



question everything

The Conscious Media Network

Paul Von Ward
Reincarnation

RM: How many times have you wondered or even researched into whether or not you have had past lives? Paul Von Ward is taking the subject head on with his newest book, [The Soul's Genome: Science Looks at Reincarnation](#). As a former theologian and psychologist Paul found that the most essential issues surrounding Mankind were not being answered by these models. He finally asked the big question: *How would we live our lives if we knew that we are the ones who will inherit the Earth as our own grandchildren, great grandchildren, and so forth?*

RM: I find it interesting that while many cultures throughout history have held in regard, and really it is woven into the framework of their understanding of Life—the notion of Reincarnation—the Western world, which is causing the greatest amount of damage at this point in time on the planet, itself, is the part of the world that is least likely to buy into this notion that would create a sense of greater personal responsibility. It is an interesting conundrum we have here, and thank God you're doing the kind of work you are doing. Let's start out with how you ended up, with your education and background, in the area of looking for the scientific case for reincarnation.

PVW: Well, I think my growth and development in this direction is a response to the question you asked. Because in my research for other books, and so on, I've always taken sort of an academic, historical, philosophical perspective to the subject, you know, and waxed philosophically and wisely on these issues. I got started in this research on reincarnation for the book in the same way. I talked to the publisher about it, and we were going to look at the history of things and belief systems and philosophies and all that sort of thing, and I started. And as I got half way through the writing of the first draft I thought *well, wait a minute. I'm saying the same things that other people have said. It has been written in many languages; it hasn't had an impact on the world that we can see as constructive, and I'm involved now in researching this book. I'm meeting mystical groups; I'm meeting psychical groups; [I'm meeting] therapists who are talking about reincarnation from their perspectives. It seems to have a little bit of impact on an individual at a moment of discussion or recognition of a possible past lifetime, but then they go about their lives the same way.* So, my question is if this is real, if reincarnation is a real part of the cosmology of this universe, it ought to be something more substantive, it ought to be something that is more rooted in who we really are and influences who we really are. And, if that is the case, we ought to be able to prove it to other people. Not that *I just had a mystical experience, and I know I'm the reincarnation of Mr. X two centuries ago.* Or, *my Spirit Guide said to me that I'm the reincarnation of so-and-so, and I feel so good about it. But, I don't change what I'm doing.*

So, I said let's try to look at this question—I switched the whole approach to the research for the book—let's look at cases that only have empirical evidence. That is there is information about the proposed link between a present lifetime and the alleged previous lifetime, and deal only with things that I can write about, I can take pictures of, I can measure that I show to other people in my book or in presentations that they too can then go look at it, and they can go test in and then say, “Paul, you didn't interpret that correctly.” Or, “Paul, you didn't measure that physical resemblance very well. Your technique is no good; it is not valid.” Then we could have a dialog, and I could say, “Wait a minute now this is the way I approached the evidence; this is what I've collected; this is how I have interpreted it. Would you take the same material and reinterpret it from your point of view if you think I've done it incorrectly? Let's look at it as a scientific process, which has to be replicated by another person, has to be observed and evaluated by an independent person to see how close their conclusions are to mine.

I thought *if we could get to that level of discussion about reincarnation it might make enough impact that it would really change the behavior of the individuals involved; it might really change the psychological state, the world view of people.* So, I said let's test that out; let's see.

So I was involved with a number of groups who are looking at reincarnation, but looking at it from what I consider to be a very narrow perspective. They've either had psychic input of information; they've had a therapeutic dream or a past life regression and it has given them a label. *I am the reincarnation of Joan of Arc.* And, they feel good about it. *I'm the reincarnation of a soldier who had his head chopped off, and I'm no longer afraid of being cut at my throat because now I recognize that was a traumatic experience from the past.* But nothing else changes.

Because people would get a clue to a potential lifetime in the past and accept it without any validation, without any corroboration from other sources or from other material, and I thought *maybe that's the reason it is not making a difference, because it is not robust enough.*

RM: It would seem that at that point if someone were to be given a glimpse of something that has some truth in it, for example, if it is revealed even in those little snippets without any further evaluation, wouldn't it still be incumbent upon a person to maybe delve into it a little bit more and understand *why have I been shown this? Or, why has this been revealed? What is the responsibility now in knowing this?*

PVW: People do talk about it in those terms. *Well, gee, I have a responsibility to live a life that St Thomas would have lived.* But you see, that is at a level of abstraction that doesn't change people at the fundamental level of personality. So, anyone who has looked at developmental theory in psychology, which has been my area of focus in psychology, is to try to understand how do we individuate and differentiate into the unique individuals that we are? Because simple explanations don't account for the complexity of the Humans that we have become.

So, I felt that if change is really going to happen at a level of interiority, if you want to use that term—at the inner sense of self—then, you've got to have a psychological process of what I call realistic, validate-able learning. I remember working with Chris Argyris at Harvard about 30 years ago. His point was Learning Theory. He and I were going to work together on some things in the State Department later on to try to improve professional change. Professional Change means changing the kind of person you are. His theory was you don't have that kind of fundamental change—learning to be a new and different kind of person—unless there is a profound realization that your basic assumptions are wrong. And then you've got to say *I recognize that my assumptions have been wrong about subjects X, Y or Z. I've got to learn what is a better explanation? I've got to learn why I made a mistake.*

I've taken that mentality, which came out of a totally different part of my life and career, and said we ought to apply that to reincarnation research.

RM: That makes sense. Did I understand correctly were you a minister at one time?

PVW: I started out my early career in graduate school. I was studying Clinical Psychology. I was an ordained minister. I had a small church outside of Tallahassee, Florida, where I was at Florida State University. I was going to be a psychological counselor from a religious orientation.

RM: It's interesting because neither one of these would support a future researcher in reincarnation.

PVW: Absolutely not!

RM: So you had to look at which of your suppositions weren't working and showing you the entire truth.

PVW: First of all the whole discipline of Psychology in the 1960's, 70's, 80's, 90's and up to the present has no plausible developmental theory to explain the uniqueness and the differentiation of human personalities as we experience it in our own lives, and as we observe in other people. I really spent a lot of time while I was doing other things, I mean ministry, counseling, and the Navy and the Diplomatic Service and so on, I was always involved in those professional roles with sort of another eye up here [just above crown of head] saying *why is the situation the way it is? Why are people behaving the way they behave?* So, my work at Harvard in the mid-70's with Psychologist David McClellan and Chris Argyris that I mentioned earlier, was also driven by that urge to understand. But, people respond in unique ways that cannot be explained by their family environment, by their early childhood culture. They make decisions, they know who they are, they define themselves and a very precocious level, and I'm not talking about just prodigies who are doing symphonies at age eight, as Mozart did, or becoming mathematical geniuses as people have at age nine. I'm talking about all of us. We have those kinds of what I call *precocity*; we are precocious. We know things at early ages that we haven't known—no one has talked to us about them, we haven't read about them, we haven't been exposed to them, but we have beliefs in them. Research going on at Yale University right now people are looking at children who hold beliefs in the multidimensionality of the Universe, who hold beliefs about the transcendent nature of consciousness at

very young ages. And they resist adults telling them that it is wrong. Now, where does that strength in conviction come from?

RM: Yes, it is a wonderful case-in-point.

PVW: The developmental theories that I studied in psychology did not explain it. The theologies of the Western religions did not explain it, because there you are supposed to be the servant of a God's blueprint for your individual life, and you have only one choice to make, which is to accept the path to salvation that your particular church puts forth. There is no room in that theology for individual self-differentiation, for free will, for self control and direction, self-actualization as Carl Rogers would call it. No theories are explaining that. And, so in answer to your first question, as I started out doing this research on this book, I picked up a lot of the individually researched and best cases where people had documented very well the full picture, the full measure of a past life, and described their own present life in terms of cognitive ways of thought, analysis thinking, emotional patterns and styles of behavior, interpersonal ways of dealing with the world and the Universe and other people. In other words they had talked about all of this data not in my terms as a psychologist looking at it and putting these labels on it, but in terms of the raw data.

The point of intuition that I mentioned to you in some of our earlier private conversations, the book—although it is a very scientific approach to testing this data—I think it is like all innovations in technology and in scientific concepts and research, the first moment is sort of an *ah-ha* moment of intuition. When I looked at all of that raw data and these dozens of cases and I saw that each one of them was, in its own way, painting a picture that was a picture of a whole being, not just some ethereal concept, not just a name, not just a historical reputation, but a robust person. So, I said *wow! If this is what reincarnation does, if reincarnation involves the totality of a being—not that it is an identical thing—but if the legacy of past lives that gets somehow transmitted into a current lifetime, if it has that kind of influence on all aspects of who we are then it is a robust, natural process that effects all humans; it is a part of our legacy.* Then I had to admit to myself it wasn't a new idea to me, but Jean-Baptiste Lamarck, before Darwin had the notion that in the process of evolution more than just these physical characteristics that Darwin focused on were involved.

Well, Darwin won the publicity battle and Lamarck got cast aside. But in effect, what I am reviving here is not a new idea, but it is a more extensive elaboration, a more structurally defined concept than Lamarck was playing with. So I said *alright, if this is what is involved in reincarnation—the totality of our being physically, cognitively, emotionally, and interpersonally in terms of our creative directions and so on.* I got all excited about it as I express it here. I said *let's try to test that hypothesis. Because if it is real we ought to be able to test it.* So, I took all these cases and I started, as I mentioned in one of the presentations that you and I had, Regina. I'm an old fashioned guy, you know, I'm from the 50's and the 60's and technology is—I'm a Troglodyte in modern technology—but I thought in terms of the old over-head projector and the way we put things together with a template. If I wanted to show a whole schema to an audience I would have a piece of it on one and a piece on the other and I would lay the pieces on top of each other and they would see the whole picture of what I was trying to show. Well, that's what happened in terms of the reincarnation research. One case I would look at and it had these areas of data, another one had these areas of data—a little bit different terminology, a different perspectives—but, looking at it from a generic kind of Classification perspective, which is what psychologists do when they try to develop personality tests and IQ tests and all that, we try to look for patterns in the underlying structures of things. To me, to my eyes, it was a very solid structure.

So, I said *ok, what are the components of it?* At that time I didn't know and that's when this intuition came. I said *well we've got a mental part, the way of thinking, analysis, critical thinking, or intuitive.* We fall somewhere on that spectrum, everybody does. But, the past life that I'm looking at in this case, in the present life has the same pattern.

RM: Let's talk about that. Let's get into a couple of specifics that have either previously been recorded in books by other people that you consider to be, as you say, among the most robust cases so you can give examples—side-by-side of exactly what you are talking about. I mean you can go with the Confederate Soldier or whoever you wish.

PVW: Well that's a good case because this book—Jeff Keen is the author of the book, and it is his own case. He discovered through an emotional experience on one of the battlefields of the Civil War, where he had an emotional experience that he could not explain in any other way, and was told by a friend that might have some past life implications for you. He sort of tried to see what that meant and he didn't really have

any lead until he saw a picture of a Confederate Soldier. He held it up and he said *I recognize that guy; I shaved his face in the morning.* So, you know, this really got his attention.

RM: Did he have a lot of the physical characteristics?

PVW: The physical characteristics, and I have done—as I mention in the book—he wrote about he developed all this raw data, stories, anecdotes about how he has similar experiences, similar attitudes and so on to this Confederate Soldier who became a General in the Confederate Army. Jeff was looking at it just as an ordinary human being saying I see all these similarities, and he has them all mixed up in the book, and so forth. Well, I took his book and that's when I did the templates—he is one of the templates. His areas of evidence filled in this part of the picture. So, you had the physical features that were very similar, not just the facial geometry, which some people have looked at in their research, and I was looking at, but also the body type, and the hair and the ear and hand proportions and those kinds of features that have been shown by metric science to be the more genetically stable parts of our physical features.

He not only had that, but then I said *ok I think there is a way of thinking here. Let me read some of the material that Jeff wrote in his book about the way he thinks, and the way John Gordon, the Confederate guy thought.* Because I had quotes of his from history books of his writing and his comments and so forth. Because of the work I had done in the Harvard research looking at speeches of politicians and articles of ministers and cases of lawyers and so on to infer what their. . .

RM: Mindset

PVW: . . . approach to thinking was and their mindsets were. I used the same approach to look at Jeff Keen, the current living retired firemen in Connecticut, with the long-dead Confederate General. The patterns were the same. I said *let me look at the emotions. Do these guys have the same sort of emotional reactions to similar circumstances?* I read some of Gordon's letters, how he talked about battle, loosing his comrades in the war, the trauma and how he was balancing his personal feelings with his sense of duty as the leader. Look at some of the things that Jeff Keen had written about his men being in a burning house, subjecting themselves to danger. He, as the assistant chief, having to stand back and direct this. These are his buddies in there in danger. The same patterns were coming through.

Then I looked and said *how about the careers of these guys?* Obviously they were both in structured, hierarchical organizations—the military, the Army, the Air Force, the Fire Department—these were psychologically the kinds of structures that a particular kind of personality needs. Another match. And, it goes on in that particular case. Not only when they finish their duties as authoritarian, structure-oriented, military careers; they have a sense of service to the citizenry—get involved in education and public service. Gordon in politics; Jeff Keen in education, and so on.

Well, that's only one case. Take Peter Teekamp and Paul Gauguin

RM: Yes, that was interesting.

PVW: Now, Peter's case started on his own with people just saying to him, “You remind me of Paul Gauguin.” And he brushed it off. For a decade or so three different significant people said that to him. Then, as he got into his research looking more carefully and closely at Paul Gauguin's paintings he discovered something in those paintings that other art critics had never noticed—tiny faces hidden away in small parts of the paintings. Now, that discovery was significant enough in itself, but Peter Teekamp did the same thing, and had been doing it all of his life. That got his attention.

RM: As an artist.

PVW: As an artist. *Why am I doing that, and I find that this guy was doing the same thing 150 years ago.*

RM: Right!

PVW: So, he began to explore and study more, and began to feel that maybe there was a combination of factors that might suggest he ought to look at it more seriously. So he met Michelle Moshay who now, it turns out, as other researchers have evaluated it, as Peter and Michelle have evaluated it, and as now I have finally done with my multi-factored package, they are—if anybody today is reincarnated as Mette Gauguin

and Paul Gauguin, it's Michelle Moshay and Peter Teekamp. You notice I said that carefully. I'm not declaring 100% certitude that this is the reincarnation of the same soul that was in Paul and the same soul that evolved and met Gauguin.

RM: Right.

PVW: But I am suggesting that when you have that kind of body of correspondences it's hard to say, it is sort of foolish to say *oh that's just by accident*.

RM: Right.

PVW: You happen to find two people that resemble each other this closely by chance. So, doing that with a number of cases. So I took some of those cases that had already been published and I wanted to take it to the next step. These people like Jeff Keen and Peter and Mette, and a few other people who were willing to let their books be used, let their material be used, and who were willing to go the next step to engage themselves in the psychological process of evaluation.

So we had interviews. I had their material. They let me have their writings; they let me have any of their private information. They went through a rigorous psychological interview where I was looking for the clues of these various profiles. I tried out my evaluations on them. In most instances—I'm not boasting my perspicacity as an analyst—but, in most cases they agreed. They said *Paul, yeah, that fits me!* And I say *do you know it also fits Paul Gauguin; it also fits Mette*. So they say *wow!* And what's happened in the feedback I've gotten from people after going through this process of not only thinking of themselves in terms of a name, in terms of maybe being an artist, and he was an artist, or in terms of some spiritual concept of, you know, *that soul is now in me*. They use terms like—I have a wonderful email from Michelle on this—saying *I've never felt so complete and whole and confident of this case that we've been working on for the last 15-plus years. It has just changed my life*.

RM: In what ways are you finding that it changes people's lives to have this kind of moving closer to certainty?

PVW: Moving closer to certainty in all of these areas, I mean they take it seriously. They now look at their own decisions, they look at their own life choices as they are making them now in the context of an evolving personality that they understand some of the roots in the past and they understand some of the implications of that legacy in the early years of this life. Peter is a wonderful example, because he has had his own suicidal episodes just as Paul Gauguin did; he's had his own family break-up, his own alienation from his children as Paul Gauguin did. But, now that he is aware of this legacy and its impact, and his ability to make some choices, he is changing. He is now reintegrating his children into his life. He is now thinking in terms of responsibility. If this is what that life in the past contributed to the way I started this life, I'm thinking of what my legacy is going to be in the person who is animated by this same psychoplasm or soul genome that has animated me, and I have some choices to make. I can make different decisions; I can go in different directions.

When you go through this process of owning, at a visceral level, this legacy you are a very weird, dead soul if you can't have a sense of some self-responsibility for the next step. I say that because there are no weird, dead souls. I mean we are conscious beings, consciously evolving beings and once you own that, you can't help but see the implications.

When I was writing the book in the first direction, before I changed directions, I was talking about Karma and more spiritual, oriental terms of this notion of *well, it's something that the Universe imposes on us and sort of sets it up and, you know we work it out and there is nothing much we can do about it. We either work it off, or we don't*. Well, I'm sorry to say to the people who feel that way that that's not the way the evidence seems to suggest that it works. The evidence suggests it works that you have a legacy and it influences your behavior as it came to you, and it influences you in that direction until you make conscious choices to change it. That's the insight. What's interesting to me is using this Western, "scientific" model that I'm using, it has revealed the fragility that if the reality of the lack of force and power of these more ethereal traditions—because they have been comfort-giving, you see. They make us feel good because we don't have any responsibility. You see, it's at this level that we don't have any control over.

But when you get to the nitty-gritty of looking at reincarnation as a real phenomenon that effects not only the way I look, but the way I'm going to make decisions about the people I'm going to be in love with, partner with, marry, work with, fight against. The choices that I make are going to be influenced by this

legacy, and I have to make conscious decisions to overcome that influence. You can't escape the responsibility for the original meaning of Karma. If you go back to the earliest definitions of the word Karma, it was a very simple, natural tradition: *The effects of one's actions*. That's as clear as it can be. So, Peter Teekamp says *yeah, I've been behaving like a ---, because I came with that legacy and I didn't realize it was pushing me. I gave into those inclinations that I was born with. But, boy, now I see that I can change; I can make a difference! I don't want to live with this legacy any more.* It's the kind of thing that a person has who goes through an authentic therapeutic process of dealing with the consequences of one's behavior, where the behavior could have either been in a previous life or in the present life.

As you know, the whole Past Life Therapy movement has been very widespread in the last few decades.

RM: Yes.

PVW: Really grew out of Freud's and his colleagues understandings of the power of buried trauma in childhood on a present life. So, if the concept that I am describing works in reincarnation, which is this integral, singular, corpus of a personality, then if there is trauma in a past life obviously it comes forward and if it hasn't been dealt with in a past life, it is going to have to be dealt with at some time in a future lifetime. Sometimes it will burst out on its own and cause difficulties for us that are extreme enough that we are forced to take action; we are forced to undergo therapeutic experiences or self-healing experiences of some kind or another. If we don't do it this lifetime it's going to be part of our legacy that we pass on.

I think one of the interesting things about people now volunteering to do past life regression and setting themselves up to "suffer" this traumatic experience of uncovering lifetimes that have very negative consequences, this is speeding up the process of conscious evolution. In other words the whole Past Life Therapy movement has become, and will become even more effective as people understand the greater impact of what we are talking about. This is like a whole generation of people consciously volunteering to undergo some of the self-healing of past behaviors with consequences that are affecting society today. It means that it doesn't have to be pushed off to future lifetimes.

RM: That's ultimate self responsibility.

PVW: It's ultimate self responsibility. I wouldn't go so far as to say everybody ought to get into the process and begin to explore their past lives, because some people aren't ready for it yet. If you do it too early before the person has the experience and the support system to really make the changes. That's why I like the therapeutic processes that take a considerable amount of time to work through, because then there is a time for evolutionary process.

RM: Integration of it all, yeah.

PVW: Integration of all of these factors and support from the therapists, from other people in the group that you might be working with. So, I'm very disappointed when I hear friends talk about *oh, I went to this person and this person wiped away my karmic debt and I don't have to worry about it anymore. I say come and see me in a month.* And, in a month they are having the same problems they were before. Those are the extremes between an immediate fix—that sort of thing in terms of past life karmic healing, is no different than the supernatural religion which says come and believe in the Lord Jesus, accept him by his name and you will be saved for eternity. In other words it is a magical moment that somebody else can do for you. I'm suggesting that reincarnation is not a magical moment that somebody can do for you. It is something that you are involved in as an individual and you need to go through it in a very serious and self-responsible manner.

RM: It has huge implications for not only our own progression, soul or psycho plasm progression, individually, but collectively, and, how we interact not just with each other, but even the Earth and all of the bounty of resources that we've been trashing so badly.

PVW: Absolutely, it affects everything we do.

RM: Well, like the notion what if we are the ones who inherit the Earth?

PVW: Yes! We now say our children and grandchildren will inherit the Earth. *We are those children and grandchildren* coming around again. So, if we don't take action to make some progress now we are going

to be faced with the consequences. That's Karma. In other words not being willing to take action to resolve the negative consequences, the negative influence of your current behaviors on the future is loading that down the road.

RM: The same burden is going to land right on your shoulders again.

PVW: Right on your shoulders again. You know I don't want to make too much of my work, but. . .

RM: You don't want to preach.

PVW: I stopped preaching a long time ago. And, I don't want to make more out of it, because this is a pilot study; it is an experiment, as you know; it is an ongoing experiment. We have a website where people can come on and read about the process, can look at some cases in progress, they can look at some cases that we have already written up and see if it triggers anything in their own lives, in their own experiences.

RM: This is called www.reincarnationexperiment.org.

PVW: Yeah.

RM: So if this is lighting your jets and you feel like there is something that has been kind of there in the background, something in the operating system that you can kind of feel, but don't know what it is yet, then maybe this is a really good place for people to plug in and become part of this experiment.

PVW: Become part of the experiment, become part of the process. What we are emphasizing—when I say we, I'm primarily responsible for getting this together. A lot of people have made contributions to the book in their own personal cases, and so forth. I have to take responsibility for the final product of the book because, you know, I edited the final version and so on. But, what I and the people who are buying into this sort of approach, I think what we are inviting people to do is to take this as an individual self discovery project. It doesn't matter if you don't know that you might have a connection with a particular past lifetime. That will come later on, because what you do is begin to look at yourself in a different way. You begin to say *how am I thinking about these issues that I am facing? What approach am I bringing? How do I normally react to stress and challenges? What is my emotional stance? If I haven't changed it much in this lifetime that must be the legacy that I've brought forward, which is pretty deeply rooted, and if I'm going to make some changes I've got to something that requires serious work and involvement.* There is no magic bullet for this. When we talk about evolution, my dear friend Barbara Marx Hubbard and I—she is way off out there in the future looking at things at a general level, and I'm here saying we've got to look at conscious evolution on a today level. We are involved as individuals, and we complement each other. So when we have these conversations it is wonderful because she is showing the potential that's out there, and I'm saying *yes, and let's do our job today, do our homework and do our self-work today so that future will evolve.* It won't evolve unless we begin to take this responsibility.

That's why I left the supernatural religions and the theology of Western religions early on in my intellectual and psychological development, because it absolved people of responsibility for who they really were. Now, many theologians from that perspective will disagree. They'll say *oh no, we teach and preach responsibility—social responsibility, love thy neighbor and all of these behavioral admissions.* But those are only admissions, and the driving force is not really to do those things, it is to fix your vision on that projected after-life, which you know if you believe in that supernatural way of belief whether you are an Islamic suicide bomber, or you are a Christian Zealot the same dynamic is at work because you know that what you are doing is going to be alright in the end because you have done it in the name of your particular religious belief system. What that does—even those who preach liberation theology and socially conscious Christianity and those kinds of systems of thought—if they look a little more deeply, they will realize that the underbelly of their belief systems lies elsewhere. It lies in salvation being at another level than one's own actions and own behavior and self responsibility.

It's sort of ironic because when you read some of the words that are attributed to Jesus—we're not quite sure what he said—some that are attributed to him are exactly what I am saying now. *Heaven is within you. Change yourself; take responsibility, and you are responsible. I'm not responsible—the Creator is not responsible; it is in your hands.* But what's happened over the last 2,000 years of Judaism, Christianity,

Islam, Mormonism and a lot of other New Age cults that are very supernaturalistic in their orientation because they place the power at this divine elevated level.

I think we get a bit of good advice from other beings. In one of my earlier books you might know, God's Change in Consciousness, I've talked about these advanced beings. We do get good advice from other sources.

RM: It's too bad we don't follow it.

PVW: Well, it's too bad that we don't follow it, because what we do is we take their good advice—I've been in some groups, and I'm in some right now who are receiving messages from various masters and various advanced beings—and what happens is they all generally say *I'm giving you this information and you've got to do something about it*. What the human reaction is *I'm blessed to have this information; I'm getting this attention from this advanced being, therefore I must be chosen, therefore I must be, by definition, doing the "right thing," the way I am so I don't have to change*. Do you see what I mean?

RM: Yes, I do.

PVW: What people don't realize is that buying into that notion that you are already somehow part of that special group, and therefore you are already chosen—like the early Presbyterians said *we are all in this church the select; we have been selected by God to be in this group*. So, this group who is receiving channeled material from some being Mr. X, or Ms. Y, or They—X, Y, Z Group of Spirit Guides because *we have been chosen, picked out by them that means we're on the right track*.

That causes us not to question our own assumptions, our own choices and saying *what are we doing in this picture? What contribution are we making? What role are we playing?* Unless you get to that level as an individual—going back to Chris Argyris's learning theory at the Graduate School of Education at Harvard—unless you face up to the fact that the assumptions that you've been living with about the nature of reality don't quite measure up, you're not going to change. It's alright; I got on my sermon mode there.

RM: It's very true words. And, again, people can join in this experiment through the website, also the book. I like a lot of the visuals you have because this really drives it home. Some of the cases you were just talking about, looking at the biometrics of the face overlays is quite interesting and that is a scientific case for reincarnation. Very important work that you are doing at this time—self responsibility. I'm with you; that's where it is at. Thank you so much for your time.

PVW: It's a pleasure. Thank you for listening.

RM: If you've had some strong suspicions about your own past or that of another, please contact Paul at www.reincarnationexperiment.org. This is an ongoing project that is approached in a rigorous scientific manner, and may provide clues as to some of your long unanswered questions. For more on Paul's work pick up a copy of his book, The Soul's Genome. Until next time, thanks for watching CMN.