

CHANNELING MICHAEL INFORMATION MORE THAN ONCE

By Shepherd Hoodwin

Occasionally when people receive conflicting chart information from more than one channel, they call upon me to try to help determine what information is correct. Before asking Michael to check the akashic records, we do extensive self-validation. First I may ask the client exactly what Michael said through the other channels and in what context.

For example, if Michael said, “You look like you’re about sixth- or seventh-level mature,” Michael wasn’t making a definite statement and therefore wasn’t fully committing to the information. They were probably reading the person’s aura, perhaps in a group where it was hard to be certain, since auras can blend together in a group. Even less certain is reading from a photograph during a telephone session, since that gives less information than reading the aura in person (if aura-reading is how Michael through that channel obtains their information). On the other hand, if they said something with certainty in an in-person individual session, it carries more weight. If the information was given from the akashic records, it carries more weight still.

I go into further detail with the client about how the different roles, overleaves, etc., manifest so that she can explore which are most true of her life. In addition, I attempt to guess what is probably correct, based on my observations. Only then do I ask Michael to give the information again; they usually confirm most of our conclusions, but they may not. If they don’t, that could lead to more questions.

If someone simply orders a chart when information has already been given—we are not working together to validate—I ask for a list of it and her validation; if she disagrees with an item, I ask her to briefly say why and what she thinks is correct.

In my experience, the first information given is usually the most accurate if it comes through a channel who is clear and skilled in that kind of material, under favorable conditions. I am careful to channel charts only when my physical energy is strong, without fatigue or headache. If the circumstances of a channeling are not ideal, such as in conditions of stress or distraction (in either the channel or client), mistakes are more likely. Therefore, as part of self-validation, it can be valuable to consider what was going on each time information was given. If information was incorrect the first time, the chances of it being correct the second time are the same as with a first channeling.

I have discussed at length with Michael why chart information is often inaccurate after the first channeling. They explained that asking for information forms a sort of electrical circuit between the asker and the information, with the channel and channeled source as go-betweens. (They called this a “structural willingness to receive.”) That circuit is strongest the first time the information is requested because there is an intrinsic need for the information—it hasn’t been given before. The circuit is weaker subsequently if there is no organic need for the information to be given again.

Because of that, other influences can impinge more strongly than they otherwise would. That is not to say that the information will definitely be incorrect, but the chances grow.

In *More Messages from Michael*, the channels discussed how information is “blocked” if one of them has already channeled it, even if the others didn’t know that. On the few occasions when I was unknowingly the second one to channel a person’s Michael chart or forgot that I had already channeled a chart and did it a second time, the information wasn’t blocked—it flowed normally. Only once or twice did something seem fishy. The charts were usually plausible, at least on the surface. However, I later discovered that most of the repeated material was wrong.

“Overleaves shopping” or “channel shopping” means going to different channels with the intention to test them, or simply to double-check. At a 1996 conference of sixteen Michael channels, including Sarah Chambers, in La Veta, Colorado, there was widespread agreement that overleaves shopping is not a good idea. Some other channels I have spoken with confirm the difficulty of channeling Michael information more than once. However, it remains controversial. To some it looks like a cop-out, a rationalization for bad channeling. All I can say is that my experience has repeatedly borne it out: when my charts are the first, they tend to be validated over time. When they’re not, they tend to be less accurate unless the client had worked with the information previously given and presented it to me. In that case, we usually get a clean chart.

An acquaintance of mine went to four Michael channels when visiting northern California and asked them all for his Michael information (which I had already given him). He didn’t tell them he had already asked other channels and didn’t realize the problems involved in doing this. He thought that if the channels were “pure,” he’d get identical information each time. That didn’t happen, and he believed that indicated that the channels were interfering with the transmission. Actually, the results were fairly similar, since the information was being read from his aura in person, and some of it, such as his role and soul age, was pretty clear-cut. However, there were some differences in soul-age level and overleaves.

Part of the problem, in addition to the weakened circuit, was that he didn’t tell the channels that the information had already been channeled. Although his intent was not malicious, there was a lack of openness in that. I can understand his wish to scientifically validate a channel’s accuracy. However, when information is withheld, the session becomes more about testing the channel than about opening to greater knowledge and experience. Channeling is a delicate process that requires a full investment by both the client and channel, including good-faith cooperation and honesty, without holding back. Telling Michael what was channeled previously can help them avoid inaccuracies. It alerts them that the circuit was probably weakened, and they can explore what was channeled previously to see if it has roots all the way back to the core of the person and shows up in his akashic records, or if it is merely somehow part of his appearance. That said, some channels do not want to know what was previously given, and that should be respected.

The Yarbro channels regard other Michael channels as not being valid. Occasionally I’ve heard about people who’d already had their charts channeled receiving information later from a Yarbro channel that seemed wildly off-base, despite the Yarbro reputation for accuracy. Even if they’re

careful about not duplicating efforts among themselves, they apparently have no qualms about duplicating channeling by others because they assume that they are the only accurate ones. Any channel who glibly repeats channeling without caution and simply assumes that he is correct is treading on thin ice.

The problem of getting information more than once is not unique to the Michael teachings. It is often said that one's first intuition is the most accurate, even in mundane situations such as taking a multiple-choice test. If you doubt your intuition and ask within again, what arises tends to be less certain and clear. When working with tarot cards about a particular problem, the first card drawn is usually the most apropos; if you keep drawing cards about the same problem, the waters become muddied. Perhaps this reflects in part that the universe operates with an economy of effort: why ask for information twice when once will do?

When subsequent channelings are largely identical (which occurs occasionally), it is probable that the person's chart is pretty obvious, without a lot of divergent influences such as an artisan with a king essence twin or a server in dominance. Another possibility is that the person's essence set it up to make sure the information came through accurately more than once because the person needed that experience. Conversely, a channel shopper may get widely differing versions of her overleaves because essence wants her to self-validate and better learn the teachings.

When channeled Michael teachings information is incorrect, it is still often plausible or has a logic to it. Consequently, it can be messy to sort it out, and self-validation can require delving more deeply.

Even if a person is sure that information is incorrect, it can be worthwhile to examine why it came up—it may convey something about what's happening in her life. Once, I incorrectly channeled that an artisan with a scholar essence twin was a scholar. She hadn't told me that her chart had already been channeled. Interestingly, though, she said that friends had told her that she had been looking more scholarly lately. The incorrect information underlined that she was drawing in more of her essence twin energy. When our essence twin has a different role, qualities of that role tend to bleed through our own, especially when the essence twin is discarnate. Perhaps her essence twin had recently passed over, increasing bleedthrough.

Another possible influence when the circuit is weak is the psychic projection of the person asking when he has a strong investment in certain information being given. For example, if from reading Michael books he is certain that he is a king, or very much hopes that he is, he may project that. The projection can appear to be the reality if it is strong enough, obscuring the actual fact even for Michael when the circuit to receive the true information is weakened.

Sometimes auras look different than usual, and this too can obscure correct information. For instance, a priest whose energy is scattered may superficially resemble the other high-frequency role, artisan—artisans' auras are naturally diffuse—especially when the person has a secondary artisan influence. If a person has more than one essence sharing his body (see "Combined Essence Energies" in chapter 10) or is working intimately with another essence such as his essence twin, a

guide, or even another person, Michael might inadvertently read the information for an essence other than the primary “leaseholder,” especially when the channeling is not the first for that information.

A thorough process of self-validation can strengthen the circuit: after going through it, there may now be an organically valid reason for the information to be given again, since what was first given was taken advantage of. An appropriate way to ask Michael to do a second chart channeling would be something like this: “Such-and-such information was channeled for me. It doesn’t seem right, for this reason. Would you please double-check it?” Before going to another channel, I recommend discussing your concerns with the original channel.

Reconciling discrepancies helps us learn about distinctions in the Michael system. For example, if a person is channeled as being second-level old on one occasion, and seventh-level mature on another, it can be educational to study the differences between those soul ages and try to determine which one is more true of that person. Discrepancies can also help keep channels and clients on their toes so that no one assumes that a particular channel is infallible. Someone who needs lessons in self-validation, who perhaps has a desire to believe in the infallibility of a particular channel or who tends to just accept whatever is given without engaging with it and considering it, is more likely to receive inaccurate information when the structural willingness to receive is weakened.

The problems discussed here occur regardless of who asks for the information. If someone else had had my chart channeled without telling me, and then I also have it channeled, the circuit is still weaker the second time. I may have a genuine need and desire for the information but not a “structural” or organic need since the information is, at least theoretically, available to me on the physical plane. It doesn’t seem fair, but it does appear to work that way. Michael through me strongly encourages sharing information in order to avoid such problems. This is part of being a good steward of what Michael gives us and not asking unnecessarily for the same material to be looked up more than once.

Channeling specific Michael information more than once is different from asking more than one channel or psychic what he picks up about, say, your health or a relationship. With a general question, there are always more pieces of the puzzle that can be given, helping fill in the whole picture. There is more than one correct answer available. That is unlike your role, for example, since you only have one, although there are secondary influences from other roles. Michael information such as your true play or life task may have several parts and can be accurately depicted in a number of ways, so such things can be asked about more than once with less diminishment. Still, whenever checking accuracy, it’s worthwhile to offer to disclose what was said previously.

I channel charts on famous or historical people reluctantly and take the results with a grain of salt, since there’s no reliable way to know what, if anything, was already channeled. If someone requests one, I first consult a list I’ve compiled from various channels, posted at <https://shepherdhoodwin.com/michael-teaching/celebrity-overleaves/>. I also check the book *Celebrities: The Complete Michael Database* by Emily Baumbach. It is a list of Michael

information on about twelve hundred well-known figures, culled mostly from the work of channels who originally trained in Orinda. What I get may disagree, but these provide a starting point.

When Emily compiled her list, there were sometimes discrepancies among some of the contributing channels, and once in a while, one channel got different information at different times. Emily, who also channels Michael, chose the information that felt most right to her at the time and later changed her mind in some instances. Although Emily's book is a valuable reference, she doesn't include the names of the channels, the dates, or alternate channelings. Furthermore, there is no way to know if channels she didn't work with received information first on someone listed there.

Even when a channel is the first to ask for information on a celebrity, if Michael is reading it psychically, the lack of direct personal contact can interfere with the results. A celebrity's media personality isn't necessarily genuine, and that can alter the way his energy looks. Actors, for instance, are often mistaken for the roles that made them famous.

Although it can be difficult to validate Michael information on people we do not personally know, we still have to decide for ourselves whether, for example, Shakespeare was a sage or a scholar, or whether Shirley MacLaine is an artisan, priest, or sage. (I channeled that Shakespeare was a scholar, confirming Yarbro, and that Shirley MacLaine is a sage.)

[This is an excerpt from *Journey of Your Soul: A Channel Explores the Michael Teachings* by Shepherd Hoodwin, published by North Atlantic Books, copyright 2013 by Shepherd Hoodwin.]