

Evan 6
Evan Sampling Day 6

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the August 29 sampling interview 6 with Evan that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/TAJNCYU2gNc>. 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

- 0:06 RTH: This is gonna be day 6-ish, maybe. I'm not a hundred percent sure.
- 0:12 Evan: That's what I have in my head. Yep.
- 0:13 RTH: I'm not a hundred percent sure about that. Anything that we should be reviewing before we look at samples?
- 0:23 Evan: Any idea, are we, are we getting close to a number where we're happy with the amount of samples? Do you think you, I think we said at the start six is, was, is sort of maybe the average amount of sessions you do with somebody, but it can go longer and it can go shorter.
- 0:38 RTH: Yeah. I, I think we talked last time about doing it two or three more [Evan: Yeah.] times, and, and I think that's in the ballpark. I think we could say this is enough today, and we could say we should do a couple more after that. I think, I think it's, it depends on whether people are still getting value out of the hours that we spent together. And if they do, then we should do it again.
- 1:02 Evan: I'm good with, with two more, and I'll try and vary up the experiences a lot. These beeps were different experiences, trying not to just sit at my desk and work for the four or five hours of beeps to vary up the experiences. So I think maybe two more sessions and I'll try vary the beeps as much as possible to get some more interesting, interesting, um, samples.
- 1:23 RTH: I, I would say that all is in exactly the ballpark of what I had in mind and, uh. [Gualtierio gives thumbs up]
- 1:29 Evan: Sounds good.
- 1:31 RTH: All right. Anything else we should be talking about before we launch into beep number 1?

- 1:39 Evan: Our episode continues to, to be a success and rise every week.
- 1:44 RTH: I still,
- 1:44 Evan: And that's also,
- 1:46 RTH: I still get an email just about every day, maybe a couple of times a day from people who would like to be a part of this.
- 1:54 Evan: Right. Very cool. Yeah. Yeah.
- 1:58 RTH: So, Gualtiero, are you happy with our, the, the method that we're doing here with me being the primary interviewer and you being the shortstop or whatever and, uh, [GP: Yes.] Okay. Then I'm ready. Number 1.

SAMPLE 6.1 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 2:13 Evan: So feeling positive. Had a sense of general sense of happiness. Was talking to my friend, hearing the words "rural Ireland" that he was saying. And then I was imagining a green Irish countryside with a stone wall. So I had an image in my head of rural Ireland.
- 2:35 RTH: And is the feeling positive sort of, is that a directly apprehended thing? Or, or are you describing that as sort of a general, general characteristic in the more direct thing as feeling Ireland and the image in your head?
- 2:50 Evan: I think it was directly apprehended. It's very much a bodily, a bodily feeling that I did have awareness of in that moment. [RTH: Okay. And...] You know, maybe, maybe 30% or so, maybe a third.
- 3:02 RTH: So three, three things. A third, a third, a third?
- 3:07 Evan: Yeah. I would say roughly, yeah. It was quite a faint image in my head of the, of the countryside and the, and the wall. Um, but yeah, roughly a third, a third, a third.
- 3:19 RTH: Okay. All right. Well, let's start with the feeling positive. Tell me a bit more about that.
- 3:25 Evan: Difficult to put into words, but it's, it's, it's a, it's very much a bodily sensation. Maybe it's, it's coming a little bit more from the, from the stomach, from the gut, but it's just a, it's just a sense of, of positivity, a sense of, of happiness, general positive, uplifting feeling.
- 3:48 RTH: Okay.
- 3:48 Evan: Hard to really explain it more than that, but,
- 3:53 RTH: And is *uplifting* a physical sensation or a metaphorical description?

- 4:01 Evan: I'd say metaphorical.
- 4:02 RTH: Okay. So what I'm gathering is that it is fair to say that directly present to me is a feeling of happi, happiness, satisfaction, whatever, and that that's bodily gut-wise, gut bias. But beyond that, really not much more to say,
- 4:20 Evan: Yeah, there's some sense of positive valence, but you know, hard to characterize or really go more specific than, than that.
- 4:30 RTH: Okay. And I'm happy with that portion. Gualtieri, are you happy with that?
- 4:34 GP: So that's a, is it fair to call that a, um, this is more, well, maybe more a question for Russ than for Evan, um, would you classify this as an emotional experience that's also located in the body?
- 5:01 RTH: I would, yes.
- 5:01 Russ comments: Actually, I object to that a bit, because it makes it seem that there is an emotional experience *and simultaneously* a bodily experience, when I did not hear any description of two experiences. So to be more precise, I would call this a *bodily feeling*. I use *feeling* to mean the *experience* of emotion (as distinct from any physiology of emotion), and if that feeling presents itself as in the body in some way, then I would append the adjective *bodily*. [There are many feelings (that is, many experiences of emotion) that have no bodily presentation.]
- 5:05 GP: Okay. That's reasonable.
- 5:05 RTH: I, I think feelings are, feelings are fairly difficult to describe in general. This is a good example of why they're sort of hard to describe. Yeah. And I would, I would say in my lexicon, this is a *bodily feeling*.
- 5:20 GP: Okay. But bodily feeling can be just where my body is, or pain, or heat. This is a affective kind of experience, too, right?
- 5:33 RTH: Yes. But in my lexicon, I would not use feeling, I would not use the word "feeling" for what you just described. I would limit that to sensation. So I would distinguish between sensation and feeling and limit in my, in my, the, the way I, the way that I apply words, I guess, I would, I would limit *feeling* to an, a affective.... *The experience of the experience of, of emotion* is what *feeling* is. And, and I agree that the word feeling is very difficult. It's one of the hardest words that, that there is because it's the definitions all over the place. And, uh, yeah.
- 5:33 Russ comments: RE "I would not use the word 'feeling' for what you just described."
That's actually too strong, because in everyday conversation, and sometimes in DES interviews, I use "feeling" to mean sensation. For example, in the description of sample 6.2, I wrote "Simultaneously (10%) I feel, with my fingertips, the bristleness of my beard." There, the word *feel* is intended to mean sensation, not emotional experience, and that is bad, from my point of view. But the alternative is to write

something like “Simultaneously (10%) I *sense*, with my fingertips, the bristleness of my beard,” but that usage connotes a more active / premeditated experience that is warranted; of “Simultaneously (10%) I have the fingertip sensation of the bristleness of my beard,” which is pretty accurate but very pedantic.

DES is not about the words. Regardless of what you call it, or how relaxed (or context specific) a vocabulary, there is, as GP says, a distinct difference between (what I when being careful) would call a sensation and a feeling (as experience of emotion).

- 6:10 RTH: But, but if, if your point is, there are plenty of times when Evan, I think has had a sensation in his stomach as the result of some workout or other, and that, that we would call a bodily sensation. And that’s a very different thing from *this*. This is an emotional experience that seems to be in some way manifested in the, experientially, in his stomach, gut region. And those are very different things. I totally agree with that. [GP: Got it. Thank you.] And it is, it is a challenge to keep the language separate because people use “feelings” for both of those things. [GP: Got it. Thank you.] So..
- 6:53 Evan: I would, I would, and I was, that was an interesting, a good distinction. I think it’s centrally in the gut, but it was a sort of an all, an all-body feeling, not just, not just the gut and stomach, but that might be the, you know, the, the majority of it or the, the epicenter of, of the, the, if it’s possible to have such thing.
- 7:13 RTH: Okay. And then by, by, by all body, do you mean including my arms and my hands and my head and...
- 7:19 Evan: Not equally, but for sure, you know, there’s a bit in the shoulder there, definitely a bit in the lower in the legs and yeah,
- 7:26 RTH: So there’s some bodily valence which perfuses or suffuses or something my entire body, but maybe sort of more in my central region than in my extremity region.
- 7:38 Evan: Right. Yeah. I’d say that’s accurate. Fair enough. And probably not in the head, very much, weirdly enough, it’s kind of neck down, which is a bit strange, but I would say that that’s accurate.
- 7:51 RTH: Okay. And then there are two other aspects. My friend is saying “rural Ireland,” and I’m seeing a rural Irish scene, I guess. And are those
- 8:03 Evan: The greatest scene in the world! Rural countryside Ireland with a nice stone wall going through. The most beautiful image there is!
- 8:10 RTH: Okay. And, and so is that more central, more salient to you than the friend saying “rural Ireland”? He’s saying it, but I am, I’m experiencing it, seeing it for myself.
- 8:25 Evan: The, the image in my head was quite faint. I wouldn’t say it was very, it was very vivid that I was seeing in extraordinary detail. Um, I would say half / half, but you know, with, with the standard error bar on that. [RTH: Okay.] That of uncertainty, but fair enough, roughly equal.

8:41 RTH: Fair enough. So, so something can, something can be *salient* to me without it being *clear*. Those are two more, (sometimes at least) more or less separate dimensions. Right. So I can be, I *could* be (I'm not saying that you are), but I could be engaged in the, in a sort of a sketchy or not very clear Irish countryside with a wall. And yet I'm, I'm totally involved with that. Those are...

9:13 Evan: Right.

9:15 RTH: I'm not trying to talk you into that, but let's start with, let's start with, uh, seeing what did, so tell me exactly what you see.

9:22 Evan: So lots of green, um, lots of green bushes, fields, thing in the background. Kind of in the foreground. There was a stone wall, um, you know, waist height, kind of stone wall, a bit damaged, and then blue sky.

9:42 RTH: And does this stonewall go side to side or is it going this way, or doesn't that matter? Yeah,

9:50 Evan: Yeah, front to front of the image, kind of from the bottom left corner, kind of upwards a little bit in the, in the frame, but, but definitely in the front of, of the frame, the bottom half.

10:02 RTH: Okay. And the

10:03 Evan: Extending across.

10:04 RTH: And, and does it divide up something like is there a road next to the wall or whatever? Or is it just the wall that goes across the,

10:11 Evan: I I think I can't see the road, but it would be on the other side of that wall.

10:16 RTH: Okay. Okay. So I see a bucolic scene, I guess you would say, of green countryside with a wall going diagonally across it.

10:28 Evan: Bucolic?. So is that word you used? Yes. I have no idea what that word is. That's,

10:32 RTH: I think it means "green countryside," basically. [they laugh]

10:32 Russ comments: Webster: "**bucolic** **2 a:** relating to or typical of rural life; **b:** idyllic"

10:35 Evan: Ah, okay.

10:36 RTH: Ba basically. Cool.

10:39 Evan: Nice word. I, I didn't know that existed.

10:42 RTH: Good. It is a pretty good word. B-U-C-O-L-I-C. We can look it up. So, and, and then my, my friend is talking. [Evan: Yeah.] And am I, am I hearing that other than it is causing me to create this scene?

11:04 Evan: Am I hearing that? I'm not sure I..

11:06 RTH: So what, what is your experience of your friend talking? I guess is what I, what I should have asked.

11:11 Evan: So I remember hearing the words "rural Ireland" in the moment of the beep. That was, those words were in my awareness was auditory hearing those words and then the, the image in my mind.

11:28 RTH: And is there anything specific about the hearing of that other than that it triggers this scene?

11:34 Evan: Don't think so. I don't think so. Okay.

11:42 RTH: Then I think I'm good.

11:44 GP: Quick, quick, uh, follow up. Um, the image, the bucolic image, um, sounds like it was fairly detailed. Um, does it include details such as seeing (in the image) individual stones in the wall or the, the, the, the, the boundary between stones?

12:09 Evan: I would, I would say yes, loosely not, not perfect, high resolution, but, but yeah, you, I can definitely make out, there was a bit of damage on the top, like there was a brick missing. Um, I can definitely make out some of the divisions in the bricks, without having, I would say a perfectly fine detail of the whole picture. I just have some idea of some,

12:31 GP: It's a brick wall, not a stone wall?

12:34 Evan: Stone wall, sorry, like stone. I mean the divisions in the stones. Stone wall.

12:39 GP: Got it. Thank you. Yeah,

12:41 RTH: Yeah. So the question that you ask is a, is the philosopher's question. And, and, and I, I think in the, in the experiential world, even in the experiential world of the external world, it, it doesn't matter how many stones there are, whether you can see the... What you see, what you experience is a stone wall that is the standard stone wall. But that does not necessarily mean that you see in individual stones and spaces in between the stone. And that's true, that's true in the, [Evan: I think I do.] that's true in the, in the real world as well. So if you see a, (I think!) if you see a real-world stone wall, it is not the case that your experience is somehow calculating how many stones there are and what, how much space there is between the stones, even though *in the real world* [Evan: Right.] there are an [inaudible] stones and so many centimeters in between the stones and whatever. [Evan: Right.] But that does not mean that that's true in your experiential world.

12:41

Russ comments: RE “the philosopher’s question”

I am referring to the questions “How many stripes does your image of a zebra have?” or “How many speckles does your image of a speckled hen have?” I think *does your image* implies (probably incorrectly, in my view) that part of you creates an image and, separately, another part of you sees that image. I don’t think there is such separation (except, perhaps, in some disorders such as schizophrenia), and therefore talking about images is risky / misleading. I think there is an *inner seeing*, not a seeing of an image.

Further, I think it doesn’t make sense to ask about a seeing of a zebra (whether inner or outer) how many stripes it (the seeing) has. If you are, in the real world, seeing a real zebra, the *zebra itself* has a specific number of stripes, but there is no reason to believe that your *seeing* of the zebra has a specific number of stripes (unless you are particularly interested in the countability of the stripes).

That is why, in the same way I reserve *feeling* for the *experience of emotion*, I do *not* talk about images or imagery, preferring the more apt *inner seeing*. (But when *inner seeing* is too pedantic, I will allow myself to use the colloquial *image*.)

Regardless of what you call it, or how relaxed (or context specific) a vocabulary, it is always risky to cavalierly talk about seeing an image, for the reasons described here. So DES asks “what do you see?” rather than “tell me about your image.”

13:43 GP:

Yeah. Well, to me, this is very interesting because I consider myself a *aphantasic*, meaning unable to visualize vividly, you know, images in my head. And so to me it borders on inconceivable that somebody would experience in their head divisions between stone imaginary stones in an image of a wall. Um, so it’s very fascinating, you know. So I, I was already blown away by the degree of detail that you listed at the very beginning. And so I thought, oh, I wonder if you would say that he could also experience some of the stones themselves in the wall and... Yeah, so more power to you.

13:43

Russ comments: Here, as is usually the case, it is entirely possible to innerly, directly experience a stone wall, in its ramshackle detail, its old-stone construction, its missing stones and spaces between the stones, *without* being able to say, for example, how many stones there are, or how many stones are missing, and so on. The inability to specify (count) such details in no way impugns the description of having innerly seen (or clearly innerly seen) a ramshackle stone wall.

14:34 Evan:

That’s what I thought, that’s that’s what I thought you were, you were getting at. I did a VVIQ, outta curiosity with my sister. She’s *aphantasic*, a perfect, perfect 16 on the VVIQ, black on black for every scene. And I actually landed on the *hyperphantasia* side of the spectrum. I dunno if I fully identify with that though. I, I think, I think I’m, I’m a little bit skeptical of the accuracy of the test when you’re kind of in that middle-ish range or middle to, to high end, high end. But yeah, seem to have a pretty decent, um, visual imagination if that test is to be believed. And apparently it’s pretty accurate and consistent. So

14:34 I would say that in my experience, the VVIQ has, like many questionnaires, a validity coefficient of roughly .3. If that's what you mean as pretty decent, then I agree. But I think that number hides some pretty interesting phenomena.

15:12 GP: Yeah, and I'm not like total blank, but I'm near that. So...

15:17 Evan: Interesting.

15:18 GP: Yeah. Like I can say, I'd say I have, you know, very faint outlines of things that I can, maybe not quite visualize, but I have a, like a quasi-visual feeling that there's something there, something like that. [Evan: Yeah.] But clearly, clearly, like we are on two different planets, you and I, when it comes to like visual imagination.

15:42 Evan: Right.

15:43 GP: You and I [Evan: Fascinating.] and many other people. I mean, many people are more like you and some people are more like me, so Yeah. Like your sister. Yeah,

15:49 RTH: I think, I think there's a wide range.

15:51 GP: Yeah. Yeah, yeah. No, and I mean, you know, I've, I've been in, in a short public conversation with, uh, Eric Schwitzgebel on this, on Facebook in which he took like the skeptical position that maybe we're all having the same experiences, but we all just described them differently, and, you know,

16:10 RTH: I don't think, I don't think that's possibly true.

16:12 GP: No,

16:13 RTH: I think I could make an

16:14 Evan: Argument. It's an absurd conclusion. Like surely it's an absurd conclusion to arrive to.

16:19 RTH: Right. I just don't think...

16:20 Evan: It's true. My, my eight, my 86 billion neurons are wired the same way as your 86 billion neurons. Seems unlikely. Yeah.

16:31 RTH: In order, in order to believe that we would have to say something like about what Evan just, just told us is that he's not really seeing anything at the moment of this beep—somehow he's just making that up. *Or* that Gualtierio *is* seeing something and *he's* just making it up. Equally unlikely.

16:47 GP: Yeah, exactly. Exactly. That's the really the only way that you could maintain something like that. You know,

16:55 RTH: On to number 2?

SAMPLE 6.2 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 16:58 Evan: I was looking at my laptop noticing the style and design of a slide. And then I had some sort of cognitive wondering about who the target audience is. This is a bit of a strange one. So I was sort of noticing, paying attention... What within my awareness was the style and the design of what I was looking at. And then in my head I was wondering who the target audience is, *thinking* who the target audience is for this. It was a product slide.
- 17:29 RTH: And, and are those two aspects more or less equal, or one's one more prominent theistic of
- 17:34 Evan: One actually have more line. I just have one more line here that I forgot. I down and had my hand on my beard feeling the fingertips, the hairs just as an additional, um, sorry, what was,
- 17:47 RTH: So of, of those now three poss, possibles, are they equally present to you?
- 17:56 Evan: I would say that the most prominent thing was me wondering who the target audience is. And then the second was noticing the style on the design. And then the third was the hand, um, on the beard fingertips touching the hair like this.
- 18:14 RTH: Okay. Well, let's start with the wondering who, who the target is. How, how does that present itself to you?
- 18:21 Evan: It's a good question. It's *not* inner speech.
- 18:25 RTH: Are there words at all? Any words?
- 18:29 Evan: I would say, I would say, it, w, sorry, I would say, I would say *No*, that I, I didn't necessarily have the words who the target audience was in my head, but it was, that was the function, the cognitive function, I guess.
- 18:48 RTH: Okay. And this is directly present to you? [Evan: Yeah.] As, as directly present to you as if you had said to yourself in inner speech "quote, "I wonder who the target audience is?" unquote? That present?
- 19:05 Evan: Yeah. Although the, the only difference is I would, I don't think there's words present in any meaningful way. I think who the target, like I can't say for certain if those were the exact words I thought or that was just the, the, the function or the idea, if, if that makes sense. Okay. The more abstract I was abstractly thinking, you know who the target audience is rather than those exact words.
- 19:29 RTH: And would it be, would it be fair to say that this thinking could be expressed as *who's this slide for?* or something, some other
- 19:40 Evan: Y, Yeah, I think so, yeah. So that, that, that would be the differences. [RTH: Okay.] It seemed to be more abstract rather than the definite words. Yeah.

- 19:50 RTH: Okay. Then I'm good about that portion. And I would say that is pretty close to a textbook example of what I call *unsymbolized thinking*. We've had some conversations about what is and what isn't unsymbolized thinking. That's, that, that's what *is* unsymbolized thinking in the sense that: it's pretty specific—it's about this particular thing and that particular audience and wondering about it—but it could be put into several different very, several very different words. "Who's this for?" Is quote, quote, "who's this for?" unquote? It's very different from quote, "I wonder what the target audience is.", who the target audience is, or whatever. So the *meaning* [Evan: Do you, do you...] the semantics is present to me without words [Evan nods affirmatively] and distinctly present to me. There's no question about what I'm wondering about here, wondering who this is for?
- 20:43 Evan: Yes. Okay. So unsymbolized thinking is sort of like inner speech, but without specific words. It's more of a function that you're getting at. It's more of a cognitive function rather than specific words.
- 20:56 RTH: Well, yes and no. I, I would say it is *sort of* like inner speech.... I could have, I could have asked, for example, "does, does this thought unfold over time?" (We talked about that a time or two ago, I think.) [Evan: Yeah.] And my *guess* is that you would've answered that question *No, it doesn't unfold over time*. But I could have asked it.
- 21:13 Evan: That's, yeah, I would say that that's right, that it didn't. But with error bars on all of these things, right? I, I don't [RTH: Yeah.], it *could* have been speech, I just don't think it was.
- 21:23 RTH: But that's, but that's, that's why I rankle a little bit when you say, "well, this is just like inner speech...." It's "...except without words." It's *not* just like inner speech. It doesn't really have any of the characteristics *at all* of inner speech, probably. Doesn't have any words, doesn't have any voice, doesn't have any rhythm, doesn't have any unfoldingness, whatever. All of those things are characteristic of inner speech. [Evan: Okay.] And yet it conveys specific semantics. And, and, and in *that* respect, it *is* like inner speech. It conveys some specific meaning. So if that's what you meant by *this is just like inner speech*, then the answer is *yes*.
- 21:23 Russ comments: This is a good example of the patience required to explore inner experience. We are three pretty smart guys, and this is our sixth or eighth hour carefully talking about inner experience, and we still have to go back to the basics about what might be meant by *inner speech*. That is *not* at all a criticism of Evan or Gualtierio or me. It is just the way it is if you want to know what you're talking about inner experience-wise, and why DES must be iterative across multiple occasions.
- 22:04 Evan: Yeah, yeah. No, I get you.
- 22:08 RTH: I, I would like, I it what, so what I would say is that you, your experience as I understood it, was not just like a *gist* of something. It's not like, well, you know, I was looking at this and you could say, well, you know, this could be for that audience, it

could be that audience. I took you to be saying something much more specific than that: that you were at this moment wondering who this target audience was.

22:33 Evan: Yeah.

22:35 RTH: So that's not just a gist-y or something. It is specific specific-y, but without words.

22:44 Evan: Interesting. So the specific element is, is definitionally important to unsymbolized thinking?

22:50 RTH: Yeah. And the real and maybe, and, and all these things are, you know, continuums, it's whatever. But the, but most people, I would say most people when I describe unsymbolized thinking, they think I'm talking about a gist. And so I, I am habitually at pains to say no, I'm *not* talking about a *gist*. I'm talking about something that's specific. But there are gists, and there's a range of how gist-y things are. I agree with that. But unsymbolized thinking can be very highly specific. You know, I could be thinking: *should I have a peanut butter and jelly sandwich? And if I have peanut butter, should I have creamy peanut butter or, or crunchy peanut butter?* I could be thinking that specific kind of a thought without any words *at all*. That's not a *gist*. That's absolutely specific. Seems to me. [Evan: Right. Yep.]

23:47 So then I'm interested in the style on design of the slide, and how does that present itself?

23:57 Evan: Yeah, so I'm sort of focusing on, instead of looking at the individual elements, I'm looking at how everything is put together. So it's, I'm not looking at the color, um, specifically, or the object specifically, but more just the, the branding and the style and the tone behind what I'm looking at. Um, it's sort of hard to explain it. It's, it's, it's a little abstract, but I'm like, I think it's really much, it is really involved or wrapped into this who the target audience is. Um, rather than really noticing the elements as strictly in my sensory experience, what my eyes are looking at. It's more analyzing the tone, the style of the whole thing. Does that make sense?

24:51 RTH: So is this, is this more like how this whole thing impacts me or the impression it makes on me or something, rather than these particular words or those particular colors or this particular geometry?

25:03 Evan: The first one, yeah.

25:03 RTH: More interested in the general impact or general tone or general...

25:08 Evan: The holistic impression. Yeah,

25:10 RTH: Holistic impression is a good word. Okay. I'm happy with that. And then my hand is on my beard.

25:26 Evan: Yeah.

- 25:27 RTH: And is that a fact of the universe, the fact as if somebody were there when the beep occurred, they would've noticed your hand's on your beard? Or do you feel something in the sensation sense?
- 25:40 Evan: I think it's 10, 10 to 20% of my awareness, but really hard to know if that's ever, you know, a a, a *post hoc* I was, was touching my beard or was it actually my awareness? I think it was, you know, a small amount there.
- 25:55 RTH: Okay. So my impression is that in previous samples you've had somewhere where that was sort of *central* to your, where your, your beard feeling was central, [Evan: Yeah.] but this is not that. [Evan: Yeah.] This is probably part of the overall thing, but not much.
- 26:10 Evan: Yeah, I'd say this beep was like 70 to 80%. The, what we said was an unsymbolized thinking about thinking about who this target audience is. That was the vast majority that that cognitive function, that cognitive process. Okay.
- 26:29 RTH: And, and then about the, without trying to be specific too specific, and I don't know is a good answer here, but are, is this a fingertip sensation or a chin sensation or a beard sensation?
- 26:40 Evan: Fingertips. Fingertips.
- 26:42 RTH: So, so I'm feeling in, I'm feeling my, I'm feeling my beard, do its thing to my fingertips.
- 26:51 Evan: Yeah.
- 26:52 RTH: Okay.
- 26:53 Evan: Which might be my most common experience at the end of this thing, which is insanely boring! [laughs] Of everything. If that's my biggest realization that I touch my at a lot! [they laugh] Eight weeks. Eight weeks, well spent! [they laugh]
- 27:11 RTH: Well, I would, I would draw, I would draw from that, that that much of, much of the important thing that people do is not necessarily directly apprehended. [Evan: Yeah.] You know, you can be, you can be processing a whole lot of stuff without it [Evan: Right.] without its making its way to your experience.
- 27:31 Evan: Right. Which is interesting in of itself for sure.
- 27:35 RTH: Yeah. Number 3? Or Gualtiero, you got any questions about that? [GP: No, I'm good.] 3?

SAMPLE 6.3 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 27:43 Evan: So I was feeling energized, a bit excited by a new idea. Again, talking to my friend, um, had like an excited body high thinking that could work. And again, I don't, I think it was thinking not inner speech, it was, I don't think I necessarily had those words "that

could work” in my head, but it was the idea that could work and then a bodily excitement about that.

28:14 RTH: So I take it those are two separate things. Is that true? Or, or two, two separate strands anyway. [Evan: Yeah.] There’s a, a bodily ex energetic-ness and uh, thinking about,

28:27 Evan: Yeah.

28:27 RTH: Is that right? [Evan: Yeah.] Equally? One more than the other experientially?

28:36 Evan: Yeah. Maybe, maybe, maybe about 50—50.

28:39 RTH: Okay.

28:40 Evan: Maybe,

28:41 RTH: Well let’s start with that. That, *that, that would work*. What, how does that present itself?

28:48 Evan: But I, without comparing samples and drawing, cuz I know you’re gonna give out to me for that. I think it was similar to before that there was an idea in my head *that could work*, but those words weren’t present. It wasn’t inner speech, there wasn’t an accent, there wasn’t a temporal dimension. Like it could equally have been, *this could work, this could be successful, this is a good idea*. All of those things are functionally correct. That was, again, cognitive function that that could work.

29:22 RTH: And cognitive. And by *cognitive* you mean *before the footlights of consciousness* cognitive? That I am somehow thinking this analytical-e, cognitive-e *that could work*. *That’s a good idea. Let’s do that* kind of a deal.

29:41 Evan: I believe so, yes. Okay.

29:45 RTH: Then I would definitely put that into the unsymbolized thinking bucket, and pretty similar to the previous beep. And then there’s the feeling energized. How’s that?

30:06 Evan: Extremely hard to, to tell. But it, I guess the body, it was very bodily. Like it was definitely from the body and my body just felt light. It felt positive. And it was excited. Like I know all of those are just descriptive words. I don’t, it’s, it’s very hard to describe these bodily sensations with words. Never do them justice, but sort of excited, light, nimble. Do any of those help? I don’t know.

30:40 RTH: Gualtiero?

30:42 GP: How similar or different was that from the feeling in the first beep?

30:50 Evan: I would, I would say a similar feeling, but maybe dialed up.

30:55 GP: More intense?

30:57 Evan: Yeah,

30:59 GP: More positive. Even more positive?

31:01 Evan: Maybe a bit more, maybe a bit more adrenaline. Um, so like you still have that sort of latent positivity, latent happiness, but maybe there's a bit of an adrenaline injection of the sudden change of *Oh, that's a good idea*. This is where I would you, you need that the heart rate monitor, you know, to, to like attach the heart rate to that, cuz I think that actually it is, then there might even, that difference might even be physiological in that, you know, there was, it just kind of felt like a bit more of a, an adrenaline-pump body high. I am. Yeah.

31:39 RTH: And, and by bodily, are we talking about heart-bodily, stomach-bodily, hands-bodily, head-bodily?

31:49 Evan: Yeah. Maybe this one, again, it's sort of neck down, which is a bit strange, but maybe this one's a little bit more in the chest. Cuz I do, I think do feel the, the heart a bit more. But again, definitely diffuse over the, the body.

32:07 RTH: Okay. And I think I'm good about that. And, and Gualtieri, what I would say about the, about the comparative question, I think the comparative question is a good one, but I would've preferred to have waited on it. I would've rather asked the, *tell me about this one specifically* and *then* ask about the other one. Because when we did it in the order than we did then, then when I, when I got it around to asking him about where it was in the, the bodily, then he was in the *comparative* mode rather than the *description about this particular sample* mode. The comparison I would, I, I thought was important, but I would've rather gotten, gotten this one as good as I could do and *then* done the comparison rather than the other way around.

32:58 GP: Very fair, thank you.

33:02 RTH: Number 4.

33:03 Evan: It does feel just, it does feel useful on my side to (I understand your point on maybe doing the comparison after) but it, it sort of helps get that finely grained differentiation to compare them. And I know you'll say maybe some of it gets distorted trying to compare experiences and new kind of elements get exchanged between them. But it does, it feels like it's helpful for me to, to think of them both and try and get that differentiation between them helps me sort of develop a more finely tuned differentiation between those bodily experiences as well.

33:34 RTH: I think. And, and I totally agree with that. And so I, when I, when I was talking to Gualtieri a minute ago, I was trying to say, that's an important question and it's an important question [Evan: Right.] for the reasons that you just described. I just would've rather [Evan: Yeah, for sure.], just would've read it had I would rather have asked that later. [Evan: Yeah. Makes sense.]

33:34 Russ comments: The overarching principle here is my acceptance of the particularly pernicious nature of confirmation bias. If one wants to see the world as it is, one needs to hold confirmation bias at bay at every step—it is just too satisfying to be shown to be right. So every step in DES is designed to help keep confirmation bias under control—my confirmation bias, Evan’s confirmation bias, Gualtieri’s confirmation bias. Every sampling interaction is designed both to start from zero (*not* to verify a previous hunch) and at the same time to profit from what we have learned on previous sampling days.

Everything we (think we) have learned on previous sampling days should both be informative and happily accepted (actually preferred) to be mistaken. Everything should be assumed to be infected by confirmation bias until it has been incontrovertibly shown to be free of confirmation bias.

Said another way, across time we are learning how to talk with Evan about his inner experience—what distinctions have to be made and what language we might have to adjust to make them—while at the same time *suspending* any conclusion or theory about Evan’s experience, and (perhaps more importantly) suspending anything Evan’s experience might tell us about our own (explicit or casual) theories of experience. *After we have learned how to talk about Evan’s experience*, it might make sense to consider generalizations and implications.

SAMPLE 6.4 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

33:50 Evan: Um, so beep 4. I am, so I was speaking to my friend out loud and I spoke the words, “are they wedded to that?” um, feeling a general sense of curiosity behind the question, and then had my hand on my chin, but I didn’t notice any hair or fingertip pering. So the mainly is speaking out loud,” are they, are they wedded to that?” And then the sense of the sense of curiosity behind the question.

34:27 RTH: And as far as your experience is concerned, is the more about the speaking or more about the curiosity? Or equal? Or,

34:37 Evan: I think the speaking is almost all of it, I would say. Cuz when you’re, when it beeps and you’re mid, mid speaking the speaking, I think it’s definitely the vast dominant of, of the experience, at least in my, in my case, I’m like fully in that almost all of my awareness, maybe 95% of my awareness, is in that speaking.

34:59 GP: You are the speaker, right? You said?

35:01 Evan: Yeah. Yeah.

35:05 RTH: So what I would say, what I would say about that is that it is often the case that people describe (just like you did) that I was speaking and that was, that was, that was it. I was totally wrapped up in what I was saying. *But* there are *also* times (less common, but still fairly frequent) where people would say “these words were coming out of me, but I wasn’t really paying attention to them at all. I was the speaker and they were coming outta my mouth and whatever, but I was not attending to them.” And I sometimes call those words like, like *gestures*. Sometimes when people speak

they, you know, they [mimes hand gestures] move their hand around or something like that. And most of the time that, those hand mo, motions are invisible to them—they're doing it, but, and they're creating it, but they wouldn't say, "oh, I was moving my hand up." And words can be just like that. [Evan: Right.] Word, words can come out of me, just like hand gestures can come out of me. So I don't want us to *assume* that just because I'm speaking I *must be* wrapped up in it.

36:04 Evan: Right. Yeah.

36:05 RTH: But I don't also wanna talk you out...

36:06 Evan: Good point. I think I, yeah, no, I think I was, which yeah, no, it's a, it's a, it's a good point.

36:16 RTH: Okay. And so does it make sense to say I was curiously speaking "are they wedded to that," and that's my entire experience?

36:27 Evan: Yeah, I have "feeling curious" written down here, but I, I don't really know. Was that sort of just implicit in the question? Or was that a feeling that I was aware of? I'm not, I'm not really sure. I guess it was sort of wrapped up, wrapped up into the question. [RTH: Okay.] I'm not really sure how to tease those apart or you, you know,

36:50 RTH: I, I think that's very difficult to, and possibly impossible to tease those kinds of things apart.

36:55 Evan: Yeah.

37:01 RTH: Gualtiero, you have questions about that?

37:03 GP: Yeah. Um, do you, did you feel that you were, did you have a experience of *intentionally* speaking those words? Or was it more like the words were flowing out of you? You, you were experiencing the words coming out of you, but not so much the intent to say that, if that makes sense.

37:33 Evan: It *kind of* does. I *think* I had intent behind it as much as I ever sort of feel like I have intent behind my speech. It didn't feel automatic or like, obviously you don't, you don't, like intention doesn't work by like, *okay, now I'm going to say something*. You just, like, I'd say that there's, I would say intention, but yeah, hard to really know what's intention and what's flowing. Maybe it's always bits both. Like, I guess there was a sense of, I if that helps. There was a sense of me saying it.

38:21 GP: Yeah. And there was also a separate sense of looking for the answer to the question. That's a kind of a separate, [Evan: Yes.] um, experience of the, that's, you know, was that, was that connected to the question directly? As in you, you knew, you sensed that that curiosity was part of the motivation for asking the question or something like that? If, if that makes sense? Or, or was it as if they were to distinct things happening just at the same, around the same time that you were asking the question and also you were looking for the answer?

- 39:11 Evan: Definitely wrapped up. Definitely wrapped up inside it. So much so that I, I couldn't parse them apart at all. I think it was an intrinsic in the question.
- 39:20 GP: Yeah. Thank you.
- 39:25 RTH: I think it's fair to say that, that this was an *intentional* question, and un and, and by contradistinction to some, I think in *your* sampling [referring to Gualtiero] you had, Gualtiero, a fair number of vocalizations that were not intentional, [Gualtiero nods affirmatively] where, where you were talking to your dog or somebody and uh, [GP: Right.] words just sort of came out.
- 39:49 GP: That's right.
- 39:50 RTH: And this was *not that*. This was, but that does not mean that there is an intentionality which is served by this questioning or something. I don't, I don't have an opinion about that one way or the other.
- 40:03 Evan: I'm curious how, I'm curious how you differentiate, Gualtiero, before between your intentional speech and your non-intentional speech. Is there, is that just a feeling? Is there a feature?
- 40:16 GP: Well, I, so I think there are, um, there are, there are, maybe there's a spectrum, but at the very least there's clear cases where there's speech coming out of me more as a matter of habit or like some kind of automatic process. And it doesn't mean that I'm always saying the same thing. It could be, there's could be a creative element, but the creative element is sort of playful, semi-automatic combining words. Um, and they might have some kind of meaning behind them, but they, you know, they just come out as they, as they please. And then I don't have to think about it. I don't, I don't have any, you know, in intention behind saying that or anything very specific that requires effort or requires, um, you know, me processing information for some specific purpose; *versus* kind of on the *opposite* end, uh, you know, I say something with a specific intent because I want to convey something to somebody. And at least in some of those cases I have a *exper* I *experience* the intentionality of the act, which doesn't even have to be verbal. It could be something else. Like I could just be grabbing a cup, I don't know, and, and I could be sometimes feeling that I'm doing this on purpose, uh, as opposed to it's just happening, you know? And I'm the one doing it. I'm the one doing it, but I, I didn't have to like in or at least I didn't experience intentionally doing it.
- 42:15 Evan: Right.
- 42:16 GP: Does that make sense? Okay.
- 42:17 RTH: Let, let, lemme give an example that I think is sort of in the spirit of Gualtiero's samples. I don't think this is exactly a sample of his, but, but if, if, let's say he's playing with his dog and he's throwing a tennis ball for, for the dog and, and he might say something like, "get the ball!" and, and the saying of "get the ball!" comes out of

him—he's saying it—but it, but it, there's nothing *instructive* about that. It's not like he's telling his dog to get the ball any more than he's throwing the ball. He's throwing the ball and he's throwing out these words, "get the ball!" And that's part of the sort of habitual act—he's, he's playing with the dog and sometimes throwing, sometimes saying, sometimes doing some other stuff. That would be sort of a *non-intentional* saying.

43:02 Evan: Right.

43:03 RTH: And, and the, and the other end of that spectrum would be as if he were saying to his dog, "get the ball!" *by contrast to* "get the stick!" I have been playing with both the ball and the stick and now I'm saying "get the *ball!*". That would be an intentional *directive to the dog* that would be quite different from just "get the ball!" as part of a ball playing.

43:30 Evan: I think that makes sense. It's useful, it's useful to know that you think of them as on the same spectrum. I was wondering is there's some objective feature, like a temporal dimension that you use to discern the two, and you can tell by that, but it is more of a spectrum maybe on a spectrum of agency, maybe like what happens automatically, just you don't know awareness of it on a on, and then the other side of the spectrum is intent, awareness and full agency of you are *seeking* something or you *have a purpose* towards your question or [RTH: Right.] Is that, what, does that sound rough, Roughly correct?

44:11 GP: Yeah, I would say there's even maybe we could do the distinction between three options. *One*, you know, things just come out of you, it could be words, but you're not really like having to think about it or having a specific goal in mind. *Two*, it's intentional, you have a certain goal, you thought about it, you chose to say those words as opposed to others. *Three*, you also have, you know, the beep goes off and you can *sense* that intention in you as you are uttering the words. Like you had a sense, as an experience of the intent of saying those words as you're saying them for a, you know, for a certain purpose because you chose to say that. So you could [Evan: Right.] y'know, you could, I think you could have all three options.

45:03 RTH: I agree with that. And, and, and people at the beep sometimes do report that third option. It's, that's more at the rare end of the spectrum. But I would say...

45:11 GP: Yeah, and I mean, I remember having cases like that, when I, yeah, I say, yeah, no, I could sense that I *meant* to say that at that moment and also I was saying it, y'know, I was *saying* it and I *meant* to say it, and those are sort of two aspects of the experience, not just one. [RTH: Right.] Yeah.

45:30 Evan: Makes sense.

45:30 RTH: I agree that [inaudible].

45:31 Evan: Sense. Yep. Yep. Makes sense.

45:31 Russ comments: To review: Speech, whether outer or inner, can be intentional or not intentional. And if it is intentional, the intentionality can be either directly apprehended or not directly apprehended. The same applies to any behavior (not just speech).

There is lots of philosophical discussion about intentionality, most of which is more about mental states (which I know nothing about) and *not* about directly apprehended experience, and is not very informative, in my view.

45:35 RTH: On to number 4. 5? 5, I guess it is.

SAMPLE 6.5 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

45:39 Evan: 5. Yeah, [RTH coughs]. Um, so, so I was typing on a computer, typing the words “I’ve already made.” While I was typing, I was picturing a video thumbnail which was related to those words that I was typing (“I’ve already made”). And then I had some awareness of my fingertips hitting the keys.

46:07 RTH: And one of those more prominent than the other?

46:19 Evan: Um, I would say it was.... No, I would probably not, I would say it was a low, low experience beep, is that the right way to phrase it? Like there just wasn’t a whole lot going on in this, like the, the typing on the computer and then the, the picturing was quite faint, and then there was thumb awareness. So all of the experiences were quite faint. But yeah, you could say probably the picturing was the most, but it wasn’t a very vivid picture in this [inaudible].

46:50 RTH: Okay. Well let’s start with the picturing. So what did you, what did you see?

46:55 Evan: So it was the thumbnail of a video. So I could make out the person’s face, um, Professor David Knott, and then I ha, and then I could picture some colors down the left side of the rectangle, so I can make out red, yellow, and green, which are going down the left side of the, of the frame. That’s, those are the main two elements: of the person’s face on the right side. And then the colors that are streaming down the left side.

47:25 RTH: And when you say you can make those out, do you, are you conveying that those are not clear? Or that, or are you saying they’re clear enough but I don’t have any specific shape to them or whatever?

47:40 Evan: They’re, they’re clear enough. I, i, it just wasn’t a, I wasn’t consciously trying to visualize it, so it was just a bit faint in the background, sort of an automatic, um, involuntary visual image, I guess, while I was typing.

47:57 RTH: Okay.

47:57 Evan: Does that answer your question?

47:58 RTH: Yes. And, and is is what's present to you the thumbnail or the face that's in the thumbnail? Primarily.

48:12 Evan: Probably the elements of the thumbnail rather than the thumbnail itself. So the face and the colors, I would say would be more prominent than the idea, like I know that it's a thumbnail, but it's, it's not that I have awareness of it being a thumbnail, it's, you're right, that it's more the face and the colors that I have awareness of.

48:32 RTH: Okay. And this is *seeing*, I *see* this. Is that right? In my imagination?

48:39 Evan: Yeah. Yeah.

48:39 RTH: And is there any difference in the seeing in my imagination as a distinct from the seeing on the computer screen right now? For example, you're seeing Gualtiero on me, on the computer screen.

48:51 Evan: Yeah, I think when I imagine visually I usually have sort of a, a rectangular sort of 16 by 9 aspect ratio in my head. So it's kinda like having a flat screen TV with a black background. So it doesn't encompass, when I'm imagining it doesn't encompass the entire possible space of it. It's, it's, it's always sort of a, a rectangle.

49:17 RTH: So setting...

49:17 Evan: [inaudible] that common. I don't think I noticed that before.

49:20 RTH: So setting aside the *I always do that* aspect, about this particular beep, this particular thumbnail, is there is this thumbnail set into some 16 by 9-ish rectangle?

49:33 Evan: Yes. It's like I'm looking at a TV, almost, and then the background is black, like, or a TV or a frame, but it's just a rectangle in my imagination. And then sort of a, there's a discernible black background around it, so it's kinda sitting in a black space, if that makes sense.

49:50 RTH: Okay. And so does this thumbnail thing occupy a small portion or a large portion of the rectangle? Can't tell?

49:59 Evan: It's the, the whole, it's the whole rectangle, but the rectangle might be, it might be only sort of 50% of my visual imagination. Like there's a lot of black space around it.

50:18 RTH: So the rectangle is black, and there's black space around the rectangle, and

50:23 Evan: Yet there's, yeah, so sorry, so the rectangle is holding the thumbnail. So like the rectangle is like a frame. That's what I mean. So the, I have an image in my head that's a rectangle, and then behind it is black. So the rectangle is the thumbnail that I'm, that I'm imagining.

- 50:40 RTH: Okay. So the, so the thing that I see has the 16 by 9 wider-than-high aspect, is that right? I'm, I'm seeing something that's shaped like this. [Uses hands to mimic a 16X9 rectangle]
- 50:58 Evan: Yes, mm-hmm. In a black space. Yeah.
- 51:02 RTH: And is the black space seen to be black? Or is it just I'm not seeing it at all, and therefore I'm gonna say it's black.
- 51:11 Evan: I think, I think I see it as black. I think I, like, I think I know it like, like I think it has, like the thumbnail has clear boundaries rather than occupying all of the visual field that I can imagine. And then I believe the background is black.
- 51:34 RTH: Okay. So I would, I would say let's, because the, the subjunctification of this, I would say let's use this as a training opportunity. Well, so there's, in the real world, in the real visual world, there is a visual perception and we could calculate the angle or whatever and figure out what, what the visual field is. But that doesn't, not, that does *not* necessarily apply (might apply—I'm not saying it doesn't apply) to the *inner* visual world. Let's not presume.... What, what I, what I'm cautioning us to do is let's not *presume* that it does apply. [Evan: Yeah.] So next time we have a visual experience, we've got a visual experience and there is, I also experience a visual field against which this thing is projected, then [Evan: Yeah.] let's talk about that. But it's also quite possible that there, there is no such thing as an inner visual field, and that does not mean that the thumbnail occupies everything that I could possibly see. The thumbnail is still sort of a self-defined thumbnail, even though the, I, I don't see anything beyond that and Right. And what I'm trying to do right now is to take an agnostic view of that and uh, let's just not *presume* that the inner seeing [Evan: Yeah.] *ocu*, or operates with the same mechanics as the external seeing, cuz I don't think it does.
- 51:34 Russ comments: RE "the subjunctification of this"
Evan's 51:11 is highly peppered with underminers, which DES calls subjunctifiers. Here they are: I think, I think, I think, like, I think, like, like, I think, like, I believe. That's ten subjunctifiers in a 50 word turn. Evan's grammar producer is telling us that he should *not* be understood to be describing his experience unequivocally.
- 52:56 Evan: Right. Makes sense.
- 52:57 RTH: And for that matter I actually, I actually don't think that external seeing has a visual field either. The eyeballs have a visual field, but that doesn't mean the experience of seeing has a visual field. That's a different conversation I suppose. Sort of the same thing that we were talking about earlier on in the Zebra and its stripes or whatever. The zebra has a fixed number of stripes, but that doesn't mean that my experience of *seeing* the zebra has a fixed number of stripes.
- 53:27 Evan: Right. Makes sense.
- 53:34 RTH: Um, then I'm typing and, and does it, yeah.

- 53:41 Evan: Yes. I'm typing.
- 53:43 RTH: And does it seem like I'm typing this whole sentence of which "I've already made" is a piece of it? Or does it seem like I'm typing a *chunk*: "I've already made"?
- 53:55 Evan: So yeah, this was part of, part of the sentence that it, like the beep interrupted me writing the sentence. That's, that's as far as I've gotten.
- 54:02 RTH: So I'm, I'm writing a, I'm writing a sentence and the beep chunkifies it. It's not like I have chunkified it and now I'm going to write this chunk. It is that I'm writing out the sentence and then the beep happens while I'm doing it. [Evan: Yeah.] And in order to describe that to these guys, I'm gonna say, "well, these are the words that I was typing."
- 54:22 Evan: Yeah, that's right.
- 54:23 RTH: Okay. And I'm good about that. Number 6.

SAMPLE 6.6 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 54:34 Evan: So I was reading the name Hilke Placeman and for some reason with an exaggerated Swedish accent in my mind. I don't know why, I don't even know if that is a Swedish name.
- 54:52 RTH: And is that the extent, [Evan: That was it.] that's the extent of your experience here?
- 54:55 Evan: Yeah, this was definitely inner speech, Swedish accent over time. Very exaggerated.
- 55:06 RTH: And can you, can you give us a rendition of approximately what that would've been like?
- 55:11 Evan: I was, I was gonna say I won't, cuz I'm gonna offend the country of Sweden, but [laughs], but it was something like, "Hilke Placeman" [said with an exaggerated Swedish accent]
- 55:20 RTH: [they laugh] Okay.
- 55:23 Evan: I got it. So it sounds better in my head, it sounds a lot more Swedish and and in my head than, than whatever just came out there.
- 55:29 RTH: Yeah. So, so what I was trying to get at was that there, that there, that there *is* a specific rendition in your experience at this particular moment? [Evan: Yes.] And this is you speaking in your voice, but said quite different from your regular, regular externally spoken voice?
- 55:54 Evan: It's a good question, if, if it's in my voice or not [laughs], it's definitely in an exaggerated Swedish accent. So I don't, I don't know if it's necessarily my voice doing

that accent or somebody else doing an exaggerated Swedish accent. I am, I, I don't, I don't actually know. I don't, I, I don't have ownership over that voice, if that makes sense. Okay. I can't claim it. It could have been, been necessarily someone else.

56:24 RTH: And do I feel myself to be speaking it even if it's not in my, what seems like my own voice?

56:31 Evan: Yes, definitely.

56:32 RTH: So it's not like I'm *hearing* a recording of somebody saying that it's that I am producing these words, I'm the speaker?

56:41 Evan: Yeah.

56:41 RTH: When I'm not necessarily speaking it in my own voice.

56:46 Evan: Like I was, it's not in my own voice insofar as it's an exaggerated Swedish accent. Right. So I am, yeah. Har, hard to know if it's in my voice or if it's a caricatured Swedish man.

57:03 RTH: Okay. So I would, what I would say about inner speaking is that the inner speaking does not have to be in your own voice. You one, one can, and people more or less frequently do, speak in somebody else's voice.

57:18 Evan: Yeah.

57:19 RTH: And I would say that your rendition made, it made it seem like you were speaking in somebody else's voice. It was, that was, so this discussion comports with my impression of your, your acting attempt.

57:40 Evan: And uh, it's interesting when you're, when you're, when you're doing like an imitation of a Swedish accent, is it in your voice? I don't, I don't know. That's like, [RTH: Yeah.] you're obviously doing a different voice than your own voice. So like in my head, it *could have* been me or it could have been, you know, some guy in a pub in Stockholm and I don't really, I can't really tell the difference.

58:02 RTH: Okay, fair enough.

58:04 GP: So were, were, were you looking at the words and reading them in your head? Or were you making it all up in your head?

58:12 Evan: The words were definitely on the screen. [GP: Okay.] If I was reading it off while doing the, doing it in my head, I don't, I'm not really sure. Like the words were there on the screen, but I might have read them and then sort of three seconds later said it. I don't know if it was necessarily at the same time.

58:31 GP: And were you at all moving your lips or doing any physical movement associated with uttering the words?

58:31 Russ comments: This question as stated is about the physical world, not about experience, and is therefore out of bounds for DES. Perhaps GP is intending to ask something like "*Did you experience* at all your lips or any other physical movement?" Given Evan's answer (and to Evan's credit), that is likely the way Evan understood the question.

58:44 Evan: That's a good question. I didn't write it down. Yeah, it's a good question. Um, I didn't write it down, so I'm gonna say *No*, but I'll, I'll trust, I'll trust the words on the, on the page is all I can do.

58:59 GP: The other reason why I'm asking is that, you know, in earlier cases you did say you were sort of muttering to yourself.

59:06 Evan: Yeah. I think I've had beeps of [GP: Yeah.] Of, of both. I, I, I don't, I don't know. Now that you say it, my memory is, you know, I'm getting all these false, false memories, so I'm gonna, I'll trust what's, what's written down. [GP: Absolutely. (laughs)] Yeah.

59:26 RTH: All right, so...

59:26 Evan: We actually got through all six, gents...

59:28 RTH: Got through all six...

59:28 Evan: ... the first time in the, in the hour.

59:31 RTH: And we are at the hour. So do we wanna schedule this again?

59:37 Evan: Yeah. Are there any things that, are there any beeps, in terms of activities, that I haven't done that I should do? Or like, are you happy with the variance? Should I go out and do more things? Like, y'know what I mean? Is there, is there, is there I kind of, I haven't done it on the weekend, weirdly enough. I've never, I like it's always been a weekday and that does sort of bias, bias the sample. So I might, I might just, I might do it on the weekend. But then the problem is then you have to, you do have to have the meeting quite close to like a Monday or Tuesday then, right, cuz it will fade over time. But I'd be curious to get beeps on the weekend.

1:00:19 RTH: So we could, we could go for Monday.