



Chapter Three – Gary Schwartz Ph.D.

“The Soul Phone”

“My brain is only a receiver, in the Universe there is a core from which we obtain knowledge, strength and inspiration. I have not penetrated into the secrets of this core, but I know that it exists.” Nikola Tesla (Photo: Gary Schwartz Ph.D. found this boat flag in a flag store in Burbank and thought of me.)

I got the following note on one of my “Flipside” book talks posted on Youtube: “We *don’t* choose our lifetimes Rich, that’s your invention because you are *so full of yourself, so scared of your own frail mortality.*” Scared of my own frail *immortality*? Perhaps. But scared of the research? Hardly.

I find that someone’s reaction to this research generally reflects their own journey through life. When someone says “There is no afterlife” it may very well be true for them. (At least temporarily, as we’ll see). Not that there isn’t one, because there’s ample evidence there is, but it may be part of their own life’s journey to be a doubter and to admonish others.

Arguing about the afterlife with those who don’t believe there is one, is a bit like being on a boat crossing the ocean with a crew who isn’t convinced they’ll ever reach land. Even when we’ve examined the maps of others who’ve been there, or we have people on board who’ve been there and back and have consistent stories about what they’ve seen, the crew still loses faith. “We’re out here in the ocean going in circles because there is no land on the other side; it does not exist!” And the rest of us go back to playing cards, because eventually we’re going to hear “Land ho!”

As I’m fond of saying, this research does the rare feat of getting fundamentalists and atheists to agree; I must be crazy.

I had one Oxford trained physics professor from my alma mater USC, “go postal” when I said “There’s research that shows consciousness isn’t produced by the brain.” We spent three hours arguing and he came away convinced I

was creating some kind of (what he called) “Hollywood Fantasy.” (Actually I’ve yet to meet anyone in Hollywood who has come to the same conclusions. I get the same wild-eyed stares from everyone I talk to about this work.)

There’s also a difficulty with citing studies in the field, as it’s hard to get scientists to come anywhere near this field. There are fences around this field, and they aren’t as easy to scale as perhaps the fence around the White House. Many scientific studies are funded by corporations that have a vested interest in the outcome of those studies, or by universities that depend on money from their donor base who might not appreciate hearing that we don’t die. I’ve been told candidly it’s next to impossible to get a study funded about consciousness, spirituality, or other ideas that don’t fit into the prevailing paradigm.

I think it’s because there’s a built in conundrum to do these kinds of studies: if the brain is not the source of consciousness, then it could depend on any number of other studies that are completely dependent upon predictability. In other words, if you’re life’s journey is not only based solely on genetics and sociological issues, that there’s a third, spiritual element to it, then how can a study conclude what the best course of action might be to take? How can a sponsor take those results into the marketplace or offer “a pill for that?”

“Materialist” science is based on the concept that the brain is the only source of consciousness. Psychic or near death experiences must be some kind of abnormal brain function, goes the argument, out of body experiences or religious experiences must be induced or created by some part of the brain, and anyone who reports there is an afterlife is being fooled, or delusional.

That critique reminds me of one day in grade school when my teacher, Sister Theophane, insisted there were “only 48 states.” Of course there were only 48 when she went to school, but never mind events on the planet had conspired to change while she was behind her own veil. Anyone who didn’t agree with her version of science was typically wacked by her ruler (an “enhanced interrogation technique.”)

Fearless, I stood and said “There were 48 states at one point, Sister, but no longer.” I guess I’m still that same kid, speaking up about what the data shows, even if it’s contrary to what good Sister Theophanes across the planet have been taught. (I’m sure she did her best with the handful of my fellow miscreants at St. Norbert’s in Northbrook, Illinois.)

Science teaches that evidence comes first, and then if it can be replicated under certain protocols, we can arrive at a proper conclusion. With that in mind, I present in this volume scientists who are on the cutting edge of what is called “Post materialist” science.

I may not be a scientist but I know one.

I met the author and Professor Gary E Schwartz through the internet. I read the Harvard/Yale Ph.D.’s book; “The Afterlife Experiments” and wrote him an email asking if he was familiar with the research done by Michael Newton in his books “Journey of Souls.” He was not. That began a friendship with Gary which has benefitted me with some epic talk-fests on Skype. Quite funny and an excellent raconteur, I’ve been to see him and his wife in their home in Tucson, not far from Gary’s lab at the University of Arizona.

I invited the former Harvard and Yale Professor to speak at the Afterlife Convention in Santa Monica in 2013. The following is an adaptation of the talk he gave.¹

¹ His bio notes: “Gary E. Schwartz, Ph.D. is a professor of psychology, medicine, neurology, psychiatry and surgery, and Director of the Laboratory for Advances in Health at the University of Arizona. He received his Ph.D. from Harvard University, was a professor of psychiatry and psychology at Yale University as well as Director of the Yale Psychophysiology Center and co-director of the Yale behavioral medicine Clinic from 1976-1988. He’s currently at the University of Arizona. His books include, “The Afterlife Experiments,” “The G.O.D. Experiments,” “The Energy

Gary E. Schwartz Ph.D.

“First and foremost, I’m a scientist. I’m a *boring* scientist because I really stick with data. I was brought up essentially in an atheist home in an all Christian community. My town half was Italian. I would go to a Catholic church with my Italian girlfriends, had no idea what was going on; it was all in Latin but adored the loving and caring going on.

As my writing partner has said “You were raised to be an Orthodox Agnostic.” What does that mean? Whether the question is; first – “Was there gravity or is there God?” My response (this is my philosophy) “I don’t know, could be yes could be no. Show me the data. I’m open.”

As I discovered over the years at Harvard and Yale and the University of Arizona, the upside to that philosophy of life is the reason I’m not attached to any beliefs, not committed to any theories, and if what I want is to discover “the truth,” I need to honor any and all hypotheses.

For example, I heard we have to wait until we’re 38 before we recover from our past lives to go on to our current life. I don’t know if that’s true or not, but I’ll put it on the table. Whether raised to believe these ideas or not, whether weird or not, I give all hypotheses the possibility of shining – because it’s in the data – to see what practical consequences we can observe and measure. So I end up getting involved in all kinds of things contrary to the way I was educated, which was with a firm materialist perspective.

The downside is personal. When do you have enough data to make a decision? When are you allowed to say “I believe?”

For me it takes an awful amount of data before I’m willing to accept it on a personal level, to go from theory to conclusion. Having done this work for almost 50 years, I’ve been forced by the evidence to the conclusion that there is a greater spirituality, that there is what we call “life after death,” that the universe is more interesting than anyone of us can imagine.

We are on a path as a species to awaken to this as it’s been foreseen by many people, but unknown to most of us. And in the process, we may discover some things even the greatest mystics hadn’t yet seen themselves; this is also part of the journey.

I’ve come to conclude that if there are five criteria present, under those specific circumstances, logic dictates we hold the belief to be true. That if all five are present, then it’s our responsibility, our ethical and moral responsibility to conclude that something is probably true; even if we don’t like it, even if it goes against our beliefs.

And I’ll give you evidence of each one:

The first is scientific theory and logic. One of the ways we come to a conclusion is if logic take us there and if theory takes us there. Although some skeptics about this arena make these preposterous statements, “There’s no scientific theory that can explain any of this!” That’s just patently wrong, patently false, and there are easy ways for us to understand this as lay people.

Healing Experiments,” and “The Sacred Promise.””

The Vacuum of Space

Let me give you an example.

If we go out in the dark and night away from the city of lights, and there's no full moon and no lights, we can see thousands of lights with the naked eye. With telescopes, we can see billions of galaxies, each with billions of stars and all that light has been traveling for billions of years through space. It's all there and everywhere you look there are billions, trillions of stars in every direction, and all that light crisscrossing the "vacuum of space." And it doesn't get mixed up because if it did, it would be degraded; you and I would look at the sky and we'd see mush. But we don't see mush.

We see the history of starlight that goes back millions of years; that's why we have astronomy and physics. Both logic and physics tells us that light has a kind of immortality in terms of the storage of information and energy; that sounds controversial, but it's only controversial if you think about it. We can spend hours talking about the theory and logic that take us there.

During the day we look up at the sky and there're no clouds; it's blue – the question is "What happened to all that starlight?" All the thousands of stars we can see with the naked eye or trillions we can see with telescopes; has it all disappeared? Or is it all still there, but just we can't see it because we're blinded by the brightness of the closest star in our vicinity, which we call the sun? Well that is the answer; in fact that's why we can't see most of the stars during the day, because city lights are interfering with us seeing this dim light.

So the take home message - the sound bite; and I was one of the youngest tenured Professors at Yale, by the way, I did my Ph.D. at Harvard - is that "sometimes we need to go into the dark in order to see the light."

Sometimes we need to go into the dark in order to see the light. That's why we learn to meditate, that's why we learn to go into quiet spaces, that's why at 3 or 4 in the morning we might be the most receptive.

And by the way, if you and I stand out in the night sky and look up at the stars, you know what's happening with the light reflected off our bodies? It's going out into space as well. We know that's a fact because spy satellites can see us walking on a sandy beach or wherever we are. And our light is like light from distant stars; it keeps going and going too.

Our light is constantly expanding out into the vacuum of space. Not just our reflected light, but all of the frequencies that comprise our bodies. There's a history that continues into the vacuum of space. So if they're looking for information on how we can continue, our information says we can continue; science allows it.

Scientific evidence supports it and there is a voluminous amount of research and literature that is consistent with this hypothesis. The evidence is spread across many different areas, reincarnation research done at the University of Virginia in controlled medium-ship research, my lab and others around the world, and now with contemporary technology; the combination of all that evidence all points to the idea that our consciousness continues.

Triple Blind Studies

I published three books in the area of investigating whether mediums were real and if so can we interpret this as continuation of the spirit – the conclusion from the data is that *some* mediums are real. Yes, there are mediums

that are fake. I realized “if you can’t beat them join them.”²

So I became a fake medium; I purchased books on how to become a fake medium and took a course in it. I’m a pretty good fake medium, so I could design research that could eliminate the tricks of the trade and therefore only the real ones would be able to do the nature of the work.

One of the most recent experiments I’ve done uses a triple blind procedure. Let me explain what that is; the gold standard of biomedical research is what’s called “double blind procedure.” Let’s say if a doctor is participating in an experiment, he’d sign a consent form knowing he was either receiving an active medication or placebo and he’d know it was one of the two. And he’d fill out the forms, so he’s blind.

Number two is the provider’s “blind,” so Dr. Gary is giving the medication, I’d be kept blind too; I wouldn’t know if it was the placebo so I couldn’t influence the first doctor. It’s double blind.

Why do we need triple blind?

Because most mediumship involves the sitters who want to speak to their loved ones and who would know when the medium would be contacting the loved ones. In that case, we can’t be sure we’re not biased; so the question is “How do we make the sitter be “blind?” By ensuring they’re not present at their own reading.

We use a proxy sitter experiment, a separate experimenter who stands in for you. You would be told what night the readings would be held, but you wouldn’t be able to be there when the reading took place. The experimenter gives your names to a second experimenter, who now talks to the medium – and so the proxy experimenter talks to the medium and we do a reading. And they get the names, any information you can about a person named, let’s say, “Bob.” How many deceased Bobs are there? A lot. The experimenter can’t give any cues because he doesn’t know anything about this Bob fellow.

The questions are; “What did Bob look like, what were his hobbies, how did he die?” Now we go onto person #2; let’s say it’s someone named “John.”

We ask the same questions; “What did John look like, what are his hobbies, how did he die?” We then have those readings transcribed, A and B and each are separately mailed. You’re told one is your reading, one is for someone else. Now you’re to score each item in terms of how it fits Bob or John and then when you’re done, you guess which session you’re examining. That’s what “triple blind” means. The medium is blind, experimenter’s blind, the sitter is blind.

What happens? We get results.

In this experiment, when I looked at individual performances, three were “extraordinary,” one was “well,” and two were “at chance.”

So what’s the conclusion? Some mediums are real. You can do this research under triple blind conditions – and the scientific data is consistent with the data.

The third of our criteria of five, is people who believe what the scientific data, logic and theory support. When I meet people who are the seven S’s; smart, successful, skeptical as in questioning – and the reason I’ve spent time

² “The Afterlife Experiments: Breakthrough Scientific Evidence of Life After Death by Ph.D. Gary E. Schwartz Ph.D., Deepak Chopra M.D. and William L. Simon (Mar 18, 2003) was the basis for a documentary on HBO as well. A “psychic” claims to use extra-sensory perception to predict or report events, while a “medium” generally communicates with those who’ve passed on through channeling, or reporting what they see, hear or feel. A medium acts as a translator for those from the flipside.

with Rich Martini is because he happens to be skeptical – people sophisticated in their thinking, savvy, meaning that they're knowledgeable, been around the block. That they're sane, meaning I was trained in clinical psychology, trained in looking for neurosis and psychosis, and these third criteria people don't show those criteria. And finally, they're straight; they've got integrity. They're truth-seekers. They really want to know what's happening and are not trying to pull the wool over the public or my eyes. When I meet people like that and they believe what the scientific data, logic and theory support, I say "Wow." And I've met a slew of these people.

The Fourth criteria is personal experience. Very often people have examined theories, logic and theory, or experimental evidence. They are people you can trust, who are successful, but they don't have personal experience. And most of us don't have it in this field. But I have. So much so, that I could spend hours sharing what I've experienced.

Put Your Seat Belt On

I'll share some brief examples; I've had the privilege to work with the "Michael Jordans" of mediumship: John Edward, James Van Praagh. I've worked with them under controlled and private conditions where I see them do readings on others and even on me. I've witnessed extraordinary things. I've written about them in my books.

There's also my own direct experience; before starting graduate school I was on the east river drive in Manhattan going south. I was driving in a little Opal Cadet; 1966, no frame, nobody wore seat belts or shoulder straps in those days. It was raining, and my first wife, was frightened and asked if I'd pull off the road. But there was a car in front of me blocking the exit and it was stalled. So we were parked behind this car. And I remember this clearly; I heard a voice say "Put your seat belt on."

Nobody wore seat belts in those days, and I had never heard a voice before, but I put mine on first, then put it on my wife and a minute later we were hit by a car going 55 miles an hour.

It was a Mustang and our car was sandwiched, totally destroyed. The trunk was in the back seat, my wife Katie, was literally ripped out of the car but because she had a seatbelt she stayed in her seat.

When I woke in the hospital, I was told I had been in a serious car accident. My wife was down the hall with a serious back injury. But I had lost memory for two plus years of my life and didn't know I was married. And over the course of about a week much of my memory returned, except for 24 hours around the accident - but the only thing I remember to this day, was that voice.

I received an occipital contusion and that's what gave me retrograde amnesia. Question was, not just "Why did I happen to hear that voice?" I was aware something magical had happened; but I didn't take it seriously! I didn't allow myself to integrate it; I just thought it was odd. It was only about ten years ago, when a student asked the more important question – not just that you had a voice and listened but "How come you weren't killed? How come you only had a couple of little bruises? A little bump on your head? How did that happen?"

There's a bigger picture, a bigger perspective I needed to consider. When you look back on your life and find salient moments which speak to the things you're witnessing in a lab, you've got to include that in your experience.

Finally, number five – if all four of those are present, and there is no good reason to reject them – no good reason to dismiss the first four; meaning, you could speculate that the theory of the continuity of life may be wrong, but is there reason to reject them totally if the experimental evidence points to it? Is there good reason to consider the integrity of the work that you know? Is there good reason to reject your own experience? As a biased observer, when there's no good reason to reject it, when you put on the skeptic's hat – under those special circumstances,

you must consider the evidence to support the case. That if all 5 are present, it's our responsibility, our ethical and moral responsibility, to conclude that something is probably true – even if we don't like it, even if it goes against our beliefs.

With that in mind, I'm going to talk about our latest work. I'm going to return to the idea that "sometimes you have to go into the dark to see the light."

There are some people who see spirit – I don't, so you could say I'm the Helen Keller of afterlife research. But I don't discount that some people can see; it turns out my wife for the past 7 years has developed the ability to see.

The question is; "What are they seeing?"

I've interviewed close to 30 mediums over the past 15 years. They connect with the energy of spirit; not just information but the energy of spirit. I began to wonder what would happen if we used sensitive enough equipment in a pitch black environment and then invited in spirit, or discarnate entities, a term I find disrespectful by the way; after all we don't call people "incarnate entities," so let's call them "departed hypothesized co-investigators."

Because they're collaborators; if we invite Susie Smith, or Marcia Eklund, or Harry Houdini into a chamber where we have super sensitive equipment to discern photons in the dark (A single detector cost \$2500 each; these are not "ghost hunter" toys, but real equipment under tightly controlled conditions.) We started doing these kinds of experiments, and much to my amazement we got positive results.

Eventually, I submitted these experiments to a peer reviewed journal and it ultimately passed muster and was published in 2010. But the reviewers complained "Yeah, but how do we know it's not the energy of consciousness of the experimenters influencing the results?" So we got rid of the human being in the experiments, so that no Experimenter could influence the questions.

Automated Experiment

Let me ask you; is it true you don't have to be present for your cell phone to pick up a signal?

You can turn it off and later download messages. And we should be able to have a computer collect data by using the voice of the Experimenter; theoretically you should get the same results. At that time I had a sizable grant and I designed the following software: the Experimenter did the experiment and then automated it.

At 4 p.m. he'd read a script, "Dear Suzie, or Dear Sophia, we have an experiment, please show up at 11 p.m. tonight to read the instructions on the Power Point, and I'll pick up the results in the morning."

At around 11 pm the computer would come to life, the cameras warmed up, and then the computer would pick a random time when to begin. It could be 11:15, 11:30, let's say midnight. From the program, the Experimenter's voice says "Hi Susie, please stay in the control room for 15 minutes. And in the next room where there's a box inside a box, then please go into the box within the box for 15 minutes and I'll tell you when the trial is over. Okay Susie? Thanks, please exit the room, and come back and we'll get a post base line." Then, later, "Okay Sophia, now it's your time..." and we'd get another baseline.

The computer would determine who came. So we did this experiment and we have the spirit trial data and the post experiment data – both for Susie and Sophia. Moreover, when doing separate trials, when nobody goes in the box; the reading is flat. So we replicated it again, and got the same results.

We then submitted it for publication. The super skeptics said that even though I'm not running the experiment, even though I was sleeping, that somehow my mind was going to the lab in the middle of the night and manipulating the data to fool me and the world too. And they consider that to be a more plausible hypothesis?

How could my mind explain all these effects? People who don't want to believe will grab onto anything, even when there's no evidence that mind could do that! At some point you just have to stop.

The Soul Phone

I want you to imagine for a moment that the technology has reached a point where we have a revolution from the cellphone to the smart phone to a *soul* phone - where you can dial a person in the great beyond and like us, they can choose to screen or answer our calls. It's their choice.

What would this mean for our society if we knew we can call Dave Bowman, Albert Einstein, Thomas Jefferson and they could choose to communicate with us, particularly if they still have love and passion for humanity or for the planet?

What would it mean? It could be the greatest transformation in human history. I mean without exaggeration there is no aspect that wouldn't be touched by this if this technology comes into existence.

Imagine Albert Einstein has been working on technology to improve an energy source, solar technology and he's working with engineers here and they take his theory and they build it and it works. Einstein then decides he wishes to submit a patent; if he had been on the Earth, there'd be no question he deserves a patent. The question is, if a patent is something that really works and the idea comes from the other side, should the government grant him a patent?

If he's awarded the patent, should he let any other inventor have a say in how it's marketed? Should he have an account to give that money to his kids or grandkids or favorite charity and pay taxes to reduce the debt? So we have a new question about intellectual property.

I use this example partly because of my own parents; imagine someone married for 17 years, the husband gets sick and dies. Everyone's got a soul phone and his widow contacts him every day - let's say they *Skype* every day - and now she comes down with cancer and she's dying. They want to do everything they can to keep her alive, but she wants her money to go to her kids. She makes her decision she wants to join her husband; should she have the right to do that?

And if so, would we create a team - passionate transitioners of people - who are trained to do this in a sacred, pain free manner? Whose choice is it? Because we know there's no death, that it's merely a transition to the next realm.

And finally one more hypothetical; imagine a young man, walking home and is approached by a man with a gun who is security for his neighborhood and an altercation occurs. Is the man who kills him responsible for his death? (As in Florida, where this happened)

But it wasn't clear who was guilty; the mother of a young man killed is convinced it was the shooter, the mother of the killer is convinced her son is innocent; but we now have the soul phone. Should victims of a crime be allowed to testify?

Kitty Hawk of Consciousness

These and so many other questions arise once we start taking this seriously. And this last thought. A little over 110 years ago there were no airplanes – we didn't know if we could fly. Many tried and failed and in December 1903, five people watched a flight that lasted 59 seconds. The second time they tried it, it failed. The third time it worked, and the 5 people who witnessed it knew flight was possible.

If we were all at Kitty Hawk could we have imagined there'd be these machines carrying thousands of people thousands of miles, flying around the world 24-7; last year 74 million flew safely. Could we imagine that every second, every time our heart beats, somewhere in the world a plane is taking off or landing every second? Could we have imagined, there would be a time we'd get a good meal on a plane, could we have imagined, TVs, I-pads, all of this could become available. And most amazing; all of us would take all of it for granted?

I think we're experiencing another Wright Brothers moment.

Science is advancing as well, not only are more people having more experiences, but science is catching up as well. My question is not what can the soul phone become, but can we imagine a day where everyone takes all of this for granted?

It's no longer the same world; it's that transformative. And all of this is driven by love. The question is who's going to bring this good news? Or as Richard's friend Joel said yesterday about how transformative that experience would be, it would be just like the film "It's a wonderful life."³

There is a rebirth of hope that's going to occur because people will bring us together and continue to move forward, because people are making sacrifices in their personal lives to help bring this message get through. And I for one, feel super privileged to be part of the journey and if this provides you a reason to believe, or hope; I feel it's been worth the journey."⁴

Dr. Schwartz is the Director of the Laboratory for Advances in Consciousness and Health at the University of Arizona. He has a Ph.D. from Harvard University, served as a professor of psychology and psychiatry at Yale University, and was director of the Yale Psychophysiology Center, and co-director of the Yale Behavioral Medicine Clinic. He's published over four hundred scientific papers, edited eleven academic books, and is the author of numerous books about this ground breaking research.

It was a voice that started Gary on this path of research. "Put your seat belt on." The voice saved him and his wife. Gary didn't go on a search to find out *who* was talking to him, but if *it was possible* that someone was talking to him. A hypnotherapy session might allow him to access that memory, and to identify the voice. ("Was it male or female? Old or young? If you could put a face to this voice, who would you see?")

The actor and comedian Chris Elliot tells the story of how one day he was babysitting his niece, and felt fast asleep. The baby decided to crawl across the table. A voice woke him out of his slumber. "Hey Skylark! Wake up!" Chris

³ As mentioned in the introduction to Volume One, it was in this meeting when Gary asked Joel, "How would you feel if you could prove there was an afterlife?" and he said "Like Jimmy Stewart felt after being allowed to see what the world was like without him." And to which I said "That's the title of my book!"

⁴ The copyright for this talk belongs to Gary Schwartz Ph.D. For permission to reproduce it in any way, please contact me and I will forward the request to Gary.

says he woke up to catch his niece as she tumbled off the table, before she hit the floor. He thought it odd that he would hear a voice, clear as a bell, warning him to wake up. He looked up the word “skylark” and found it meant “horsing around.”

I looked it up as well; it’s an old sailor’s phrase – someone who was lolly-gagging on deck, watching sailors play in the tall ship’s sails (“skylacing”) was a skylark; another word might be “goof off.” As if someone said “Hey goof-off! Wake up!” Except one wonders, what sailor was talking to him from a world beyond this realm?

Years ago, Chris was involved in a comedy “Cabin Boy.” Chris co-wrote the story, the film was produced by Tim Burton, co-written and directed by Adam Resnick. The story took place when a sailor might have called Chris a “skylark.” Which came first? A previous lifetime as a sailor? Or someone in Chris’ world that came from that era who shouted a warning? As Dr. Schwartz’s research in this area demonstrates; it’s worth “putting it on the table” to find the answers.

The reporter Katie Couric did a segment on her show where she allowed Dr. Brian Weiss (“Many Lives, Many Masters”) to do a past life regression. During the session she remembered a lifetime in a particular time and place. However, in college, that era was part of her studies, and she wondered if she was “inventing” her memory of a lifetime based on her research of it. Dr. Weiss countered that perhaps the reason she took up the topic in college was because it was already familiar to her. ⁵

Dr. Schwartz’s research into the afterlife continues at the University of Arizona. For the latest updates, please find him at DrGarySchwartz.com.

"Life is a dream walking. Death is going home." - Chinese proverb

⁵ Who Was Katie In Her Past Life? The Katie Show 9-25-13

