

INTERVIEW WITH WALDO VIEIRA: INTERPARADIGMAS

(Scriptor; 4th year; n. 4; p. 102-103).

Waldo Vieira is a doctor, odontologist and has a post-graduate degree in Plastic and Cosmetic Surgery. A conscious projector since 9 years of age and researcher of consciousness and manifestations outside of the body for over half a century. He proposed the sciences of Projectiology and Conscientiology that are systematized in the treatises *Projectiology: A Panorama of Experiences of the Consciousness Outside the Human Body* (1986) and *700 Experiments of Conscientiology* (1994). Author of dozens of books, including the treatises *Homo sapiens reurbanisatus* (2003) and *Homo sapiens pacificus* (2007), as well as the *Dictionary of Neologisms of Conscientiology* (2013). He is the organizer of the *Encyclopedia of Conscientiology*, which involves a team of over two hundred verbetographers and nearly 3,000 entries (Base year: 2013).

Could you detail the emergence of the idea and the proposals about the new Scientific Journal to be organized by CCCI researchers who have doctorates or post-graduation titles?

W. V. Through the questions received in conscientiological tertulias we perceive that, in general, people stay within conventional science, but this does not attend their demands or evolutionary needs. So they will look at what we are doing. Today a man, from a university, wanted to know what is *this philosophy of an objective body*, if this hypothesis has been accepted. I had to explain everything. So you see: we need to have contact with these individuals in order to debate. They avoid us as much as possible because they don't understand anything about parapsychism and always think they are *above everything* and that we are just a pseudoscience, a false science or something along those lines. It is necessary to prove and show they are wrong various things, because Science itself must study everything, it cannot evade any approach on any theme, otherwise, what science is this? Is not Science for the welfare of humanity? So, it has to debate everything. Why not? But there is much scientific dogma that must be overcome. The worst of them, for example, is the problem of a person performing non-participative research. This is nonsense, given the process of energy. They [scientists] do not understand anything about energy, they do not admit the existence of energy nor do they perform self-research, and therefore they do not notice how they themselves function. We have to finish this in a way that is a little daring. No need to fight, but we must be bold, use *testosterone*. That's what debates are for. A *lukewarm* or *cold* debate does not solve anything. A debate has got to show the person's reality, the reality of the subject, the reality of the theme, the reality of the context.

So, what would be the profile of this journal's target audience?

W. V. I think that everyone who's interested in science, wherever they are; of any kind, from conventional science to ours. These people are worth the effort, that's the target audience. Preferably, people who have a PhD or a doctorate in any area.

What would be the materthosene of the journal?

W. V. The materthosene would be, beyond good will and good intentions, the maximum criticizing of this condition. To tell aeronautic scientists what comes from being self-discerning. Conventional scientists do not have self-discernment, otherwise they would have better defined priorities. If priority is lacking it is because there is no discernment. It's just like a person who smokes. For example, in conventional science there is Freud who smoked cigars non-stop. There is also the philosopher Pondé [Luiz Felipe Pondé], who is an inveterate smoker. All these people are *narrow-minded, short headed*. They do not study themselves and they do not see that smoking will end up destroying their health. It is like the teacher who lectures and throws their cigarette on the lecture theatre floor. How is it possible? It is incoherent. We have to work to make research more coherent.

From the beginning, when the idea was launched, you spoke of the possible institutionalization of the Journal, to later create a CI.

W. V. It is the ideal, with time. For example, look for a base, however small, but for debates. When you have a physical office, people give it greater value and volunteers arrive. The journal must have high-level collaborators. Then it is good to have a proper, adequate, comfortable base at the level doctors are accustomed to. This is very important.

An environment to receive eventual doctors from universities?

W. V. Yes, high-level doctors. There is nothing to hide, everything should be told face to face. This is the ideal.

Besides the journal, what other activities could this CI have?

W. V. You'll have to study. First it is necessary to create the CI, with a social purpose. Little by little the situation will begin to come clear. Let the facts orientate the research.

In terms of a broader view, what would be the possible role of the journal in the group maxiproaxis?

W. V. I think it is the process of debate, which helps greatly because it clarifies. Also this become fixed in the documentation. It all ends up being a time capsule, it is the multiexistential self-relay. The journal will deal directly with the mentalsoma.

These researchers of Conventional Science can also, in their future, access the journal?

W. V. They can, also they can get to lambast the journal. That is what would be interesting, to have a mixture, the more, the better. Now, who has logic and rationality swallows the other. Little by little, people will mature and minimize their emotions during the debate, from there rationality arises. At this time others will fear the debaters. That is great, that is the goal we must attain.

More or less what happened when you debated in INPE [National Institute of Spacial Research, in Portuguese: Instituto Nacional de Pesquisa Espacial].

W. V. The scientists remained silent, laughed at me, but I used energy, like at Columbia University in Manhattan. The scientist presented himself to be a volunteer

and without anyone telling me I noticed he had a surgery recently. When I asked him to open his shirt, there was the heart surgery. At first they booed, then were astonished and nobody said anything. Some of these scientists, including this one, followed my courses, during a period of time.

Do you think that this journal will bring a new condition, which would be the binomial authorship-doctorate?

W. V. The work is important because we have to value the doctors, speaking in their language. They will not be able to complain. Doctor to doctor, we also are. However, we are showing that we do not think like they do. This alone will make the journal worthwhile. Just by having authors-doctors in Conscientiology, doctors who do not think like the other doctors, this already creates an enclave within conventional science. That is, we are doctors, but we think differently. If they criticize our doctors, it means their doctorate has no value. In other words, if there are some doctors that are worth nothing, *everyone is worth nothing*. It is a deadend for them. This is the greatest! It must be shown by a similar person, one at the same level.

What kind of gescon can be expected from the doctors?

W. V. You should write articles on controversial topics that scientists do not like to address. You discuss the matter. It is a platform. The journal should be a tribune. The journal will help, you will see with time.

You had mentioned in the Conscientiological Tertulias and Minitertulias that there are many consciousnesses waiting for this work.

W. V. Yes, and you know why? Because they are conscexes (extraphysical consciousnesses) who committed a lot of nonsense with Electronics and are now suffering. They are regretful and want to help. The controversy of the debates, even the most pacific, will help this condition. These conscexes are afraid of resomating and remaining the same way that they were. Look where they are thinking: in the future, in their next lives. They are afraid to come to the intraphysical and be the same. Conventional Science is hard, there is a lot of dogma. In fact, one of the worst dogmas of the current times is conventional science. Only religious fanaticism ranks higher in this condition.

These conscexes can also inspire the team working here as conventional scientists?

W. V. They inspire everyone. They are most interested because they are guilty, have a guilty conscience, did stupid things. And another thing: there are women and men, including those who desomated at some certain age. I've seen some of them.

And are these people from the Intermisive Course?

W. V. In the Intermisive Course they changed everything, so they want to go back in time. It is already another pattern, it is another generation from the Intermisive Course. Forget everything. This alone will already make the journal worth doing: to help these people who will be reborn. Some must already have be reborn around here. In this case, it's the relay of the intermission with the intraphysical and that is the best!

And what is the logical expectation we can have about the entry of the consciential paradigm in the university environment? Do you have any prospective?

W. V. No. In some places it has already entered, but the problem is that there is dogmas. The scientific paradigm is now fighting religion. Soon they will start fighting themselves. This is inevitable, I predicted it long ago. I predicted it about 40 years ago. They will fight the process of religion and after they will enter into the fight with their materialism.

Will they perform self-criticism?

W. V. They will, sooner or later. This is the century of self-criticism and heterocriticism. That is why it is so good to have this journal published. Without self-criticism there is no discernment.