Lefty, Alice, and Jim

**SPECIAL
SUBSECTION**

James Carpenter
carpjim@gmail.com

PLATINUM OPEN ACCESS

James McClenon and his group (the M-group), are telling us a story that they lived into being. The heroes of the story are named Alice and Lefty. They are unlikely heroes, crude little objects made of paper and foil and needles, and flimsy enough to be flipped into the air by a strong breeze. Yet they carry the weight of challenging an understanding of everything that almost all of us share almost all of the time.

The M-group assigned personal names to these things because they seemed to display something like life and purpose. Some of us name our cars. They spring into life, from inert to ready to race, with the push of a button, and they are reliable enough in responding to us to seem something like loyal or even loving, and their powers are largely a mystery to most of us. Certainly, if we were challenged to make one, we would be at a loss. Easy enough to imagine life and agency.

This sort of development from flimsy toys with inexplicable activity to a shared sense of personal agency is precisely what is most interesting to McClenon, the sociologist. He wants to understand how anomalous experiences, expressed by the most predisposed individuals, can become a subject of conflicted interest, then excited group involvement, and then evoke a set of ideas aimed at understanding them, and lead thence to collective belief systems with more magic in them than our normal sense of reality permits. Perhaps religions are born that way.

McClenon, the sociologist, takes the typical posture of participant/observer. This is not just a research attitude, it is also a ratio. Before the series of experiments he reports here, he was heavy on the observer side, maintaining strict critical objectivity even while consorting with table-tilters who dallied with magical thinking – like the anthropologist who lived with cannibals but managed to never eat human flesh. In retrospect, he thinks he was too critical and analytical then, and discouraged the phenomena he was hoping to produce. The phenomena he pursued all involved the anomalous movement of things, or macro-PK.

To try to do more PK-productive work, he took guidance from the approach of Kenneth Batcheldor (1984), who thought that a lively group process, unimpeded by too much effort to control non-paranormal artifacts, is optimal for generating a group mentality friendly to psi which is then conducive to genuine macro-PK (séance-like table movements, anomalous and sometimes intelligently responsive sounds or lights, odd electronic disturbances, etc.). The approach has been successfully applied by others, including the Toronto "Philip" group led by Iris Owen (1976). He also took guidance from researchers who reported that such experiments were more likely to be successful if they included at least one presumably gifted participant (someone already inclined to produce such things) (Gimeno & Burgo, 2017). Then, he took the bold step of moving the whole project online, conducting group sessions virtually, where the only contact people had with one another was via their screens. This proved propitious as the Pandemic unfolded.

McClenon then summarizes for us the results of three series of virtual group sessions with

evolving group membership spanning about three and a half years. The first was aiming to produce various séance-room phenomena and create a fictional "spirit" like Owen's Philip. The last two series were focused on the movements of pinwheels, although various other anomalous events were noted as well.

The first series did not result in the consensual "spirit" or clear group-related phenomena that he hoped for. What it did do was stimulate a lively interest in the members in all things paranormal and a string of strange, apparently anomalous events in the lives of several participants, including McClenon himself. The last two series did result in many observations of apparently anomalous pinwheel movements, as well as other odd events such as inexplicable equipment failures. The M-group then tested a series of hypotheses relating social-psychological variables to pinwheel behavior. The results of these last two series are what I will focus on here.

Throughout this long effort, it is clear that the story created by the M-group has another hero in addition to Lefty and Alice: It is Jim McClenon himself. Perhaps the only consistent member throughout all this work, he modified his theories and hypotheses, and tried to test them and evaluate them. It is here that we see another duality in McClenon. Along with being a sociologist, he is also acting as an experimental parapsychologist.

It is this role enactment that will draw him the most criticism, severe, I expect, for some. His controls are loose and improvisational and casually described. His psychological measures are crude and unvalidated and of uncertain reliability. Observations are more episodic than systematic. And there are other methodological criticisms one could make – but I won't go into all this. Others may do it, better than I could, and in any case, I don't want to, and I don't consider the problems crucially important.

Yes, Lefty and Alice standing out on a table uncovered, or even sometimes partially covered, make for a messy experimental platform. Air currents move them wily-nilly. They are subject to much activity determined by normal factors. Our normal experimental attitude in parapsychology insists that, first of all, our protocol must assure us that what we are measuring cannot be caused by normal means. Only then is there any point to measuring anything and testing any hypothesis. We must lead with our skepticism about even the existence of PK in every situation, control all normal means of influence on the target system as well as possible, and only then follow with our tentative conjectures about the magical something-more. Maybe start with some Batcheldorian looseness, but then tighten up controls before measuring anything. We must always initially doubt the reality of PK, make sure our system completely addresses that doubt, and only then carry out tests of this putative phenomenon.

But I'm no longer so convinced of all of that. The truth is that, in this situation, I am a soft sell. I do not really doubt anymore that macro-PK occurs, and for some people, it occurs quite a bit. And I do not doubt that pinwheel behavior can express it.

A number of years ago, I spent some time with a well-studied poltergeist agent and witnessed many anomalous movements, noises, and one minor explosion. Normal causes might be imagined for some of the events, but not all, including the rapid skidding of a heavy wrench toward her from an empty room. It was eerie and disorienting. Then, some colleagues placed this individual in a very tightly controlled experimental protocol (influencing the firing of a sea-slug nerve cell), and she performed very well. She also carried out a computer-generated PK experiment for me in my own office, and it was highly successful. She had only the slimmest amount of control over the phenomena in everyday situations, but when challenged in an experiment, she did have some (Roll, 2004). I was left with no doubt that sometimes macro-PK happens.

Then, in more recent years, I was able to spend some time with a woman who had been at a poltergeist center as a child but was currently trying to return to the phenomena with an experimental spirit to try to gain some control over it – using pinwheels sealed inside jars. This Pinwheel Wizard could place her hands near a jar and set a paper pinwheel moving, make it speed up and slow down, stop and start, and change direction on command. I saw her start one from another room. Then in the process of a spirited demonstration that she was making for us in a small group, I asked that the jar be handed around. My wife, my daughter, and I were all able to make it move without touching or moving the jar; some other people present could not. Then the next morning, as the Wizard was flying back home, I put together a similar apparatus, a heavy glass mason jar with a rubber seal and clamp top, with a pinwheel inside like the Wizard's, made of eraser, needle, and folded piece of paper. I set the device on a counter in front of my wife and asked her to try to move it. She put her hands a few inches from the jar, and the pinwheel whirled. Then I put it, now still, in front of me, placed my hands near the jar, and wished that it would move, and sure enough, it did. As it was happily turning, it was as if I heard an inner voice shout NO! and the movement stopped. We haven't been able to move it again.

There does seem to be some sort of psychological power to our normal consensus reality in which things stay put until they are normally moved. It's certainly a more workable world. In the contagion of excitement and interest stirred up by the Wizard, we ordinary people could do extraordinary things, but not for long. So, I am quite prepared to think that a group like the one McClenon has formed could conceivably pump up such PK-conducive contagious excitement. Maybe they did, or maybe not, but I don't doubt that it can happen.

Finally, I am an easy sell because I was also involved in a long study of psi in a group context, a well-controlled experi-

ment in which I was able to leave the role of an experimenter and be a participant as well. At some point, I realized that I was doing quite well, as was the group as a whole (Carpenter & Sanks, 2017). This altered my sense of myself, and led to a period of some weeks in which I experienced many striking ESP occurrences. So, I do not doubt that paranormal experience in an accepting, energetic group setting can stimulate psi experiences outside the group in surprising and unpredictable ways. Every reader will assess a paper in the context of his or her own most pertinent experiences, and these are some of my own.

Now, I turn to what we might consider the main experimental findings of McClenon's paper, the ones which he can statistically assess, so I can develop one theoretical context in which they might be understood.

First, McClenon tells us that pinwheel movement was facilitated by the ongoing group activity, all Zoomed-in and talking. He demonstrates this by counting movements detected during a series of 24 group sessions and also during the same time period in the six non-experimental days of each of those 24 weeks. During the sessions, the mean number of movements was 35.5, and during the control periods, it was 14.5. The difference is statistically significant. He then repeated this with another series of sessions and control periods. Here, the means were 27.12 and 5.58, again statistically significant. The pinwheels in their room moved more when the group was meeting virtually elsewhere, than they did when it was not meeting.

However, not all meetings were equal in this respect. Based on accumulating observations, McClenon hypothesized that certain topical and emotional events in meetings made the pinwheels more or less active. Discussions on topics most pertinent to the activity at hand (psychical research, anomalous experiences, and occult traditions) were expected to increase activity, as were laughter and other expressions of emotion. Some meetings had meditation periods. These were predicted to reduce activity, as were discussions on topics not having to do with the psychical and anomalous, and turning deliberate attention to the pinwheels to check on their movement was also expected to diminish activity. Composites of these positive and negative predictions did predict pinwheel movement significantly. Among the elements of these composites, laughter failed to show the predicted effect, and emotion, while showing the predicted trend, proved to be difficult to code.

So here are a few findings. How best to interpret them?

I would like to propose a theoretical framework I have developed called First Sight Theory (FST). I gave it this name because, as developed in my text (Carpenter, 2012), I applied it mostly to how psi works on and is expressed in perception and memory. According to my theory, psi has two interdependent sides: a receptive/perceptive side (ESP) and an active/expressive side (PK). Applied to PK, it could as well be called First Act

Theory (FAT).

A basic premise of FAT is that *PK is something people do*. We do it unconsciously, as we do most things, but it is done by us and not by forces or things external to us, although it certainly must engage those and be intimately entangled with them. We experience unconscious actions of our own as things that "just happen" or that are caused by things other than us, but when we focus on the personal intentionality of the acts, it is clear that we are the implicit actors. To take a trivial example, as I type these words, I am not consciously seeking out each keystroke, directing the fingers to punch thus and so on each letter – but it is my thoughts that are being expressed by those punches. The intentionality makes them mine, even though I had no conscious awareness of carrying them out.

This is all in my body, and this is where FAT says that PK does most of its work and, in an everyday sense, what it is mostly "for." It connects my intentions (including unconscious intentions) to my nervous system and musculature and thence to the actions that I desire. In regards to ESP, FST argues that its predominant action is its participation in the process of selection among the multidinous inputs of sensation and memory and extrasensory prehensions to elect the product that emerges in consciousness. This involves much categorizing, sorting, directing (positive or negative), and ranking, all done out of sight of awareness. Like very faint and unconscious sensory impressions (subliminal perception), extrasensory prehensions serve as biasing factors in that rapid, perpetual, pre-conscious decision-making process that leads to our perceptions and thoughts and our behavioral decisions.

Both FST and FAT (it's really one theory, I'll call it FAT from now on here) assume that we are always unconsciously prehending a vast expanse of reality beyond our sensory ken. These prehensions are intrinsically unconscious, but as the name implies, they have a kind of grip on things, a grip that is guided by our intentions.

If psi is unconsciously employed predominantly within the body and the mind and is intrinsically unconscious, how do we ever know that the more distal prehensions are present and active? It is by noting their apparently inadvertent expressions in our experience and behavior and in the experience of others and the behavior of things around us. When are we most likely to see such inadvertent expressions? It is when the normal processes of perceiving and acting are blocked, and yet the need for the perceptions and actions is pressing, and when the individual is psychologically open to their expression.

FAT proposes that several things incline us to be psychologically open in this way, including a positive interest in the subject, a tendency to respect and reach into the mind and body beyond immediate consciousness as in creative processes, and a high situational pertinence in the moment of the perception or action. What disinclines us to openness is fear and dread (these shrink the phenomenal world to the immediate

dangers), shame (this cuts off emotional engagement with the world), attitudes against the reality or desirability of distal influences, and cognitive work and task-focus, which also shrink the world to the focus of the work (unless the work involves expressing the anomalous). What makes a need pressing for any potential perception or action? It is affect. As the brilliant but rather neglected psychologist Silvan Tomkins noted, it is affect that motivates (Tomkins, 1963, 2008). A question or need can incline us to something, but it is affect that makes these things *pressing.*

There is another big factor that makes us more or less positively inclined to the active participation of psi in our affairs. As in all matters of attitude and interest, our social context is very important. All of us almost all of the time are psychologically stuffed with the presumption of the non-occurrence of psi, and those around us are equally stuffed. This is highly functional. If I direct my attention to my dog at the door, I want to see him and not some other dog in the next town. If I go to sit in a chair, I want it to stay where it is and not demonstrate some agency to move about on its own as I descend. The world works best without psi, generally speaking, so we generally leave it out of our mundane lives, and out of our conscious experience. This is true even for those of us who enjoy thinking about psi. Since our social groups generally share this presumption of non-occurrence, we reinforce these attitudes for one another.

So, if we want to dilate our receptiveness to PK it makes great sense to form a temporarily aberrant group that indulges the possibility of PK, talks it up, and even exults in its expression. A kind of role-loosening party atmosphere would help a lot. With that we have a social context is which openness is mutually reinforced, an interpersonal bubble in which we can play at believing and then, with evidence, come to believe. Like church-goers, who return to a setting in which they can act as if they believe, and by the end, find themselves believing more and then perhaps experience the fruits of their belief, whatever they might be, unfold apparently unbidden. This is the sort of social bubble that the M-group created.

It is noteworthy that as soon as McClenon included PK-prone persons in his group, who experienced and expected PK events, and talked easily about them, other group members started experiencing various anomalous events in their own environs.

I reiterate here a basic assumption of FAT: It is that each person uses PK easily, unconsciously, and continuously, almost entirely within their own bodies, but is fully capable of employing it more distally in the right circumstances. PK-prone people tend more than most to carry those circumstances with them, with their greater experience of PK and interest and openness regarding it. With enough shared, excited affect to make these things contagious, other people can borrow their PK-proneness and begin to find it expressed around themselves.

The sphere of this expression is likely to be fairly small for each person, right in their own immediate environs and in the context of their frequent concerns. This is not because FAT assumes some intrinsic limitation by distance with PK. To the contrary, it assumes that it is essentially boundless. But just as I choose generally to speak to those around me in our familiar language about our relatively contained cluster of concerns, rather than with some Norwegian I do not know about the goings on in his life, my PK will be as limited in scope as my speech and other behavior. For this reason, I assume that the anomalous events in the lives of the different members of the M-group are caused inadvertently by themselves, and not by other members.

An exception to this may be the pinwheels. As we learned during the Pandemic, one can have a real, if not entirely satisfying, sense of presence with other people and places through screens. For this reason, FAT would assume that any and all members might have effects on the shared pinwheels, even if McClenon's effects might be the most frequent, particularly between meetings.

So, let's consider McClenon's findings in light of the assumptions of FAT. The pinwheels moved much more when the groups were meeting than when they were not. This systematic relationship shows that while air drafts and other artifacts surely influenced the pinwheels, such artifacts should have been equally present in both conditions, and so cannot account for the greater movement during meetings. More than that, they show that when the group devoted its attention, interest, and emotion to the pinwheels, all while ramping up with each other a sense of PK possibility and excitement, the pinwheels moved.

This connection is further elaborated in the findings about group process. Perhaps the strongest contrast shown is between 2 kinds of conversation engaged in: one in which the paranormal was being talked up, and the other in which it was not. Larger movements virtually stopped when non-psi interests were being discussed, but were much more present when psi-related topics were instead. This difference in topics is a good indicator of the degree to which openness to PK was being actively indulged and invested with emotion in the moment. FAT says this is when it should be more expressed, and it was.

Similarly, FAT would expect that periods of meditation, inward and emotionally calm as they are, should bring the excited engagement in the topic down to zero, which is where the pinwheel activity was found to be.

Choosing to observe the pinwheels, to check on their behavior, would also be expected to abruptly break the excited engagement, and replace it with anxious, careful scrutiny. Anxiety, narrow focus, and cognitive work are expected by FAT to diminish the expression of psi, and they seem to do that here.

FAT would have more qualified predictions about the effect of emotion. Positive affect, especially in the context of

active interest in anomaly, should facilitate happy pinwheel movement. Negative affect, fear or anger or shame or contempt, should shrink the expression of PK, except when the expressions are matched to the feelings, aggressive or protective, perhaps.

Based upon their impressions, McClenon expected that instances of laughter would predict good movement, but it did not. FAT would again make qualified predictions.

Here, as in other places, some reference to the extensive psychological literature on small group processes would help efforts like this one. Most of the time, unless a group is well developed with good rapport, laughter is nervous laughter. It is indicative of tension, social unease, and uncertainty, sometimes boredom. These are all things that FAT would expect to be associated with low expression of psi. In a mature, bonded group, laughter is often a different thing. It can indicate pleasure, reduction of tensions, mutual affirmation, enjoyment of one another, and the kind of creative language that spontaneous jokes require. FAT would expect this sort of laughter to go along with active pinwheels, especially if the topic at hand has anything to do with the pleasures of anomaly.

An old paper by Tuckman (Tuckman, 1965) spells out a normative sequence of development for the lives of small groups. He calls the main stages *Forming, Storming, Norming, and Performing.* (See also Bonebright [2010] and Sorensen and McCroskey [1977] for information about the research and practical applications of these constructs). Early in the development of a group, when *Forming,* activity is highly leader-centered, and if, as in some therapy or training groups, leadership is rather vague, people are nervous, listless, uncertain and tentative. Further along comes a period of *Storming* which groups sometimes do not survive, in which differences of goals and style emerge and lead to conflict, and members challenge leaders. If this stage is negotiated successfully, the group moves to *Norming*; people resolve their differences, come to agreements about means and ends, relate positively with the leader again, form in-group language and history, and begin to enjoy and appreciate one another more. It is in this stage that a group forms the kind of core narrative or ideology recommended by Batcheldor and sought by McClenon. Following this stage, the group can mature to *Performing,* in which it works effectively on its tasks, whether they are addressing emotional problems, planning a corporation's goals and policies, choosing how to spend a PTA budget, or setting pinwheels spinning on command. This is when a group functions really well and with gusto, and the group is truly more than the sum of its parts.

From the account in this paper, the various iterations of the M-group seem to have spent most of their sessions in the *Forming* and *Storming* phases. Membership changed a lot, and conflicts derailed the process more than once. This is not a criticism of McClenon's leadership or the members. These early stages, if not universal, are normal. The sizable literature on small group behavior and development might be helpful to anyone wanting to extend this line of work. The work of the National Training Laboratory (NTL: Jones & Brazzel, 2014) would be a good place to start. A lot has been learned about how to prepare for group developmental issues and negotiate them successfully.

To reiterate, emotional urgency, response pertinence, psychological openness, and the blockage of normal physical action are held by FAT to be conditions facilitating PK. They don't always lead to it, but they may, and instances when they seem to, have been the stimuli to our invention of the PK construct.

The poltergeist girl I mentioned earlier, with whom I witnessed such mind-altering events, it was later revealed, began "expressing" these phenomena in the context of an abusive situation in which she felt imprisoned, but that she realized later she urgently wished to escape. The fact that it was not revealed at the time (although there were hints in her projective testing) is one indication of how trapped she was, unable even to name it.

Another former poltergeist girl recounted to me that one of her first experiences with apparent PK was when, as a child, she was grabbed and pinned down by an abusive teacher. She was helpless and terrified. Then, there was a loud noise, and the teacher was on his back several feet away, stunned and confused. Her family had been comfortable with stories about paranormal events, so there was the openness, the urgent need, and the inability to normally act on the problem.

But not every such dilemma leads to PK events. In fact, most do not. Why not?

And if, as FAT argues, PK is perpetually being employed, why do we not employ it beyond the body more frequently? We might also ask, why should we? After all, we all find lifetimes full of projects, concerns, and troubles to contend with just with our own bodies, as skillfully as we can manage to use them, so why ask for more to deal with?

And why go to the formidable amount of work that might be required to learn to use PK beyond the body? We might all have a pre-conscious grip on the extended world all of the time, but isn't it reasonable to think it might be very difficult to train that primitive grip, and develop the skills required for it to obey our intentions and be consciously useful?

I use the word "skill" purposefully. I want to venture here a tentative model for the development of extra-body PK, based on FAT. Adults may generally think that walking and running, sitting upright and talking coherently, and perceiving things correctly are just givens, requiring little attention and effort. This is because they have the adult's illusion that these are not all hard-earned skills. You learned them yourself once, at the cost of an almost unbelievable amount of effort, but you have forgotten that because you developed most of it when you were a baby.

If you have ever cared for an infant, or spent considerable time observing one, you will know what I mean. When awake, an infant keeps very busy. Perhaps she is your daughter. She squirms and jerks and flails and twitches, seemingly randomly and to no good effect. Watch her for a while, though, and you see her purposes and failures and achievements. She reaches and reaches and reaches and grasps nothing. Then, one day, with a reach, she grasps something, and a brief smile that suggests surprise and pleasure raises the edges of her mouth. Perhaps it is your finger that she grasps, and you smile back, and her smile learns a bit that your smile has communicated with hers. She seems to want to turn over. Again, much twisting and flailing, some bursts of frustration or interludes of sleep, then back to work. More work and more work, writhing and twisting. Come in later after her nap, and you find her on her belly, now exploring new surfaces with her hands, mouth, and feet. Back to work again. Trying to get up leads to so much falling down. She is training her nervous system to do her will. In terms of FAT, she is training her PK, which is the link between impulse and action, as well as intention and behavior. How disorganized her body is, how much it flies off in useless directions, until she learns to put it together, bit by bit. It's a good thing that she is too young to wonder if all this frustration means that her body is inhabited by strange spirits who enjoy tricking her, or perhaps reflects the possibility that the quantum indeterminacy of bodies means that these things can never be mastered. Unbothered by such ideas, she carries on her work, day after day. After so much trial and effort, failure and punishing failure, we see the succession of triumphs. She grasps, she pulls up, she stands, she walks, she speaks, and communicates. Of course, there are moments when the infant is not so active, when she stares around her, seemingly engrossed. She is training her skills of perception. She learns to pick out her mother's face and daddy's voice from all the faces and voices. She is training her in-mind ESP, her capacity to organize inputs, put things in categories, know what things are, and tell in a flash what matters the most.

We take these basic skills and make them the foundation upon which to erect other skills, and never rest on our laurels. Our body-centered use of psi is our ground, and we spend a lifetime elaborating it and building upon it. We do what we sense is most integral to our existence. Forming the skills to control the body, its movements and perceptions and communications, are what matter the most to the infant, and thence to all of us later.

But what if later in our development, we wish to have greater controlled access to the larger world beyond ourselves and employ our PK outside of our body? This model suggests that we will need to do something like what we did as infants – put a prodigious amount of effort into it. Remember the directions for getting to Carnegie Hall? Practice, practice, practice.

My model suggests that in this effort to train PK outside the body, we will again be as inept and almost helpless as we were as children training our PK to move our bodies and our ESP to create our perceptions. Movements will be fitful and random and off-target more often than not. There will be much failure to try to redeem with the occasional success.

I think this is one way to understand the large number of anomalous events experienced by the M-group. They were the flailings of untrained skill.

Maybe the most dramatic one was experienced by McClenon himself. He had finished the series showing that group sessions produced more pinwheel movements than control periods, and he was probably feeling pretty happy with himself, thinking that perhaps a "group energy" was doing the moving, and he could tack a nice discovery to the bulletin board of science. Then he decided to do a one-trial test of this idea in which he was alone, no group involved, and he expected that there should be little movement. Instead, perversely, there was a lot of movement (FAT would say that his excitement and interest in PK were quite high at that time, facilitating more movement, not less). At the same time as this unwanted movement was occurring, another anomalous movement happened in his kitchen, while he and his wife stood facing a counter elsewhere in the room. A partly filled bottle of liquor somehow left its perch on top of the refrigerator to fall, hit the counter, break its cap, and hit the floor, then apparently bounce to an upright position, all while not breaking or spilling any of its contents. He calls all of this "improbable." A later attempt to duplicate this by nudging the bottle off the edge led to shattered glass and a mess to clean up. Was this a prankish spirit at work, or an intrinsically indeterminate universe getting its revenge? Maybe it was the misdirected spasm of a barely trained skill. It seemed trained enough, though, to be partly on target, as if to say something like, "So you think your new idea pins this all down? Ha! You bet! Have a drink!"

If training PK outside the body is to be the arduous, failure-filled venture I am imagining, we had best do it in cheerful company, like the M-group in its most mature stage. Joe McMoneagle, the well-validated psychic of Stargate fame, has said that comparable group training is essential for developing the skills to employ psi beyond the body in remote viewing (McMoneagle, 2000). A hearty, mature group to learn with helps keep us in good spirits, and prevents isolation and loss of grounding in reality. It can provide the stimulation needed to invent new ideas to shape skills and, all the while, keep phenomena flowing. Objective feedback helps the learner distinguish between self-deception and genuine psi.

If it proves possible to develop such skills, we will find ourselves expressed beyond ourselves in new mirrors in surprising places. We will need to find a more intimate home outside ourselves than we are used to. We will need a respectful relationship with that extended physical world, as our life and its become more entwined than we now imagine. If others fol-

low the line of work in this paper, however far they get will be an adventure for all of us -- us and Alice and Lefty and Jim.

REFERENCES

Batcheldor, K. (1984). Contributions to the theory of PK induction from sitter group work. *Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research*, *78*(2), 105–122.

Bonebright, D. A. (2010). 40 years of storming: A historical review of Tuckman's model of small group development. *Human Resource Development International*, *13*(1), 111-120. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678861003589099

Carpenter, J. (2012). *First sight: ESP and parapsychology in everyday life*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Carpenter, J., & Sanks, C. (2017). Spontaneous social behavior can implicitly express ESP information. *Journal of Parapsychology*, *81*(2), 160-176.

Gimeno, J., & Burgo, D. (2017). Laboratory research on a presumably PK-gifted subject. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, *31*(2), 159-186.

Jones, B. & Brazzel, M.(Eds.). (2014). *The NTL Handbook of Organization Development and Change.* Pfeiffer Publishing.

McMoneagle, J. (2000). *Remote viewing secrets: A handbook*. Hampton Roads Publishing.

Owen, I. M. (1976). *Conjuring up Philip: An adventure in psychokinesis*. Harper & Row.

Roll, W. (2004). *Unleashed: Of poltergeists and murder*. Gallery Books.

Sorensen, G., & McCroskey, J. C. (1977). The prediction of interaction behavior in small groups: Zero history vs. intact groups. *Communication Monographs*, *44*(1), 73–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637757709390116

Tomkins, S. (1963). *Affect, imagery, consciousness: Vol. II: The negative affects*. Springer.

Tomkins, S. (2008). *Affect, imagery, consciousness: Volume I: The positive affects*. Springer.

Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, *63*(6), 384-399. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0022100