attached to a biological body.
- Spirits incarnate *multiplies times*. That is, any given life is a **reincarnation** (except in the cases in which it is the very first).
- The entire span of reincarnations is *finite*. For all of us, there will be one last reincarnation.
- As spirits *incarnate and disincarnate*, at birth and death, respectively, only the biological body ages and dies.
- **WE ARE** the incarnated spirit. That means that our essence, identity, personality, experience, etc., survives the death of our temporary biological body.
- *Every human* has a sort of spiritual sixth sense, called **mediumship**, which is one of the most fundamental functions of the human mind.
- Roughly speaking, mediumship is the ability to perceive, interact and communicate with ethereal beings such as discarnate spirits (the spirit of those who passed over). There are different forms of mediumship just as there are different forms of physical senses.
- **Every one of us has mediumship**
- The simplest form and expression of mediumship is the so-called *intuition*, which is naturally available to all of us.

- There are advanced forms of mediumship (mental and physical), expressed as a range of phenomena and abilities (channeling, automatic writing, clairaudience, clairvoyance, healing, etc.). A so-called **medium** is a person having any of these advanced forms, even though, to an extent, we are *all* mediums.
- Some people are *naturally-born* mediums (in terms of advanced forms of mediumship). Some people *develop* some type (or types) of advanced mediumship through specialized training. And some other people acquire advanced forms of mediumship naturally, but only after some critical event, or at a certain point in their lives.

Typically, a spiritualist organization develops around one or more mediums, who then, in turn, help those who join them develop their own mediumship. Also, typically, a spiritualist organization is actually *founded from the etheric side*. That means that it typically starts with a group of *discarnate spirits* who, when the time and place are right, set to the task of initiating a spiritualist church or movement. They work from the etheric side to open a *transcommunicational* bridge and connect with one or more mediums to channel their intentions and wisdom. These founding discarnate spirits are often in charge of directing, protecting and helping the proper development of the new movement, religion or organization they started.

The largest, best known, most studied and taught example of a spiritualist movement brought about in that way is **Kardecian Spiritism**. You can learn about the history of Kardecianism in the movie *Kardec*: <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt9213932/>. Kardecian spiritism officially started in Paris, France, on April 18, 1857, with the publication of "Le Livre des Esprits" (The Spirit Book) [8] ¹

Spiritism was so popular back then that around the same year (somewhere between 1857-1858), the very first spiritist society was founded in Buenos Aires, Argentina, under the name "Fe, Esperanza y Caridad" (Faith, Hope and Charity, the well known *Three Theological Virtues*) by Spanish immigrant and medium Justo de Espada. By 1880 there were a few institutionalized spiritist centers in Buenos Aires, some of which exist even today, such as "La Fraternidad" [12].

3.2 The dawn of the BSSA

Around 1915, in Buenos Aires, Argentina, French immigrant **Bernardo Eugenio Portal** was struggling really hard. With the world right in the middle of World War I, his profession—a Public Notary—often required him to go against his ethical principles. He was familiar with the ideas of spiritism, such as the existence of a higher spiritual world, and the possibility of reaching out to higher spirit guides with the help of a medium. Since he was not a medium (at *that* time), he decided to reach out to the mediums in the city, in the hope of receiving, through them, some guidance from the higher spiritual world. After having tried some different possibilities, he met with another French immigrant, **Blanca Aubreton de Lambert**. They resonated immediately, right in their very first meeting in which he explained his dilemma and she perfectly understood how significant it was.

Blanca, during her youth in Paris, became friends with a soldier named **Jacob**, of the *Zouaves army*. Jacob was a nurse and a Kardecian spiritist, who trained Blanca not only in mediumship but also in the Kardecian doctrine. She quickly became a prolific medium and highly knowledgeable of the spiritist doctrine, especially in its creed of love, forgiveness, charity and service. Eventually, she got married to **Hippolyte Lambert** and migrated to Buenos

¹by Hippolyte Léon Denizard Rivail, under the pen name Allan Kardec. Spiritism as a social phenomenon was already quite common in Europe and America, but it was largely a curiosity.

Aires, Argentina. In Buenos Aires, she put all her spiritual knowledge and mediumistic skills to help all those in need that reached out to her, such as Eugenio.

In that **very first** meeting with Eugenio, Blanca channeled a discarnate spirit. It was Eugenio's father: **Pedro Basilio Portal**. This spirit "**materialized**", which is a special kind of mediumistic phenomenon (which can take place in different forms). In any form of spirit materialization, the spirit becomes *fully visible* to the human eye without the need for clairvoyance. The only requirement of spirit materialization is a special medium that can provide the right form of subtle energy for the phenomena to occur. These kinds of mediums are very *uncommon* (even among mediums), but Blanca was one of them. Since Pedro **materialized**, Eugenio was able to see and recognize him.

Eugenio's purpose when he reached out to Blanca was to get some guidance on how to carry on with his professional duties without compromising his principles. But what happened that day was quite different and totally unexpected: Pedro (materialized through Blanca), told them *both*, Bernardo Eugenio Portal, and Blanca Aubreton de Lambert, that *they had a mission, which was to initiate a spiritist school*. Literally shocked, and without fully comprehending the complete scope of the mission, they both accepted and the Basilio Scientific School Association was initiated.

Eugenio's father, Pedro Basilio, explained to them in that very first materialization, that they had both chosen this mission before incarnating. He also explained that he was going to become the spirit guide of the new school and that its primary purpose was going to become a vehicle for the redemption of all those who suffer, **both incarnated and disincarnated**, through the mediumistically driven study and understanding of the nature of God, Love, the ultimate reason for suffering (which is our own mistakes) and the road back to God (and with it the end of suffering).

Wholeheartedly motivated by such a revelation, they began to meet two times a week to work on this new enterprise. Blanca was a highly skilled medium, and highly knowledgeable of the spiritist doctrine, but Eugenio was not, so their very first task was to prepare him mediumistically. He quickly became a prolific medium himself. For the development of the doctrine of this new spiritist school, they carefully studied the works of Allan Kardec, but they also received further higher knowledge from Pedro through successive materializations.

Over time, a few other people (around 5 or 6) joined them in their meetings, becoming the very first members of the new spiritist school.

3.3 Mediumship and knowledge from higher spirits

In popular culture, mediumship is almost exclusively associated with the task of contacting those who have passed on (typically the loved ones of the person requesting the contact). Although this *use case* can be of great *personal* importance to those in grief, it is the least important function of mediumship. As a feature, the primary objective of mediumship is getting guidance from our spirit guides (they wouldn't be able to operate at all without mediumship).

We all have spirit guides and we are all guided by them, even without our conscious awareness, since we are all—at the very least--*intuitive* mediums.

As it turns out, there are entire worlds beyond this physical Earth, inhabited by spirits with all levels of progression. Some have had their last incarnation here, often long ago, after a long sequence of human lives. Some others are so progressed that they have never had a human life at all. And many have had a *unique, single* human life, to carry some special mission (not like the rest of us, who are here to learn some hard lessons as humans). Spiritism refers to these as *higher spirits*. Our spirit guides are always higher spirits who accompany each and every one of us during our incarnated lifetime.

Every now and then, higher spirits find here on Earth the right conditions to channel their guidance through an appropriate medium. That is especially the case when a high spirit incarnates with the specific mission of being a channel, through their advanced mediumship, to the spirit guides, as it happened with the many *prophets* that we have known throughout human history.

Throughout history, and in all sorts of places, several mediumship circles, centers, and schools have been formed to become a *bridge between humanity and the higher spirits* so that they can provide us with universal, high-level guidance. Such a mediumistically given guidance is not just theoretical but also practical, and typically, the members of such spiritist organizations are engaged in the so-called *spiritual practices*.

The stated mission of the newly found BSSA, which is quite similar to that of so many other spiritist centers and organizations around the world, is then to study and develop mediumship so that in turn, the spirit guides can channel their universal wisdom and make it available to all of humanity.

3.4 Jesus's guidance

There has always been a large number of higher spirits actively working on guiding humanity in several ways (such as channeling their wisdom through a medium in a spiritist center).

Jesus of Nazareth is one such spirit. His colossal work on our redemption included his one and only human incarnation, but it is not limited to that. He has been our Redeemer long before he incarnated, and even *after* his bodily death, he continues giving us his guidance, though not through a physical body anymore, but through a mediumistic bridge, on every occasion in which the bridge is strong and stable enough (as it happened in the BSSA but *also in other places and times*).

Around the fall of 1916 (about a year after the BSSA initiation), the (few) members of the dawning BSSA were having their usual meeting. They were all deeply saddened by the news of World War I coming from Europe. Blanca fell into a mediumistic trance and produced an *etheric image*. Eugenio, who was sitting right in front of Blanca, initiated the standard procedure of speaking out loud a systematic description of what he saw *clairvoyantly*.

Below is an English-translated transcript of Eugenio's detailed description [2]

The couch on which sister Blanca is sitting got illuminated. It is now surrounded by a big spotlight. It looks as if beams of light from all over the universe shone on her. I see the reflection of a spirit. It is a man. His hair is blond as gold; it is quite long, so long that it spreads over his shoulders and falls over his back. His eyebrows are straight, slightly slanted at the end; they are just a bit thick at the beginning and rather thin at the end. He has big eyes, thick eyelashes and a very light color, just like his hair. His look is sweet, calm and penetrating; It feels as if he could read your mind, removing the grief of the soul, washing away your sorrows and bringing you happiness. The color of his eyes is indefinite; they look light blue, but it seems as if they were of a gamut of colors. His nose is thin and straight. He has tanned skin. His cheekbones are high. His face is elongated with a pointed chin. He has a mustache that follows a pointed beard that reaches about the center of his chest; it is blond, just like his hair, and gives him a character that represents his personality. Even seated as he is, it shows that he is a tall man. From the slender way he sits you can see that he is thin and fit. The toga that wraps him follows the ways of the Romans back then. There is a spotlight behind his head. He is now smiling, which says, more than all words, the immense happiness that it will bring to us being on his side.

— Asociación Escuela Científica Basilio 80 años de Vida Institucional (translated by this author).

When the description was over, they were all in such a *deep emotional shock*, that they just parted without saying a word.

In a follow-up meeting, Pedro Basilio communicated (through Blanca) that the spirit who had reflected that night was Jesus of Nazareth. He also told them that Jesus would be the *Spiritual Teachings Guide* of the BSSA.

Within the BSSA, we refer to Jesus as "el Maestro" (meaning *Teacher*) because he is the source of all the spiritual teachings. We do not refer to him as Master, Prophet, Lord or any of the common denominations used around the world. In this book, he will be referred to as *The Teacher*.

3.5 BSSA official public launch

After about two years of intense work, the BSSA officially launched to the general public on November 1^o, 1917. In front of a small group of members and advocates, Blanca channeled the *very first mediumistic message from Jesus of Nazareth on the BSSA* (keep in mind that Jesus, as many other high spirits, channels his universal guidance wherever and whenever there is a well-established energy and communication bridge. The BSSA is just one such place, but it is not the only one).

Below is an English-translated transcript ² of Jesus' very first message, channeled through Blanca, on the BSSA [2]

I, Jesus of Nazareth, in the name of GOD, our Creator and Father, give you the rays of his noble light for the initiation of this Deed of Human Redemption, entrusted in these first two missionaries, Sister Blanca and Brother Eugenio, who had promised GOD to fulfill this mission before incarnating.

The spiritist practice and the rules of GOD will serve as a basis for this fertile Brotherhood whose Deed will, dispelling the darkness about the spiritual life, establish in a definitive way the undeniable principles of its existence, as well as the consequences of wrongdoing.

It will be a School because it will continually spread the Spiritual Teachings.

It will be a Doctrine for it will establish the undeniable principles of this Faith.

It will be a Science for it will make a systematic study of the existence of the world of spirits.

It will help everyone who needs it for whatever reason.

Its doors will be open not only to comfort pain but also to spread out the norms for establishing Equality.

It will be based on Love, the pillar of all its actions.

I trust this legacy to you, Sister Blanca and Brother Eugenio, whose fulfillment will be witnessed by GOD upon your disincarnation. Jesus of Nazareth will always be with you.

— Asociación Escuela Científica Basilio 80 años de Vida Institucional (translated by this author).

²I took the liberty of slightly rearranging a few of the words in this translation to make it readable in the English language.

3.6 Blanca's death

Unfortunately, Blanca left this physical world just 3 years later, on June 25, 1920. The shock of her physical death was so hard that all of the members split. Eugenio, however, who had developed a mediumship of his own by this time, was able to persist. In spite of the grief and despair, he fully understood the colossal importance of the mission that was given to him, thus, even after having been left all alone (but only physically, for Blanca remained, now in spirit, on his side), he managed to re-initiate the BSSA just a few months later [2]

3.7 BSSA re-launch and spread

Thanks to Eugenio's hard work and persistence, the BSSA was re-launched on November 1^o, 1920. The re-opening document was signed by 20 members.

Over the following years, the BSSA became the largest spiritist organization in Argentina. It expanded to other countries, becoming a worldwide organization, with currently over 200 church branches in Argentina, plus over 140 in the rest of the world.

Bibliography

- [1] Gettier problem, March 2023. Page Version ID: 1146984353.
- [2] Asociación Escuela Científica Basilio. *80 años de Vida Institucional*. 1997.
- [3] Anabela Cardoso. Instrumental transcommunication (itc) evidence suggestive of the survival of consciousness.
- [4] Jordi Cat. The Unity of Science. In Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman, editors, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Spring 2023 edition, 2023.
- [5] Marian David. The Correspondence Theory of Truth. In Edward N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Summer 2022 edition, 2022.
- [6] Brian Hepburn and Hanne Andersen. Scientific Method. In Edward N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Summer 2021 edition, 2021.
- [7] Jonathan Jenkins Ichikawa and Matthias Steup. The Analysis of Knowledge. In Edward N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Summer 2018 edition, 2018.
- [8] Allan Kardec. *The spirits' book*. Cosimo, Inc., 2006.
- [9] Jürgen Klein and Guido Giglioni. Francis Bacon. In Edward N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Fall 2020 edition, 2020.
- [10] Peter Markie and M. Folescu. Rationalism vs. Empiricism. In Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman, editors, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Spring 2023 edition, 2023.
- [11] Matthew McGrath and Devin Frank. Propositions. In Edward N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Winter 2020 edition, 2020.
- [12] Juan M. Corbetta y Elizabeth N. Moreno. Los orígenes del Espiritismo en Argentina. 2015.
- [13] Georges Rey. The Analytic/Synthetic Distinction. In Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman, editors, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Spring 2023 edition, 2023.
- [14] Eric Schwitzgebel. Belief. In Edward N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Winter 2021 edition, 2021.