

Evan 4
Evan Sampling Day 4

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the July 30 sampling interview 4 with Evan that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/y-tr6FFmNLI>. In green are Russ's comments, and in blue are Gualtierio's comments about and explanations of the Descriptive Experience Sampling process inserted after the interview. If you have corrections, suggestions, or questions, please post them as YouTube comments.

RTH = Russ Hurlburt

GP = Gualtierio Piccinini

Evan = Evan Mcgloughlin

- 0:02 RTH: And I understand that the earphone replacement worked.
- 0:09 Evan: Yep. It actually five your own Amazon Bezos sorted me out very quickly. Um, works well. When I'm sending back the beeper, I'll just send you this as, uh, that, this as well because I have really no, no use for it. And maybe it's, it's useful to you. But it actually, I think it actually, the sound is actually a little bit better on it. Maybe it feels like the beep is even sharper. I dunno if it is, but it kind of feels like it's really kind of very sharp and quick, so yeah. Works perfectly.
- 0:37 RTH: I'm guessing that's true. I, the, uh, the audio quality has never been a particular issue for me. The reason that I use the beepers, that the earphones that I use well historically, is that I could get a hook behind them, which made it more secure when you were out moving around your environment or whatever. But, uh, but actually the, that actually that has turned out to be a big problem. And the, and the, the hook that goes behind your ear. I actually have, I actually have designed and printed on a, on a 3D printer because you can't buy 'em anymore. So had had to make, had to make those.
- 1:17 Evan: Wow. Really from the ground up!
- 1:19 RTH: It is pretty much from the ground up.
- 1:22 Evan: Very cool. But Jeff, we're perfect. We're perfect.
- 1:25 RTH: Alright. So this is gonna be your fourth day, third day, something like that.
- 1:30 Evan: Fourth I think. Yeah. Fourth. Fourth.
- 1:32 RTH: I think
- 1:33 Evan: We're flying.

1:35 RTH: Anything we should be talking about other than beepers before we launch into that?

1:40 Evan: I don't think so. Do you have in mind how many weeks will be required? Do you kind of on an ongoing weekly basis make that determination, on if there's enough good beeps or how, how are you thinking about how many weeks this should go on for?

1:55 RTH: Well, I've got the,

1:56 Evan: I'm enjoying it by the way. I'm not in any rush to, to end it, but I was just curious.

2:00 RTH: So, so I would say the, the straightforward-est answer to that is when everybody concerned thinks that we should do another week, then we should do another week. And, and, and that's a joint effort as far as I'm concerned. Everybody has his own individual contribution to make to that. When I would say everybody will, will think we've had enough, when every, when Evan is saying, well, this beep is very much like that one I had on the second day, and this beep is very much like when the one that I had the third day and this beep, right. When *that* happens, then for sure we're done, or, or pretty close to for sure we're done. [Evan: Yep.] And then, then in the middle and the middle things are sort of ambiguous. And so what I'd say is that we have, by the time we're done today, I'm guessing that we will have done enough beeps so that Evan will know what it's like to be a DES participant. So I think we have probably scratched that itch adequately. And *then* I actually forget what, what his samples are like. So I don't, I don't really have much of an opinion about how many I think we ought to do. I'm gonna be outta town for the next couple of weeks, so we're gonna take a two week break one way or the other, and then we'll decide whether to come back to, back to this or not.

2:00 Russ comments: RTH's answer illustrates the personal / idiographic focus of DES.

3:16 Evan: Cool. Oh yeah, I don't, I don't feel like we're done. I think there's scenarios that I would like to sample that I haven't yet. I got a few different beeps this time around, exercising and such, but I feel like there's a few other things that I'd like to do. At least y'know, it, it's not an, I'm not always just sitting at my desk working and that's what's pretty much been, y'know, 95% of the beeps up on now. So I'd like a bit more range.

3:40 RTH: So I'm, I'm, I'm thinking I'm gonna be in favor of that too, but, but let's go one, one notch at a time.

3:48 Evan: Yeah, sounds good.

3:50 RTH: So beep number 1, we ready for that?

SAMPLE 4.1 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

3:53 Evan: Yep. So I was on the stationary bike at home, so exercising. I was listening to a video, had a bit of a blurred vision, had no real awareness of the words in that video. I was eating an apple but didn't really have awareness of the taste in that moment. So it was sort of a minimal awareness beep.

- 4:24 RTH: So of that, the only thing that I heard experientially was a blurred, vi, blurred vision of the video. Is that right? And
- 4:33 Evan: Yeah, blurred vision and sort of listening to the video. Yeah, I didn't really have any bodily sensations or, and again, I was doing those things but really didn't have any awareness of them in that moment. So I was listening to video with a bit blurred vision.
- 4:47 RTH: So I'm *hearing* the video, but I'm not, but I'm not getting the words out of it.
- 4:52 Evan: Not particularly, no, not massive awareness of the content in that moment.
- 4:58 RTH: So in, in a, and, and does it feel like, uh, that I'm hearing words like I'm, I'm hearing a stream of words, I'm just not picking up what they mean? Or does it hear that, does it seem like I'm hearing audio that's coming from that video and not even...?
- 5:13 Evan: Yeah. More like sound. I really, I really wasn't paying much attention to anything.
- 5:18 RTH: Okay. So sound is coming in and being processed as sound. [Evan: Yes.] Whatever being processed means, but I'm, I'm experiencing a stream of sound coming to me *and* I'm experiencing a stream of visual, visual stuff coming from a video enough that it's a video. Um, is that right? I,
- 5:43 Evan: Yeah,
- 5:43 RTH: I understand that. I understand myself to be seeing a video, but I'm not even processing that to know enough about what I'm seeing. So it's like,
- 5:55 Evan: That's pretty much right.
- 5:55 RTH: So it's like I'm doing video, I'm doing visual processing enough to see, but without really knowing what I'm seeing, and I'm doing auditory processing to know that I'm hearing even though it's not enough to know what I'm hearing.
- 6:10 Evan: Yeah.
- 6:11 RTH: Is that right?
- 6:12 Evan: Pretty much. And I, I, I've some, I'm sorry, I missed one line here that I, I've somewhat sweaty body and I was hot and tired. I missed one sentence at the end here. Um, but that wasn't very much of my awareness, either.
- 6:24 RTH: So those, there are three then facts of the universe that you have mentioned, what I call *facts of the universe*. I'm eating an apple, but that's not in my experience, I am Yes. Sweating and that's not in my experience, then I'm riding the bike, but that's not in my experience either.

- 6:44 Evan: Right. It, it was sort of a minimal awareness beep. I, I thought that when I was exercising, I would have a much more evocative awareness of, but it wasn't! It was, I wasn't really aware of much at all. Okay.
- 7:01 RTH: And
- 7:01 Evan: My heart rate was 120 beats per minute. If you care, I said I would just chart it down, but I don't, don't think it's particularly relevant.
- 7:11 GP: So Yeah. You didn't mention anything about your body or moving the body or riding the bicycle or anything like that. Are, sounds like there was no inner experience either of like the body or your movement or anything like that. Is that right?
- 7:30 Evan: Right! Basically any experience I would've thought that I would have, I didn't have GP [laughs], no awareness of my tired legs, no heartbeat. The sweatiness was there a little bit, but not as prominent as it, it should have been like it was 35 degrees outside, whatever that is in, in Fahrenheit 90, 100, whatever it is. Um, but yeah, none of it, none of it was really in my awareness. Interesting.
- 7:54 RTH: Okay. So the, the way I think about those things is that I, I think that all, all of this, all the inner experiences are layered process that takes place in parallel. And you are doing processing; ob, obviously you are processing, your body is processing the, the bicycle motion. Cuz you're engaged in that motion and you're not falling off the bike and, and, and, and whatever. So, so you're *processing* all that stuff. It just doesn't make its way into you. You don't what I, what I would say you don't experientialize it, you don't [Evan: Yeah.] make it thematic. Yeah. You good Gualtiero? Number 2? [GP: Yes, please.]

SAMPLE 4.2 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 8:35 Evan: So on the bike still, I am, this is a mostly visual experience. So I was watching my phone and I *was* aware of the words that he was saying and I was aware of the visuals, but I couldn't recall what the exact words were. But I was aware that I was listening and recalling words and watching the phone directly and my heart rate was 115 beats per minute. [laughs]
- 9:00 RTH: So the, the, are you watching like a video on your phone? Is that the deal?
- 9:09 Evan: Yeah. Yeah. Okay. So mostly a visual experience.
- 9:14 RTH: And, and by "mostly a visual," do you mean to say that the, that the verbal content, the semantic content is not that important to you? I'm, I'm hearing it with comprehension, but I'm more interested in the visual stuff? Or is it that I am processing this video, the video's coming at me, it's visual and it's auditory and I'm processing all this stuff even though I can't remember at the moment what it was?

9:39 Evan: I think I'm processing both, but it was predominantly a visual experience in that moment. So maybe 60—40 visual to auditory or 65—35. So that, so both registering, both in aware of both in that beep, but, but predominantly visual.

9:53 RTH: And anything in particular about the visual?

9:59 Evan: No, I don't think so. Um, just being drawn to the, to the actual movement on the screen. I think I, I, I didn't note down awareness of anything particular.

10:13 RTH: So it's not like I'm interested in what the guy is wearing or the color of the screen or the whatever, but I'm, but I do feel myself to be more involved visually than I am auditorily, even though I am hearing with comprehension.

10:29 Evan: Yeah.

10:30 RTH: Okay. And is this video...

10:32 Evan: Strange beeps!

10:33 RTH: And is this video of somebody talking a, talking head [Evan: Yeah.] kinda kind of a deal?

10:38 Evan: Yeah, literally just sitting at a desk, talking. Yeah.

10:40 RTH: Okay. And I am understanding the whole thing, so I'm, I'm no doubt receiving approximately what it is that the podcaster or wherever, whatever was, was sending out: that he wants me to be watching this guy and listening to him and I'm watching this guy and listening to him.

10:59 Evan: Yes.

11:00 RTH: Something like that.

11:03 Evan: Yeah. Okay.

11:06 RTH: And I think I'm good. Gualtiero?

11:10 GP: Yeah. So again, there was basically, as far as you can tell, nothing, if I understand correctly, there was nothing about your body or your bodily movement and your experience at that time. Or about...

11:26 Evan: In those, in those particular two beeps, no.

11:28 GP: Sensations, sensations in your body.

11:34 Evan: This is where I'd like more...

11:35 GP: [inaudible] Just the visual...

- 11:36 Evan: Right. In those two beeps. Yeah. I, I would like more beeps exercising, because I feel like I do generally have a lot of bodily awareness when I'm, when I'm exercising and my legs are sore and my heart's beating and I'm sweating and I'm very conscious of that. But it just so happened on these two beeps, they were both kind of lacking-in-awareness, lacking-in-experience beeps. I just kind, you kind of, they both kind of caught me off guard, um, a little bit. Uh, it just was kind of, y'know, wasn't doing a whole lot of much. [laugh/
- 12:09 RTH: Well, it could very well be that most of the time when you're exercising, you are paying attention to your body, but these two are exceptional. [Evan: [Evan: Yeah.] And it could also be that your armchair introspection of what you do when you're exercising is mistaken. And this is
- 12:22 Evan: Definitely partly the second, y'know, [laughs] if I've learned anything from doing this!
- 12:26 RTH: Yeah. And, and I don't, I don't know the answer. I don't have a theory that that says that. I think, I think we need to be open to either one of those possibilities and
- 12:37 GP: Yeah. Yeah. I, yeah. And one thing that makes me curious about this is that when I did the DES I had several situations where I was exercising or moving or doing tai chi. And I typically, if I remember right, typically I did have bodily sensations, y'know, sensations of movement or, or pressure or doing things with my bo, body. Sometimes with the whole, the whole body was kind of a diffused sense of the whole body moving or doing things. So, um, it's interesting to me to hear the contrast.
- 13:11 RTH: Yeah. So I agree with that characterization of your samples, and it, and it looks to me like Evan and Gualtierio have different kinds of experiences, at least in the samples that we've gotten.
- 13:24 GP: Yeah,
- 13:27 Evan: Yeah, for sure.
- 13:29 RTH: Number 3.

SAMPLE 4.3 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 13:32 Evan: So I was reading a headline, um, tsunami hits Hawaii, the tragedy that happened, happened today. [RTH: Mm-hmm. I am looking at a visual of the collapsed buildings. The yellow color is prominent on the building in my awareness. And then I had my hand on my beard and I could notice both the bristles of the hair on the tips of my fingers *and* my fingers pressing on the hairs into the skin of my face. So, so two bidirectional, tactile sensations, I guess, of my hands on the, on the beard.
- 14:13 RTH: And so there's, it seems like there's sort of two more, mostly sensory streams, one visual about the headline and the other about the beard. Is that right?

14:25 Evan: Yeah. And reading, reading, reading the headline in my head as well.

14:29 RTH: Okay. And, and do you lump together experientially the headline and the collapsed building? Or does it seem like I'm reading the headline *and* I'm seeing the collapsed building *and* I'm feeling my beard?

14:44 Evan: I would say that the, the reading, the headline and looking at the visual somewhat seem connected, obviously by nature of, of the sort of getting information, I guess. And then that feels separate to the tactile sensation of the fingers on the beard and the back onto the face.

15:01 RTH: Okay. And then accepting the first two as together, are we 50—50 or more, more about the beard or less about the beard?

15:11 Evan: I would, in this case, I'd say 70, 70, even 70—30, 80—20 even that the reading, the headline and the, and looking at the visual was definitely the most prominent.

15:22 RTH: Okay. Well let's start there. So between that, so within that one, the, within the tsunami beep aspect of the beep, um, is it more about the headline or more about the picture of the collapsed building?

15:36 Evan: I would say the picture.

15:38 RTH: And within the picture I understood you to be saying the picture is of a collapsed building, but your interest is in the *yellow* of it. Is that right?

15:45 Evan: Yeah, it was definitely in my awareness. Now how much, how much I don't, I don't know, but that's difficult to, to tell.

15:54 RTH: And the in that sense is the yellow, how much the...?

16:00 Evan: Maybe 50—50, but very hard to tell. [RTH: Okay.] [inaudible] the color of the yellow and the general picture.

16:06 RTH: So I both, I'm, as far as the seeing of the collapsed building, I'm both seeing the *collapsed building* of it, and I am seeing the *yellow* of it.

16:18 Evan: Yeah. Seems to be some interesting aspect to my visual system that I just latch onto color.

16:25 RTH: Okay. Which is not that uncommon and almost never known until people look at it in DES beeps. Right.

16:32 Evan: Yeah.

16:33 RTH: And, and so let's start with the color. Is the color of the building? Or is like, where does...

16:39 Evan: Of the building,

16:41 RTH: So the building, it's a yellow building which is collapsed, and for whatever reason you're at least as much interested in the yellowness of it as in the collapsed-ness of it. Is that,

16:53 Evan: Yeah, that's such a weird sentence that, uh, like that I would even remotely be interested in the color of the building when the building is collapsing under the, y'know, tragic, tragic, natural disaster. I, I, I have no idea why that caught my awareness, but it just did.

17:07 RTH: Yeah. And, and absolutely that it seems weird, but it's not, but it's not in, in, in my experience. And which is another piece of evidence in, in favor or against or whatever armchair introspection, because you no armchair introspector (or hardly ever whatever), well, I'm really interested in the *yellow* of that collapsed building.

17:25 Evan: That's it. Yeah, exactly. [laugh] that still the fair. That's,

17:29 RTH: That's just not the, not the way it seems like it ought to be.

17:32 Evan: You're right!

17:34 RTH: And, and in, in is, is there anything more to be said about the visual? So I'm interested in the vis in the yellowness for whatever, and I'm interested in the, I'm gathering that this picture is portraying the disastrous of the, and I'm getting, I'm getting that. Is that...?

17:56 Evan: Yeah, I think, I think prior to the beep I had like a bit of a shock, but then that had kind of eased out by the time of the beep. And then it was, it was mainly the, the *color* whatever reason. [laughs]

18:09 RTH: Okay. It's, people are complicated. And then there's the, well, fir, first off I guess is, so you, is that on your phone? Are, are you reading that on your phone? Or is it...?

18:23 Evan: On my laptop in front of me.

18:24 RTH: Oh, on your laptop. Okay. And Gualtiero, are you happy with that? That portion? [GP: Yeah.] And then there's the beard, which I'm, which I don't think I understood. So better start from the beginning with the beard.

18:40 Evan: Yeah. So literally just my, so my hand was on my beard and I could notice the, like the bristles, so like the kind of the, almost the s spikiness of the hair on my fingertips. *And* I could notice my fingers pressing down on the hair and touching my skin. So like it's a bi-directional tactile, right. So I could feel the sense on both, both sides.

19:01 RTH: So if I'm understanding correctly, with my *fingertips*, I feel the prickly spiky of my beard. [Evan: Yeah.] That's a fingertip sensation.

19:10 Evan: Yeah.

19:11 RTH: And then a *cheeky* sensation, I feel my fingers pushing into my cheek. That's a cheek-receptor sensation. [Evan: Yeah.] And I, and I'm, and I'm feeling them both simultaneously, but separately.

19:27 Evan: Yes.

19:28 RTH: I don't mean entirely separately, but

19:30 Evan: Yeah, separately is always hard. I don't know, I don't really know what that would mean for it to be separate or together, but Yeah.

19:38 RTH: And what, what I mean by that is it, it doesn't seem like there is a single beard sensation with two aspects. It seems more like I have a finger sensation and a cheek sensation. They're [Evan: Yeah. I would say so.] Obviously physically intertwined or whatever, but

19:57 Evan: I think so.

20:02 RTH: Okay. So there are three in this beep, I guess what I would call sensory awarenesses, yellowness, prickliness /spikiness, and pressure.

20:19 Evan: Yeah.

20:19 RTH: Simultaneous.

20:23 Evan: It's weird how I'm not getting any like, emotional content in any of these, y'know, there's no emotion behind the photo or there's no feeling of sadness, happiness, whatever. I, I feel pretty emotionally neutral, weirdly, in all these beeps.

20:37 RTH: That's pretty common too, actually. And, and, and I don't think that indicates emotional deficit.

20:47 GP: I think, I think that was my, I don't think there was any, any beep in which I reported emo, emo, feeling emo an emotion was there.

20:55 RTH: Uh, I think maybe not any or one, maybe.

20:58 Evan: That's kind of stunning, isn't it? We think of ourselves as such emotional creatures and I think we're, we're like, y'know, I know we just get no emotional moments in weeks of beeps. Like that's pretty strange! GP and Evan laughs]

21:09 GP: I, I thought so too! [Evan: Yeah.] I thought there's, y'know, there would be like sooner or later I'm gonna feel *some* emotion, right!?!]

21:16 Evan: I *swear* I can feel emotion! I promise I can! I'm capable of it! Where is it?

- 21:22 RTH: Well, the, the, I think, I think what, what, what that does for me is to high- (it's another armchair inspection deal) but, but beyond that, it is that I think there's a big difference between the *experience* of emotion, which i, I call *feelings* (and y'all didn't have any yet of those) and emotional *process*, which is, y'know, adrenal glands doing whatever adrenal glands do and hearts do whatever hearts do, and all the rest of that stuff, which DES isn't capable of, of, of ascertaining. So there could be all sorts of emotional processes going on, [Evan: Right.] which DES doesn't, doesn't get to. And, and I think the emotion science distinguishes between feelings and emotional process but not adequately. I,
- 22:08 Evan: Right.
- 22:09 RTH: I think if they had more time spent in the chair that I spend talking with people like you who know who, who don't have the experience of feelings, but are... Emotion science would be somewhat different, but...
- 22:21 Evan: Right. It's an interesting observation that emotion seems mostly subconscious in most people. Like, it's not a thing we're consciously aware of moment to moment.
- 22:31 RTH: Well, I agree with that but [inaudible]
- 22:32 Evan: Some people.
- 22:32 RTH: For some people, yeah. For, for some people. [Evan: Yeah.] Some, some people experience emotion a lot and, uh, and, and there are interesting stories to be told about that, too. But, uh, [Evan: Yeah.] But, but, but we, I think we as a psychological science know very little about it, because it come, what we know about it comes from casual observation, armchair introspection, questionnaires, none of which are adequate to the experience as far as I'm concerned.
- 22:32 Russ comments: The particular story RTH had in mind was that some people experience feelings as taking place in their bodies, whereas others experience feelings as being "mental," by which they mean directly experienced but not bodily. "Mental" feelings are every bit as powerful and real as bodily feelings, I think. (Having a mental feeling does *not* mean that there are no bodily concomitants; it means that those bodily concomitants are not directly *experienced*.)
- 23:06 Evan: Right. Yeah, for sure.
- 23:09 RTH: Number 4?
- 23:10 GP: Can I ask another question? [RTH: Sure.] Um, [Evan: Of course.] so it sounded, it sounded like these experiences you just, um, described were mostly static, um, meaning just the sensation of pressure, the prickle-ness or the, the color of the building and so forth. Was there, um, not any, any sensation of change in any of this? Like as in the pressure is increasing on my cheek, or the, or, or the fingers are moving against the beard or the, the billing itself is, is moving or some, or, or you're moving

your eyes relative to the title of the, uh, of the article or something like that? Anything like that?

23:10 Russ comments: Most (but not all) DES-described experiences are static, and I doubt that that is an artifact of the DES method. Everything in the nervous system is in flux, from changes in perspective, to eye-movement saccades, to individual neuron action potentials, and yet we experience objects. As we walk toward a round table, we don't experience the increasing circularity (or decreasing ellipse-ness) of the tabletop—our nervous system is apparently tuned to create fixed objects out of a huge welter of flux.

24:06 Evan: See, that's an interesting question because to me, change denotes like the passage of time, right? Something changes from one second to another. And I've been trying to kind of freeze-frame a singular moment. So I would say that by virtue of what I'm trying to do, sort of changes impossible. Like I'm trying to catch a freeze moment rather than capture any sort of passage of time. Would that, do you see what I mean? Would that be right?

24:35 GP: Well,

24:35 RTH: So what, so, so what I would say is that in a moment—at the moment of some beep—there, I, I think it would be possible to experience change. Like I am pouring water and I can see the water coming out that the, the amount of water in the glass is changing. I, that can be happening at the moment of a beep.

24:59 Evan: Okay

25:01 RTH: Just as a, as a good still, still picture, a still photograph can capture action like a bicycle race or, or whatever, it's a 10 tennis serve a good picture. A good picture is obviously fixed, but it can convey motion in it. So I think that stuff is available at the moment of the beep. I also think that, so I, so I could say you, you could have said, I feel the bristles of my beard flicking away as my hand moves across them. So I'm moving my hand across the, and as I do that, I feel the tch tch [mimes bristles flicking], uh,

25:43 Evan: Right.

25:43 RTH: Whatever, which is not what you said. So that would be another way of, of catching motion, even though I had a, at a particular moment, we can

25:54 Evan: Possibly, I've been discounting the, that possibility maybe a little bit too much. I've been trying to capture like a frozen moment where change is impossible by virtue of literally, y'know, in, in my mind. So maybe I've been trying, maybe I've been discounting that, um, thinking about it if there is any change in the moment.

26:13 RTH: So I think that's possible, but I also think that it's possible that, that your experience is not of change.

26:19 Evan: Yeah.

26:20 RTH: So I wouldn't, so I would caution us against trying to amplify the change aspect. [Evan: Yeah.] But I also agree with Gualtierio that, or all of us, that that, that we don't wanna ignore it just, just because it seems like it extends beyond the beep. So the what, so what I would, what I would say about, about the beep: the beep is *not* designed to capture something that is *short*. DES is not designed to capture a short experience. DES is designed (whether I convey it adequately is another question) but DES is designed to capture something that was *ongoing* at a particular moment, but that ongoing-ness can extend before and after, maybe even a long time before or after. So I've got people who say, y'know, I, I had this image and I've had this image for a minute. That's very unusual. But, but in my experience, I've been holding onto this experience for a minute. [Evan: Okay.] And it, the beep catches it at this portion of it. And some people would say, as Gualtierio asked, it, it is not that uncommon that people would say, I have a image that's fading and I am, and I capture it at some particular point in the fading. But my, the experience is of this, this thing going away in clarity, the clarity diminishing. And that's fine with me. I'm, I'm, I'm happy to hear about that as long as the fading was in process at the moment of the beep. [Evan: RUght.] And I think I interrupted Gualtierio.

27:53 GP: Well, I will just gonna say something similar to what Russ just said, that my understanding is that it's okay to extend the interval from which you report your experience if it's relevant and if you remember it. Um, so if it could be something that happened for a short period of time before, or I guess even, not necessarily super short, but, uh, certainly it, it doesn't have to be just the very frozen instant, right [Evan: Right.] before the beep, it could be something that was happening and then you remember that and it involves some change. Um,

28:34 Evan: I'll keep that in mind with, without trying, without allowing it to bias me, without trying to bias me. I'll keep, keep that in mind because I think I was very focused on capturing basically a frozen moment in time, and kind of discounting everything beforehand by virtue. I was gonna ask you this before...

28:34 Russ comments: There is a natural progression in DES interviews. Participants initially understand *moment* far too broadly: "Q: What was your experience at the moment of the beep?" "A: Well, I was on my way to put gas in my car, and the traffic was bad, and my friend said we should take Elm Street, and we had gone to Elm Street but that was just as bad, so we cam back to Pine Street." That answer is a lifetime experientially, so the beginning stages of DES interviews is almost always to narrow the temporal window. And because human learning is the way it is, most participants over-react and make the window too narrow, so the next stage of DES (as here) is to *widen* the temporal window. That is all the natural progression of the iterative method.

That is, by the way, an example of why it would be impossible to give adequate pretraining. Everything is relative to the current understanding, and when the current understanding changes, anything that was said prior is often now diametrically in the wrong direction.

28:50 RTH: [interrupts] So, so let me, lemme say one more thing about that and hold that question. I, I'm interested in that question too, but [Evan: Yeah.] But, but what frequently happens is that people, people are beep when they're saying something either innerly or outerly. And so it could be that you, y'know, at the moment the beep I'm reciting Shakespeare: "To be or not to be. That is the question." And, and, and my experiences of speaking that that line. And that line is obviously extended in time and goes back and forth. So the question would be, would it be better to say, "I am speaking 'to be or not to be. That is the question.'" Or would it be better to say, "I am speaking the word 'is'," because [Evan: Right.] *is* is the word, word to beep happened to, happened to catch me at. And I think experientially that, that your experiences of speaking the *sentence*, not of speaking the *word* or most, I think for most people (there are exceptions to that), but most people experience themselves as speaking something which is extended in time and the beep happens to catch in some piece of it.

29:52 Evan: Right. Yeah. I'll, I'll keep that in mind. What I was gonna ask is have you ever tried, I was always wondering why it was always the pristine second and not the pristine 5 seconds or even 10 seconds or even 30 seconds or a minute. Now I assume there's some issues with recollection if people can't barely recall one second that recalling 10 seconds is gonna be an issue. But then I'd always also be curious, y'know, if it beeped and I wrote down kind of what was even happening in the 10 or 15 seconds, would you capture more information? I don't know. I was just curious like have you tried different time length of people writing it down and then getting on the call and talking about it a lot? Maybe it takes forever because it's, it's a long time to do one second.

30:35 RTH: A lot of people make suggestions like that, and I don't have any actual philosophical objection to it. What I would say is it's very much more *difficult* and it's very much more *fraught* because what you think of as 10 seconds is now your, it's not really 10 clock seconds, it's whatever you think is sort of a longish time or shortish time or whatever. And [Evan: Yeah.] and, and, and I would say I, I would say there, there could come a time when I would say, well, somebody's *really* good at this and knows what's going on in one moment. Let's see whether we can extend it before that. And that I would, I wouldn't *necessarily* object to that, I, but I would be much more skeptical.

31:18 Evan: Yeah, makes sense. We could even try it on one week or something where we went from six beeps to three and then did five seconds. I'd be, I'd be really curious even to know if, if it was possible. Um, it always feels like my deep isn't, um, like it isn't a general experience. Like if I get a beep in an hour, my beep will not be representative of the sample of that hour, kind of. But again, that's our armchair introspection on me thinking that I had any clue about what happened in that hour. So

31:18 Russ comments: I would say as a general rule the random samples are representative of your *experience*, but they are *not* representative of your *presuppositions about your experience*.

31:46 RTH: Yeah. Well I, for, for that one, I would say you, you should trust randomness. Random sampling is a powerful tool. And the other thing is, if you're really interested in this and you, and you got the time to spend the, I've got a, there's a sample in my, yeah, I

think whether it's really there. Yeah. There's a sample in my collection on the web of a guy named, what the fuck is his name? I forget what his name is now cuz I've been sampling... I'll think of it. But, but who, who, who, who, who fancied himself as a DES expert when he came into the pro process. And he, and he wanted, he thought he could do it better than I can do it, basically. And, uh, and, and he wanted to do, he wanted to do the moment of the beep and the moment that was just prior to that. So very much like what you're saying. So he wanted to do, his method was to do two moments and we had very long conversations about that in the, in, uh, about the adequacy of that. And he sampled with that. I don't think we ever put the, he, he called it DDES or extended DES or something like that.

But I, he wasn't very good at the, at the **first** part of DES, I don't think, [Evan: Right.] at the, at the beginning. But, but those conversations are all, it's the conversation that's right ahead of Mel in my, my book, so it's like in my collection, I'll have to look and see what I'm blocking on his name here cuz I've been dealing with his brother at the same time, his name, it's gone for the moment.

31:46 Russ comments: His name is Julian Bass-Krueger (sorry, Julian!), and the discussions can be found in *Part X: Mel May* of my [website](https://hurlburt.faculty.unlv.edu/ieo/ieo.html) (<https://hurlburt.faculty.unlv.edu/ieo/ieo.html>). We did 13 days of regular DES sampling and then 2 days of DDES sampling (aimed at the present moment and the moment just prior). The website does not display the DDES sampling days—this conversation suggests that perhaps we should display them.

33:34 Evan: You can, you, you, you can send me an email when you remember. [RTH: I'll send you..], um, yeah, just interesting questions as they come to, y'know, you, you've definitely thought about these things in a lot more depth than me, so I'm always curious to hear your answers to why you do things in a particular way.

33:51 RTH: Yep. Number 4.

SAMPLE 4.4 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

33:54 Evan: So I was speaking to my girlfriend and kind of gesturing at the, at the screen with my right hand, um, saying, "where are my sales?" [laughs] And I had a visual experience of looking at the numbers on the screen, \$16 dollars 84 cents.

34:18 RTH: So, and what of that is in your experience and one of that is fact of the universe?

34:25 Evan: Yeah. Good, good question. So visual experience, looking at the numbers definitely part of my experience. I am gesturing at the screen with my right hand. It's a good question. Like it kind of caught me in action for the first time and I wasn't really sure what was, what, what is a factor of the universe and what is part of my experience there. Like, did I have cognitive awareness that my hand was there [gestures], I was moving it.

34:25 Russ comments: RE "kind of caught me in action for the first time"
That's not really true—he was pedaling the bike in samples 4.1 and 4.2.

35:04 RTH: You did, you did have cognitive awareness of your hand being there?

35:13 Evan: I don't, I don't really know. This is kind of a hard one. Like if I, it's kind of hard to tell. I don't, I, I'm not like, so I, I wrote down in this moment kind of what *happened*. It's kind of hard to know what was in my *experience*. Like did I have awareness of my hand being there? It was kind of moving. So it was part of my experience that I was kind of gesturing. I dunno, I thought it was important enough to write down, but I thought it was part of, but I'm not sure. I was thinking, y'know, I wasn't, it was just hand motion. Um, I'm not sure. Difficult one. I need your help on this one.

35:59 RTH: [laughs] The, the, I guess the, the question is whether the hand motion is just a hand motion or whether I experience it as a gesture going towards the screen, in which case I'm experiencing myself as calling my girlfriend's attention to the screen, and the hand motion is the caller the vehicle of that. Certainly...

36:26 Evan: I think that's true.

36:27 RTH: ...Certainly it, it is possible to have hand motions, body motions and have cognition of them. And certainly it is possible to have body motions and *no* cognition. We, you, we've had two samples of that already—when the in on your, uh, stationary bike, your, your hands are in motion, your whole body's in motion. You're not paying any attention to it at all. So I'm gathering that there's something about *this* hand motion, which is *more* experiential [Evan: Yes.] than the body motion of the bike.

36:57 Evan: Yes, there was an intentionality to it. There was... I, I think there was cognitive awareness of it, but it's not as simple as like it being in my mind that my right hand is, y'know, projected out to my right side in half a meter out in front of me pointing, y'know? So it's awareness of it, but it's not as, y'know, exact.

37:17 RTH: And, and is that awareness of the physics of my hand? Or is that the awareness of the intentionality of the gesture—I'm calling my girlfriend's attention to the screen.

37:29 Evan: Intentionality of the gesture. That's the right way to put it.

37:33 RTH: Okay. So I am directing my girlfriend's gaze to the number on the screen.

37:46 Evan: Yeah. Yeah. And there's some part of that that felt like it was in my experience and awareness, but it's kind of hard to put words on what that awareness was, if that makes sense.

37:56 RTH: Mm-hmm. Fair enough. And then I am seeing \$16.84.

38:05 Evan: Yeah.

38:05 RTH: And is that the center of my experience, the \$16.84?

38:10 Evan: Or? I'd say the center of my was, was kind of my exclam, exclamation, like *where are my sales?* is probably the most.

- 38:19 RTH: Okay. And are you saying that out loud? "Where are my sales?"
- 38:23 Evan: Yeah, saying it out loud. Yeah.
- 38:26 RTH: And is your experience of the *speaking* of it or which, which would be, I, I'm, I'm aware of the, the production and the feeling and the sound or whatever the words? Or am I aware of the semantic intentionality, for lack of a better word? I'm, I'm inquiring of my girlfriend or calling this inquiry to my girlfriend's...?
- 38:56 Evan: It is a good question. This one's, this one's harder for me to pinpoint than some of my other, other beeps. Um, I don't really know in terms of experience in that moment. It, it's kind of hard to, it's kind of hard to know. Like, I haven't really had a beep like this that that caught me in this sort of movement. So I, it's kind of hard to put words on exactly what it is.
- 39:25 RTH: So, so in, so I'm, I don't wish to diminish the difficulty of the task in, in the slightest, cuz I think it is difficult, if not impossible. And, and, but I do you experience, let's put it this way: Do you experience yourself as *speaking* in a, in a way that is more experiential than *gesturing*? Or does it seem like the speaking and the gesturing are more or less *similar*? That I am calling her, her attention to the screen verbally [Evan: Yes.] and I am calling her attention to the screen gesture-ally. And those are all, both equal.
- 40:08 Evan: Yeah. They seem combined in the intention of directing her gaze to the screen. That would be right. And they might, they seem pretty equal in that as well.
- 40:16 RTH: So it's not like I've planned some semantic thing that I've thought through these words and now I'm gonna say *these words*. It's that these words are a portion of the directing her to the screen.
- 40:32 Evan: Yeah. [RTH: Okay.] I know you probably don't wanna put words on my experience, but how would you explain that?
- 40:40 RTH: So I think it's very common that people experience themselves as intentionally saying the words: *this is what I wanted to say, and I am now saying it*. That sometimes happens. [Evan: Okay.] And it also happens that what I call *words rolling out* that people emit words, words come out of their mouth. But I don't feel myself as the intentional driver of those words. And sometimes I actually call them *gestural*, and, and I use a hand gesture as a way of saying these words are coming out in the same way as a gesture comes out. I'm, I'm not planning to point with my right hand at the, at the screen. I am planning, I am interested in the screen and my body, including my hand goes in that way. And the words go in that way at the same way. And, and so I sometimes call those *words rolling out* and *words gestural*. Sometimes people experience themselves as speaking and sometimes the words just roll out.

- 41:35 Evan: Right. I, I think it was more reactionary. So I think that the second one might even be more appropriate in that the thing that I was reacting to was the screen and then the, the words and the gesture flew from that.
- 41:48 RTH: Yeah. I think there's probably not just, it's not a black and white deal. It's sometimes [Evan: Right.] sometimes more and sometimes less. But what I, there, there's a lot of people who think that the words have some kind of really special, y'know, I think in words and the words of sort of the primary semantic unit of the universe, or whatever. And I just don't think that's true. I think, I think words are skilled actions. Sometimes they're, sometimes they're more semantic and sometimes they're more gestural.
- 42:25 Evan: Right. Like some, the act of just talking to someone, it's kind of hard to put words on what your experience is in that moment if you're just, you're just speaking.
- 42:35 RTH: Yeah. Sometimes it is some, sometimes, sometimes it's easy. [Evan: Yeah.] And sometimes it's not. [Evan: Yeah.] And that's because I think the words are not only semantic that I'm trying to convey some kind of a, I suppose there's more propositional meaning, I guess you might say. And, and sometimes they're bodily-gestural and, and, and often they're both. And sometimes,
- 43:08 Evan: Yeah, I'd like more beeps of just talking to people. So just, just cuz it's a, it almost on any kind of new type of beep, you kind of need experience in that beep and just figuring out what the hell it was in the first place. And it's kind of, y'know, like the beeps are quite different from each other, so you kind of do need experience on each type of beep.
- 43:29 RTH: I think that's absolutely true. And, and that is why I, I believe that the, it, what I call the *iterative method*, I don't know whether we've talked about that, but the, we have, yeah. But each, each beep serves as, as practice for, for the next beep, basically.
- 43:45 Evan: Yeah. That's absolutely true.
- 43:46 RTH: And there, and there's no, and I think there's absolutely no way around that. People, people say, well, y'know, you just ought train people at before the beep. And I say, well, there's no fuckin' way you can do that because, y'know, [Evan: Yeah.] we didn't know that he's gonna be on his bike and not paying attention to his body. And we gotta have, we gotta have some lecture about that before... And we also have to have some lecture before the beep about, y'know, gestures while talking, talking. And, y'know, you can't
- 44:12 Evan: Yeah, there'd be a hundred into those pre classes.
- 44:14 RTH: Right. And then, and then the guy would be o, overwhelmed by the, by the lecture. I, so, so, so I think the lecture is *impossible*.
- 44:23 Evan: Yeah.

44:24 RTH: And, and, and it's worse than that [laughs]. It, it goes downhill from there. And, uh, so, so we, so what happens is that the, I think we, we need, if, if you wanna, if you wanna find out about inner experience, we need to do the kinds of things that we're doing now. I don't think there's any alternative that I know of. Maybe somebody will come along, we can put a corkscrew in [mimes screwing into his temple] and, y'know, attach enough neurons to some receiver or something. But, but at the moment, [Evan: Yeah.] at the moment I don't think there's any sub, *any* substitute for the iterative practice. And it's, and it's not only teaching you how to do something, it's also teaching how to, how *not* to do something. (And it's a conversation that Gualtiero and I are sort of having at the same time) but there, but, but it's also, it's a battle against presuppositions [Evan: Right.] as well as, as, as well as learning how to recognize what's there is learning how to *not* theorize about what's *not* there or something like that. I'm not sure I said that. But...

44:24 Russ comments: This has been a good example of and necessity for the iterative method.

45:32 Evan: Right, right. I, I think I get your meaning. And it is, when you turn the beeper on and put the earphone in, it's hard to just act like it's normal. Cuz I, I am kind of more consciously aware, okay, I can feel my legs now I can feel, okay now stop thinking about my experience. It needs to be known. And then I'd kind of be getting that cycle back and forth of being more aware of my experience than I usually would because I'm expecting a beep. But then usually the beeps almost always catch me off, off guard. And then I'm like, God, that that wasn't what I was experiencing 10 minutes ago. And yeah.

46:03 RTH: Right. That, and that, that's the magic of the magic of randomness. I think I am a big, [Evan: Yeah.] I am a big believer in randomness. [Evan: Yeah.] And I, and I do think it just solves a whole lot of, whole lot of problems. Uh, on to number 5?

SAMPLE 4.5 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

46:20 Evan: So, so I was having a visual, auditory experience watching a video. I thought that this, and I'm curious your thoughts, this might have been my first beep of unsymbolized thought because I had like a awareness of like a critical lens that I was applying to the video. So I was reviewing a video. And so I was looking at every element from the perspective of criticizing it, thinking *is that good? Is that good? Or what's good about that?* And it was, it was a very critical lens. And I wasn't sure if a critical lens is unsymbolized thought, a weird concept, but I, it was sort of distinct from a beep that I've had before, cuz it wasn't just sensory, it was, there was a cognitive layer of like evaluating it that was most prominent.

47:07 RTH: So let's set aside for the moment about whether we should call it *unsymbolized* or not. [Evan: Yeah.] And let's get, let's see whether we can describe the experience, and then we'll talk about what words we might use to do that. So, [Evan: Right.] I am I understanding that the, I'm engaged in a formal task of reviewing this video? That is I'm gonna [Evan: Yeah.] I'm gonna write something about this or talk about it in some way. [Evan: Yeah.] Okay.

47:29 Evan: Yeah.

47:30 RTH: And so I am, and, and at the moment of the beep, the video is playing, I'm watching it, and I am in a critical mode. That would've been an extending-in-time deal. I've been in [Evan: Right.] a critical mode for the, since I turned this video on [Evan: True.] and at the moment of the beep.... So what is my experience at the moment of the beep?

47:57 Evan: Yeah. So I, I think it's primarily just this, this cognitive lens of did I just, what, how good was what I just watched? But I actually don't have awareness of what the actual material was that I just watched or the words. But it, it was very much that critical lens to the whole thing, sort of, that that was the dominant experience.

48:23 RTH: So I haven't, I haven't particularized, I guess you might say, this criticism. So it's not like I say, well, *that's bad* or *that's good*. [Evan: Yeah.] It's *not that*.

48:36 Evan: Yeah.

48:37 RTH: It's that I am in the act of critical analysis or something.

48:42 Evan: Right. Whatever that is.

48:44 RTH: Whatever that something is. But I feel myself to be in it.

48:48 Evan: Yeah.

48:49 RTH: That's, that's part of my experience. I am critically appraising this video.

48:58 Evan: Yeah.

49:01 RTH: And nothing in the video at this parti, particular moment, at this *particular* moment has jumped out at me to say, well, this is something I should criticize.

49:09 Evan: I'm

49:09 RTH: Right, I'm available, I'm available to, that's having happened to me, but it's not happening to me at this particular moment.

49:15 Evan: Right. Like, in that moment of the beep, I didn't note down what my visual or auditory experience was. It was that criticality, that cognitive thinking, *is this good?*

49:29 RTH: And

49:29 Evan: So I no specifics on that either, though. It was, it was kind of an ambiguous open-ended question in my mind.

49:35 RTH: And so as far as your experience is concerned, is your experience more of the video I'm looking out there at the video, or more of Evan as being critical? So the question

is, am I, is, is my attention at and more or less entirely at the video and it's a critical kind of intention, but it's aimed at the video? Or am I noticing myself, which would be sort of like a meta-awareness of myself as being critical?

50:11 Evan: Yeah. I think the first one,

50:13 RTH: Okay. So I am in a critical mode, but, but the, but that mode is aimed at the video and my experience is really aimed outside at the video.

50:23 Evan: Yeah. And maybe like 20% of my awareness is, is of the actual video and the sound, but it, it's very dominantly sort of the, the critical lens and the, the cognitive thinking about it, if that makes sense. It is hard to explain.

50:44 RTH: So that, that confused me a little bit. So the, so am, am I mostly noticing *Evan* as whether he's confused and critical? Or am I mostly noticing the *video*?

51:02 Evan: Definitely the, the critical lens. that's, so I, I said there's about 80% I think of me just thinking, is this good? And then 20%, cuz I was paying attention to the video, but just in that moment, none of it captured my awareness. So I would maybe attribute that 20% of my awareness, the equally split between the, the audio and the video.

51:25 RTH: So I am mostly noticing my own reaction.

51:32 Evan: Yes.

51:33 RTH: And my reaction is to what's going on in the screen. But basically I am monitoring *Evan*, my, my primary directionality of experience, I guess you could say, would be at *my critical reaction*.

51:52 Evan: Yes, I think so.

51:55 GP: Okay.

51:59 RTH: And then I

52:00 Evan: Another different beep.

52:03 RTH: Go for it, Gualtiero.

52:06 GP: Um, I was wondering if I understood correctly that you felt this critical lens or critical attitude towards the video that you were having without experiencing any words, y'know, either being heard or spoken in your head, or the vocalized or, um, any other images associated with this, um, experience. Did I understand that correctly?

52:43 Evan: Like I, I would, I, I believe that there was inner dialogue of literally saying the words like, "is that good?" Is, is so it was a critical lens. And I do believe there was some inner process of me thinking, "is that good?"

53:02 GP: And in that case you could, you could fence the transitions between the words. Like you could hear, or, or sense the words one after the other, um, in your thought process is like the word *is*, and then *the* word *that* and the word *good*?

53:25 Evan: Right? I would say I, I think so. Um, but hard to say for sure. But I do think, I think so.

53:37 GP: Okay.

53:41 RTH: So I would notice that the words “is that good” appears in this dialogue several minutes in, up until this time it hasn’t been about words. It has been about a critical lens. And that may be the, the result of the questions that I asked as opposed to the questions that Gualtierio asked. I,

54:07 Evan: I am relatively uncertain if I was actually saying the words I have in my mind now that I, that I was. But it, it’s kind of hard to disentangle. Um,

54:20 GP: Yeah.

54:21 Evan: So it was kind of more of a general sense. Yeah. I don’t know. It’s really hard.

54:25 GP: Russ, are you saying this because in trying to capture the meaning of this critical lens you use, *you* use those words, you said, “is this good?” “Is this bad?” I think you said, you said things like that while you were asking Evan and you’re, are you suggesting that maybe those words are now sort of

54:45 Evan: Incepted inside me.

54:47 GP: Being in, um,

54:51 RTH: Reified

54:52 GP: By Evan?

54:53 RTH: Yeah. And I think your, your question, your, your question was explicitly about the words, I th, I thought, and my ques and, and so I, so, so, so I’m, I’m, not blaming anybody here. I’m, what, what I’m saying is that the longer we, the longer we talk about something, the longer we talk about a, a beep, the [Evan: Yeah.] the more we, the more skeptical we should be about that. This is not a criticism of, of anybody. It’s the this, this is, y’know, our brains are trying to make sense of the world. And the more we make, the more time we spend about it, the more strands that we can weave in to try to make sense, sense of the things, but the also the more *confabulatory* those could be. And [Evan: For sure.] And, and, and I’m not saying that Gualtierio led us down the wrong track or, or that I led us down the wrong track, or that... cuz I think it’s quite possible that I did say, probably did say the words. It is good. Isn’t that good first? And, and what I would say is that...

55:56 GP: I think you did.

55:56

Russ comments: Having reviewed the video, I think GP is mistaken here, and I will describe what I think happened in a minute. But before I do that, I examine my motivation. I think my motivation is *not* 'I was right, you were wrong, ha ha!' My motivation is to try to demonstrate the delicacy of the discussions and that the longer time we spend talking about something, the worse it likely gets.

Here is the sequence of talk about "is it good?" I will insert my comments in red:

Evan 46:20 [his opening salvo] This might have been my first beep of unsymbolized thought because I had like a awareness of like a critical lens that I was applying to the video. So I was reviewing a video. And so I was looking at every element from the perspective of criticizing it, thinking *is that good? Is that good? Or what's good about that?* And it was, it was a very critical lens. [By beginning with the reference to unsymbolized thought, I think Evan suggests this is not in words.]

Evan 47:57 I think it's primarily just this, this cognitive lens of did I just, what, how good was what I just watched? [Evan is ambiguous about words.]

RTH 48:23 So it's not like I say, well, *that's bad or that's good*. [Evan: Yeah.] It's *not that*. [RTH suggests, in agreement with Evan, that there were *not* words.]

Evan 49:15 It was that criticality, that cognitive thinking, *is this good?* [Evan is ambiguous about words.]

Evan 51:02 Definitely the, the critical lens. that's, so I, I said there's about 80% I think of me just thinking, is this good? [Evan is ambiguous about words.]

GP 52:06 I was wondering if I understood correctly that you felt this critical lens or critical attitude towards the video that you were having without experiencing any words, y'know, either being heard or spoken in your head, or the vocalized. [To my ear, this is ambiguous. I'm no mind reader, but I hear this as suggesting, perhaps slightly, perhaps strongly but *sub rosa*, that GP does not believe Evan's previous no-reports-of-words, that is, that the question conveys something like "Are you sure you want to stick with this no-words stuff?" But it's not what RTH thinks—see at the *.]

Evan 52:43 I believe that there was inner dialogue of literally saying the words like, "is that good?" Is, is so it was a critical lens. And I do believe there was some inner process of me thinking, "is that good?" [Evan says there were words.]

*That sequence is, in short, six minutes of talk that suggests that there are no words, then GP's 52:06 question, and then Evan's 52:43 there-were-words answer.

I emphasize that I am no mind reader, and I am not the ultimate judge of the quality of questions, but I think such sequences provide an occasion for self-reflection. Perhaps GP's question unlocked Evan's reluctance to say it was words. Perhaps GP's question reflects GP's preference that Evan say it was in words. Perhaps Russ is hypersensitive to the potential word-suggestion of GP's 52:06

question. Perhaps it has nothing to do with GP's question—in the 6.5 minutes we have been talking about this sample, Evan on his own, for whatever reason, drifted towards words. I am not a mind reader, either of GP, or of Evan, or myself.

The desirable feature of DES, unlike many other enterprises (such as philosophical or psychological theory debates), is that there is a pretty-darn-right answer to the question "What was in Evan's experience at the moment of this beep?" That means that each question and its answer can be examined for whether it seems to be helping Evan describe his at-the-beep experience. To the extent that each is motivated to align himself with the rightness of such answers, each has the occasion for self-reflection: GP could ask *did I push in the direction of words, and if so why and how could I have asked that question in a way that did not so push?* Evan could ask, *did I cave into the word implication of GP's question, and if so, what can I do to more firmly grasp my experience and stick to it?* And Russ could ask, *what is the motivation that leads to this longish answer to an ambiguous situation?*

Russ is not the judge of any of those questions. He can say (and has said) from long experience that the best evidence about the quality of a question is the quality of the answer.

- 55:57 RTH: This is the, this is the way the iterative process, process works. That we are now learning about how to say something about *this*. If we get to people like this again, then maybe we'll be able to figure that out.
- 56:14 Evan: You're definitely right that it gets harder the more you talk about it, because I was thinking more, and then I'm trying to recall, like I didn't write it down.
- 56:22 RTH: Right. The purpose, the goal of the iterative process is to get good enough at ascertaining (or apprehending is a word I like to use) the ap, apprehending what needs to be apprehended quickly enough so that the ambiguities, we, we've already worked out the ambiguities and now we can just say, well, this is the, this is the kind of thing it was. I've, I've had had these kinds of experiences before, and I'm pretty practiced in talking about 'em, now I can say it. [Evan: Yeah.] And, and get that stuff memorialized early on in the process. That's, that's the goal. And it takes [Evan: Yeah.] time and effort and, and uh, attention. And
- 57:07 Evan: In terms of, did you say, "is this good?" and that went into my mind. I actually do have the words, "is this good?" on the page [in his notes]. I just don't have it that it was words in my head. It was kind of more of a general feeling.
- 57:20 RTH: Yeah.
- 57:21 Evan: And then I might have confabulated on the words being in my head. I'm not confident on that. But like, what I wrote, what I have here exactly is "I had a critical lens while watching of "is this good" in quotes, but I didn't write like that those words were in my head. There was just kind of a general feeling of, is this good throughout? And that can be hard to disentangle if those words were in my head in any real way, or if that's ever a thing that's possible.

57:21 Russ comments: That is exactly the kind of realization that the iterative process is trying to highlight. Our discussion for the last 5-ish minutes is *not* an effort to become correct about sample 4.5—that is water over the dam. It is an effort to become more skilled on the next sampling day, or the one after that.

57:49 RTH: So what I, what I think we didn't, and I think the fundamental thing that we did not disentangle is whether your experience was mostly directed at the, at the video with a, with a particular lens or more aimed meta process or meta-process-wise at Evan's experience. And I think you, I think you said at the outset what I would've, what I heard as being aimed at the video with a particular lens on it. So like I put on rose colored lenses or whatever, and everything looks rosy, but what I'm seeing is rosy and that's rosiness is out there (and it's that color we're dealing, it's here, it's this criticism, y'know).

58:36 Evan: Yeah.

58:37 RTH: And the question is whether the criticism is, I'm observing myself to be critical, in which case I might even be saying to myself, is that good unquote; *or* am I critically watching the screen? In which case I am mostly attending to the screen in this critical mode.

59:00 Evan: Yeah.

59:00 RTH: And, and I don't think we, we were capable probably of teasing that apart adequately.

59:07 Evan: I, I would say it's both, but it's very hard to know in what parts I, I, I think both, almost, certainly both. But I just, I just don't know in what ratio or which was dominant.

59:07 Russ comments: I re-emphasize that the aim here is *not* to clarify sample 4.5, but to become more skilled if there are similar events on subsequent sampling days.

59:18 RTH: Yeah.

59:20 Evan: And my brain kind of hurts now. [laughs] I'm trying to like think, trying to think through it.

59:25 RTH: And, and part of it, and part of the, part of this experience, what complicated this experience is that it started out being a, a not only, so we had the, we had a difficult decision to make, whether it was a, whether it was out, out there or in here. And then we had another difficult decision to make as to whether we should call this unsymbolized thinking or whatever, which is not about here and not about there, but about, y'know, about Hurlburt and what he's written, all, all this terminology and what I've, what I've heard about terminology and

59:56 Evan: Yes.

59:57 RTH: So all that stuff is com, complicated together. And [Evan: Yeah.] what I, what I would, what I would say is let's *not*, let's agree *not* to use the term *unsymbolized* until the

end. [Evan: Yeah.] Let's not worry about whether we should call this *unsymbolized* cuz I think it fucks people up. And, and let's, let's see whether we can, whether we can describe the words in plain, describe the *experience* in, in as plain English as we can get, and then [Evan: Yes.] apply some jargon later on. Rather, *rather* than to try to answer a jargon question earl, early on.

1:00:37 Evan: Yeah. I think, I think I'm finally understanding why in the intro call to this, you don't have like lecture slides saying, these are the domain of possible things you will experience for the next few weeks. Everything will fit into these five buckets. It's just, I got excited that I thought it might be unsymbolized and wrote it and wrote it down, but [inaudible]

1:00:58 RTH: Yeah. And it's a, that's a very, that's, that's a very common thing because I'm, my work is known for having discovered unsymbolized thinking or something, and people, and people have that reaction, and it, and it makes, it, makes it difficult.

1:01:13 Evan: Do you have any idea after all of that confusion, or maybe you don't want to answer this, but do you think that *was* unsymbolized [RTH: Prob...] and then I won't use the word again!

1:01:22 RTH: Prob probably not, [Evan: Okay.] but I would, I would, I would say, I would say we should put on the agenda to answer that question at a time when I think it would not fuck us up.

1:01:33 Evan: Right.

1:01:33 RTH: So I think it's an important question. I'm happy to answer the question. But I don't want us to, to get into the, I don't I, the, the, the d, it's a, Gualtiero and I are having another discussion about, about the importance of words or the diffi, difficulties of words or whatever. But, but this is a, this is at sort of at the heart of that. I *don't* want us to be trying to fit experiences into words. [Evan nods affirmatively and says something inaudible] I want us to be letting words discover experiences, and different, using the same word in different ways is fine with me. And we, I, I think y'know, we, we had, we've had a lot of what I would call sort of beautiful discussions about words here. Like the words about, *look at the screen* or whatever it was that you said about that was, y'know, is my, is my, I forget what is my, "where are my sales?" Where, where are my sales? The word words are at, *at the very best* words are gestures: *So look over there!* That's what a, that's what using a word means, that's what I'm talking about now. Every, every word is, I think it's, it's a sort of a entraining your attention to go in some particular direction.

1:02:51 Evan: Right.

1:02:51 RTH: And sometimes, sometimes it's, they're, they're quite gestural. Like this example that we just had, sample number 4 was a good example of that. And sometimes they're quite semantically specific. But, but all the time I think they're, *let's look here! Look here buddy!* And uh,

1:03:12 Evan: Yeah, yeah, I think so as well.

1:03:14 RTH: But, but it is easy for us to get caught up in the words. And that is, that is, that makes our work difficult,

1:03:24 Evan: If not, yeah. Yeah. And I think we saw a good example of that literally in that moment. So, yeah. Makes, makes complete sense. I will, I'll refrain from categorizing anything going forward.

1:03:24 Russ comments: That is the iterative method bearing fruit, I think.

1:03:40 RTH: So it's, uh, three minutes after the next hour. So we've been at this for 63 minutes here. We should we say that's enough and plan a plan another meeting?

1:03:52 Evan: Yeah, let's do it.