

## **Dr. Gary Schwartz**

Perhaps one of the most controversial researchers of modern times is Dr. Gary Schwartz. His current ordeal is a prime example as to why scientists do not study the paranormal, and ignore any evidence that is legitimately collected. Gary E. Schwartz, Ph.D., is a professor of Psychology teaching courses in psychology in the departments of Medicine, Neurology, Psychiatry, and Surgery at the University of Arizona. He is also the Director of The VERITAS Research Program of the Human Energy Systems Laboratory in the Department of Psychology at the University of Arizona.

He received his Ph.D. from Harvard University. Schwartz is the co-author of *The Living Energy Universe*, and is the author of *The Afterlife Experiments: Breakthrough Scientific Evidence of Life After Death* and *The Truth About Medium* and has published several hundred scientific papers and edited eleven academic books.

Schwartz's major research focus has been in the field of parapsychology. The stated goal of The VERITAS Research Program is "using individuals called mediums to communicate with the deceased" and using scientific methodology and protocols to measure the results. Subject mediums have included John Edward and Allison DuBois.

Schwartz has been criticized by claimed psychics and skeptics alike. The skeptics include James Randi, Robert Todd Carroll, Paul Kurtz and Psychologist Ray Hyman. Schwartz wrote a response to Hyman in May 2003 to which Hyman wrote a rebuttal to in the same May issue.

Some of Schwartz research subjects have been critical of him. For example, DuBois criticized Schwartz's book *The Truth About Medium* as a "feeble attempt to cash in" on her publicity. Claimed psychic Laurie Campbell appeared on *Geraldo at Large* and when asked by Geraldo if Schwartz was ethical Campbell replied, "Well, I think with my resignation it kind of shows in 2005 that I felt he was highly unethical and I can no longer be connected to his program or the university."

On October 6, 2007 two parents of a deceased son appeared on *Geraldo at Large* claiming that Schwartz sought 3.3 million dollars from them. The parents said that Schwartz claimed "He was going to become a chairman of a new corporation that was going to exist from the otherside and was going to help the world, but what I wanted was ... all Knopf had to do, the professor said, is provide him with \$3.3 million". Michael Knopf wrote him out an installment check of \$50,000. Geraldo noted that investigations by the Arizona Attorney General found that while his actions were unethical, he did not violate any laws. Even still Geraldo criticized Schwartz's actions and the university for funding him.

In reponse to the news report Schwartz wrote the 'Geraldo at Large' "...segment was highly selective and biased in its reporting". He further added that, "Geraldo made a point on the show of reporting that Dr. Schwartz did not return their calls, with an implicit negative connotation.

How could anyone seriously draw a damning conclusion of Dr. Gary Schwartz or anyone for that matter on the strength of an Geraldo "investigation"? I mean I still have visions in my head of Al Capone's "secret" vault. What about digging for further information and clarifying the facts first? In America, a person is innocent until PROVEN guilty, but apparently Geraldo suffers from amnesia when it comes to constitutional rights, which it is weird since he claims to be an attorney.

And another thing, who in their right mind would call Geraldo a "credible journalist"? I watched the report and my first thought was the fact that it was highly manipulative. It was edited to maximize the "shock and awe" of the allegations and to discredit Dr. Schwartz with impunity. The editors also used sound bytes and archive footage that were obviously inserted to generate a bad impression.

I love the added "We tried to call but Schwartz he didn't respond." This is because they used a typical journalism ploy that seedy reporters use to make a party look guilty. They called his office after hours so there was no answer.

The following is from a person who is IN the news business who covered the original story in 2003. He shall remain anonymous, but those familiar with the case will know who he is:

"In 2003, I personally filmed with Gary Schwartz (at his lab at the University of Arizona) for a Discovery Channel documentary. Nevertheless, I wouldn't stand up for him if I thought these allegations were legitimate. What I can report, from first-hand experience, is that:

- Schwartz was open in showing me (and providing me a copy of) unedited video material shot simultaneously with two camera during his 'Afterlife Experiments'. He didn't try to hide any particular sequences to make anything look more convincing.

- During my interview with Scwhartz, he wasn't grandstanding in front of the camera or constantly trying to 'self-promote'. He actually struck me as an authentically open-minded scientist who drew his conclusions from the results of the experiments he was conducting.

- Schwartz also NEVER made any claim to being psychic himself. Hell, he even admitted to me that his initial reaction to his first experiments with Laurie Campbell, John Edward, etc., was complete disbelief! As a scientists, he found

what he was seeing hard to swallow, but then he had to make a choice. Deal with the data, or ignore it. So he did more experiments...

And now we end up here today, with Geraldo doing a 5-minute on-screen assassination and causing all this fuss.

I repeat. If Dr. Schwartz has been unethical, I hope we find out the truth. If he hasn't and is just being targeted for DARING to look at the "scientifically inexcusable", then I hope Geraldo gets his socks sued off."

I understand Dr. Schwartz has filed a lawsuit in civil court for defamation of character.

To Dr Schwartz's credit, he has responded with a few facts of his own that Geraldo neglected to mention.

It was Mr. Knopf who initiated contact with Dr. Schwartz following Mr. Knopf's successful private readings with Ms. Campbell.

Mr. Knopf communicated to Dr. Schwartz that Mr. Knopf had recently been released from spending time in jail.

New guidelines and procedures for advancing the ethics and scientific understanding for mediums were being formulated at that time, initiated partly by some inappropriate behavior by Ms. Campbell and some other mediums.

Geraldo made a point on the show of reporting that Dr. Schwartz did not return their calls, with an implicit negative connotation. The truth is that there was no genuine attempt by the Geraldo show to contact Dr. Schwartz to have a fair representation of both sides of this story. What Geraldo failed to mention was that the call to Dr. Schwartz's office was made only after closing hours of his office on Friday, October 5, for a show that was ready to be aired on Saturday, October 6.

Dr Schwartz concludes by saying "legal action will be taken against each and every individual who has made defamatory comments against Dr. Schwartz, and the truth will be brought out in the court room".

So what is the entire hubbub about?

In 2002 Dr. Schwartz wrote the book *The Afterlife Experiments, Breakthrough Scientific Evidence of Life After Death*, in which he reports on the experiments carried out with five prominent mediums by Schwartz and his research partner, Dr. Linda Russek, in their University of Arizona Human Energy Systems Laboratory. In the beginning he was highly skeptical about the whole subject of mediumship until he met Susy Smith, a medium and popular author on psychic

matters in 1995. Schwartz received his doctorate from Harvard University and served as a professor of psychology and psychiatry at Yale University before moving to Arizona, and is highly respected in the field of psychology. Susy Smith, however, piqued his interest in a possible study of the whole medium phenomenon, and he gradually came to accept the reality of mediumship based on his acquired data from experimentation.

"I can no longer ignore the data and dismiss the words," he wrote in his popular but somewhat controversial book. "They are as real as the sun, the trees, and our television sets, which seem to pull pictures out of the air."

Among the mediums studied by Schwartz over the years has been John Edward, who hosted a popular television program, *Crossing Over*, and, more recently, Allison DuBois, whose real life as a psychic legal investigator, inspired the weekly television program *Medium*.

"We are not just doing research to get percent hits under different levels of control," Dr. Schwartz has stated. "We are now interested in studying the process. The whole idea of how you establish that the medium is actually receiving communication from a genuine conscious, decision-making person (spirit) is a very important question, and we're now asking questions as to what the afterlife is like. That takes the work substantially further."

Schwartz also pointed out that in the 'discarnate intention' experiment, there are 18 life questions and 38 life after death questions.

"The reason we do the life questions first is to be sure the medium is getting accurate information about a particular deceased," he states. "That allows the medium to earn some credibility before we get into the afterlife questions and take them seriously. And if you have multiple mediums independently contacting the same deceased persons and asking the same questions of the afterlife to the extent that you get replication of information, you then have a scientific way of drawing a conclusion, saying, 'yes, it's very possible this deceased person is experiencing the afterlife in this way and another deceased person is experiencing it differently'."

While Dr. Schwartz admits realistically that it is too early in the experiment for any generalizations or conclusions as to what his findings into the reality of life after death are, but he has made some comment.

"There is a massive amount of data and we are in the throes of analyzing it now", he said. "There is only one thing I feel comfortable talking about now, even though we have all these questions. What I find most amusing and potentially reassuring is that when people are 'dead' it's easier for them to 'multitask' in the afterlife. Meaning, to do multiple things at the same time but also to be in 'multiple places' at the same time as well. The capacity for doing non-local and

multi-process activities is just easier than when you are in the physical and located in a very specific place. That's something that has been universally observed."

Naturally, since the release of *The Afterlife Experiments*, Dr. Schwartz has come under vicious attack by "scientific" fundamentalists, people referred to as 'debunkers' or 'pseudo-skeptics' of life after death, but whom Dr. Schwartz kindly calls 'super-skeptics.' They have scoffed at his research, calling it 'junk science' while pointing out that the studies detailed in the book were not double-blind or subject to replication, two fundamentals of hard science.

Consequently, Schwartz has since performed double-blind and even triple-blind studies (where the researcher, the medium, and the sitter were kept in the dark), but they have been equally unacceptable to the scientific fundamentalists. I note that this is because Science tends to be very hard to accept and move in new directions in controversial subject areas. Early researchers such as Galileo and Davinci could have been burned at the stake as witches, or in the very least, excommunicated from the church. Today, you are ridiculed and black balled out of existence. Case in point. In some scientific circles, Quantum mechanics is still dismissed as junk science. In 1957 researcher Hugh Everett came up with the "Many Worlds Theory" to explain certain aspects in Quantum Mechanics. He was ridiculed out of the scientific community, left mainstream research and designed weapons and weapon systems for the U.S. government. He subsequently drank himself to death. Recently, Dr Deutsch of Oxford University showed mathematically that the bush-like branching structure created by the universe splitting into parallel versions of itself can explain the probabilistic nature of quantum outcomes. This work was attacked but it has now had rigorous confirmation by David Wallace and Simon Saunders, also at Oxford.

Dr Saunders, who presented the work with Wallace at the Many Worlds Conference at the Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics in Waterloo, Canada, stated "We've cleared up the obscurities and come up with a pretty clear verdict that Everett works. It's a dramatic turnaround and it means that people now have to discuss Everett seriously."

I rest my case, but back to Dr. Schwartz...

"Based on my repeated observations of them and my experience with them, I would say that there is no experiment that I could even imagine designing that would convince them (skeptics)," Schwartz said. "Let's say, for example, that we design an experiment where the mediums are sequestered and locked in a room with no telephone or communication and we have them watched by security guards to be certain no one provides them with information from the outside. Well, then these skeptics will ask how we can be sure the guards weren't paid off by the mediums, how we can be sure the guards weren't involved in fraud. The

truth is that if you are absolutely convinced that the phenomena can't be true, then no matter what experiment you design, you can always find some way in which there might be fraud. Therefore, you are going to dismiss it, or you're going to admit that you got it in that case but you want to see it replicated by other people. Then you want to see it replicated again, and it just goes on and on."

To step in here, Dr. Schwartz also needs to understand that in science, the ONLY way it will ever be accepted is by repetition by thousands of researchers who gain similar results.

To gain an insight into what Dr. Schwartz is dealing with, go to:

<http://skeptdic.com/essays/gsandsv.html>

Schwartz recalled a recent conversation with one of the super-skeptics, a university professor, and asking him what his reaction would be if he were able to observe positive results for the reality of life after death in a multi-center double-blind study.

"He said he would want to see it replicated a few more times before he'd take it seriously," Schwartz said, "but I pointed out to him that the whole purpose of a multi-centered study is that you have independent laboratories replicating the phenomenon. We've already built in the replication, so I asked him why he'd need to see it a few more times, and his answer was, 'Gary, one of the things I've become interested in is why it is that I have no control over my beliefs.' Now, if you can't change your beliefs as a function of evidence, that's a sad state of affairs."

"I'm not hopeful that the super-skeptics will accept any degree of data, but I'm not doing research for them. We're just doing the work. We want to know if it is true. Our project is called Veritas (Latin for truth) for a reason."

But the skeptics have made an impact on the work in a positive manner. Dr. Schwartz is now conducting research relative to the mindset of the super-skeptic, in an effort to discover what pathology drives their closed-mindedness.

On an end note, orthodox religion has ignored Schwartz's research into life after death, apparently satisfied with faith alone, even though that faith might be turned into conviction with Schwartz's findings.

"It's remarkable how this research has been for the most part ignored by religion," Schwartz said, "but, frankly, I'm relieved."

In spite of the attacks by the scientific fundamentalists, the indifference of orthodox religion, and the ignorance of the mainstream media, Schwartz

courageously moves on with his research into life after death, feeling that it is having some impact on the public.

"I think it is ultimately the research mediums, like Allison DuBois, as they become visible and public," he concluded, "who will awaken the public to the science, and then the people can go to the science and reach their own conclusions."

Ref the Psychic Times

<http://veritas.arizona.edu/>