

**Gabriel H.: A university student with philosophy interests**  
**Gabriel Debrief Interview**

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the March 9 interview with Gabriel that is available on YouTube at [https://youtu.be/Py3A\\_WBj24Y](https://youtu.be/Py3A_WBj24Y). In green are comments about and explanations of the Descriptive Experience Sampling process. If you have corrections, suggestions, or questions, please post them as YouTube comments.

RTH = Russ Hurlburt

AG = Amber Goto

CK = Cody Kaneshiro

Gabriel = Gabriel H.

- 0:00 RTH: So I don't think we have a particular agenda for this meeting. We have sampled together now for however many days it's been, [AG: 13.] 13 days, which is pretty many days by our standards (or by your standards too, probably). And, and we have not organized any kind of thinking about that. Sometimes we get together and... [to CK] Have we, have we done any in a green meeting? [AG: No.] We haven't, we haven't done any, we haven't done anything, which is a little bit surprising for us. But it's, it's, I've been very busy and other people have been busy, and so we haven't really, we haven't really sorted anything through. But in a way that it doesn't much matter because the, the structure of this whole enterprise, I think, has been an egalitarian kind of a thing in the sense that you are a part of it. And if we, if we decide to do anything, you should be a part of the decision that we make to do it. And so I would say broadly speaking, that's what today is about. [Gabriel: Okay.] Today is, is a conversation about what, if anything, we should do about what it is that we've done. And so that's sort of one aspect.
- 1:15 RTH: And another aspect is to, which is a related aspect, is to make sure we've answered every question that *you've* got so that you know what we've done. And, and I would say the rules of that game are the same as the rules that we've asked of *you*, which is to say, we, we have said we would like to know about your and your experience, and we'd like you to be candid with this, to tell us about what that, what your inner experience was like. And you could say it's none of your business. That would be fine. But if, if you had, uh, the rule has been, if you're gonna tell us about your inner experience, we'd like you to be complete and forthcoming and, and whatever. And, and so now if you have questions, we would, we would return that favor in the sense that we could say, if you ask us a question, we could say, well, it's none of your business. *Or* if we choose to answer it, then we would try to answer it forthcomingly. [Gabriel: Okay.] So that's the preamble. Anybody have a preamble? Addendum?
- 2:17 AG: I guess all I would say is, do you have any questions for us?
- 2:20 Gabriel: I suppose so.

2:21 AG: Anything you were wondering?

2:22 Gabriel: I guess so, um, yeah, definitely. I mean, uh, I don't know how much direction you guys usually have when you sample from someone. [AG: Okay.] Uh, is there anything specific that you guys were looking at right now? Anything specific that you guys were looking for? [AG shakes her head in the negative.] Okay.

2:40 AG: We, we were never, whenever we get the people come in, we we're never, we have never have a hypothesis. [Gabriel: Oh, really?] We never expect to find anything. We, [Gabriel: Interesting.] We just start wondering what's going on with, with you.

2:50 Gabriel: Okay. Got it.

2:52 RTH: So I would

2:52 CK: Go ahead. I was gonna, we do sample with certain populations or, you know, whatever. So like, um, right now, one of the studies we have going on in the lab is a synesthesia study. So we're looking at people who experience automatic colors when they look at letters or numbers, for example. But even in that realm, we've identified a certain group of people who we think might have interesting things in their inner experience. Maybe! I mean, right, it hasn't been done before. So we figured it, that seems like a good idea to go and see what the characteristics are of their experience. [Gabriel: Okay.] But the procedure is the same as what you went through. [Gabriel: Sure.] So it's, we're not looking for any particular phenomena, it's whatever [Gabriel: Okay. I see.] comes from around the beep. [Gabriel: Yeah. I see.]

3:39 RTH: So I, I would be a little broader under in or take a little broader understanding of the question. So the, *at first* the aim of this study was to give Amber practice. [AG: Yeah, I guess so.] That was, this was a, you were a guinea pig for Amber. So that she's learning how to do this technique. She's, she wants, she needs to have people to ask questions of, and then we need to talk about what, what he said when he said that, and why, why we asked that and how you understood that, and those kinds of questions. That's, that's where we began.

4:17 But I would say over the, over the, over our interactions, at least *my* interests changed somewhat or morphed somewhat. I don't know whether it changed. Cuz it was always to some degree the same, the same interest. But I would say *your* answers to our questions, our conversations together are from my point of view, more or less similar to philosophers with whom I have sampled. [Gabriel: Oh, really? Okay.] And, and, and that's interesting to me in a variety of reasons. For one, I would say the philosophers are more interested in my work than the psychologists are. And that's, that's *not* really by design. I have worked with some philosophers over the years. But the, but it, it has come to pass that there's more conversation about unsymbolized thinking or whatever in the philosophy literature than there is in the psychology literature. And I think that's interesting. I don't know what exactly to make of it, but it's interesting.

5:16 And I would say that sampling with philosopher-type folks is often very difficult. And for me, I'm speaking personally now, anybody else can speak, speak however they want to, they wanna speak about it, whatever. And, and *that* is interesting to

me. So *why is it* that somebody who's sort of philo, philosophically inclined, I, why is it that I would find that difficult, find sampling with them difficult? And that's a, that's as much a question about *me* as it is about *you*. [Gabriel: Okay.] It is, I'm, this is not a blame game. This is a, I'm noticing a phenomenon. I'm noticing a characteristic. I'm trying to figure out what the deal is. And, and I'm genuinely interested in that. I, and, and so I think the reason that we went to 13 sessions with you (which is a lot by our, our standards) was at least in part because I'm trying to figure that out. And [pause], and, and there's, there's no premeditation about that. It's not like I'm, I, I can't say it's true that I say, well, we should sample with him because I'm gonna figure that out. But the, when the question becomes, well, should we sample with him some more if he wants to sample some more? Then part of my interest, that would be on the *yes* side of that scale, because I'm trying to figure that out.

6:48 Gabriel: Okay. Interesting.

6:51 RTH: And, and, and I guess I would say when I, the reason I think it's difficult or the reason that the reason that it's interesting or that difficult, or maybe those are the same thing, I'm not really sure is that it's, it's a question as we.... It could be that philosopher-type people are just more careful about things. And so other people will let things slide and philosophers won't. And so I'm accustomed to letting, to working with people who let things slide. And when I run across somebody who doesn't let them slide, well, that makes life difficult for me. That's possible. And it's also possible that people who are philosophically inclined have inner experience which is not particularly easily investigated by the method that we've got here. And that could be a limitation of the method, or it could be, or a characteristic of the phil, people who are interested in philosophy. I don't know the answer to any of those questions. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] I'm, I'm genuinely interested in *all* of those questions. And so when we asked, well, should we go from the sixth day to the seventh day, I would say, *well, yeah, I'm interested in that*. I'm trying, I'm interested in those questions.

8:13 Gabriel: Okay. Did you, uh, did you come to any, uh, I know you wouldn't have come to a conclusion, but did, do you feel like you had any, uh, the the samplings with me pushed you in one direction or another when it comes to your thoughts on that?

8:29 RTH: Well, now I wish I had spent more time reviewing what we have done,...

8:36 Gabriel: Oh. Okay.

8:36 RTH: ...because I would like to be able to answer that question for you. And, and what, what I what I think from, from here is that it's, it's sort of some of both. It's, it's some that you're pickier than others or more careful in your words than others. So that forces me to be more careful, whatever. But I think it's, I think it's actually more than that. I think, I think there's something about the inner experience of the philosophy inclined that is somewhat more difficult. But, but I would you all can we, we've probably had conversations about this, so if you have a better memory than I do, I'm, I'm not being evasive at all. [Gabriel: Okay.] I'm, I just can't remember. Yeah. And, uh, and I would be happy to have another conversation if you, so if you're, if, if you end up not satisfied with the answers that you get here and you want to, and you would

like more information about that, this is a vitally important question to me. I, I'm, I don't mean vitally important, like, and I'm gonna die if I don't get the answer to that, but, but I'm, I am live, I have a lively interest in it. So

9:51 AG: Are you referring to like the innerly heard versus innerly spoken thing? Is that what you're referring to? I don't know if that's,

10:00 RTH: Remind me of what I might be interested...

#### ABOUT INNER SPEAKING AS AN AUDITORY PHENOMENON

10:01 AG: Um, like, so like he, like, um, the *auditorily*, is that like an example of [RTH: Yeah.] what you're trying to communicate, that the *auditorily* term? I'm just thinking of something specific.

10:13 RTH: So that is, that is one specific example, and it's a good one. And maybe if we talk about it enough, I can remember what we're talking about. [AG: Okay. (laughs)] The philosophy types speak about in, in, in my experience, *I think*, (I'm not a hundred percent sure about this, but I think) that that people in the, in the philosophy camp (broadly defined) speak of what I would call *inner speech*, they speak of that as an *auditory phenomenon*, as did you, I think. And it's *not* primarily an auditory phenomenon, I *think*, even for you, [Gabriel: Okay.] as best I can figure it. That it mostly, it's like a speaking phenomenon. And the speaking phenomenon is *not* mostly auditory. [Gabriel: Okay.] The speaking phenomenon is something other than auditory. [Gabriel: Okay.] I'm talking about *external* speech. And I think it's also true of *internal* speech. Philosophers, for reasons that, that go beyond my understanding, refer to that as an auditory, refer to speaking, *inner* speaking, as an auditory phenomenon, and I, if you've got an opinion about why that might be, I'd be interested in hearing about that. [Gabriel: Okay. Um,...] and not necessarily now. [Gabriel: Okay.] I don't want, my goal is not to put you on the spot. [Gabriel: Okay. Got it.]

11:30 I'm trying to, I'm trying to fully answer your question because I think you deserve that. [Gabriel: Okay.] Not, not that you personally deserve it any more than anybody else does, but, but I think people deserve, people who, whom we have asked to be forthcoming with us deserve for us to be forthcoming with them. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And, and, and that, that doesn't mean that you have to hear everything that I have to say, because you could be not interested in that anymore. You could say, well, you know, shut up. I I've heard you're just carrying on beyond what I'm interested in. That would be fine too. But if you're *interested* in, so I'm, I am interested (and Amber's got a good, that is a good example) in why it is that a philosophy-inclined person would call this an auditory phenomenon. And it took us some number of days, I think, some number of sampling days, to sort through. Well, did Gabriel mean auditory when he meant [RTH misspeaks; this word should be said.] auditory? Or did he have some category that comes from *something* that, that encouraged him to say *auditory* when it's really more *speaking*.

12:44 Gabriel: Okay. Interesting.

- 12:45 CK: And can I flesh out a little bit? I would say, I think it's in that spirit where I think still remains an open question. I, because I would agree for me, I, I don't, I'm not coming out of this saying, oh, I, I feel strongly one side or the other about this whole difficulty in the philosophy stuff, where we land. But for example, there were beeps, I think where you would talk about, you would use the word like, I'm, you know, *there are words here and it's auditorily present*, or something like that. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] Yeah. So you're talking, and that seems to suggest, well, this is like a *hearing* thing. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And as you talked about it, there were some, y'know, like you would s, you would be talking about it as if it were spoken. And so then there even that slight contrast would be enough to go, okay, is this a, y'know, I, I'm, I don't know what's going on, right.
- 13:30 And again, it's not like it, and we don't strive for understanding, *per se*. It's not like we're doing this to understand, y'know, to prop to, to like *explain* the phenomenon. But it's to understand like, well, I wanna honor what your experience was. Cuz if it's a hearing thing, that's a very different thing than if it's a speaking thing. Right. At least those things experientially seem like two very different things. And I want to make clear which one it is that's going on here at this moment. [Gabriel: Okay.] And so, and so after all of that, that, that's where I think I, I can speak for me, that's what it's in that stuff where, and I'm leaving the interview going, I'm not really sure exactly which one it is. And I don't know if it's, if this is a word sort of a thing. Like you have a, you in your parlance you use *auditory* to refer to *speaking*, or whether the phenomena itself, right?
- 14:17 Like, cuz that could be something about the actual experience where the experience itself is sort of this muddled mix. Like it isn't that line between hearing and speaking maybe is not very clear, in which he, that's a very interesting thing to, for us to know about, right. [Gabriel: Okay.] But I think to, to flesh out what's already been said, I would say that's the kind of, that's the flavor of that, like the, the difficulties with like the philosophy stuff that at least for (speaking, for myself at least) that's what the, that's a little bit of insight into what the difficulty is.
- 14:46 Gabriel: Okay. Interesting. Hmm. So I, I remember when we talked about the inner speaking, eventually I would just, I would usually say, I think at the beginning I would say, "so in my auditory experience was the words this..." and I was innerly speaking them. Eventually, that's what I would do. At that point, was there still, like, was that still, uh, confusing or, or did that still make, uh, was that still an unusual thing? Or at that, at that point? Did y'know what I meant when I, when I started doing that? Or at least did you feel I know what you knew what I meant?
- 15:21 RTH: My recollection (and I don't have a very good recollection for these kinds of things), but my recollection is that we eventually understood you to be saying "I was," most of the time "I was innerly speaking."
- 15:32 Gabriel: Okay. Got it.
- 15:33 RTH: And is that what you rec recall?
- 15:36 Gabriel: Uh, I don't know what percentage of the time I said there was something auditory in my experience that it was an inner speaking. But I know, eventually, I would always

specify if there were, was something in my, what I would say my auditory experience, I would then say it was an inner speaking, if it, if it was,

15:54 RTH: So the, the method, the method is fundamentally problematic, because we are interested in something that we can't see, obviously. That's, we're, we're interested in your private experience and we wanna honor your way of, of *describing* that to us. But we don't want to just roll over and say, *well, he's using the word like that. We're gonna use the words that he used and leave it at that.* [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] That, a lot of psychology does that, y'know. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] They, he, *he said this, and therefore that must have been the way it was.* A lot of philosophy like believes that people are infallible about their, about their inner experience. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] We don't think that's, *I don't think that's true.* I think people are mistaken about their inner experience, at least sometimes, some people, some of the time. And so I'm, I try to figure that out, and which seems to me to be what the, the scientific, that's the essence of science, I think. *I think that's the essence of science, is try to figure out what people mean when they say stuff.*

16:52 Gabriel: Okay.

16:59 RTH: What makes it difficult is we don't want, I don't want, to impose on you, look here, godammit, you gotta call this *inner speech* [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] if that's not, if that doesn't rest lightly on your experience. [Gabriel: Mm.] And so when you would continue to say, well, "this is auditory experience," and then maybe, but it's in your speech, that is confusing for me.

16:59 Russ comments: *Confusing does not aptly describe the situation. RTH is not confused; it is more that he is on heightened alert or on increased carefulness.*

17:27 RTH: Not confusing, but it's, I, I have to wrestle with that. So now what do I do? So I have to ask him, "do you mean auditory in a sense of hearing, or do you mean auditory in a sense of inner speaking?" And then I gotta make sure that I'm not pushing you harder in one direction than, than... S I, I don't, I don't wanna know the answer to that question more than I want to know about your inner experience. I want to know about your inner experience. I don't *care* what we call it. If you want to call it auditory, and we can, we can understand that by *auditory* you mean *inner speech*, I'll go with that. [Gabriel: Mm-Hmm.]

18:05 Which is to say, it's not a matter of my imposing a vocabulary *on you* or you imposing a vocabulary *on me*. I want us to understand what we're talking to each other: when I say this, you understand what I mean. And when you say that, I understand what you mean.

18:27 But if you use words like *auditory*, this is a good example, and then go on and talk about speaking, that's gonna be sort of fundamentally confusing to me.

18:33 Gabriel: Okay.

18:36 RTH: *And it's interesting to me that you're not the only philosophy-inclined person to do that. I think in the philosophy literature in general, they speak, when they speak of*

inner speech, they call it an auditory phenomenon for reasons which are, I don't know the answer to that.

18:53 Gabriel: Okay.

19:01 RTH: *And* I know I, I've sampled with a half a dozen professional philosopher kind, kinds of people, maybe more than that over the years. And some of them will get one day into it and then, and walk away and say, y'know, I, I'm not gonna do that anymore. And *that's* interesting. What, what's that about?

19:19 Gabriel: Hmm.

19:20 RTH: Y'know, they'll say, well, y'know, I'm busy, I gotta grant to write. Or whatever. But that's not necessarily why they're, why they're quitting.

19:33 Gabriel: Yeah. If it's a trend, presumably that's not the reason.

19:38 RTH: It would seem.

19:42 Gabriel: Hmm.

19:42 RTH: And, and so I'm, I'm, I'm genuinely interested in, in what that, what that's about. [Gabriel: Okay.] *And* I need to add, I don't take you as being a representative of philosophers, [Gabriel: Hmm.] cuz I don't think that's fair to you or to the philosophers probably, but the, or y'know, any, any more than I, I take Cody as being interested in syn a synesthesia researcher, y'know, Cody's Cody, and happens to be interested in synesthesia, but that doesn't make him like other people who are interested in synesthesia any more than it makes *you* like or unlike other people who are interested in philosophy. [Gabriel: Okay.] That said, there are some, you have some similarities with other people who are interested in philosophy. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And so I might learn something about philosophy broadly defined by sampling with you.

20:44 Gabriel: Okay. Hmm. I did have one question about the auditory thing. Um, I, I, I would assume that we do all agree that auditory experience is part of inner speech. Like you, there is a part of hearing, like, and when you, you hear yourself when you speak, right? So there's an auditory experience *there*. We, would we agree on that?

21:07 RTH: Not necessarily.

21:09 CK: It *can be* [Gabriel: Okay.] But just because even someone can say I'm in innerly speaking [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And there is kind of a wide degree of what that even that experience really is. [Gabriel: Okay.] Some people experience that as, I mean, y'know, you can say, I, I feel like I, it feels like I'm saying this out loud. Like it feels, it, like it almost feels like my vocal cords are, are vibrating and I'm saying it in my lips and all that is involved. Sometimes it's totally a, a mental sort of a thing, right? Like the physicality stuff is not really there, but it's me speaking this, sometimes it's mostly a hearing thing, but it's like I'm, I'm saying this right? I mean, there's a, there's

also a way of you can speak it and there is no hearing and it's, it's, there's so many combinations. [Gabriel: Okay.] That's possible.

21:09 Russ comments: I think CK is somewhat talking past Gabriel at this point. I understand Gabriel's (20:44) "you hear yourself when you speak, right? So there's an auditory experience *there*" to be a characterization of *external* speaking, but CK's response is entirely about *inner* speech.

21:52 Gabriel: Alright. Interesting.

21:53 RTH: And, and let me answer that question from a somewhat different perspective. In *outer* speech, if you ask yourself, about outer speech, *is hearing part of outer speech?* you're gonna answer that question as *Yes*. Everybody who would, everybody who engages in that kind of armchair, what I call armchair inspection, is gonna come down to, *well, yeah, I'm talking, I'm gonna listen to it. Sure. I'm, I'm, I'm hearing it. No question about.* It seems like every time I armchair-ly introspect my external speaking, there's hearing involved. On the *other* hand, if a beep happens while you're externally speaking, it is very likely that you're not gonna be aware of what it sounds like or even what you're doing. You're gonna be interested in what the other guy's reaction was, [Gabriel: Okay.] or you're gonna have a picture in your head about what you're trying to describe, or a whole shitload of other kinds of stuff that have really nothing to do with the speech. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] Your speech is ongoing, but whether it's directly in your experience is another deal altogether. [Gabriel: Okay.] And *that* is almost impossible to find as the result of armchair introspection [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] because armchair introspection is going well, it's going to say, *well, speak now* and see what happens. But that isn't the way the world really is.

23:05 Gabriel: Right. Okay.

23:07 RTH: So *I* am a high highly skeptical of armchair introspection, [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] which is makes me different from a lot of philosophers, which I think a lot of philosophy is based on their armchair introspection. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And I *think* it's possible that that's where the auditory part of inner speech comes from

23:27 Gabriel: Hmm. Interesting. Okay.

23:29 RTH: But I don't really know the answer to that. That's, that would be my speculation about it.

#### ABOUT SKEPTICISM AS AN IMPEDIMENT TO THE PROCESS OF DES

23:36 Gabriel: Okay. Alright. Right. I'll be thinking about that. Um, most, yeah, it is, it is interesting why there seems to be a trend of philosophers leaving after the first day [laughs]. I wonder why that could be. I wonder if it has to do with like, skepticism of the whole process itself. I wonder if that might be it. Because I know that there were a few times where there, um, I, I was just so like sort of uncertain as to how I could possibly narrow down like, which things were in my experience consciously in the past, and which weren't, partially because of like philosophical problems I had with that. Uh,

like things that I can wrap my head around that I was a little, I was maybe like a little bit frustrated with, um, with my attempts. So I wonder if maybe that had something to do with it. I don't know.

- 24:35 RTH: So I think the answer to that is *yes*, but I would *say* about that is that in my recollection, and these folks are, you can correct me if I'm mistaken about that, but in the, in the second half of the sampling, broadly defined, I would say there were many cases where you didn't seem to have that equivocation that you had had earlier. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And *that's* an interesting thing. So now [by "*now*" he means during the interview where Gabriel was not equivocating] I have to think about that. So why is it that Gabriel would not be equivocating now? Have we, have we bashed on him oft, often enough [Gabriel laughs] that he's just decided it's just easier just to say it? What the fuck? And.. *Or* have we now come to understand each other enough that he, that he doesn't worry about saying it? *Or* have we set aside as sort of presuppositional that there must have been those, there *must* have been those characteristics. [Gabriel: Hmm.]
- 25:29 And, and I don't know the answer to that. I'd be interested in your, your take on that. And I *think*, I think, and I, and, and I want to be abundantly clear, this is my opinion without, y'know, I'm not, I'm not expounding on it as the Truth with a capital T, but my, my guess is that philosopher types come into the sampling with very strong opinions about the way things are. [Gabriel: Hmm.] And then when they sample, we give 'em the beeper and they, they, they sample, then what they find does not exactly correspond with what they *know* [gestures air quotes] to be true about the world. [Gabriel: Okay.] And that is a problem for them. [Gabriel: Hmm.] And in *my* lingo, that would mean a presupposition coming up against an apprehension of experience. And for most people, most of the time, presuppositions win.
- 26:35 Gabriel: Okay.
- 26:38 RTH: And I think that might be *particularly* true for professional philosophers whose career and whatever depend on this view. And if they apprehend in their own experience something that may, *maybe*, just, *maybe* might threaten that point of view, well then they better not do that again.
- 26:59 Gabriel: Okay. Interesting. Um, well, I, I think what happened for me, what made it like easier, I guess was, um, I just, I did, I sort of decided to operate on the *assumption* that, um, in the same way that like in this current moment in the present, there are always things that are directly, uh, there. Um, I decided to just assume that somehow the things that are directly present to me are logged in memory to some extent. And, and that, and on that *assumption* I said, okay, well *if there are things that are lodged in memory about what was directly present to me, and I just assume that*, uh, then it's those, it's these particular things from the past, this past experience. Like, if it's not those, it's nothing else. So that's what I went with.
- 27:58 That, so I operate on that assumption. So I would say I kind of like just, uh, in a sense, uh, used, just assumed that to, and then ignored the, the, the philosophical problems I had with it. Cuz I felt like that was in line with the whole not letting logic get in the way of what is in your direct experience. Uh, and like not using reasoning

to figure it out as opposed to just what's directly there. Um, and I said, *okay, if I assume that is, that is possible, this is what it was.*

28:36 RTH: So, so what, what I would, what I would say is, is your exposition of what it is that you did [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] I thought was very interesting and al, and almost impossible for me to track.

28:51 Gabriel: Oh, really? Okay.

28:52 RTH: And I'm, I'm just being honest, [laughs], I'm not telling, I'm not saying it's good or bad here. I'm just saying, I'm telling you about what's in *my* experience. My experience is that kind of exposition, I just can't track it. [Gabriel: Hmm.] I have to, I have to work very hard to keep, to keep up. And I used to think that was *my* problem and it may very well *be* my problem, but I, I just don't have the, the intelligence or whatever it takes to direct that. But I don't think it's that. I think when I think about it (I'm just not, I'm telling you what I *think* about that. That it's not, not to be confused with the truth), [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] what I *think* is that that kind of, that kind of expedition, exposition pi, starts with one theoretical point of view and hinges off to that or attaches to that another sort of philosophical point of view, which gets to another philosophical point of view, which gets to be sort of like a whirlwind. And it doesn't touch, it never touches the ground. That whirlwind can sustain itself. But *I* am a terrestrial figure. And, and that kind of whirlwind isn't, is well I just have a, I have a hard time I going with it.

30:25 Gabriel: Okay.

30:30 RTH: And, and what I think of what I think DES does is basically it says, *let's let that whirlpool collapse cuz it's, this is what we're interested in.* Let's let *that* whirlwind collapse cuz it's, this is, this is what we're interested in. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] Now whether that's a good thing or not, I, I, we, we I'd be happy to have a debate about that. I'm, I'm telling you what it's like *for me*. And then you can decide whether you want to talk more about that or not. [Gabriel: Okay.] Or whatever.

31:01 But I think it, I think it's all about the, I think we're, we're zeroing in on why this is a difficult thing for philosophers, cuz the philosophers want to whirl around. This is *my* take. The philosophers want to whirl around from their connection between, y'know, Kant said this and Leibniz said that. And they never, nobody know, or knows really what they mean when they say that because Kant said a whole lifetime's worth of stuff. And so it's to *my* way of, to my way of thinking, there's no grounding in that. It's, uh, it, well it's, there's no grounding in that. Let's leave it at that.

31:48 And, and it's, uh, it's, but it's worse than that, better than that, or more than that or whatever. To, to enter into that realm, you have to spend enough time with Kant that you can say, "well, Kant said....," and not worry about being refuted. [Gabriel: Hmm.] But you're never really gonna know what Kant said, because to would get, to know what Kant said, you'd have to spend the whole lifetime reading only about Kant because he wrote a whole shitload of stuff.

32:23 And then you might be able to say about what Kant said, but then you wouldn't be able to say anything about what Merleau-Ponty said, because he said a whole lot of stuff which *changed* from what he said at the beginning to what he said at the

end. And so you really can't say what Merleau-Ponty said. You'd have to say what he said in his *early* life and by his early life you really mean.... So I don't, I just, those, those kinds of references (which are common among the philosophical type) leave me breathless, I would say, because I don't, I don't think they know what they're talking about, and I'm sure I don't know what they're talking about. And I'm pretty sure that the guy, the other philosopher that they're talking about [he means talking to] has a ver, different version of what they're talking about. And that's pretty unsatisfying to me. [Gabriel: Hmm. Okay.] And I've spent, I, I will say I spent a good deal of my life at your age trying to understand enough about Kant and Merleau-Ponty so that I could say, I could engage in that kind of conversation, but I never got there. Tried pretty hard, but not successfully.

33:35 CK: Can I make a comment here too, because I, I, I do think one thing that, to go back to what we originally talked about in the sense of like, that that struggle between like sampling with philosopher types is difficult. I mean, I do think one thing that I, I always worry about with, with DES as a method is whether we, it whether there is sort of an implicit presupposition that, of getting what we're calling the terrestrial ground stuff, right? The phenomenon. Whether that is sort of an artifact of the method. Because I guess my observation would be also through sampling with people and, and doing it as is like, I wonder, right? Like you, you spent some time talking about, again, to my ear, not, not phenomena right. About like when the beep went off and this is what's going on. Y'know, I'm trying, I'm struggling with these sort of like, philosophical questions and I, y'know, I don't really know what was there. And so I'm trying to logic my way through. Like that sort of the, to my ear, this is just, this is just me. This is all kind of half baked. But to me that my ear is like, that's sort of, it sounds like a lot of context. Like, I mean, I understand sort of the process here, but what I don't understand is how that experiential, like what is that experience like, right? Like, and, and to me it, it makes me start to think, especially with the philosopher types, like that could be a reflection of the experience, right? Like meaning when, when we struggle with, we, I guess when I, right, as, as the interviewer struggle with trying to figure out like what's going on and, y'know, what's the phenomenon here, right? It very well could be that people's experiences range drastically. And that there are a whole sets of people out there, which I know we've talked about, right? Where pe their experience doesn't really comport to like, it is just sort of the swirl, right? It, it's inchoate, it doesn't, it, it doesn't really, it doesn't ever sound like this is an inner speaking, right? It sort of is sort of straightforward inner speaking that ah, y'know, maybe people's experience actually don't reflect that.

35:39 And, and thus, right. And I don't know how that all interacts, but that's where you get people who are like basically self-selected into philosophy, for example, right, and that's, and that's sort of a tendency. And, but a reflection of their experience, right? Meaning that it's, this is not a words deal. It's not like this is just, oh, everyone experie, everyone's experience is the same and people have different ways of talking about it or grasping it or whatever. Like that people genuinely that, that there's a wide spectrum of how people experience the world, of which there are some people where we sample with and it, it, it gels really nicely, right? Like, it, it's sort of, it, it's clear from the perspective of phenomena and it's like, oh, y'know, like this is a

sensory awareness. I'm drawn to the red of the notepad. Y'know, like I understand that. They seem to understand that great, y'know.

36:18        But like I, but I do worry that sort of, we, we do well with those folks who can do that. And that's great. And it sounds like we're seeing something about inner experience, but that maybe like that, I don't know, maybe that's 10% of the population. There's a 90% that actually everyone is kind of just, their experience is like not very, not that clear, not that well defined. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] I don't know how to get over that, but I, I just thought, y'know, I, I wonder about that. I don't, I don't know how to, I don't know how to the answer to that. I don't know how to, y'know, test out of that, but ...

36:56    Gabriel: Alright, well that [laughs] Yeah, that's interesting. Hmm. I, I, I mean it would definitely explain a, a good number of things if that was the case. Especially why some people have like a, a revulsion to like those kinds of concepts, philosophical concepts, uh, that could probably, uh, explain some of that as well.

37:20    CK:        And I should say, what I said doesn't, isn't to imply that I think I, I guess to me, the only, the only way you're gonna answer that is by doing DES, is by doing this [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And, and trying to really make clear phenomenon stuff because there is danger in textual analysis, for example, right? Like, if, if we're only concerned about the words that people say, yeah, that, that people, people don't say what they mean, right? [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] Like, people will say all kinds of stuff about themselves and those words are sort of half true or three-quarters true, or a quarter true or something, right? And so I, I do think it's, I can't think of another way you can answer those types of questions without doing this kind of stuff. And maybe doing a good job with it, doing a poor job with it. I mean, that's the whole point, right? Is you have to do it. And even if, even if aft, say hundreds of years in the future, decades, however long, we find that all this stuff actually was sort of misguided. But we, but by doing this, we get an answer, right? Until we get, we collect some data to know what's better. I mean, I, I just don't see another way you can do all of that and answer those questions without doing this. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.]

38:26    RTH:        So what, what, so my response to that is I don't think that there actually is a real ground. [slams hand on table] Maybe there is, but I don't have any, I don't have an opinion about that. I'm agnostic about whether there *is* a real ground. What I *think* is that *at least for some people* there is a real ground. So we had a, we, we, the three of us [gestures to RTH, AG, and CK] had a sampling meeting with a guy this morning, or whenever that was (I guess it was this morning) [AG: Yes.] where he said "red." And at the moment of the beep was in his study and he was looking at the red spines in the back of his bookcase and this red spine and that red spine, this red spine. And it was pretty clear from that, from his experience, that he was drawn to the red. Drawn to the red, drawn to the red. Now, was that an artifact of the experience or an artifact of the process? Maybe, but it seemed pretty solid. And you had some experiences like that, too, where it seemed like, at least in those cases (I can't remember what they were Now, unfortunately, somebody has a good example of a fairly clear Gabriel experience) then

39:44 AG: Like you would say, I innerly said whatever you would innerly say in my inner voice. Okay. And that was it.

39:50 RTH: Oh, the *raspy* voice, right!

39:50 AG: Yeah! [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] that kind of thing. Yeah. Like that, that was a consistent, very clear thing.

39:56 RTH: So whispery, raspy my, my speaking innerly speaking voice. Yeah. You seemed pretty confident about that. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And so what's, so for me, that's all, what's the deal with that? Is that an artifact? Doesn't seem like, it seems like it's a little bit of a stretch to say, well, y'know, he's just making that up. He's making it up consistently across many sampling sessions. Well, it's possible. Maybe he's shining us on. He, y'know, he's going to the bar and the guy in the bar is gonna say, "I'll *bet* you could tell Hurlburt you had a raspy voice and he'd believed you!" That's possible. I doubt it. But y'know, you never, you never really know. But it, it, it seems to me that *I was innerly speaking in my raspy voice* has a different level of connection to something experiential than Kant, a reference to Kant, or reference to which are very often, or particularly to Merleau-Ponty if you were talking about experience, *I was speaking in my raspy voice* is a lot different from that, it seems like to me.

41:22 Gabriel: Okay. Yeah, I agree. That makes sense.

41:27 RTH: But in line with what Cody was saying, I think there's limitations to that. I, I don't, I don't think, don't think it's fair to say that that at those beeps it was *innerly speaking in his raspy voice*. *That's a perfect description. And there was nothing else*. I don't think that's true. What I think is to a fairly substantial degree, there was the experience of speaking in a raspy voice, probably some other stuff going on too. Don't really know. He doesn't really know. We don't really know how to, how to get that. But it'd be pretty hard to say that the raspy voice was no more salient to him than some of those other stuff that was down there in the weeds. [AG: Mm-hmm.] [Gabriel nods affirmatively]

42:14 And so what DES is, to the extent that it's anything that DES is, it tries to have a conversation where it knows the difference between what, what seems like it's pretty clearly apprehended, what we would call pretty clearly apprehended (like I was speaking in my raspy voice) and some other stuff that, that might be more contextual or theoretical.

42:42 Gabriel: Okay. Alright.

42:51 RTH: And I guess I, I guess I would also say that, uh, part of, part of my interest, I'm just trying to be candid here. Part of my interest was, well, here's a guy with, with a philosophy gene, whatever that is, he's with an interest in philosophy every, I lightly refer to it as the philosopher's gene. I don't really know what I'm talking about there, but, but an interest in philosophy, philosophical things, but not yet old enough to be unalterably committed to a particular point of view.

43:26 Gabriel: [laughs] Right. Okay.

- 43:29 RTH: And by old enough, I mean, really, I think probably financially aligned enough that not only, not only would it be a matter of seeing things accurately, but it would be a matter of seeing things accurately with the recognition that that is going to seriously disturb my income stream.
- 43:47 Gabriel: Ah, okay.
- 43:51 RTH: And, and maybe I'd come out the other side with a better income stream or, or whatever, but, but at the *moment* I'm gonna lose, I'm, I'm gonna, I'm not gonna be able to get the merit increases that I would've gotten because I can't write like that anymore because now I know it's not true or something like that. You're younger than that. And so I thought, and I, I, I wouldn't wanna say this is a premeditated way, but, but that would be part of what would be interesting to me. Well, here's a nascent philosopher kind of a guy who has his own opinions about things, but not yet enough baggage on them or not enough professional identity riding on that. [Gabriel: Okay.] So then I, I might, I might learn something. Did I ever explicitly think that? Probably not. Did that color that way of thinking color my saying *Yeah. Let's go from number seven to number eight?* Probably so.
- 44:53 Gabriel: Okay. Interesting. Well, I did wonder if that might have been part of it, actually, so that, that makes sense.
- 45:01 RTH: Which part?
- 45:03 Gabriel: The, uh, not being, I, I didn't think of it as the income thing. I thought of it more as like not being old enough to be completely, uh, I guess indoctrinated in a particular point of view. But
- 45:15 RTH: It's sort of the same thing, I think. [Gabriel: Right.] One, one more extreme than the other. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] *Follow the money* is generally a good, good idea. But, but there doesn't necessarily have to be money involved.

#### OTHER QUESTIONS

- 45:31 Gabriel: Okay. And then, uh, one other question I had was, I know that you had mentioned earlier about, um, putting transcripts online. I know that you did with that one. Uh, or I don't know if you actually posted that one transcript, but you sent it to me. Uh, or are you still planning on doing any of that? Because I'd be happy for that. I'd be fine with that if you did.
- 45:53 RTH: So planning is definitely too strong. [Gabriel: Okay.] Is that still a po, a live possibility for me? *Yes*.
- 45:59 Gabriel: Okay.
- 46:02 RTH: And I, and I would... And and does that enter into my interest in having a candid conversation with you today? And, and maybe at some other time? *Yes*. Did I, do I

have as an agenda item, I gotta get that solved. And I didn't tell him about that. So I'm, I'm sort of hiding that part of the agenda from him? I don't, I think I could honestly say *no, I don't think so*. I think these, these conversations that we're having around the beeps today, the whole deal I think are interesting conversation. And I think of interest not just to the four of us in this room, but to people who are outside this room. What to do about that, I don't know the answer to that. For the last couple of years, I have been thinking, well, I should put these kinds of conversations online, and people who really care about them are going to wade through them and whatever.

47:02 I keep track of the statistics of the people who are visiting my website and the average length of time that people are there, it's so like 25 seconds. So I know they're not, most people are not spending the time that is required. Or maybe the, or maybe this, the website doesn't really measure things, y'know, if you go in there and you click [AG: The link....] you click a link and then you, and then you go in and [AG: ...takes you off.] and takes you off to the actual day, I don't measure that. So I would, I, I haven't, I'm not the kind of a guy who spends a lot of time trying to figure out how to drive clicks to my website. The,

47:42 I *am* the kind of a guy who thinks that these things are important. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And, and if we can figure out a way to advance somebody's ball about that, whether it's one guy's ball or two guy's ball, or three guy's ball or whatever, I don't really know. And so I *would* be interested in putting things, putting *some* of these things or *all* of these things out on the web. And there's a, and if we, if we do that, there's a lot of ways that we, we can do that. We can blur your face out so that nobody can recognize who you are, actually, and call you by whatever name you would like to be called. That's one possibility. We could call you by your name, make you a co-author of these kinds of things. These are co-authored publications from my point of view. And I don't know, I don't think I'm in a position to know what the best way to do that is. I, as far as I'm concerned, we're sort of all adults in the room. And I try to, I try to set up a situation where there's little or no coercion involved. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And I do that by saying, well, I'm not, I don't want, I don't want you to make up your mind *today* about that, y'know, think about it and talk to your friends or priest or whoever you talk to about those kinds of things. [Gabriel: Okay.] And, and, and we can figure that out. You can figure that out whether you, whether or how you want be.

49:28 Gabriel: It doesn't sound like, uh, you're necessarily decided on doing this anyway, right now. So I have a feeling you'd probably shoot me an email or something, uh, if you decided that you did want to post some. I, I,

49:42 RTH: I definitely have *not* decided to do that. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And we haven't, I don't think we've had had a conversation about it *at all*.

49:49 Gabriel: Okay.

49:50 RTH: At the out. I would, that might be slightly too strong. And I think maybe all four of us had a conversation somewhere along the line. Y'know, sometimes we put these things on the web and you ought to know that sometimes we put these things on the web [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And maybe this would be a good thing to put on the web.

We probably had the four of us had that kind of a conversation. [Gabriel: Yes. Mm-hmm.] I don't think we've had, we, the three of us have had a conversation more than that. Maybe we have and I can't remember about it. So, but it, it's, I would, I can totally confidently say that we have, we have not thought it through other than, well, we gotta talk to Gabriel about it and see what he thinks.

50:33 Gabriel: Okay. Got it. Well, I'd be happy. I'd be happy with it if you guys end up do, if you do end up deciding that you'd like to. So,

50:43 RTH: And would you like to be a part of that? If we, if we decide to do that?

50:45 Gabriel: What do you mean by that?

50:48 RTH: Well, there's work involved. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] So for example, the transcript that I sent you, that, that, I think I did that transcript. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And I and those transcripts, I would say take eight or ten hours to make [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And somebody's gotta do that work, whether I do it or you do it or whatever. If you, if you would like to be a part of that effort, then we can figure out how to [Gabriel: Oh, okay.] how to make that happen. I think there's something to be learned from doing that. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] because I think (this is my, my thought process about this thing) is that when you slow something down enough so that you actually, you actually understand exactly what people are saying, which is what a transcript is. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] when you do it, when you do a transcript, it forces you not, uh, it forces you to confront your own expectations about what was gonna come next. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.]

51:39 Because you write down what was gonna happen and then you find out, well, that isn't really what he said. And then you gotta go back to fix it. And then anything was said, I, I, I was *apparently* giving him credit for about to say something that he didn't really say. What does, what does that mean about my understanding of what it is that he was saying? [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And that kind of thing happens, y'know, word by word or paragraph by paragraph or whatever. So I think that's, that is a, it is not a wasted time to, to make transcripts.

52:09 It is, it is work to make transcripts. And then, and, and then if, if we were to do it, then we can decide how, how or what we could do. We could put on, for example, we could put out on the web just the interviews with the transcripts; or we could put out on the web the interviews plus this conversation. (This, this conversation would get me in trouble, but that might be a good thing.) And, uh, I think we, I think we should, we, we would've to *talk about* that. [Gabriel: Okay. Sure.] Whether that would be a, an advantage for you to be a part of this conversation, for me to be a part of this conversation for that everybody else to be a part of this conversation. Every, everybody should have a right to say, "I don't want that to be out there on the web for, for all of eternity."

52:58 Gabriel: Okay. Got it. Well, I think, um, uh, I would love to be, I would love to continue to be a part of this whole thing, uh, if you guys end up deciding to, um, post those. But of course that'd probably be a conversation for a future time when, um, when, and if you guys make that decision. So,

- 53:17 RTH: So *twice* there you used “you guys making that decision,” which I would say “us guys” as opposed to “we guys.” [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] *[It doesn’t come through too clearly in the transcript, but RTH’s point is to include Gabriel in the us.]* And, and I, I would be interested in knowing whether you would *like* that to happen, whether, so is this a begrudging *Yeah, if you want to do it, it’s all right with me*; or, uh, enthusiastic *I hope you guys, I guys do it, cuz I think it’s a be a good thing for me*.
- 53:46 Gabriel: Oh yeah! It’s enthusiastic! Definitely.
- 53:52 RTH: So we got that on tape when the lawyers come after us. [all laugh]
- 53:58 RTH: [pause] But the whole, the whole enterprise, it seems to me, it’s not, it is not *just* about, well, finding out what’s in Gabriel’s inner experience. (It’s, it’s largely, I don’t even, even know if it’s largely about that. It’s substantially about that for sure.) But the whole, the whole enterprise *I think* is trying to figure out what can a what can psychology, what, how, how, how, how *can* psychology, if you, if you put, *if you took time and money out of the equation, what can psychology say about Gabriel?* That’s, that’s really sort of the fundamental question that’s, that’s at, at stake here. And we could give you a battery of psychological tests and at the end of that, we could give you a profile, y’know, said on this MMPI scale, you scored that. And on that NIEQ scale, you scored that, on this Big Five scale, you score that or whatever. And I think that doesn’t say anything at all about Gabriel, because what at the best, at the very best, what that does is that says something about a comparison between Gabriel’s pencil strokes and some comparison group’s pencil, pencil strokes. Not about Gabriel as an individual, but about a comparison between Gabriel and somebody else, some other group, some other unspecified unknown, unknown group.
- 55:45 And yet clinical psychology, which is what we’re the sort of, the game that we’re playing here is, is, is to try to say something about *Gabriel*. [inaudible] Y’know, if a client comes to you, you want to, you want to say something about *that client*, you don’t want to say something, *well, people in general...*, y’know. And, and so that, that’s what, that’s what drives this whole, the whole deal. And my conclusion, my answer to that question is the best I can figure out how to find out something that’s really about Gabriel is DES.
- 56:20 Because when we say, *well, Gabriel pretty often has a raspy in her voice when he, when he [innerly] talks*, that I think is a true statement about Gabriel. That is *not* a comparison between Gabriel and Amber, or between Gabriel and some control group out there. That’s as best we can say about Gabriel.
- 56:47 And so what? I don’t think we, I don’t think we actually know the answer to that. Maybe it’s just, y’know, well, y’know, so, so he speaks with a raspy voice, some, some of the time. What difference does it make? Well, maybe nothing. It, it may be entirely insignificant. But it could be that if we—psychology in general—knew some stuff like that, then it would, it might be able to learn something that would be applicable to Gabriel as a person. But, but we, we, we’ve never really known about that. The, the best, the best that psychology has done is like clinical interviews or whatever. And clinical interviews are not very good, really, if we’re honest about it. You got a clinician with his presuppositions talking to a client with his presuppositions, and at the end of the day, they sell, tell some kind of a story, which

is half me and half you. That's what a clinical interview sort of is. It's pretty hard to get past that.

57:51        DES tries not to do that. DES tries to make a story about *Gabriel* that *doesn't* have Russ in it. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] Gabriel has raspy voice regardless of whether Russ thinks that or not, *I think*.

58:13        And the question then, because well, *So what?* And the answer is, *Well, I don't know*. We'd have to have a whole lot more people out there doing it as well or better than Russ is doing it, so that then we could try a whole lot of other kinds of things and say, well, let's see what happens when Gabriel takes this kind of drug or whatever. And that what happens to his experience? No, maybe we know something about his drug. As it is now when we do drug a drug study, y'know, we say, *Well, how, how, how'd you feel today, Gabriel?* What the hell?

58:44    CK:    I think it's several steps *worse*. Because in your example, you're saying a clinician will come out saying it's, and again, right, loosely, it's half the clinician's presuppositions, half the client's presuppositions. That's it. Or in the report it's the same thing, right? It's, it's half your stuff is the person writing the report and half the client. I think the problem with psychology is, and, and earlier you had mentioned something like psychologist's goal, right, is to say something about the client. And I think contemporary psychology now, like what training is involved is, we actually don't care about the client we care about, like in a report, it'd be, I'm talking about these constructs, right? Like, I wanna see something about Gabriel's short-term memory or Gabriel's personality clusters and how that goes. That doesn't exist as a thing, right? Like conscientiousness, agreeableness, like those things we're, I talk about it in the report as if I'm saying something meaningful about, y'know, these, these traits are what defines Gabriel when that's *totally* distorting. It's distortions upon distortions, right, because it's like nothing about what I'm gathering from your pencil strokes tells me anything really about you. You're asking these questions and all this sudden I'm, I'm cleaning it up through all this construct talk that makes it sound like I'm saying something very authoritative when, y'know, you could have read the question and been like, I didn't really know what to say, so I kind of selected this, but I don't really know. Right? And, and, and so it's, it's, I think it'd be good if the problem was just people's biases. I think it's both people's biases and presuppositions and also all this other crap of like [AG: Demand characteristics.] I mean, just these constructs that don't really are, y'know, like even the symptomatology of, y'know, like *this person met 9 out of the 12 criteria for major depressive disorder*. And the reason why I know that is because I gave you a questionnaire of those 12 things and you just said *yes* or *no*.

1:00:30        Does that apply to you? I don't really know how these things manifest. And, and I don't think truthfully training nowadays, as in the general conventional sense really teaches people to be attentive even to the fact that like, I think it'd be kind of a good thing if we leaned into our humanness, right? Like the fact that we act, ask questions about it. We can't just, again, like do a word analysis and be like, *here's this questionnaire. This is what they said*. And that's, I mean, like, I don't think that tells anything. And so I think even people don't wanna talk about clients. People wanna talk about, y'know, like, again, the constellation of constructs that vaguely are attached to this person, right? But like, I wanna see something about this person's trauma, but I'm interested in trauma. I'm not really interested in the, I'm interested

in like, the trauma and how that affects this person when it's like, well let's focus on what this means in man, y'know, what is Gabriel's stuff with this and what is Andrew and what is Sarah and all that. Y'know, I, and I think we don't, I, I wish it was about people and I, I don't think we're moving that, I think we're moving further away from that direction.

- 1:01:34 RTH: So I agree with most of that, maybe all of it. What DES is is a different path. And we're trying to figure out whether that path is of, has some virtues to it. And if so, what are they? And we're not presuming to know the answer to that question or it's pretty early on in the process.
- 1:01:58 Gabriel: [There is a buzzing noise.] What's that? Oh,
- 1:01:59 RTH: This is somebody's iPhone. [AG: Yeah.]
- 1:02:01 Gabriel: For some reason I thought it was coming from this. [holds up the beeper] I didn't think, I thought it was coming from this, the, the beeper. I didn't know it could do that.
- 1:02:08 RTH: I thought it was coming from that too. So it could.., we've been at this now for an hour and a half, for an hour. And it could be that, that we should, we should say we've talked about this enough today. Unless there, if there's, if anybody has a specific thing they wanna say or a question they wanna ask, we should ask it. Otherwise it could be that maybe we should, we should think about whether we should schedule another one of these things.
- 1:02:36 So I'm guessing that Gabriel came into this not expecting to have the conversation that we had, exactly. And um, and now that he knows what the, what we, what the conversation *could be*, if he wanted to have it, then he might be better prepared the next time we get, get together. And I might have time to look at what his experiences have been. And so when he asked, *well what did you think about something?* I would know what I was talking about.
- 1:03:07 AG: Do we want to open up the, the green? Like should that be the next thing we schedule? We schedule the green and then we have these conversations, we go through the samples. Cuz that is also an option.
- 1:03:37 Russ comments: The "green meeting" is a DES colloquialism for a session (or sessions) where all the interviewers review all the samples with the aim of bring all the sampling back to mind and perhaps recognizing some patterns or emergent phenomena.
- 1:03:20 RTH: So let's talk about that. So what she's talking about is, what we talk about is we have what we call a "green meeting." And the green meeting is where we go through all of the samples and try to understand what Gabriel's experience was like in the, in that sample. And then we write out what we call a "caption" about that, which in our, the world that we do this in, we write it in green, in in green font so that we can see them. [Gabriel: Okay.] And that's what we call the green meeting. So basically what we're gonna do is we're gonna re, reawaken our memory about, about, uh, each one

of, each one of your samples. [AG: Mm-Hmm.] And as a general rule, the participant isn't present at the green meeting because the participant's got other stuff to do. But if you're interested, we could have a green meeting and which would include you. [Gabriel: Okay.]

1:04:12 And we, we have sometimes, sometimes we do that we don't have a rule that says we don't ex, that we exclude [AG: Mm-hmm.] participants. I would say maybe over the last several green meetings we've done it is sort of 50—50. The person's been here or not. My memory isn't that good, so I don't remember. But, but if you're *interested*, we could go then back through and, and I'm guessing that that would be an interesting conversation to have. And the reason that I think that is that almost every conversation is better if it's tied to a particular moment, [Gabriel: Hmm.] which is sort of another way of saying I have a trouble with the, with the whirlwind because the whirlwind is, goes from some general thing that Kant said to some general thing that Merleau-Ponty said to some general whatever, and it never, and it never touches down at a particular moment. And the green meetings are always about moments. And in, our, in the conversation where *you* would be present, then we might be able to discover some stuff that might be interesting.

1:05:27 Gabriel: Okay. That sounds interesting. Yeah. I, I, I'd like to participate in that. Alright.

1:05:33 RTH: Why are we gonna do it?

1:05:34 AG: Um, I can meet, uh, I can meet over spring break, but it'd have to be over Zoom.

1:05:40 RTH: I don't think it should be over zoom.

1:05:42 Gabriel: Okay. I would not be able to do it over Zoom over spring break anyway. Okay. Because I'll be in, uh, or I would be able to do it over Zoom, but I would only be able to do it over zoom, uh, because I I'd be in uh, California. [AG: Okay.]

1:05:55 RTH: Well then let's think about whether, whether the desirability of doing it face-to-face outweighs the desirability of doing it soon.

1:06:04 AG: Hmm. Okay. Um, doesn't matter to

1:06:09 Gabriel: Yeah. I it does it either way works with me. Uh, actually that said, uh, I'm gonna, I, where I am gonna be in California, I don't know how the internet's gonna be, cuz it's gonna be a place near on the coast and I've never been there before. And sometimes these little places have bad wifi. So I don't know if it's actually like a great idea to schedule it over over spring break for that reason.

1:06:37 AG: Okay.

1:06:40 RTH: So I, I, as a general rule, I prefer a face-to-face conversation because I think there's, there's a level of communication that takes place face-to-face that's not present in Zoom. [Gabriel: Hmm.] And particularly when we're gonna be talking about, y'know, things which are of personal values or whatever, like, like I, I think the conversation that we had here today would've been somewhat different if over Zoom. [Gabriel:

Mm-hmm.] I'm not sure in what way it would've been different, but, but it's one thing for me to have said what I said when I can see you in person, and it's another thing for me to have said what I would've said if, if I can see a headshot of you [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] that fades in and out with the quality of the internet.

1:07:36 Gabriel: Alright. So I think, uh,

1:07:38 CK: We can, we can schedule them for the week after spring break.

1:07:41 AG: Yeah. Yeah. [Gabriel: The week after spring break.] I can do Tuesday. Well for the week after, I can do Tuesday at the same time that we met today. I don't know what you've got, but I can do Tuesday. Okay.

1:07:51 RTH: That would be Tuesday, March 21st.

1:07:53 CK: Yes. Tuesday, March 21st at 4:15. [AG: Yes, I can do that.] That works for me.

1:07:57 Gabriel: Alright. That would work for me as well. [AG: Okay.]

1:07:59 RTH: That'd work for me too. So you wanna put that on the calendar?

1:08:02 Gabriel: I'm, wait, do you mean Thursday? Tuesday.

1:08:05 RTH: Tuesday the 21<sup>st</sup>.

1:08:05 Gabriel: Tuesday. Oh wait. Oh, lemme think. Um,

1:08:07 RTH: Or Thursday. Or Thursday. I can do Thursday.

1:08:08 AG: I can't do Thursday.

1:08:10 Gabriel: Lemme make sure about Tuesday. [CK: Tuesday or Thursday works.]

1:08:15 AG: Uh, I can't do Thursday.

1:08:16 CK: Yeah. Cannot Okay.

1:08:19 Gabriel: 4:15. Um,

1:08:25 RTH: Or some other time there's nothing or

1:08:28 CK: Yeah, well we, Wednesday works too.

1:08:30 Gabriel: Tuesday at 4:15 would work. That does work with me. [CK: Okay.]

1:08:33 RTH: Everybody happy with that? Yeah.

1:08:34 AG: Yep. I can do Tuesday. That's the best day that week.

1:08:37 RTH: Tuesday at 4:15. Okay.

1:08:39 AG: What are we, is this, what is this? A green meeting?

1:08:42 RTH: Green and uh, and uh, the choreography of that meeting will be something like a green meeting.

1:08:49 AG: Okay. I'll just put, I'll just put green. So we,

1:08:52 RTH: And by something like, I mean we'll do a, a sort of a standard green meeting, but we could expect that we would have some discursion [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] excursions that we might not otherwise have.

1:09:02 CK: I don't think we should marry ourselves to the formalities of well we have to the green meeting cuz that's what we said we're gonna do and then we [RTH: Right.] [inaudible] it that.

1:09:09 RTH: I would, I would say that our green meetings are generally pretty excursive or discursive or something like that.

1:09:21 CK: Yeah. I'd say we do it and then you, we can see, y'know, treat it as a one-time thing and you can have the right to say afterwards like, y'know what, I'm, I'm good. Like this was, this is good and I, I'm, y'know, I don't, I'm not upset anymore. Let's do it some more. And [AG: Mm-hmm.] But, so it's, uh,

1:09:36 RTH: And the other thing I would say is we don't generally tape record the green meeting, but I think in this particular green meetings we've probably ought to record. [Gabriel: Okay.] And what, what we'll do in that situation is, we'll, we'll display on the screen there, the, the descriptions. I don't know that you've seen the descriptions that we've written. [AG: No]

1:09:53 CK: I don't think we shared it with you.

1:09:56 Gabriel: I know that, uh, you, you talked about green. I know the comments you wrote in the transcript were green,

1:10:00 RTH: But, um, that's a different, different kind of green.

1:10:03 Gabriel: Okay. In that case, I don't think I've seen it.

1:10:07 RTH: So you've seen one day's worth of transcript. [Gabriel: Mm-Hmm.]

1:10:11 RTH: But you, so, so what you don't know maybe, or maybe you do know and we just haven't talked much about it, is that at the end of every sampling day we have written a description which we call the "messy description." And what that, what that means is that one of these two folks has written a description and I've commented on it, then the other one has commented on it and then we've

commented back and forth. And so there's, there is a description with a bunch of track change stuff that we, that we call the "mess." It's the, it's the messy description and, and we believe that keeping that messiness alive until the end is a good idea. Hmm. So we do *not* at every week try to come up with a firm best description, *because* we think we might learn something *next* time that would cause us to rethink what we thought Gabriel was saying *this* time. And so we try to keep all that stuff alive, [Gabriel: Okay.] basically.

1:11:14 Gabriel: Okay. I see.

1:11:15 RTH: Until we get to the green meeting. And then in the green meeting we try to sort of come over, come together about, well my opinion was this, her opinion was that your opinion was that other. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] Can we, do we have to go back to the tape and look at it? If we do we do and or can we, can you figure out a, a way to provide a fairly high-fidelity description, which would then be the description going forward?

1:11:43 Gabriel: Mm-hmm. Okay.

1:11:46 RTH: And the green meeting, I, I, in your case, the green meeting is gonna take six or eight hours probably. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] one hour at a time.

1:11:53 Gabriel: Okay.

1:11:55 RTH: Would be my guess.

1:11:56 Gabriel: Okay. Yeah, that makes sense. It'd be a lot, it'd be a lot to go through at every single one of those. Uh, like do you go basically over each beep, [RTH: Yes.] essentially? [CK: Every single one.] Okay, got it.

1:12:07 RTH: Generally we start at the end and work backwards. [Gabriel: Mm.] Because the end, the end beeps are the ones that we think we, we understood most, because [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] we've seen. [Gabriel: Right. Yes.] And then, and then we get to unfurl that stuff backwards [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] across the previous beeps. But I would, I think that's our general procedure. We don't have, well we don't have any rules about anything, but that's, that would be what we generally do. [Gabriel: Okay.]

1:12:34 CK: I would say there's no prep you need to do for this meeting either. Like it's just to show up and we'll talk about it as, y'know, it's kind of hard to like, like the sound thing. Right. It's like we're telling you what sort of the goals are. But I would say relax into it and [Gabriel: Okay.] we'll talk about it. Let

1:12:47 Gabriel: Okay, sounds good

1:12:48 RTH: To the meeting. It does seem like there's a little preparation for us and that is that we should send *you* the messy descriptions.

1:12:55 Gabriel: Oh okay.

1:12:56 RTH: So that you are so that we're not taking you by surprise or whatever [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] at this meeting. And you with the understanding that we're gonna start at the end and we're backwards and it's probably gonna take us, if we get through two days, day 13 and 12 or whatever, in one hour we'll be doing good.

1:13:14 Gabriel: Okay. Got it.

1:13:17 RTH: *And* when we send you the messy descriptions, if you have reactions to that, you should log them and we can talk about that either in the green meeting or, or whenever. *And*, and I would say those messy descriptions were not meant for you. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] They were meant for us cuz we were, we were involved with it and we're gonna open them to you and we would appreciate it if you would treat them the same way that we would treat them, which is to say keep them amongst ourselves until such time as everybody involved says it's okay to... We're *not* saying it would be okay for you to say, *well you should see what Cody said about that!* But whomever, that's [Gabriel: Okay. Got it.] That would *not* be okay. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] There might come a time when we would want to put all this stuff out there and anybody who could, could look at it. But everybody should have a right to do that. [Gabriel: Okay. Got it.]

1:14:20 CK: And to make it abundantly clear, right, like our goal is not like we're gonna go through this and do an analysis to say like, let's *explain* Gabriel's experience. Right? Like, it's not like we're gonna come to your answers as like, *why were you focused on the red versus this*, right. Like that it's purely about describing [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] what the beep caught in flight. And so the discussions we'll have is around, for example, something like, well was this an inner speaking sort of a deal? Or an inner hearing sort of a deal? Or both? right. Like that's the kind of discussions that we'll often have around [Gabriel: Okay.] When we say we're talking about and figuring it out, it's, it's stuff like that. [Gabriel: Okay.]

1:14:56 RTH: So I think we should adjourn this meeting. [Gabriel: Okay.] Thank you very much. And uh, look forward to the next, the next step of it. [Gabriel: Okay. Sounds good. Alright.] And, and I would, one last thing and that is that any commitment that you may have made today, you should feel free to rescind that. And so should we. Y'know, if we say *Shit! We shouldn't really have Gabriel present for that!* then we should be able to, we should be able to say that. [Gabriel: Okay.] I don't expect to say that but [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] but uh, but I would like us to all be free agents when we come together. [Gabriel: Okay. Understood.] [CK: Mm-hmm.] [Gabriel: Got it.] Alright, have a good break. [Gabriel: Alright.] Thank you very much.

1:15:35 CK: Thanks. You too. Have a good break.

1:15:37 Gabriel: I guess I'll see you on uh, next Tuesday.