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Abstract

One of the most prospective directions of study of C.G. Jung’s synchronicity phenomenon is reviewed considering the latest achievements of modern science. The attention is focused mainly on the quantum entanglement and related phenomena – quantum coherence and quantum superposition. It is shown that the quantum non-locality capable of solving the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox represents one of the most adequate physical mechanisms in terms of conformity with the Jung’s synchronicity hypothesis. An attempt is made on psychophysiological substantiation of synchronicity within the context of molecular biology. An original concept is proposed, stating that biological molecules involved in cell division during mitosis and meiosis, particularly DNA may be considered material carriers of consciousness. This assumption may be formulated on the basis of phenomenology of Jung’s analytical psychology.
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psychology was guided, in particular, by principles of contemporary theoretical physics. For instance, it is well known that Jung has developed the concept of synchronicity in close collaboration with Wolfgang Pauli. Thus, the Swiss psychologist has always made sure that the data gathered from his clinical observations conforms to the principles of natural science.

Still, specific mechanisms which, probably, lay at the core of synchronicity phenomena became a subject of discussion only in the early 1980s thanks to the progress in experimental studies of certain concepts of quantum physics. In one of the relatively early papers devoted to this matter (Keutzer 1982), the synchronicity phenomenon was juxtaposed with the ‘morphic resonance’ hypothesis suggested by Rupert Sheldrake. In turn, the Sheldrake’s theory is interpreted in the above study in the context of quantum non-locality, a consequence of solution of the so-called Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. In his later papers (Keutzer 1984a, b), this author clearly associates quantum non-locality with Jung’s synchronicity. Afterwards, other researchers (Mansfield and Spiegelman 1989) have reviewed non-local quantum correlations, the Schrodinger’s cat paradox, and experiments verifying Bell’s inequalities in relation to the synchronicity phenomenon. The same researchers also reviewed the principle of superposition within the context of attempts to explain the synchronicity phenomenon (Mansfield and Spiegelman 1991). Furthermore, Mansfield, reviewing Jung’s theory, has analyzed, among other aspects, the role of Bell’s inequalities per se in respect to the problems of analytical psychology (Mansfield 1991). A similar paper (Germine 1991) also dealing with the synchronicity phenomenon, the concept of quantum non-locality, and the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen and Schrodinger’s cat paradoxes, is devoted to determination of the nature of consciousness. Study of relation between quantum non-locality and Jung’s synchronicity, and the matters concerning Bell’s inequalities continued in later papers (Mansfield and Spiegelman 1996).

Publications discussing, in one way or another, the synchronicity phenomenon in relation to the quantum entanglement phenomenon have appeared during the past decade (Walach 1999; Walach and Römer 2000; Duch 2002; Milgrom 2002; Primas 2003; Stillerfied and Walach 2006; Teodorani 2006). The latest papers in this sphere of study contain quite detailed research (Lucado et al. 2007; Carminati and Martin 2008; Martin et al. 2009; Martin et al. 2010).

At the same time, it should be noted that attempts to explain the synchronicity phenomenon by considering other physical mechanisms not directly related to quantum non-locality (Zabriskie 1995) are quite scarce.

It should also be mentioned that some authors look at the quantum entanglement phenomenon in regard to other aspects of Jung’s theory without linking this phenomenon directly to the synchronicity phenomenon (Blutner and Hochnadel 2010; Conte et al. 2010).

Nevertheless, even though the probable role of quantum non-locality in realization of synchronicity phenomena is clearly emphasized in the above papers, the question of what physiological mechanism might be responsible for the existence of quantum entanglement between different human bodies has not been considered so far. The only exceptions in this respect are, perhaps, the studies by Michael Hyland, who also believes that the synchronicity phenomenon is caused by quantum entanglement (Hyland 2004a). The criterion enabling to consider that the mentioned corresponding physiological mechanism has been suggested is a description of necessary and sufficient conditions for occurrence of quantum entanglement between biological molecules of different people. Broadly speaking, these molecules may not be interconnected by quantum entanglement prior to mutual interaction. As quantum entanglement between biological molecules of different people may not exist per se, in the absence of once occurred special physical interaction, it is only this criterion that can be valid. We cannot generally assume that available quantum entanglement between molecules of different people is taken for granted. In one of his papers (Hyland 2004b), Hyland made an assumption that quantum entanglement may exist both between cells of the same human body and between different subjects. Apparently, this
author came very close to the solution of this problem in his another paper (Hyland 2003a), where he not only assumes existence of quantum entanglement at DNA level within the same body, but also describes possible role of quantum entanglement in meiosis processes. It is quite possible that all that needs to be done is just one little step further – to expand this author’s perception of existence of quantum entanglement at DNA level within the same body and its role in morphogenesis to the hypothesis of existence of quantum entanglement between DNAs of different bodies. As far as meiosis processes are concerned, Hyland regards the role of quantum entanglement exclusively as regulating the cell division. The fact that meiosis may represent a mechanism ensuring quantum entanglement between different bodies was left out by this author. In the meantime, solution of the problem of existence of non-local quantum correlations between different bodies, in particular, synchronicity phenomena, could be right there. The answer to this question will be proposed in this paper below.

**Study goal and hypothesis**

Synchronicity phenomena have been studied for quite a while, and not just by Jung but (a much lesser-known fact) by Sigmund Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis. His several papers corroborate this fact (Freud 1922, 1953, 1966). Naturally, the famous Austrian psychiatrist used somewhat different terminology, but in the essence, he studied phenomena of the same nature. A telling fact: in the same period, scientific community gained understanding of the nature of quantum phenomena which later were associated with the synchronicity phenomenon. We are talking about the so-called Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox, study of which helped postulate existence of quantum non-locality and quantum entanglement, closely related to non-local quantum correlations.

As we know, the quantum entanglement means a quantum-mechanical phenomenon in which quantum state of two or more objects should be described in interrelation with each other, even if individual objects are spaced apart. As a result, correlations appear between physical properties of these objects.

The quantum entanglement phenomenon is also viewed at in relation to such notions as quantum coherence and quantum superposition. The principle of superposition in quantum physics will be discussed further in connection with the Schrödinger’s cat paradox.

Nevertheless, this branch of theoretical physics began experiencing rapid development only during the past few decades. It can be explained, first of all, by emerging possibilities for experimental verification of violation of the so-called Bell’s inequalities. It is also important to note that quantum entanglement, as follows from definition and the nature of this phenomenon, represents the most ‘functional’ (comparing to other physical mechanisms) instrument as far as attempts to interpret Jung’s synchronicity are concerned. Yet, it still remains unclear how exactly the quantum entanglement may exist at the level of material carrier of consciousness, i.e. brain, and how the quantum entanglement may ensure non-local correlations between different subjects which make synchronicity possible. Solution of this problem is the goal of the study this paper is devoted for.

Let’s assume that correlation of mental processes in different people not exchanging any information among themselves, i.e. synchronicity, is caused by non-local quantum correlations (quantum entanglement) between certain parts of these people’s brain (Persinger et al. 2008). At this point, it needs to be noted that we can’t talk about existence of quantum entanglement as such between macroscopic objects. The ‘quantum entanglement’ term is applicable exclusively to the objects of microworld, particularly at submolecular level: molecular orbitals (electron shells) of molecules, chromophore parts, etc. Therefore, it is, for example, correct to say ‘quantum entanglement between neuron structures at submolecular level’ instead of ‘quantum entanglement between nerve cells’, or make the following formulation: ‘quantum entanglement between electron shells of neuron molecules of different people’ instead of saying ‘quantum entanglement between different people’. Also, as of today, direct
observation of effects involving quantum entanglement at the level of macroscopic objects is highly questionable. Nevertheless, it should be noted in this respect that by this time, certain attempts were made at experimental observation of these phenomena as part of the quantum superposition studies (Gevaux 2010; O’Connell et al. 2010). And finally, it is important to emphasize that quantum entanglement cannot directly represent a mechanism of communicating information per se. Quantum entanglement may serve only as an instrument of ensuring correlation of certain physical quantities. In this case, correlation may be implemented at indefinitely large distances without limitation on speed imposed by the special theory of relativity.

Currently, existence of quantum coherence and quantum entanglement in biological molecules is intensively studied and is considered proved at experimental level (Gilmore and McKenzie 2005; Plenio and Huelga 2008; Thorwart et al. 2009; Hossein-Nejad and Scholes 2010; Sarovar et al. 2010). Many researchers believe that quite specific problems in living organisms may be solved using quantum entanglement (Cai et al. 2010). However, when studying the synchronicity phenomenon it is important to find out how quantum entanglement between biological structures of different organisms may occur. In this respect, let’s assume that quantum entanglement between biological molecules may occur as a result of ‘coherent resonance energy transfer’ (Jang et al. 2008; Olaya-Castro et al. 2008; Collini and Scholes 2009; Nazir 2009; Kekovic et al. 2010; Nalbach et al. 2010; Scholes 2010). Some authors describe possibility of quantum entanglement occurring during electrostatic (Coulomb) interaction (Mishima et al. 2004). Consequently, one may also assume that quantum entanglement between parts of biological molecules occurs as a result of the above interaction. Another physical mechanism by virtue of which quantum entanglement can arise is the Fermi resonance (Xi-Wen and Chuan-Ming 2009; Peng and Hou 2010; Hou et al. 2010). However, it is obvious that mere presence of different people close to each other hardly offers a sufficient condition for occurrence of quantum entanglement between any biological structures of their bodies. Also, synchronicity phenomena (correlation of mental processes in different subjects) may, generally speaking, be observed even if these people have never communicated with each other. Therefore, it seems prudent to put forth a hypothesis, whereby quantum entanglement occurs, and is subsequently maintained, at the level of genetic material.

In addition to other studies of quantum coherence and quantum entanglement in biological molecules, possibility of these phenomena existing in nucleic acids, particularly in DNA, was also intensively studied in recent years (Ogryczko 1997; McFadden and Al-Khalili 1999; Bieberich 2000; Schempp 2003; Sirakoulis et al. 2004; Tulub and Stefanov 2007; Ogryczko 2008; Cooper 2009a, b). Analysis of development trends in this area of study allows to assume that this direction is very promising (Curtis and Hurtak 2004; Ananthaswamy 2010). It has been, for example, suggested that quantum effects may be responsible for morphogenesis processes (Hyland 2003b), and represent, in a way, a link between genotype and phenotype (Rosen 1996). Therefore, it is possible that DNAs of different cells within the same organism may be connected by quantum entanglement as a result of division of cell during mitosis. On the other hand, it is also fair to assume that quantum entanglement between DNAs of different cells may occur during meiosis, when gametes are forming. This situation may take place, for example, during homologous genetic recombination – crossing-over. It means that quantum entanglement may exist between cell structures of different organisms as well. There is, however, one important circumstance worth noting: theoretically, quantum entanglement between DNAs of brain cells may occur exclusively during embryogenesis. The explanation is as follows: as we know, nerve cells experience mitotic division only during prenatal period. During postnatal period, neurons do not divide. Small percentage of neural stem cells may be disregarded. As of today, several papers have been already devoted to the matters concerning quantum entanglement at the level of central nervous system cells (Pereira 2007; Pereira and
Furlan 2009; Pereira and Furlan 2010). At the same time, it should be noted that quantum entanglement may exist not only between nuclear DNAs of different cells. Any cellular structures interacting both before and during mitosis and meiosis processes, and afterwards, after cells have divided, ending up in different cells, may potentially represent elements which cause existence of quantum entanglement between molecules of different cells (Hameroff 2004; Tulub 2004). It is hardly possible to describe existence of quantum entanglement between biological molecules of different organisms without taking into account mitosis and meiosis processes. It is so because in order that quantum entanglement does occur between the objects of the microworld, such objects should have interacted. Generally speaking, in case no interaction took place, the objects of the microworld will not be related with quantum entanglement. Some particular cases of quantum entanglement among fermions make an exception to this rule (Zhou 2000; Vedral 2003; Oh and Kim 2004; Clark et al. 2005; Vertesi 2007; Jie and Shi-Qun 2008; Habibian et al. 2010). However, for these rare instances it is characteristic to adhere to a series of specific conditions. At this stage of science development it is premature to suggest that such conditions exist as applied to neurones of several different people. Furthermore, another important question requires our attention. It concerns not the quantum entanglement occurrence mechanism, but the problem of its long-term preservation. We are talking about the so-called decoherence, a process which involves destruction of quantum coherence under impact of electromagnetic fields and other factors. Decoherence involves transformation of states characterized by quantum superposition (the so-called ‘pure’ states) into states where quantum phenomena cannot be observed (‘mixed’ states). Nevertheless, recently this problem has also been tackled at with increasing success (Shabani and Lidar, 2005; Manfredi and Hervieux 2006; Grace at al., 2007), particularly in terms of understanding the processes occurring in DNA (Ogryzko, 2008; Cooper, 2009a, b). And finally, we still have to find out how quantum entanglement may occur between cellular structures of quite large number of subjects, because during meiosis, genetic materials may be transferred to descendants only. A hypothesis may come to rescue, whereby all humans originated from the same center in Africa approximately 80-200 thousand years ago – ‘recent single-origin hypothesis’ (Batzer et al. 1994; Armour et al. 1996; Liu et al. 2006; Pritchard et al. 1996). Not extending, surely, the assumption of existence of quantum entanglement onto the scale of genome of all people, one may, nevertheless, assume that certain population groups bear in their genetic material DNA parts inherited from prehistoric men, which are common to these groups (Goldstein et al. 1995; Jorde et al. 1995; Nei and Takezaki 1996; Hey 1997). Therefore, existence of quantum entanglement between DNA molecules of relatively large groups of people cannot be ruled out.

Considering the aforementioned hypothesis, we can assume that ‘material carriers of consciousness’ include, in particular, molecular orbitals (electron shells) of molecules, biologically active during meiosis and mitosis. This conclusion is helped by phenomenology of analytical psychology, namely the synchronicity phenomenon.

An assumption that the molecules participating in meiosis can play a role of tangible media of consciousness, apart of the other biological molecules, by no means contradicts our formed presentation that the human psyche is ‘localized’ in the brain. An absence of such contradiction is conditional on the circumstance that the molecules displaying biological activity during meiosis are viewed merely as an ‘intermediate’ link when quantum entanglement is formed between brain cell molecules of various people. The molecules participating in a cell division during meiosis may appear as ‘intermediaries’ while the quantum entanglement is formed between certain brain cell molecules of a person with the same molecules of the brain cells belonging to another person. In its turn, biological molecules used during mitosis can be similar ‘intermediaries’ in the course of quantum entanglement formation. However, the molecules used during mitosis can ensure a formation of quantum entanglement not between molecules of various people but
between the cell molecules of one human organism. Specifically, it can occur between
the brain cell molecules and the molecules which are active when forming gametes of
one and the same person. As it has already been noted, quantum entanglement between
the molecules of brain neurons of an organism may, theoretically, arise during
embryogenesis exclusively. Quantum
entanglement between the brain cell molecules and the molecules of other cells
within one and the same organism may also arise exclusively in the process of prenatal
development. Among other things, it also
refers to quantum entanglement arising
between the brain cell molecules and the cell
molecules of other organs wherein meiosis
takes place within the frame of one
organism. Still, quantum entanglement
between the cell molecules of the organs
wherein meiosis within the frame of one
organism takes place may occur not only
during embryogenesis but also in the
postnatal period.

Again, an assumption that genetic
material can be a tangible medium of
consciousness has been contemplated so far
by a number of researchers (Dennis 2010;
Tariq et al 2010) and is not viewed now as
something remarkable. Recently there also
appear papers (Vaas 1999; Molyneux
2010) which allow of a rather skeptical
attitude to a stereotyped notion that the
nature of a human psyche is conditioned by
electric transfer of signal in the brain.

In this context it should be pointed
out that orientation to quantum effects when
trying to explain the nature of consciousness
and, specifically, orientation to quantum
entanglement phenomenon (including at the
genetic material level) seems more than
justified. To corroborate this thesis let us
consider modern information technologies.
Complexity of contemporary
supercomputers and computer networks, a
number of electronic links therein and the
volume of transferred information may be
currently comparable with certain similar
indices applicable to describe human brain
properties. However, as yet nobody saw
.generally, it is hard to imagine that anybody
could have observed such a thing) any
technical device possessing consciousness
which operating principle was based upon a
transfer of electronic signals. It refers, inter
alia, to technical devices developed within
the framework of artificial intelligence
studies. Therefore, it appears highly doubtful
that the brain of a newborn, able to transfer
electric pulses only, is an adequate medium
of consciousness and can provide for a
development of the personality possessing
intelligence. It seems so that the brain
molecules of an individual are to be linked,
via a genetic material and by means of
quantum entanglement, with genetic
material (and molecules at the level of the
central nervous system) of a great number of
other people.

Characteristically enough, a famous
British biologist Rupert Sheldrake has come
up with a similar hypothesis at his time,
assuming that correlation of mental
processes in different people is caused by
DNA. At the same time, Sheldrake did not
specify what physical mechanism precisely
may be responsible for this correlation. And
only some other authors have reviewed the
Sheldrake’s theory in light of quantum non-
locality (Keutzer 1982; Resconi and
Nikravesh 2008). Also, key provisions of
analytical psychology were viewed at in
connection with David Bohm’s theory of
dilatation and Karl Pribram’s
holographic brain theory (Zinkin 1987).
Besides Jung, the assumption that mental
processes somehow correlate with certain
processes occurring beyond human brain
was put forth at the time by John Eccles,
laureate of the 1963 Nobel Prize in
Physiology (Popper and Eccles 1977) jointly
with Wilder Penfield (Penfield 1978).

The hypothesis outlined in this article
may be viewed at a different angle. As we
know, phenomena which quantum
mechanics deals with in no way fit the
perception of surrounding world which we
carry in everyday life. This is also true about
the principle of superposition in quantum
theory, a phenomenon when, for example, an
object of microworld may be ‘located’ in
several points of Hilbert space
‘simultaneously’ (Garraway and Knight 1994;
Back in his time, one of the founders of
quantum theory Erwin Schrödinger showed
that as a result of this principle, one can
model a situation when a living creature, for
example a cat, may be both ‘alive’ and ‘dead’
at the same time. However strange this
thought experiment might seem to us, at this
time practical experiments aimed at
realization of quantum superposition at
macroscopic level are already underway (Gevaux 2010; O’Connell et al. 2010). One of
the consequences of existence of quantum
entanglement between chromosomes of
brain neurons in different people may be the
fact that consciousness is not ‘localized’ in
brain of an individual but, in the essence,
’simultaneously’ ‘belongs’ to a group of
people. This point of view is rather closer to
Arnold Mindell’s transpersonal
interpretation (Mindell 2000, 2004) than, in
fact, to the theory of collective unconscious.

Conclusions and prospects of
this study
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