We study when, why, and how people intervene in others’ choices with paternalistic objectives. In our experiment, Choice Architects construct choice sets containing bundles of time-indexed payments for Choosers. Choice Architects frequently withhold options to prevent impatient choices, in spite of ample opportunities to provide advice, believing their interventions benefit the Choosers. How do Choice Architects decide which choices to prevent? A conventional behavioral welfarist acts as a benevolent and correctly informed social planner; an introspective paternalist tries to help others avoid choices she wishes she could reject when making decisions for herself; and a projective paternalist seeks to bring others’s choices in line with her own. We find that projective paternalism provides the best rationalization for observed interventions by Choice Architects. We also show that projective paternalism in the laboratory coincides with support for actual paternalistic policies.