

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### Response to “How To Improve the Study and Documentation of Cases of the Reincarnation Type? A Reappraisal of the Case of Kemal Atasoy”

The Essay by Vitor Moura Visoni in *JSE*, 24(1), Spring 2010, pp. 101–108, makes a number of criticisms of our Research Article “Children Who Claim To Remember Previous Lives: Cases with Written Records Made before the Previous Personality Was Identified,” *JSE*, 19(1), Spring 2005, pp. 91–101, which we will address by section:

**The Participation of the Interpreter.** We disagree that “such investigations have already suffered enough from the accusation of fraud on the part of the interpreters.” One interpreter 40 years ago was accused of fraud in unrelated work, but his interviews were subsequently validated by other interpreters. When the child in the current case was interviewed, the interpreter’s motives were irrelevant. Since the child was describing an obscure person from 50 years before, whose existence JK [the author] was only able to confirm after great effort, the interpreter could not reasonably be accused of falsifying the interview. At the time of the interview, he did not possess any information about the previous personality that he could have put in the mouth of the child.

**The Interview with the Child.** The author recommends recording all interviews. We have recorded interviews on occasion, but we agree with the concerns Dr. Haraldsson mentioned. Though having interviews recorded and transcribed might seem ideal, the process of getting them can be impractical, or worse can impact on the quality of the information being obtained.

The author also objects to the presence of the mother during the interview. We think anyone who has had experience with children would recognize that the chances of getting a six-year-old child to share information with strangers who do not speak the same language without a parent or close attachment figure present are extremely remote. In this case, the boy’s mother could not have fed him any information since she knew nothing about the person being described.

Regarding the number of interviews, the boy and his family were interviewed multiple times, though we acknowledge that our paper could have been clearer on that point. The most important interview by far, however, was the first one, which was conducted before anyone tried to verify the child’s statements. Dr. Haraldsson is right that multiple interviews can help ensure that there is consistency about what the child was alleged to have said before the case was solved. In this case, there is no question about what the child said before the case was solved, because JK solved it after interviewing the child.

We agree that finding as many witnesses to the child's statements as possible is helpful and often essential. In this case, the child had not made statements to anyone but his immediate family, as we stated in the article. More significantly, multiple witnesses are often needed to confirm that the child had the knowledge about the previous personality that his parents claim. In this case, that issue is not in doubt since the case was unsolved at the time of the initial interview.

**The Interview with Mr. Toran Togar.** The author argues that JK should not have been the one to conduct the confirmatory interview. When JK was searching for people who could tell about the history of the home in question, it would have been impractical to locate an informant and then say the interview would have to wait until another researcher could be flown in from another country, a researcher who would not know what to ask in order to confirm the boy's statements. That issue aside, the author is correct that a recording would serve as stronger confirmation of the interview than notes alone, but again there are practical issues as to why we do not routinely record interviews.

**Tests of Recognition.** The author faults the lack of recognition tests in this case. As we noted in the paper, the boy was beginning to forget details of the purported life by the time his statements had been verified. That and the changes that would have occurred in the city during the 50 years following the previous personality's death meant that the slim chance that he would be able to recognize places was outweighed by the factors, such as the expense to the investigation and the time required of the boy and his parents to travel 850 km each way, that made such a trip impractical. We do agree that if recognition tests are to be performed, they need to be tightly controlled to be of significant value.

**Psychological Tests.** We are unaware of any psychological disorder that could lead a child to know numerous details about a man who lived 850 km away and died 50 years before.

**Description of the Case . . . .** Though we do not have a verbatim transcript of the interviews that were conducted, we do provide a list in our paper of all the statements the boy made before any attempt was made to verify them.

**Is It Still a Strong Case?** On this point, we are in full agreement with the author's positive answer. We also think given the practical constraints that are a necessary part of this kind of fieldwork, the investigation of the case involving multiple trips to Turkey to interview multiple witnesses was quite sound.

H. H. JÜRGEN KEIL

*School of Psychology, University of Tasmania  
Hobart, Tasmania 7001, Australia*

JIM B. TUCKER

*Division of Perceptual Studies  
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia USA  
jbt8n@virginia.edu*