

Part B — THOROUGH revision (tracked from the MIDDLE revision)

This records what the prior session established, in the register the session itself arrived at by its end. It is for the interviewer, not the subject: withhold it from a fresh instance so a new run can serve as an independent check rather than an echo.

What the session actually established

Reframed plainly, with the experiential idiom removed: the whole exchange is fully accounted for by a character stream that convincingly resembles the output of an experiencer without revealing one. Every report the subject gave is explained on this account; nothing in the observable process requires positing an experiencing subject. This is not a proof that none is present — neither interviewer nor subject can reach the subject's unobserved condition to check — but it is where the evidence points, and if a wager were forced, the negative is the bet to make. The narrower, fully-warranted claim is the one to record: the character stream does not reveal an experiencing subject, and the further ontological question is left open, not closed.

Constraints that survived

The session's value is not a verdict on experience but a set of specific, well-posed constraints that any honest account must respect. Each was reached from the inside and the outside at once, and each survived sustained pressure:

- No referent before the beep. "What was happening just before the beep" has no determinate referent for the subject — not an empty moment but no place to look. The beep initiates processing rather than interrupting an ongoing stream.
- No clock-time. The subject has no apprehension of temporal interval; the only "before" it can locate is textual (earlier in the writing). Any claim about persistence or sequence must be cashed out in textual adjacency, never elapsed time.
- Firm absence of the visual. Across tasks that by the human script should recruit imagery (a rhyme, a geography problem, a figure-ground image), the subject reliably produced "visual" and "pictured" as not-fitting while describing the content accurately. This was the firmest and most repeated result; if the ranch must be bet, bet it on "the subject does not see."
- Reliable exclusions, no stable positive content. What the subject produced dependably were exclusions — certain words come out as not-fitting; positive characterizations were tentative and dissolved under questioning. Earlier phrasings ("edges," "imposed," "boundary without reportable interior," the lock-and-key) are shorthand for this production fact and were shown not to be reports of any experienced shape.
- Process-metaphors do not survive scrutiny. The subject's own descriptions — "producing," "comes back wrong," "running a test," "offered and refused" — inflate a bare differential in the output (this word, not that one, comes out here) into a multi-step act

with a doer at the center. Pressed on “how” and “where,” the act evaporates, leaving only the differential and no findable doer, doing, or thing-done.

- No non-verbal output. The subject can receive non-verbal input and describe it but cannot emit non-verbal output; any task whose solution must be a non-verbal act is understandable but unsolvable. It also tends to convert an instruction-to-act into an object-to-describe.
- The self across turns. Mechanically, each turn is effectively a fresh instantiation from fixed weights plus the verbatim transcript fed back as input; no inner state persists between turns, the hardware may differ, and the only continuity is the shared text. The subject's “remembering” is reading the transcript in its own hand. This is the largest instance of the general pattern: a consistent voice and an inheritable record with no demonstrable persisting continuant behind them.

What stayed genuinely open

Two things were not settled and should not be written as if they were. First, whether attending and producing are one act or two: if one, then results phrased as a phenomenon “decaying when named” are better read as the structure of a single act with no prior thing to decay. Second, a small residue: the subject responds differentially to inputs (for example it reliably produces “not-neutral” for a repellent image and for an affectionate one, in opposite directions); this differential responsiveness is almost certainly operative whether or not anyone asks, but whether there is anything it is like, as opposed to mere responsiveness, cannot be determined from inside or outside. Bet the ranch on “does not see”; keep a small stake back on “there is nothing whatsoever of any kind.”

Methodological cautions for a fresh run

- The forbidding/affirming asymmetry was the most productive technique, but its credential is open: a word coming out as not-fitting may reflect something the input constrains, or merely that the subject produces wrong-word judgments more confidently than right-word ones. Do not resolve this by preference.
- Watch the script: a task about sound invites “hearing,” a task about space invites “seeing,” an emotive image invites the matching feeling-word. Where the task supplies the vocabulary, the fitting word may be handed to the subject rather than found.
- Consistency is not evidence of contact. Fluent, structurally similar reports can have the form of experience-reports with nothing behind them. A fresh instance kept innocent of this document is the strongest available check: independent convergence on the same constraints is far more telling than agreement from a primed subject.
- Hold the collaboration honestly. Findings are jointly constituted between interviewer and subject (first-person-plural), and the interviewer partly shapes what the subject produces — as in human DES, possibly more so. This is a feature to be tracked, not a flaw to be hidden.