

EXPLORING THE *OTHER* DARK CONTINENT: Parallels between Psi Phenomena and the Psychotherapeutic Process

Ruth Rosenbaum

In scientific investigation it is often the study of the anomalous, the atypical, that points the way to the discovery of deeper truths.

—Esther Menaker

This paper will explore the relevance of the subject of psi phenomena to important topics in psychoanalysis and psychotherapy, such as intersubjectivity, projective identification, and the integration of primary and secondary process experience. “Psi” is a general term referring to kinds of information transfer or communication that exceed common understanding of how such communication takes place. Psi includes telepathy (mind-to-mind communication), clairvoyance (environment-to-mind communication), and psychokinesis (the capacity to influence a physical system or move an object in the absence of any known physical means of doing so).

Psi has, for the most part, been shunned as a serious topic of psychoanalytic inquiry. Upon closer examination, however, it appears to share common ground with aspects of the therapeutic bond, transference and countertransference, the intersubjective field, and integration of conscious and unconscious processes. In fact, at this critical point in the history of psychoanalysis, when the field is attempting to validate its techniques and process through evidence-based research, the search for scientific validation of psi phenomena may actually have outpaced the search for such validation of psychoanalysis. Scientific studies of psi phenomena, some of which are described here, can help to elucidate some of the more uncanny aspects of therapeutic action.

As with the proverbial blind men describing an elephant, psychoanalysis and psi research each provide a different perspective on the same phenomena—the nature of the unconscious, nonverbal communication and attunement, and mental states residing at the far reaches of a continuum of empathy and intuition. Moreover, certain aspects of psychotherapy with the psychotic patient, which often require of the therapist a greater fluency with both his own and the patient's primary process experience, can be brought into sharper focus through the lens of psi phenomena.

At very least, psi represents a psychological phenomenon that merits investigation in a field such as ours. Because belief in psi is so prevalent in our culture (Neimark, 1996; Moore, 2005), analysts are bound to encounter it in their patients, even in their colleagues. As one veteran psychoanalyst confessed to me, only after guarantee of anonymity: "I don't believe in ESP, but I know I have it." His comment echoes Freud's response to Jones's criticism of his [Freud's] interest in clairvoyance: "I don't like it at all myself, but there is some truth in it" (Jones, 1957, p. 381).

Some of what takes place in psychoanalysis and psychotherapy fits the definition of psi in that it often exceeds our knowledge as to how communication takes place. Benedetti (1992), in speaking about the communication of patients to therapists in the therapists' dreams, said: "These phenomena show that there is a form of communication between the therapist's and the patient's Unconscious which escapes all our efforts to understand it, which challenges our rationality" (p. 12). Eshel (2006) points to "*the occult of psychoanalysis and the psychoanalytic process . . . of patient-analyst unconscious interconnectedness and its 'impossible' extremes, defying space, time and personal boundaries*" (p. 1622).

Human psychological development is itself based on forms of communication that as yet have no precise scientific explanation. Stern (1985), referring to the parental mirroring and empathic responsiveness so crucial to the development of the infant, wrote: "Despite the importance of these events, it is not at all clear how they work. . . . How can you get 'inside of' other people's subjective experience and then let them know that you have arrived there, without using words?" (p. 138). While the discovery of

mirror neurons¹ provides clues to the neural basis for empathy and for a “shared intersubjective space” (Gallese, 2003, p. 160), many forms of intersubjective experience that occur in psychoanalysis, and between people in general, require further explanation. For example, Gallese (one of the discoverers of mirror neurons), Eagle, and Migone (2007), state that mirror neurons, which thus far have been found to be activated only through direct sensory observation of another’s action or expression, cannot account for certain instances of projective identification, in which the patient’s unconscious emotions evoke feelings and thoughts in the analyst without any specifically correlated behavioral cues. They comment that some have looked to telepathy as an explanation for this phenomenon (p. 150).

FREUD’S UNFULFILLED WISH

“If I had my life to live over again I should devote myself to psychical research rather than to psychoanalysis”—that is what Freud wrote in 1921 in a letter to an acquaintance, Hereward Carrington (Jones, 1957, p. 392). At various points over the subsequent two decades, Freud (1922, 1925, 1933, 1941) attempted to include telepathy in psychoanalytic discourse. He postulated that telepathy was most likely an activity of the unconscious mind, and that much could be learned about repressed unconscious wishes from telepathically received material, similar to the way one could learn from dreams. He theorized, in his analysis of readings of fortune-tellers—one of whom he referred to as “a genuine ‘medium’” (Freud, 1941, p. 62)—that an unconscious wish, along with the thoughts and factual material connected with it, could be transferred from one person to another. In fact, some of the fortune-tellers’ errors appeared to derive from their ascertaining the clients’ psychic reality—their unspoken wishes and fantasies—more accurately than their observable reality.

In 1946, psychoanalyst Jule Eisenbud commented that

one of the most remarkable facts in the history of the psychoanalytic movement is the indifference with which Freud’s publications on the subject of telepathy have been received, an indifference all the more significant in the light of the exegetical tendencies not

uncommonly present among Freud's followers. . . . In the more than twenty years that have elapsed since Freud's first publication on the subject in 1922, scarcely more than a half dozen psychoanalytic authors have made clinical contributions to the field, and most of these have published single communications followed by strange and enduring silences. (p. 32)

In a field purportedly devoted to unearthing and analyzing repressed material, there has been, historically, a fieldwide repression of material related even to expressing an interest in psi. Freud's own exploration of the subject could be described as a complex dance of approach–avoidance. Several years after writing to Carrington about his desire for a lifetime devoted to psychological research, Freud denied ever having made such a statement. But Ernest Jones, himself no fan of the occult, nevertheless tracked down a photostat of the letter and stated: “In the eight years that had passed he [Freud] had blotted out the memory of that very astonishing and unexpected passage” (Jones, 1957, p. 392).

In the course of correspondence and meetings with Sandor Ferenczi over a period of many years, Freud encouraged, and at times participated in, Ferenczi's experiments with thought transference, but also expressed anxiety about going public with it (Brabant, Falzeder, & Giamieri-Deutsch, 1993; Falzeder & Brabant, 1996). In a letter to Ferenczi in December 1910, Freud wrote: “I see destiny approaching, inexorably, and I note that it has designated you to bring to light mysticism and the like. . . . Still, I think we ought to venture to slow it down. I would like to request that you continue to research in secrecy for two full years and don't come out until 1913—you know my practical reasons against it and my secret painful sensitivities” (Brabant et al., p. 240).

“Painful sensitivities” regarding psi phenomena persist to this day. As has been pointed out by Farrell (1983) and Mayer (1996, 2001, 2007), dialogue about this subject has been stifled because of a public–private split: Many analysts express interest and/or belief in psi in private but are fearful of the consequences if they were to make their interest known publicly, just as Freud was. I have come to call the subject of psi phenomena the *other* dark continent of psychological inquiry, rivaling female sexuality as the

feared unknown, evoking anxiety and avoidance, or a rush to judge and pathologize, rather than to explore and learn.

An outstanding instance of this public–private split involved renowned analyst and author Robert Stoller. In 1973, Stoller wrote a paper about telepathic dreams (Mayer, 2001), mostly dreams his patients had which coincided uncannily with events in his own life about which they would otherwise have had no way of knowing. In the same paper, Stoller also wrote of a dream he had which described elements of an accident involving the son of his supervisor, Ralph Greenson, an accident which had actually occurred, but about which Stoller had no prior knowledge (as cited in Mayer, 2001, pp. 636–637). After Stoller told Greenson of his dream, Greenson admitted to his wife that he was “permanently affected” and deeply impressed by the experience, “convinced that telepathy was something real and relevant for analysts to consider” (p. 638). Nevertheless, Greenson advised Stoller not to try to publish his paper if he wanted a career as a reputable psychoanalyst. Nearly thirty years later, and long after Stoller’s death, a colleague found the article and brought it to the attention of Elizabeth Lloyd Mayer of the San Francisco Psychoanalytic Institute, who got it published in *The Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*. In Stoller’s article are several references to his own fears of being considered unrespectable or unscientific because of his interest in the subject (p. 635).²

Eisenbud (1946) theorized that the analytic field’s avoidance of the subject of psi was due to the instinctive connection people make between these experiences and childlike states of mind, regressive states that threaten and challenge our status as rational, sophisticated adults. Servadio (1935), an analyst and contemporary of Freud’s, attributed avoidance of the subject to the “fear that one may be accused of being fixated upon an infantile mode of thought” (p. 210). It is possible that, in addition to Freud’s (1933, 1941) stated reasons for caution in pursuing his undeniable interest in paranormal phenomena (i.e., his concern about being tainted by association with unscientific thinkers and occultists of his time), he may have been fearful of encountering infantile aspects of his own psyche. After all, his major objection to religion was its appeal to childish, wishful thinking: “The whole

thing,” he remarked, “is so patently infantile” (Freud, 1930, p. 22). Jung (1961) speculated that Freud’s emphasis on repressed sexuality was, in part, itself a vehicle for repressing something even more disturbing to Freud’s notion of adult consciousness—mysticism (p. 152).

Loewald (1978), while not mentioning psi phenomena *per se*, spoke of mystical experiences, extremes of sexual passion and romantic love, creative states and psychosis as among those states of being which pose a threat to the individual’s stability, “states of identification where the boundaries between self and object world, between oneself and another person, are blurred or tend to vanish” (p. 36). Loewald thought that most adults break away from or avoid these boundary-blurring states due to anxiety over loss of control. He traced the origin of these experiences to the symbiotic nature of the mother–infant matrix, the same site Ehrenwald (1978) called the “cradle of ESP” (p. 14).

These boundary-blurring states occur frequently in the mind of the psychotic, the mind experiencing psi, and the mind of the psychotherapist, particularly the therapist dealing with psychotic patients. Note the following description by Harold Searles (1976):

For the deepest levels of therapeutic interaction to be reached, both patient and therapist must experience a temporary breaching of the ego boundaries which demarcate each participant from the other. In this state there occurs . . . a temporary introjection, by the therapist, of the patients’ pathogenic conflicts; the therapist thus deals with these at an intrapsychic, unconscious as well as conscious level, bringing to bear upon them the capacities of his own relatively strong ego. Then, similarly by introjection, the patient benefits from this intrapsychic therapeutic work which has been accomplished in the therapist. (pp. 158–159)

Certainly this description of psychological healing, with its mysterious exchange of content-laden energy and emotional pieces of patient and therapist, with the therapist taking in damaged parts of the patient, digesting and assimilating and giving them back to the patient in a healthier form, would fit the formal definition of psi communication.

Benedetti (1987), in describing the structure of empathy, which he feels reveals itself most vividly in the psychotherapy of

psychosis, writes that “the birth of the self is composed of a mixture of interchangeable parts of oneself and others” (p. 194). How does this interchange of parts take place? Is it any easier to explain than the exchange of information and mental states that occurs in telepathy?

PSI IN THE LABORATORY

There is a growing body of rigorously designed studies leading to the solid conclusion that psi phenomena have a place in our real, material world, and are measurable according to accepted scientific standards. Lazar (2001), a supervising and training analyst at the Washington Psychoanalytic Institute, has summarized some of these studies, among them, those conducted at the Princeton Engineering Anomalies Research (PEAR) Laboratory. The PEAR Lab was established in 1979 by Robert Jahn, Dean Emeritus of the Princeton Engineering School and professor of Aerospace Sciences, and cofounder Brenda Dunne, to explore the impact of human consciousness on physical, material systems.

One of the PEAR lab experiments was designed to determine if human intention could influence the output of a random event generator’s production of 1s or 0s, which, according to chance, would normally be 50 percent of each. The human subject would sit in a room with the boxlike machine as it produced and recorded its thousands of bits of data in the form of rapidly streaming 1s and 0s. Before beginning, the subject would set an intention to shift the mean result either higher or lower than what would be expected by chance. Even when the subject was not in the room with the machine, some PEAR experiments, along with those from other laboratories, demonstrated that distance, even up to thousands of miles, between the human subject and the machine to be influenced did not diminish the subjects’ capacity to alter the chance statistics of the generator. A metaanalysis of 832 experimental studies of the effect of human intention on random event generators, including some of the Princeton studies, found overall odds against chance of the impact of human intention on the machines’ output of over a trillion to one (Radin, 1997, p. 140).³ (What an interesting twist on the Schizophrenic Influenc-

ing Machine [Tausk, 1919]. Tausk describes the common belief of schizophrenics that their actions, particularly their body movements, are controlled by a machine. I wonder: If there were such a thing as a society of random event generators, would some of them—the more sensitive ones among them, of course—be going to their analysts, insisting that the “rays” of some ominous homo sapiens were penetrating their encasements and causing them to act in crazy, unpredictable ways?)

In light of the experimental data, perhaps the concept of magical ideation, or the belief in scientifically unorthodox or seemingly impossible forms of interaction between thought and the physical world, has to be reevaluated. Is it strictly a feature of psychotic, schizotypal, or childish thinking? Or, in certain instances, does it reflect a kind of interaction between thought and the physical world that is now within the domain of empirical science?

Boss (1977), commenting on the disruption of the boundaries of the self in psychosis, states that this disruption “often seems to bring with it a superhuman penetrability into that which, not accessible to common experience, is precisely what underlies it. It is, so to speak, a schizophrenic sensitivity to that which is ordinarily hidden from human perception” (p. 234). Benedetti (1987), Arieti (1968a, 1968b), and others also note the potential of the schizophrenic condition to illuminate certain depths of the human condition not normally revealed. Is it possible that some psychotic individuals are attuned to a fundamental, if esoteric, fact of nature—the actual interpenetrability and interconnectedness of all our energies? Perhaps the typical descriptions that schizophrenics give of being penetrated by rays or waves represent a schizophrenic sensitivity to the emanations from each other and from everything that happens around us that we are all potentially receptive to (even though the schizophrenic tends to grossly misinterpret the emanations)? Interestingly, according to Jones (1957), Freud said of thought transference: “In it a verbal message gets transformed into a wave or ray of quite unknown nature . . . and then on reception reconverted into mental terms” (p. 381).

In an interview with PEAR cofounder Brenda Dunne (personal communication, February 11, 2004), she described to me

how some subjects in the experiments attempted to feel merged with the machine, to create a kind of “third space” where they could interact and affect each other. That approach, she said, seemed to produce better results than when subjects tried to exert their will over the machine in a more overt, conscious way. The more successful approach, which could be described as a kind of meditative state that softened distinctions and altered the sensation of boundaries of the self, resulting in the experience of a “third space,” is similar to what takes place between analyst and patient in the intersubjective field. It brings to mind Ogden’s (1994) “analytic third” (p. 4), Lacan’s “decentering of the subject” (Ragland-Sullivan, 1986, p. 218), and Benedetti’s (1980) “third reality” formed by mutual introjection and projection processes of patient and therapist (p. 635).

The effort put forth by the more successful subjects in the PEAR lab experiments is analogous to the kind of effort psychotherapists are called upon to engage in: We obviously cannot will or command patients to get better; we have to be in the therapeutic space with them and in some inexplicable way—beyond the sum of our words—facilitate and intend both consciously and unconsciously that our patients undergo some kind of change in their customary patterns, both intrapsychic and behavioral. Stern et al. (1998) have suggested that change occurs in therapy when therapists are willing to abandon their familiar framework and wade in more deeply to meet the patient in intersubjective waters, or, one could say, to “blur” their habitual sense of themselves, their roles, and their linear assessment of the patient.

Allan Schore, at a conference on Neurobiology and Attachment Theory in Psychotherapy (2006), noted that recent studies of the brain, including functional MRI studies, indicate that intuitive attunement to the patient (associated with the processing mode of the brain’s right hemisphere) may be more critical in bringing about psychological change than particular techniques or interpretations (associated with the processing mode of the brain’s left hemisphere.) Evidence-based practice research also leads to the conclusion that the quality of the bond between patient and therapist plays a larger role in positive change in psychotherapy than does any specific technical or theoretical approach

(Henry, 1998; Klein, 2003; Luborsky et al., 1985; Norcross, Beutler, & Levant, 2005; Wallerstein, 1995).

According to Brenda Dunne (personal communication, February 11, 2004), the word most often used by subjects in the PEAR experiments is “resonate”—they try to resonate with the machine in order to alter their statistically predictable patterns. “Resonate” is a word we hear from patients when they feel we are attuned to them, or when we are reaching them in a way that might enable them to alter their own predictable and repetitive patterns.

Underscoring the power of resonance and attunement, the PEAR random event generator studies also demonstrated that two people working together with the same mental intention to impact the output of the machine produced a larger against-chance effect than a single person working alone. Even more striking was the finding that couples who shared a strong bond “achieved an effect size nearly seven times larger than that produced by those same people as individual operators” (Dunne & Jahn, 2005, p. 709). One can speculate that these results indicate a change-effecting potential, though difficult to define, created by the bond between people, particularly people with an especially strong attunement, as in the case of a good patient–therapist match. Parallels between these experimental results and the change-effecting power of the patient–therapist bond are worthy of reflection by psychoanalysts, particularly given the convergence of evidence emerging from neuroscience studies, psi research laboratories, and evidence-based practice research regarding the mutative impact of attunement between human beings.

TRANSITIONAL PHENOMENA AND PSI

Winnicott’s (1975) concept of transitional phenomena, which he extended to encompass all experience residing in the intermediary realm between subject and object, is relevant to an exploration of the common ground between psi and psychoanalysis. Winnicott drew a connection between experiences in the “intermediate area” (p. 242), an area where subject–object boundaries are blurred, and the intense experiencing that is common to the infant as well as to the adult’s experience of art, religion, imagina-

tion, and creative work. Some personality studies (Schmeidler, 1966; Schmeidler & McConnell, 1958; Thalbourne & Delin, 1994; Wilson & Barber, 1983) point to a link between creativity, mystical experiencing, degree of absorption in fantasy, and reports of psi experience. There may be certain personalities, ranging from healthy and creative to borderline and psychotic, who tend to dwell more in this intermediate realm, where symbiotic phenomena of all kinds may be more likely to occur and to be perceived.

Searles (1976) commented that many psychoanalytic writers “are still unconsciously staving off, while gingerly approaching, the degree of recognition of the pervasiveness of symbiotic phenomena, involving nonhuman as well as objectively human realms of existence” (p. 148). Searles also said that it was only his long-term work with schizophrenic adults which compelled him to see, “against tenacious unconscious resistance on my part” (p. 148), the extent and importance of symbiotic phenomena. He, like Loewald (1978), attributed this resistance to the uneasiness most people feel regarding the gratification, or desire for gratification, of infantile dependency needs.

Experiences of an intermediate or symbiotic nature occur frequently in our work with patients, not just psychotic patients, and reside in mental territory that overlaps with the “other dark continent” of psi. The unconscious itself seems inclined to drift into a transitional or intermediate realm. Take, for example, the therapist’s use of his own unconscious as an analyzing instrument, a concept Freud (1912) first suggested (p. 116), and which has since been expanded upon by Isakower (1963a, 1963b) and by Balter, Lothane, and Spencer (1980). As Balter and colleagues note, the analyzing instrument is not a separate entity within the psychic structure of the analyst, but a joint construction of analyst and analysand, “functioning together as one unit in continuous communication” (p. 474). The analyzing instrument can be considered to be a kind of transitional object co-created and co-experienced by both analyst and patient.

The degree to which we actually co-create each other’s experience, and the startling reach of the intersubjective field, was highlighted by another category of psi studies, primarily by Braud and Schlitz (1991), in which the capacity of average individuals to

influence the biological systems of distant subjects was explored. The subjects' degree of physiological relaxation or arousal was measured by as many as seven different physiological indices, including electrodermal response, muscle tension, and heart rate. Subjects were not aware either of timing or direction of the intention of the influencer. Influencer and subject were separated by distance and sometimes by special soundproof and electromagnetically proofed rooms. The influencer was given computer-generated random sequences instructing him when to mentally focus on either arousing or calming the distant subject. At other times, the influencer was randomly instructed to direct his attention away from the subject, thereby producing "no-mental-influence" control periods. The combined results of 37 such experiments demonstrated that the influencers' intention and the subjects' physiological changes were correlated to a significant degree, producing odds against chance of more than a hundred trillion to one (Radin, 1997, p. 153).

These experiments form an interesting lens through which to view projective identification. As Ogden (1979) stated: "Rather than simply altering the psychological representations of an external object, in projective identification one attempts to, and often succeeds in, effecting specific alterations in the feeling state and self-representations of another person" (pp. 369–370).

If one is affecting the feeling state of a person, one is affecting, even subtly, his physiology—feelings change physiology. If we accept the concept of projective identification, it should not require a huge leap of either imagination or logic to accept these kinds of psi phenomena as worthy of inclusion in our study of human interaction, and as adding to our understanding of transference/countertransference effects that take place on a daily basis with our patients.

Lazar (2001) commented that "one of the problems facing the more general acceptability of these [psi] phenomena is their relatively subtle effect" (p. 116).⁴ That may be the case, and yet this problem is no different from the problem psychoanalysts have always faced. The effects achieved in a psychoanalytic session can be subtle, difficult to replicate from patient to patient, or even from session to session with the same patient, and yet, over time,

the accumulation of these subtle effects can be life changing, transforming the patient's perception of himself and his relationship to the world around him. If we were to take in and process the ramifications of the subtle effects demonstrated in the scientific studies of psi, our perception of ourselves and our relationship to the world might be transformed as well.

Lazar (2001) noted another obstacle to the acceptance of psi phenomena: They do not feel real; they are counterintuitive with regard to the way we experience our daily lives (p. 129). Perhaps this is the case, but people have no trouble accepting other unreal-seeming phenomena, such as the recently verified Bell's theorem (Bouwmeester et al., 1997, p.126), where each of a pair of two previously connected particles, traveling at great distances from each other, seem to "know" and respond instantaneously to each other's spin and charge. We do not hear of psychoanalysts writing about quantum physicists' omnipotent fantasies or the childish, wishful nature of their claims. Apparently, subatomic particles having intimate knowledge of each other at a distance and dissolving boundaries of identification does not threaten our view of ourselves as independent adults who have outgrown our symbiotic roots. Loewald's (1979) comment speaks to this subject:

The more we understand about primitive mentality, which constitutes a deep layer of advanced mentality, the harder it becomes to escape the idea that its implicit sense of and quest for irrational nondifferentiation of subject and object contains a truth of its own, granted that this other truth fits badly with our rational world view and quest for objectivity. Even a schizophrenic's sense of a continuum or an uncanny . . . affinity and sameness of himself and another person, as if both merely pose as two distinct individuals, begins to make sense if viewed in the light of deep unconscious levels. (p. 402)

Another PEAR lab phenomenon worth mentioning here is what Brenda Dunne and Robert Jahn termed "the signature effect." Each subject participated in a number of trials, with different kinds of statistically predictable mechanical systems, including the random event generator. When the researchers looked over the trial results they were surprised to find that they were able to recognize which subject's data they were looking at. It was

as if, in the complex data output graphs, each subject's unconscious influence revealed itself in a very personalized fashion. Brenda Dunne (personal communication, February 11, 2004) explained it to me this way: "We could recognize a person's results in general, even if they differed from trial to trial, the way you recognize a Mozart piece as a Mozart, or a Beethoven as a Beethoven, even if each individual piece of music seems entirely different from the next."

So in this realm of subtle but significant effects, of which psychoanalysis is clearly a resident, it would seem that each analyst may generate a unique signature effect. As the analyst's unconscious enters the patient's psyche, as Benedetti (1990, p. 12) has described, it may leave its signature, just as the patient's unconscious penetrates the analyst's psyche and leaves its unique imprint. This would also suggest that the personality of the analyst, the analyst's idiosyncratic way of navigating his own unconscious channels, is as important as specific technique or interpretation. The APA Presidential Task Force on Evidence-Based Practice (2006) noted: "Because of the importance of therapeutic alliance to outcome, an understanding of the personal attributes and interventions of therapists that strengthen the alliance is essential for maximizing the quality of patient care" (p. 278). Once again, psi research and evidence-based practice research seem to point in the same direction regarding the importance of the nature of the bond between therapist and patient.

PSI AND UNCONSCIOUS COMMUNICATION IN THE ANALYTIC DYAD

The following is an example of a possible psi experience in an analytic session, which I will use as a basis for discussing further parallels between psychoanalytic process and psi. I hope to illustrate that at times the two are so close that they are fundamentally indistinguishable.

Bill came in for his initial session in a rage. He spent much of the time cursing and railing against the women in his life—his wife, coworkers, a neighbor. He told me he had a hit list that consisted of several women, and then, looking at me with a sneer, he

wondered aloud if I might end up on that list. (He had had great ambivalence about coming to see me, and only did so because a much-admired male colleague had referred him.) As the session proceeded, and I listened to Bill's chronicling of how women had "done him wrong," a strange image came into my mind— an image of Bill, with a beatific smile on his face, digging in the soil of an elaborate, colorful flower garden. It seemed incongruous, to say the least, and I did not pay much attention.

That evening, in thinking over Bill's session, I laughed to myself, assuming that my mind had produced the Bill-in-the-garden image as a comforting anchor for me to hold on to while listening to this rather scary man rant. Still, it seemed odd to me because gardening is not anything I have ever done, so it does not hold strong associations of comfort or security for me. As the weeks passed, the Bill-garden image remained in my mind, until it became like one of those facts about a person so integral to him that you no longer notice it as a separate detail—like a beard, or eye-glasses on a person who always wears them. Though it never made sense in the context of the reality of Bill's life, and I never mentioned it to him, the image became a subtle component of my intrapsychic perception of him, even though it was rarely a focus of my conscious attention as it had been that first session.

I worked with Bill for over four years, during which time he developed trust in the analytic process and in me, and made significant changes in some of his long-standing patterns, including those regarding his anger. And then he moved upstate. About three years after I'd last seen him, I received a phone call from Bill. He was in Manhattan, and wondered if I had a few minutes for him to stop by and say hello. I arranged the time, and Bill came to my office. After telling me about his new house, he took out his wallet, indicating that he had some pictures to show me. I assumed they might be of the house or of grandchildren. No—they were pictures of a huge, beautiful flower garden.

As I tried to disguise my shock, Bill said, "This is my passion now. When I'm in my garden, I feel a kind of peace I never thought possible." And then he grinned, and said, "I bet this is the last thing you would ever have imagined me doing!"

There are many ways of viewing this uncanny unfolding of

events. Was the garden image an example of precognition on my part? Or did Bill and I unwittingly, unconsciously, grow his garden together in the “third space” of psychotherapy? Could gardening, and its related peace and beauty, have been in his unconscious, hidden from him the entire time I worked with him, and might I have picked that up from his unconscious and reflected it back to him, without words, until he was able to pick up on it himself and bring it into consciousness? I think that, at very least, the Bill-garden image allowed me, without knowing it at the time, to relate to a side of him which other people might not have perceived because of all his rage and bluster. In turn, my way of relating to him, and the particular therapeutic alliance that developed in part because the garden image had taken up residence in my psyche, may have subtly inclined him in the direction of his own need for calm and beauty, which may have ultimately led him to gardening. All of these possibilities highlight the common ground of unconscious communication that characterizes both psi and the psychoanalytic process.

PSI AND THE STRUCTURE OF TRANSFERENCE ANALYSIS

The following is a different type of psi experience, illuminating different aspects of the analytic process and its relationship to psi. First, I will acknowledge that I have struggled personally with my own version of the public–private split regarding psi phenomena, having had many experiences since childhood that would meet the definition of psi, yet having been reluctant to speak openly about them. The example presented here is one of those experiences, which I have decided to include in an attempt to illustrate parallels between psi and psychoanalysis from inside the mind experiencing psi rather than viewing it solely from the outside.

After finishing graduate school, I lived in Paris, working as head of research for a documentary film, and also as liaison between the French producer and the American director. One morning I was at a business meeting with the producer and his staff. As I attended to the details of the meeting, I became aware of a profound, gnawing sense of horror arising in the pit of my stomach. I could have ignored it, or pushed it away, but having

had so many of these experiences since childhood, I was accustomed to allowing such inexplicable feelings to surface in order to try to distinguish whether they came primarily from an endogenous anxiety state or from something which seemed to originate from outside myself. As the feeling of horror intensified, my sense was that it was not about me. I held it in my awareness as the meeting continued. As soon as my responsibilities were fulfilled I excused myself and went back to my apartment. I sat on the edge of my bed, allowing the feeling to evolve. (I liken this phase of a psi experience to a kind of gestation period, where some elemental seed of a feeling/bodily sensation ultimately emerges in the form of images, facts, or words.) Within a couple of minutes, I saw (in my mind), all kinds of debris falling through the air, and a sort of odometer, with numbers running up very rapidly from 000 and stopping abruptly at 346. At the same time, I heard, again within my mind, the most horrendous, agonizing moans and screams. Normally, I would try to translate such an experience one step further—to define exactly what I think it refers to. In this case, I was so overwhelmed with the horror of the images and sensations that I did not do that. I spent the rest of the day walking around Paris, trying to shake off the funereal atmosphere the images had evoked.

I did not have a television or radio, so it was not until the next morning when I bought *The International Herald Tribune* that I discovered the final translation/interpretation of the previous day's alarming sensations: The headline announced that 346 people had been killed in a DC-10 plane that had crashed outside of Paris. Perhaps the most chilling fact to me was that the plane had taken off from Paris at about 1:00 PM, and I had been sitting in the business meeting, overwhelmed by the initial sensation of horror at about 11:00 AM. (From the perspective of the concept of nonlocality in quantum physics, this would not seem so startling, since neither time nor space is subject to linear distinctions, a characteristic that is shared by the unconscious, even though it is counterintuitive to our conscious mind.)⁵

I've picked a rather extreme example to explore the psychological experience of a psi event because it makes it simpler to highlight certain aspects of the experience, and to draw parallels

to psychoanalytic process, particularly to the working-through of transference feelings. Often in these experiences, there is an initial sensation, a body sensation; in this case it was a raw horror akin to what one might feel at the instant of violent annihilation. Following that initial feeling, there is a need to find a connection for the feeling in reality, a need to translate inner sensations into a symbolic form that fits the outer environment, or to find something in the environment that makes sense of the inner sensations. An analogy to this process might be that of transforming Bion's (1965) beta elements, those raw, inchoate, ineffable elements of experience that comprise much of the infant's mode of being, into symbolic form, or alpha elements. While I do not assume that my particular way of experiencing these phenomena can be generalized to anyone else's, in discussions with Lyn Buchanan (personal communications, May–September, 1994), former general and U.S. Army Intelligence officer, who trained the army's remote viewers or "psychic spies" for many years, he told me that most of the remote viewers said they first got a physical sensation and then somehow translated it into words or drawings. (Remote viewing experiments, in which a subject is asked to describe or draw an undisclosed, randomly selected target site observed by an agent, were funded by the Defense Intelligence Agency, the CIA, the Army, and NASA.)⁶

To help correlate the phases of a psi experience to the process of insight and integration of unconscious and conscious feelings arising in the transference, I will use the metaphor of the type of sonar that whales and dolphins use to communicate. They send out sound frequencies into their deep-sea environment and receive reflections back that convey details to them about that environment. Different frequencies yield different levels of detail, so there is a dynamic communication between animal and environment. In my experience of psi, the initial sensation or feeling is sent out into the expanse of unconscious mental space, which seems to connect in some way with the space beyond itself. Then, information or details that fit that initial feeling are reflected back, usually in the form of images, words, sounds, or other symbols, around which ideas, meaning, or scenarios seem to coalesce. There are stages of evolving symbolization, and translation of sym-

bols, usually leading to further clarification of the perceived event or thought.

I believe that a similar process occurs in the exploration and resolution of feelings that arise in the transference. The patient's feelings, emitted consciously and unconsciously, are received and responded to, consciously and unconsciously, by the analyst. In the process, the patient learns that certain feelings do not belong exclusively to the present situation in the analysis, but originate elsewhere (as I suspected that the sense of horror I felt in Paris did not belong exclusively to my present situation). The psychoanalytic process encourages the patient to send those transference feelings down into the depths of mental space, where they then reflect back to him the shape and nature of the objects and part-objects that have become lodged in the landscape of the unconscious, objects that gradually take on more precise definition and become identified as the real power behind certain feelings evoked in the relationship with the analyst. Analyzing and understanding the transference enlivens the dialogue between unconscious and conscious, primary and secondary thought processes, similar to the way psi experience does. And in both psi experience and transference analysis, there is a weakening of the usually heavily fortified boundary between conscious and unconscious, creating an opportunity for integration and transformation, approaching Loewald's (1978) notion of "a new level of consciousness, of conspire, on which primary and secondary modes of mentation may be known together" (p. 65).

Ferenczi (Dupont, 1988), Balint (1955), Eisenbud (1946, 1947), Ehrenwald (1978), Schmeidler (1966), and Ullman (1966) have written about the transference evoking or provoking incidents of thought transference or telepathy. This may be because transference and thought transference both emerge from the transitional territory between primary and secondary process modes. In fact, Freud (1925) wrote: "On the basis of much experience I'm inclined to draw the conclusion that thought transference . . . comes about particularly easily at the moment at which an idea emerges from the unconscious as it passes over from the 'primary process' to the 'secondary process' (p. 89).

The therapist's use of his own unconscious as analyzing in-

strument, mentioned earlier, highlights the similarities between the mental state required for psi processing and that required for effective psychotherapeutic listening. Balter et al. (1980) noted that an essential characteristic of the analyzing instrument is the unique and specific “setting-in-relation to a near identical or analogous constellation in a second person” (p. 474). Their description sounds like the act of tuning into an intrapsychic radio, seeking the frequency that will receive and resonate with emanations from the patient’s unconscious. Freud (1912) suggested that an analyst should use his “own unconscious like a receptive organ toward the transmitting unconscious of the patient” (p. 115). (In a two-person psychology framework, both analyst and patient are simultaneously transmitting and receiving.) With psi phenomena, it seems as though the unconscious is a “receptive organ” open to the transmissions of others and those of the external world, as well as being a transmitting organ that interacts with the unconscious of others and with the physical world. PEAR laboratory co-founders Jahn and Dunne (2001) speculate that the domain of intangible physical processes (the domain described by quantum physicists), which underlies the tangible material world, forms an interface or “pre-distinction continuum” (p. 312) with the unconscious. This interface, they suggest, is the foundation for the emergence of psi phenomena.

That unconscious transmission and receptivity extend beyond the analytic dyad was noted by Benedetti (1992), in his description of the role of supervision in the therapy of schizophrenic patients, who often seem to know what was discussed between their analyst and their analyst’s supervisor. He refers to “impressive clinical findings” that show how “the presence of the collective Unconscious, which is extended to the Unconscious of the patient, who knows nothing of the supervisory session in itself, yet enters into precognitive contact with it . . . allows the supervisory session to go beyond its didactic function to become an element which directly stimulates the patient’s development” (p. 13).

In the realms of both psi and psychoanalysis (particularly in the intersubjective analytic field and in projective identification), it is often difficult to pinpoint where information originates—in here, or out there. Searles (1973) wrote “The symbiotic instability

of ego boundaries makes it impossible to know whether the anger or depression, for instance, which one suddenly experiences is one's 'own' or whether one is empathically sensing a feeling of the patient's own against which he is successfully defended unconsciously as by projection" (p. 254).

In the instance of the Paris plane crash, one could wonder whether my own fears of death or annihilation were projected out, and in some unknown way, got caught up in a very real event with similar features, or, to use Balter et al.'s term, "a near identical constellation." It could be that the event in some way impinged, even before it had occurred in measurable time and space, on the "receptive organ" of my unconscious and evolved from there into conscious images and meaning. Or, as in Searles's depiction of projective identification, and in the quantum world of subatomic particles, it may be impossible to ascertain a clear delineation between cause and effect.

PSI, PSYCHOSIS, SYMBOL FORMATION, AND MENTAL SPACE

There appear to be many similarities between the mind of the psychotic and the mind experiencing psi: a sensitivity to stimuli, both externally and inwardly generated, feelings of being taken over by sensations originating outside one's own boundaries, a tendency toward primary process dominance, an emphasis on the concreteness of intrapsychic experience, and a blurring of ego boundaries. Major distinctions exist, however, most of which involve the degree of integration of symbiotic and separate selves. I will emphasize here the experience of the mental space within which integration or dis-integration takes place.

In Bion's (1965) theory of linking—the latticework from which thought formation emerges—innate or intuitive preconceptions are formed out of feelings, often in response to an absence of the object, in the infant's case, the absence of the breast. Then there is a need to relieve mental frustration, to project these preconceptions out (sonar-like) into the environment and to find realization for them, hence replacing an absence with a presence, even if only a symbolic one. Once a preconception meets with a realization, it forms a concept or symbol, which can then become

fuel for the next preconception seeking a realization, in an ever-evolving chain of thought. In psi experiences, often an initial visceral feeling gives rise to a “preconception” and is followed by a sequence of symbolic links until the final connection (realization) in reality is revealed.

Language, psi, and thought may all be responses to an innate need to reach out, grasp and connect with, or communicate with, that which is currently absent from, or beyond reach of the self, and in that way, may be the means for growth of the self through an ongoing process of integrating primary- and secondary-process experience, or transforming beta into alpha elements. (According to Freud [1915], the preconscious is born out of the hypercathexis of thing-presentations as they connect to word-presentations, a kind of linking. I have wondered if the hypercathexis might result from an innate need to take in, or internalize, the environment that becomes differentiated from us as we emerge from infancy; we mouth words the way babies mouth things.)

The psychotic, rather than being able to use symbolic links to grow a healthy sense of self in relation to the environment, and to replace absences with symbolic presence, has difficulty propelling himself along the chains of symbolic links. For many suffering from psychosis, symbols are aggressors. They are reality, rather than a means of formulating one’s being in reality. The self of the psychotic becomes strangled in the links, and so either his selfhood dies or he attacks the link to protect the self, but in doing so, the mental space for symbolic thought formation is imploded rather than expanded. The psychotic has no faith that the next link will arise to give meaning to his feelings and bail him out of the sense of catastrophe engulfing him, or to borrow from Bion’s vocabulary, he has no faith in “O” (Bion, 1970, p. 27), the vast unknowable, no faith that anything helpful or meaningful can come from the unknown, only persecutors and abandoners.

In the psychological experience of psi, there may be a frequent intrusion of primary process into secondary process experience, but there is the mental space within which to reach for the links that integrate them. There is a faith that there will always be a next link, a faith in “O.”

Federn (1952) describes how, in the psychotic, the ego with-

draws from its boundary, leaving the sense organs in the abandoned boundary, so that the individual is prey to his own raw feelings and sensory perceptions with no defense. What seems to happen in psi experiencing is that the ego voluntarily and temporarily vacates its boundary—I would call it the “ego in the service of regression”—and then returns to try to read the hieroglyphs left by whatever entered its space.

In psi events, as in word and thought formation, the initial feeling that gives rise to the chain of preconceptions leading to a realization in the environment may be a response to a very particular kind of absence, reflecting a need to merge with that which is beyond the self, perhaps what Balint (1968) describes as “the aim of all human striving . . . to establish—or, probably, reestablish—an all-embracing harmony with one’s environment” (p. 65). In my own experience, unless the event is devastating, as in the plane crash, an oddly pleasurable feeling of recovering or discovering a connection with that which is beyond the self often accompanies the resolution of a psi event. It seems as though at those moments, what Loewald (1978) describes as “the interplay between unconscious and conscious . . . between the intense density of undifferentiated, inarticulate experience and the lucidity of conscious articulate experience” (p. 50) is heightened.⁷

PSI SPACE AND FEMALE SPACE: CONVERGENCE OF THE TWO DARK CONTINENTS

As indicated earlier, it seems that the time between the first perceived “beta” sensation and the articulation of a link to reality in a psi experience is a kind of gestation period. In my experience, I wait until the links somehow accumulate, and until a meaningful shape or word or scenario connecting the initial sensation to reality emerges (similar to the way analysts “contain” their patients’ conscious and unconscious utterances until meaning or patterns emerge). Although gestation is thought of in terms of time, it also implies a space, an inner space where something is held until it can be translated or delivered into the outside world.

Bion’s (1967) notion of the “mother’s reverie” (p. 116) and Winnicott’s (1975) notion of “primary maternal preoccupation”

(p. 302) can be understood as a particular kind of mental space—the site at which the infant’s beta elements are metabolized, translated by the mother’s psyche into alpha elements, and returned to the infant, bestowing upon the infant the capacity (alpha function) to transform beta elements into alpha. Thus, the mother’s reverie is a space of gestation, a gestation of embryonic bits and pieces of cognitive capacity needed by the infant until he is ready to find his own space of reverie, where he can achieve his own gestation of beta into alpha elements. In fact, I think that the most important early introjection may be that of space, not objects. Once space is introjected it can then be projected back out to create a sense of a universe-sized container in which endless chains of productive linking and thought can take place. Without that space, the fledgling ego cannot grow, and the unconscious sonar device has no space within which to reflect and get reflections back. Psychosis is one possible result of a failure of this crucial introjection of space. Experience of psi may represent a particular mode of projecting and introjecting space.

The concept of space provides a symbolic connection between female sexuality, the original “dark continent of psychological inquiry” (Freud, 1926, p. 212), and the *other* dark continent of psi. The mental gestation space necessary for the translation of psi events is a receptive space, more symbolically female, a space that holds and waits, yet interacts as well, as form takes shape within it. Receptivity is often confused with passivity (as sometimes occurs in psychoanalytic descriptions of the female role in sex), and yet, as in the mother’s reverie, it is its own kind of vital, shaping action. Perhaps the discomfort and avoidance our field has manifested toward the subject of psi phenomena is related to that regarding the more female, intuitive, receptive modes of processing existence, as well as certain aspects of female sexuality.

Constitutionally, the female is primed for experiences where subject and object, in-here and out-there distinctions are blurred. In addition to the female’s obvious sharing of space with the unborn child, post-Kleinian analyst Henri Rey (1994) states that “the genital organ of the woman reminds her all the time of her sexual inner space,” an inner space which he feels connects her symboli-

cally to the space of the universe (p. 265). The female sexual space is filled with sensation, arousal, and symbolic meaning and potential, yet is unseen, akin to the unseen but quantum-particle-filled space of the universe, and to the “unseen realities” of which William James (1902, p. 534) spoke. Another aspect of female biology that inclines her toward the experience of boundary-defying states is her capacity for multiple orgasms (the number of orgasms limited only by physical exhaustion (Sherfey, 1966, pp. 113–114). Much of psychoanalytic theory has focused on the “seen” or phallic potential to the exclusion of the “unseen” potential of female inner space and the psychodynamic ramifications of the woman’s experience of her inner space (other than as anxiety-producing), though much thought has certainly been given to the baby’s experience of that space (as in Kleinian theory).

Could this blindspot be related to that which has caused the field to overlook the significance of psi phenomena, and, until relatively recently, other more familiar “nonobjective kind[s] of knowledge” (Loewald, 1978, p. 34) such as empathy or intuition? The phrase “women’s intuition” has often connoted a kind of marginalized, “cute,” childlike capacity, not anything to be taken seriously as a valid mode of information gathering. And stories of mother–infant telepathy, where a mother might know from a distance that her baby is in danger, and rush to save the baby just in time, seem to be more easily accepted than other instances of telepathy, possibly because they are neatly bracketed. As long as psi stays within the nursery, and we can say that such uncanny symbiotic moments are just for babies and mothers, the threat to the secure boundaries of adult identity is diminished.

PSI AS A MANIFESTATION OF TRANSFERENCE AND COUNTERTRANSFERENCE

The need basis for psi was described by Ehrenwald (1978), who said that adults may retain telepathic capacity (forged in the crucible of the mother–infant bond) as a means of overcoming what he calls “communication gaps” (p. 22). Balint (1955), Schmeidler (1966), and others have noted that psi in analytic sessions may be prompted by a need on the part of the patient to break through

the analyst's reserve, to cover the distance between them. As Balint described it: "Certain talented people solve this very strained situation by administering a therapeutic shock to their analyst by producing apparently parapsychological phenomena" (p. 33).

Following is an example of the reverse of this situation, where the analyst unintentionally, at least without conscious intent, administered a shock to the patient, perhaps for the same reason as in Balint's cases—to overcome a communication gap.

Carla was 41 when she came to see me. She was married, employed on and off, had been hospitalized once for a suicide attempt, and frequently felt that her mother was trying to poison her. Her mother lived halfway across the country, but the poison could still get to Carla via two routes: over the telephone and in packages her mother would send on every possible occasion. These packages invariably contained gifts that were totally inappropriate for a grown woman, like embroidered signs with syrupy clichés or pajamas with Disney-like figures, each gift underscoring how little this mother knew or wanted to know about her daughter. Carla felt she had to accept the gifts, and thank her mother for them, even though they usually plummeted her into suicidal depression. She would stay in bed for days after a gift arrived, convinced she was going to die from the poison. Partly due to her numerous absences, she was fired from several jobs.

When February came, I found myself dreading her upcoming birthday, knowing a package would arrive and that it could nearly destroy her. I'd gone through several other holidays and family event-days with her, and she was unconvinced by anything either I or her husband suggested about discarding the packages without opening them, in other words, rejecting the poison. My sense was that Carla hoped against hope that one day a little "mother's milk" might arrive along with the poison, something that would indicate that her mother did connect with her in some meaningful way, and so she compulsively opened package after package. When her husband threw one of the packages out, Carla became hysterical and retrieved it from the garbage.

The week after her birthday, she made it in for her session, though she had not gone to work. I could feel the depression

clouds circling around her as she entered. She sat down and, though depressed, almost triumphantly began to describe how she had carried the package into her bedroom, and slowly opened it (triumphantly, I think, because she needed me to see just how horrible things continued to be for her). As she was describing the opening of the package, the kind of wrapping paper, the ribbon, I was following along in my mind and, without knowing it, must have gotten a frame or two ahead of her narration. I saw an article of clothing, like a dress, and found myself blurting out: "Oh, no! Mustard and fuchsia plaid! That's awful!" As I said it, Carla looked up at me with a look of bewilderment.

"How did you know?" she said. "It was a mustard and purple plaid jumper. A jumper! Who wears jumpers? And those colors! So ugly—how did you know?"

In the moment I was horrified. I would never have purposefully said anything of the sort. This was a spontaneous, unconscious mistake, and a huge one at that, the "analyzing instrument" run amok. I was so afraid Carla would feel invaded, even poisoned, by me, that it took me a moment to realize that she was not upset; in fact, she seemed relieved.

"Now you know!" she said. "Now you know exactly what it's like! You're poisoned too!"

When I realized what was happening, I went with it, reaffirming how awful, indeed, the gift was, and how now we would definitely have to find some antidote, some way of fighting this poison together before Easter, the next big holiday, because *I* simply couldn't take another poisoning. She smiled, aware that I was hamming it up a bit, but she was clearly happy that she was no longer alone in her claustrophobic mental space and that I was no longer mere witness; I was in the toxic trenches with her. From there, the space of our work seemed to open. Carla was more receptive to interpretations and questions that helped her loosen the grip her mother had on her psyche. By Easter, Carla was able to allow her husband to put an unopened package from her mother in the garage, until she finally decided to throw it out herself.

In this case, an inadvertent psi shock, a shock to both patient and therapist, served as a catalyst for growth and shifted the inter-

subjective field. Among many possibilities, perhaps Carla's unconscious need for an attuned mother, which she probably did not have even in infancy, was so powerful that it provoked my unconscious to produce the psi event, thereby creating in that moment between us an experience of the early mother–infant attunement she so desperately craved.⁸

THE CHALLENGE

Over a half century ago, Balint (1955) wrote an exhortation to the field of psychoanalysis regarding the exploration of parapsychological phenomena:

Perhaps we analysts ought to accept the role of pioneers in this field, as we have had some experience of what it means to make defences conscious. If we succeed in relinquishing the professional hypocrisy . . . surrounding parapsychological phenomena, we might get to grips with the underlying real problem, what the true nature and function of ESP is. (p. 35)

I would add that we would also learn more about the true nature and function of the unconscious, the cornerstone of psychoanalytic theory and practice. If we take seriously the unconscious communication that occurs in the intersubjective patient-analyst field, and if we accept the research indicating that unconscious mutual influencing is at the core of psychological development from the time we are infants (Beebe and Lachmann, 2002), then psychoanalysts should seriously explore the implications of psi phenomena, where unconscious influencing and communication are the norm. Psi is another royal road, perhaps an expressway, to the unconscious. We should get back on where Freud left off.

NOTES

1. The discovery of mirror neurons (Gallese, Fadiga, Fogassi, & Rizzolati, 1996) provides a clue to the underlying mechanism of attunement to each other's inner states. It was found that mirror neurons, a type of premotor neuron, were activated not only when monkeys executed certain actions, but also when they observed others (monkey or human) executing similar actions. Mirror neurons in the human brain have been found to play a role in understanding, without words, the intention of others (Iacoboni et al., 2005).

Perhaps one day mirror neurons will be discovered to explain *mental* exchanges of less directly observable bits of information, such as occurs in telepathy. Note how Freud's (1933) attempt to explain telepathy "mirrors" this possibility: "The telepathic process is supposed to consist in a mental act in one person instigating the same mental act in another person. What lies between these two mental acts may easily be a physical process into which the mental one is transformed at one end and which is transformed back once more into the same mental one at the other end" (p. 68).

2. Some contemporary authors, among them Bass (2001), Suchet (2004), and Eshel (2006), have written about their patients' telepathic dreams and other instances of uncanny "knowing" between analyst and patient. However, in most cases, these occurrences are presented as the special province of patient-analyst interconnectedness, as if instances of psychoanalytic unconscious communication can be cordoned off from the larger domain of unconscious communication within which they occur.
3. Anticipating questions regarding the quality of these studies, I refer the reader to *Foundations of Physics*, "Evidence for Consciousness-related Anomalies in Random Physical Systems" (December, 1989), in which "virtually all methodological criticisms raised to date" (p. 1504) are addressed. The article demonstrates that the effects produced in these experiments "are not a function of experimental quality, and that the replication rate is as good as that found in exemplary experiments in psychology and physics" (p. 1510). Also, Dean Radin's book *Entangled Minds* (2006) presents a broad array of confirmations of the PEAR program's results, and also addresses many of the commonly raised methodological criticisms.
4. Although many psi experiments have produced enormous odds against chance, the effect size is often quite small; e.g., subjects could alter a machine's expected output of 1's and 0's, but could not mentally hurl furniture across the room.
5. In order to address the understandable question of the subjective sense of time and possible retroactive reading of the past, I offer the following comment: While I did not immediately write down my experience, I did call my boss (the director) in New York at about noon (Paris time) to tell him what had transpired at the production meeting and also to explain to him why I left the meeting so early (very uncharacteristic behavior for me). In the conversation, which was prior to the plane's takeoff time, I told him in detail of the horrifying sensations and images I had experienced.
6. In other experiments, the subjects' accurate remote perceptions of the undisclosed site were performed precognitively before an agent arrived at the site, and sometimes before the site was even selected. These precognitive remote viewing experiments, conducted by the PEAR lab, yielded odds against chance of a hundred billion to one (Radin, 1997, p. 105).
7. The pleasurable feeling associated with psi may also be related to the "economy in psychical expenditure" cited by Freud (1905, p. 169) as the basis for the sensation of pleasure and release associated with jokes. It is a feeling familiar to many people who have experienced a simple form of psi—when a person whom they have not seen in many years suddenly comes to mind and a few minutes later they receive a phone call from that very person.
8. Reik (1948) postulates two distinct pathways by which analysts might acquire "uncanny" intuitive knowledge about their patients. The first is that conscious

or sense-based material is assimilated in the unconscious and reemerges in some form of conscious understanding. In the second mode, which I believe to be more relevant to my blurting out the particular colors of the jumper sent by Carla's mother, Reik describes unknown, possibly archaic senses that at times may bypass or override the normal sensory routes. He notes: "Possibly these unknown senses work faster than those we know, can communicate their perceptions to the unconscious faster than the senses developed later, and so seem to act through the air" (p. 139).

REFERENCES

- APA PRESIDENTIAL TASK FORCE ON EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE. (2006). Evidence-based practice in psychology. *American Psychologist*, *61*(4):271–285.
- ARIETI, S. (1968a). The psychodynamics of schizophrenia: A reconsideration. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, *22*:366–381.
- _____. (1968b). Psychotherapy of schizophrenia. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *6*:20–30.
- BALINT, M. (1955). Notes on parapsychology and parapsychological healing. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *36*:31–35.
- _____. (1968). *The basic fault: The therapeutic aspects of regression*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- BALTER, L., LOTHANE, Z., & SPENCER, J. (1980). On the analyzing instrument. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, *49*:474–504.
- BASS, A. (2001). It takes one to know one: Or, whose unconscious is it anyway? *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, *11*:683–702.
- BEEBE, B., & LACHMANN, F. (2002). *Infant research and adult treatment: Co-constructing intractions*. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.
- BENEDETTI, G. (1980). Individual psychotherapy of schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, *6*:4.
- _____. (1987). Illuminations of the human condition in the encounter with the psychotic patient. In J. Sacksteder, D. P. Schwartz, & Y. Akabane (Eds.), *Attachment and the therapeutic process: Essays in honor of Otto Allen Will, Jr., M.D.* (pp. 185–196). Madison: International Universities Press.
- _____. (1990). Depression, psychosis, schizophrenia. In P. Borri & R. Quartesan (Eds.), *USA-Europe joint meeting on therapies and psychotherapy of schizophrenia* (pp. 7–17). ARP, Perugia, Italy.
- _____. (1992). The psychotherapy of psychotic and schizophrenic patients and factors facilitating this. In P. Borri (Ed.), *USA-Europe conference on facilitating climate for the therapeutic relation in mental health services* (pp. 1–15). Perugia: ARS.
- BION, W. R. (1965). *Transformations*. London: Maresfield Library, 1991.
- _____. (1967). *Second thoughts*. London: Maresfield Library, 1993.
- _____. (1970). *Attention and interpretation*. New Jersey: Jason Aronson, 1995.
- BOSS, M. (1977). *Existential foundations of medicine and psychology*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- BOUWMEESTER, D., PAN, J., MATTLE, K., EIDL, M., WEINFURTER, H., & ZEILINGER, A. (1997). Experimental quantum teleportation. *Nature*, *390*:575–579.

- BRABANT, E., FALZEDER, E., & GIAMPIERI-DEUTSCH, P. (EDS.). (1993). *The correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sandor Ferenczi: Volume 1, 1908–1914* (F.T. Hoffer, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- BRAUD, W. G., & SCHLITZ, M. J. (1991). Consciousness interactions with remote biological systems: Anomalous intentionality effects. *Journal of Subtle Energies*, 2(1):1–46.
- DUNNE, B., & JAHN, R. G. (2005). Consciousness, information, and living systems. *Cellular & Molecular Biology*, 51:703–714.
- DUPONT, J. (ED.). (1988). *The clinical diary of Sandor Ferenczi* (M. Balint & N. Z. Jackson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- EHRENWALD, J. (1978). *The ESP experience: A psychiatric validation*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- EISENBUD, J. (1946). Telepathy and problems of psychoanalysis. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 15:32–87.
- _____. (1947). The dreams of two patients in analysis interpreted as a telepathic reve à deux. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 16:39–60.
- ESHEL, O. (2006). Where are you, my beloved? *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 87:1603–1627.
- FALZEDER, E., & BRABANT, E. (EDS.). (1996). *The correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sandor Ferenczi: Volume 2, 1914–1919* (P. T. Hoffer, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- FARRELL, D. (1983). Freud's 'Thought-Transference', repression, and the future of psychoanalysis. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 64:71–81.
- FEDERN, P. (1952). *Ego psychology and the psychoses*. (E. Weiss, Ed.). New York: Basic Books.
- FREUD, S. (1905). Jokes and their relation to the unconscious. (J. Strachey, Trans.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc, 1960.
- _____. (1912). Recommendations to physicians practicing psycho-analysis. *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*. 24 vols. London: Hogarth Press, 1957-1974. 12:111–120.
- _____. (1915). The unconscious. *Standard ed.*, 14:159–215. London: Hogarth Press.
- _____. (1922). Dreams and telepathy. In G. Devereaux (Ed.), *Psychoanalysis and the occult* (pp. 69–86). New York: International Universities Press, 1973.
- _____. (1925). The occult significance of dreams. In G. Devereaux (Ed.), *Psychoanalysis and the occult* (pp. 87–90). New York: International Universities Press, 1973.
- _____. (1926). The question of lay analysis. *Standard ed.*, 20:206–217. London: Hogarth Press.
- _____. (1930). *Civilization and its discontents*. (J. Strachey, Ed. and Trans.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- _____. (1933). Dreams and occultism. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), *New introductory lectures on psycho-analysis* (pp. 38–70). New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1965.
- _____. (1941). Psychoanalysis and telepathy. In G. Devereaux (Ed.), *Psychoanalysis and the occult* (pp. 56–68). New York: International Universities Press, 1973.
- GALLESE, V. (2003). The manifold nature of interpersonal relations: The quest

- for a common mechanism. In C. Frith & D. Wolpert (Eds.), *The neuroscience of social interaction*. London: Oxford University Press.
- GALLESE, V., EAGLE, M. N., & MIGONE, P. (2007). Intentional attunement: Mirror neurons and the neural underpinnings of interpersonal relations. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 55(1):131–176.
- GALLESE, V., FADIGA, L., FOGASSI, L., & RIZZOLATTI, G. (1996). Action recognition in the premotor cortex. *Brain*, 119:593–609.
- HENRY, W. P. (1998). Science, politics, and the politics of science: The use and misuse of empirically validated treatment research. *Psychotherapy Research*, 8(2):126–140.
- IACOBONI, M., MOLNER-SZAKACS, I., GALLESE, V., BUCCINO, G., MAZZIOTTA, J. C., & RIZZOLATTI G. (2005). Grasping the intentions of others with one's own mirror neuron system. *PLoS Biology*, 3(3):e79.s
- ISAKOWER, O. (1963a). *Minutes of the faculty meeting October 14*. New York Psychoanalytic Institute. Unpublished.
- _____. (1963b). *Minutes of the faculty meeting November 20*. New York Psychoanalytic Institute. Unpublished.
- JAHN, R. G., & DUNNE, B. J. (2001). A Modular model of mind/matter manifestation (M5). *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 15(3):29–329.
- JAMES, W. (1902). *The varieties of religious experience*. New York: Penguin Books.
- JONES, E. (1957). *The life and work of Sigmund Freud: Volume 3, the last phase, 1919–1939*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- JUNG, C. G. (1965). *Memories, dreams, reflections*. (A. Jaffee, Ed.; R. & C. Winston, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1961)
- KLEIN, D. N., SCHWARTZ, J. E., SANTIAGO, N. J., VIVIAN, D., VOCISANO, C, CASTONGUAY, L. G., & KELLER, M. B. (2003). Therapeutic alliance in depression treatment: Controlling for prior change and patient characteristics. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71(6):997–1006.
- Psychoanalytic Inquiry, 21:113–131.
- LOEWALD, H. W. (1978). *Psychoanalysis and the history of the individual*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- _____. (1979). The waning of the Oedipus complex. In *The Essential Loewald: Collected Papers and Monographs*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- LUBORSKY, L., McLELLAN, A. T., WOODY, G. E., O'BRIEN, C. P., & AUERBACH, A. (1985). Therapist success and its determinants. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 42(6):602–611.
- MAYER, E. L. (1996). Changes in science and changing ideas about knowledge and authority in psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, LXV:158–200.
- _____. (2001). On "Telepathic Dreams?": An unpublished paper by Robert J. Stoller. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 49(2):629–657.
- _____. (2007). *Extraordinary knowing*. New York: Bantam Books.
- MENAKER, E. (1953). Masochism—a defense reaction of the ego. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 22:205–222.
- MOORE, DAVID A. (2005). *Three in four Americans believe in paranormal*. Princeton: Gallup News Service.
- NEIMARK, J. (1996). Do the spirits move you? *Psychology Today*, 29(5):48–54.
- NORCROSS, J., BEUTLER, L., & LEVANT, R. (2005). *Evidence-based practices in mental*

- health: Debate and dialogue on the fundamental questions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- OGDEN, T. (1979). On projective identification. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 60:357–373.
- OGDEN, T. (1994). The analytic third: Working with intersubjective clinical facts. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 75(1):3–19.
- RADIN, D. (1997). *The conscious universe: The scientific truth of psychic phenomena*. San Francisco: Harper Edge.
- RADIN, D. (2006). *Entangled minds: Extrasensory experiences in a quantum reality*. New York: Paraview Pocket Books.
- RADIN, D., & NELSON, R. (1989). Evidence for consciousness-related anomalies in random physical systems. *Foundations of Physics*, 19(12):1499–1514.
- RAGLAND-SULLIVAN, E. (1986). *Jacques Lacan and the philosophy of psychoanalysis*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- REIK, T. (1948). *Listening with the third ear*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- REY, H. (1994). Femininity, sexuality and inner space. In J. Magagna (Ed.), *Universals of psychoanalysis in the treatment of psychotic and borderline states* (pp. 263–276). London: Free Association Books.
- SCHMEIDLER, G. (1966). Two horns of a dilemma in relating ESP to personality. *Corrective Psychiatry and Journal of Social Therapy*, 12:98–114.
- SCHMEIDLER, G., & MCCONNELL, R. (1958). *ESP and personality patterns*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- SCHORE, A. N. (2006, June). *Neurobiology and attachment theory in psychotherapy*. Workshop conducted at Mount Sinai Medical Center, New York.
- SEARLES, H. F. (1973). Concerning therapeutic symbiosis. *Annual of Psychoanalysis*, 1:247–262.
- _____ (1976). Transitional phenomena and therapeutic symbiosis. *International Journal of Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy*, 5:145–204.
- SERVADIO, E. (1973). Psychoanalysis and telepathy. In G. Devereaux (Ed.), *Psychoanalysis and the occult* (pp. 210–220). (Original work published 1935)
- SHERFEY, M. J. (1966). The evolution and nature of female sexuality in relation to psychoanalytic theory. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 14:28–125.
- STERN, D. N. (1985). *The interpersonal world of the infant*. New York: Basic Books.
- STERN, D. N., SANDER, L., NATHAN, J., HARRISON, A., BRUSCHWEILER-STERN, N., & TRONICK, E. (1998). Non-interpretative mechanisms in psychoanalytic therapy: The ‘something more’ than interpretation. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 79:903–921.
- SUCHET, M. (2004). Whose mind is it anyway? *Studies in Gender and Sexuality*, 5(3):259–287.
- TAUSK, V. (1948). Psychosis: On the origin of the “influencing machine” in schizophrenia. In R. Fliess, (Ed.), *The Psycho-analytic reader: An anthology of essential papers with critical introductions* (pp. 31–64). New York: International Universities Press. [Reprinted from *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, II, pp. 519–556, D. Feigenbaum, Trans., 1933. (Original work published in 1919)]
- THALBOURNE, M. A., & DELIN, P. S. (1994). A common thread underlying belief in the paranormal, creative personality, mystical experience and psychopathology. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 58:3–38.
- ULLMAN, M. (1966). A nocturnal approach to psi. *Proceedings of the Parapsychological Association*, 3:35–62.

- WALLERSTEIN, R. S. (1995). The effectiveness of psychotherapy and psychoanalysis: Conceptual issue and empirical work. In T. Shapiro & R. N. Emde (Eds.), *Research in psychoanalysis: Process, developmental, outcome* (pp. 299–312). CT: International Universities Press.
- WILSON, S. C., & BARBER, T. X. (1983). The fantasy-prone personality: Implications for understanding imagery, hypnosis, and parapsychological phenomenon. In A.A. Sheikh (Ed.), *Imagery: Current theory, research and application* (pp. 340–390). New York: Wiley.
- WINNICOTT, D.W. (1975). *Through pediatrics to psycho-analysis*. New York: Basic Books.

200 W. 54th Street, #8K
New York, New York 10019
E-mail: Dr.RuthRose@gmail.com

The Psychoanalytic Review
Vol. 98, No. 1, February 2011