

Gabriel H.: A university student with philosophy interests
Gabriel Interview 11

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the February 13 interview with Gabriel that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/DiaPnKXPVKo>. In green are comments about and explanations of the Descriptive Experience Sampling process. In brown are portions of the interview that discuss the Descriptive Experience Sampling process or the procedure. 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 this is going to be Gabriel...

0:04 AG: 11.

0:05 RTH: 11 Already?

0:06 Gabriel: Mm-hmm. [RTH: Alright.]

0:09 AG: Um, when did you wear the beeper?

0:11 Gabriel: So I wore the beeper last night, and, uh, also this morning. So this morning for two beeps, last night for three. So I had five beeps in total. [RTH: Inaudible]

0:24 AG: You said this morning was two, correct?

0:26 Gabriel: Yes.

0:28 AG: Okay. Sounds good. [RTH: So I'd-] And any questions, problems?

0:33 Gabriel: Uh, no problems, no.

0:35 AG: Okay.

0:37 RTH: So I'd say we ought to start with beep number... Beeps from today.

0:41 Gabriel: Beep. Okay. I'll do [RTH Inaudible] the most recent beep then, first?

0:45 RTH: Yeah. So just go backwards, I guess I would. We could just-

0:48 Gabriel: Okay, sounds [AG: Uh] good.

0:50 RTH: 5, 4, 3, 2, 1.

0:52 Gabriel: Okay. So for context-

0:55 RTH: And, and Amber, you wanna go first?

0:58 AG: Um, I'll go second.

0:59 RTH: Sorry?

1:01 AG: Oh, second. [RTH: I'll go first?] That's how we've been doing it so I'll... [RTH: Me, you, Cody?] the same. Yeah. [RTH: Me, you, Cody? Okay.] Yeah, I'll keep the same order.

1:09 RTH: All right, we're ready then.

SAMPLE 11.5 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE (beginning with sample 5 and working backwards)

1:11 Gabriel: Okay, got it. So for context, um, I was, uh, reading a text-message bubble, and in my experience at that moment was the word "bleeding." And that was **auditorily** in my experience, i, in my inner voice, my internal speaking voice. Uh, and I, and it was, uh, it was experienced as the reading of the word "bleeding" in conjunction with my internal speaking voice saying it.

Um, at the same time, there was the image of a, uh, in, in my sort of imagination (so not in the real world) um, an image of a general ki, or, or a kind of, just a glob of, of blood that was flowing down. And it was kind of a shiny blood, uh, like a red kind of shiny, uh, liquid that was flowing down. Uh, not any, not anything in particular. There was a blue background. It wasn't, uh, on anything. It was just that.

2:29 RTH: And is [Gabriel: And that, is everything.] And i, is the seeing or the word more in your experience than the other, or are they both the same?

2:38 Gabriel: I would say the, uh, the auditory experience of the word is most, in my experience,

2:38 Russ comments: In 1:11 and 2:38, Gabriel refers to his inner speaking as an "auditory experience," when the experience is more of production (the speaking) than audition (the hearing). Many people with philosophical interests (for reasons that I haven't figured out) make this same kind of mischaracterization.

2:45 RTH: 60/40, 90/10?

2:47 Gabriel: Uh, I'd say somewhere close to 80/20.

2:53 RTH: Okay. Then let's start with the, the word. So I had understood you to be saying that you are innerly speaking the word "bleeding."

3:01 Gabriel: Mm-hmm.

3:02 RTH: In the voice that you've described before?

3:05 Gabriel: Yes.

3:06 RTH: And is, [clears throat] is it the same voice that you've described before? As far as I know, which [Gabriel nods] I guess I remember as being sort of raspy, toneless, whispery, something?

3:17 Gabriel: Uh, [pause] y'know, in this instance, I'd, I don't really remember what, if it exactly was that part. I assume it was, but, uh, I did not think of, I did not take note of that. Uh, and I think the reason I didn't take note of it was because I just assumed it was that voice. But now that I think about it, um, I'm not sure [RTH: Okay, fair enough.] if it was that particular voice,

3:46 RTH: But it was that particular *word*.

3:48 Gabriel: It was that particular word.

3:50 RTH: And was that word part of a sentence that you were speaking and reading? Or does it seem like it's just this one word that you have isolated out at this moment?

4:02 Gabriel: It *was* part of a sentence. Uh, however, in that particular moment, I was just thinking about that one word. [RTH: Okay.] And that's not, because, um, that's not to say that I was reading a sentence and that word popped out at me. In that moment, I was just looking at that word.

4:28 RTH: So the, the distinction here that I think is interesting, or important, or whatever is: does it seem like, like [clears throat] there's a stream of words going by and the beep happens to catch me at this one? Or does it seem like I'm reading this word and then I'm reading this word and then I'm reading this word sort of as separate words, like sausages on a link or, link sausage [inaudible]?

4:49 Gabriel: It's, it's neither of those two I would say. It's that I was, eh, I wasn't reading, I wasn't in the process of reading a sentence. Uh, I was just looking at that word. So it was like, um, I was just looking at that word, uh, on my phone. It was, it was *in* a sentence, but I wasn't in the, in the process of reading a sentence.

5:12 RTH: *Uh huh*. So you're speaking the word and seeing the word. I guess I should say that the other way around. I'm seeing the word and speaking the word, and the word, word on the screen is part of a sentence, but I'm, but I'm not in the midst of that sentence. I'm just looking at [inaudible]

5:26 Gabriel: Yeah, I'm not in the midst of the sentence.

5:27 RTH: And, and does the word have any meaning to me? Is this, is, is this a semantically meaningful um piece of information here? I'm, I'm interested in, in "bleeding." And so I'm seeing, I'm interested, so I'm saying bleeding, or is it, or is this just sort of a random s... random [Gabriel: Uh-] semantic-free utterance?

6:02 Gabriel: I would say it does have meaning.

6:05 RTH: Okay. So I'm, I am looking at the word "bleeding," which I understand means blood stuff. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And I'm saying "bleeding," which I understand means blood stuff, but it's not, I'm not trying to say that there's some separate thinking that goes around, well, that's blood stuff or whatever. But that I understand that as a, as a reference to red stuff.

6:33 Gabriel: Yes.

6:35 RTH: Okay. But *not* as part of a sentence. I don't understand it as part of a sentence. It *is* part of a sentence, but that is not how...

6:45 Gabriel: Right, exactly.

6:46 RTH: Got it. Anybody else have any questions about that? [AG and CK: Shake heads] And *then* I see red stuff, [Gabriel: Yes.] which I understand to be blood on a blue background.

7:00 Gabriel: Uh, I understand [cuts out] blood, it happens to be in my imagination. Um, there's some sort of kind of bluish background. Um,

7:10 RTH: But that's not essential to your,

7:12 Gabriel: That's not essential. No.

7:14 RTH: Okay. You broke up, so I wanna make sure I understood what you said. I see it as blood. I don't see it as a red liquid. I see it as blood?

7:26 Gabriel: [Video and audio cut out for a moment] I see as blood.

7:28 RTH: You broke up again. Must be,

7:30 Gabriel: Oh, shoot, [laughs]. I do see it as blood.

7:33 RTH: Okay, good. And is it in motion? I see it running down? Or is I just see a glob of blood?

7:44 Gabriel: Uh, it, okay. So it's, it's formed as though it was in motion. Like the shape of it indicates that it is dripping, but it is not actually in motion in my experience. It's sort of frozen in time.

8:00 RTH: Okay. So this is, this is like a still picture, still seeing of, blood?

8:06 Gabriel: Yes.

8:06 RTH: But the blood itself is in motion and I could,

8:10 Gabriel: The blood itself is, it, it's a still seeing of blood that, uh... All I can say is that it's formed as though it was in motion.

8:21 RTH: Okay. So I see it as blood. I don't see it as dripping blood?

8:27 Gabriel: Yeah. I see it as blood that takes the shape of drips. [Pauses] So it's a purely geometrical thing that I'm saying.

8:49 RTH: So th, if, so, does that mean: I see it as blood and whether it's moving or not, just doesn't matter to me? The fact of what I'm seeing happens to be shaped like a drip, but it's not like I'm seeing a drip, I'm seeing blood, and it sort of [Gabriel: Yeah.] inconsequentially happens to be drip shaped?

9:11 Gabriel: Yes.

9:13 RTH: Okay. And it's red. And is it, is, is it the redness that grabs my attention, or is it, uh, just as I'm, I'm illustrating this blood for myself?

9:34 Gabriel: Um, the redness does not particularly grab my attention. Um, I would say it's more the second thing, which is that, yeah, this is just simply, uh, me illustrating blood.

9:49 RTH: Okay. And, and it's on a blueish black background, does that background disappear or is like, [mimes a square frame] is like a frame with a blood drip in it or?

10:02 Gabriel: Uh, so the background, it does, it does disappear out into, y'know, uh, the bord, whatever borders it has, it does disappear out into whatever those are, y'know, some undefined thing. Uh, I will say it's not like a solid blue background, it's like a background that's, it's really what I mean by background is, this is actually, it's like a room, uh, but it's really, it's like blurry and out of focus, and it just happens to be in a bluish light, kind of like there's light streaming in from a window on a cloudy day. Um, that's what the blue is. It's the blue of the, of a cloudy day's light streaming through a window and, and sort of dimly illuminating an out of focus room.

10:46 RTH: Okay. So does that mean I see blood in a room? Or do I see blood and then when you asking me about what it, what the background is like, I can say, well, sort of looks like a room?

10:58 Gabriel: Uh, I would say I see blood in a room. [RTH: Okay.] In, in my experience, it does have a location within this room.

11:07 RTH: And in the middle of the room? Suspended in the room? And, [inaudible]

11:12 Gabriel: Uh I, I don't know if it's in the middle of the room or not, because I don't know, what's behind me, so I don't know if it constitutes the middle.

11:21 RTH: Okay. And suspended at, suspended in the room, like in the middle of the-

11:24 Gabriel: Yes, it's suspended, it's levitating.

- 11:26 RTH: Not sitting on a table or whatever?
- 11:29 Gabriel: Yes. [RTH: Mm-hmm.] Not sitting on a table.
- 11:32 RTH: Okay. [Pauses] And I think I'm good.
- 11:39 CK: Me too.
- 11:42 RTH: Number 2,er, number 4 [working backwards beginning with 5]
- 11:39 Gabriel: I hope nobody [RTH: [inaudible]] here, uh, faints at blood, because that might have been an uncomfortable conversation. [laugh].
- 11:50 AG: Oh [audio cuts out] Could I ask one more question about that, about the inner seeing? Um, so- [Gabriel: About the what?] So, about what you saw in your experience. [Gabriel: Okay.] In the, um, so I, I understood you to be saying that there was these, there were these qualities to the room, like the bluish lighting and all of that stuff. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] Are, is that, is that what you're seeing at the moment of the beep? Or is that,... Is that part of your experience in the moment, the beep? I just wanna clarify.
- 12:15 Gabriel: It's part of my experience. Um, but I, I think to use the language that we've used in the past, it's not thematic. It just so happens to be part of the visual experience, but I'm not making a deal out of it.
- 12:29 AG: Okay. [Gabriel: Okay.] Then I am good. And we can go onto beep 4.

SAMPLE 11.4 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 12:35 Gabriel: Okay. Beep number 4. So for context, uh, I was in class and, uh, my professor was writing on the whiteboard and giving a lecture. So at the moment of the beep, uh, in my experience was the reading of the, the two words, "some woman," and also (so visually they were there in my experience, uh, as the experience of looking at them on the whiteboard) and also auditorially as the experience of my, uh, uh, of my professor having just said them. So not having read them, not me reading them in my internal voice, but rather the voice of my professor.
- 13:18 AG: And what is the, what is it that the auditory, what, what was it again?
- 13:24 Gabriel: "Some woman" [AG: "That you have... Okay."] was written, it was written on [audio cuts out] board. And, um, uh, additionally there was a visual aspect of this experience, which was, um, uh, I, and I, it was this sort of image of a kind of like marble block, maybe ivory block, uh, that's dripping in honey, like honey is kind of glazed over it. And there's like gold dust sprinkled inside there. And somehow this image carries with it a sense of motherhood, um, or, uh, or the concept of motherhood. And to me, I experienced this image as, as the ambiguous woman,

which was a, a concept we were discussing. The ambiguous, uh, the ambiguous something in this case [AG: Okay, and-] the ambiguous woman.

- 14:28 AG: Okay. And of these, um, aspects, is there anything that's more prominent? Or they all same?
- 14:34 Gabriel: Um, uh, the, the image was the most prominent in this case.
- 14:42 AG: Okay. And [Gabriel: And-] how much more prominent would you say?
- 14:44 Gabriel: I would say like, uh, 60/40.
- 14:51 AG: Okay, so like 60, and the other things are 40, right?
- 14:57 Gabriel: Yes.
- 14:59 AG: Got it. Okay. So let's start with the image. Um, so could you tell me again what it is that you see?
- 15:07 Gabriel: So there is a block of, I think it's ivory, and it's sort of chopped off and ragged at the top, but the sides of it and the bottom are uniform. It's like, it's like a cube. Um, it that's chipped at the top. And, um, it's, it's kind of, [audio cuts out]
- 15:39 RTH: We're having trouble with, we're having trouble with your, with your audio, Gabriel.
- 15:45 Gabriel: Gold dust. I, [audio cuts in and out]
- 15:47 RTH: We're still, we're still having trouble. We can't, we can't hear you. [Gabriel: Is anyone there?] I can't hear you, anyway, it's...
- 15:54 CK: Yeah, It's this same on my end [Gabriel: Oh boy.] too. You, um,
- 15:59 Gabriel: Shoot.
- 15:59 CK: Maybe Gabriel, what you can try to do is to turn off your camera and that way, see if the audio will... Sometimes that helps to boost the audio a bit. I dunno if anyone else has other ideas.
- 16:11 RTH: I think that's worth a shot.
- 16:13 AG: Yeah.
- 16:19 RTH: So you're frozen audio and visual on our screen at this moment, Gabriel.
- 16:27 Gabriel: Hello.
- 16:28 RTH: Now we can see you. So if you, if you

16:36 Gabriel: Okay, I, uh- [Gabriel turns off his video] Like that?

16:37 AG: Yeah, that works better.

16:39 RTH: Let's, let's, let's try that and see what [Gabriel: Okay.] see what-

16:42 Gabriel: I've also switched. I've also switched to a hotspot instead of wifi, because oftentimes that does better.

16:50 RTH: Okay.

16:51 AG: Okay.

16:52 CK: It, it seems like your-

16:51 RTH: Here you wanna put, you wanna put your camera back on and see whether that works and

16:56 Gabriel: Sure. And if, tell me if it doesn't and then I'll turn it back off.

17:02 RTH: So it looks good. So, so Amber had asked you something like, tell me what you see about this block and then we lost it.

17:10 Gabriel: Okay. So, uh, I see a, a cube or a rect, uh, a cube of ivory, and the ivory is chipped at the top. Um, and it's also, uh, uh, sort of drizzled in a blanket of honey. And inside of the honey is, um, gold dust sprinkled through it. So the honey kind of is glittery. And there's a black background. Oh. And they're also in the top, in the top left is a light source. I think it's like a sun.

17:53 AG: Do you see a sun or is that just, is it just a light source? Like it,

17:56 Gabriel: I, I see, I, I think I see a sun. Uh, but it, at the very least, it is a very sun-like light source, which is a big ball of, uh, that's kind of yellowish and shiny. [AG: Okay.] Bright. Okay.

18:18 AG: And then, um, you had also mentioned that there was a, this sense of motherhood or this ambiguous woman. Could, could you tell me more about that?

18:29 Gabriel: Oh, so, uh, I mean, those are kind of two different things. So this image and the sense of motherhood combined, I am experiencing this whole thing as the am, the concept of the ambiguous woman. Attached [AG: Okay.] to the image is this sense of motherhood. [AG: Mm-hmm.] Um, which is somewhat difficult to define, uh, how, to explain, um, but there is sort of like, it's like an, it is specifically sort of an affectionate, there's like a sense of affection. Uh, and, um, yeah, so there's a sense of affection, uh, for a child, uh, coming from a woman.

19:36 AG: And I, I know you were saying it was difficult for you to describe the, the sense and you, uh, but is there anything more to be said about how that is present to you or

how that's attached to the image? Or if those, that doesn't make, that question doesn't make any sense?

- 19:50 Gabriel: I guess there is more to be said about it, which is that it is kind of comforting. Like it's a, it's a kind of nice thought. Um, uh, it's not, it sort of take, it's not stressful at all. And uh, there is also connected to it. Some, there's also connected to it, some sort of smell as well, which is sort of a vanilla-y smell.
- 20:21 RTH: And maybe you broke up, or when you say "connected to it," you mean connected to this marble honey glazed image?
- 20:29 Gabriel: I would say, no, I would say this is specifically connected to the sense of motherhood, and I guess by extension is connected to the marble honey glazed thing.
- 20:43 RTH: So then I've lo I've, I've lost something of a fundamental, maybe Amber can ask about it or you want me to ask about it, Amber?
- 20:50 AG: Oh, you could ask about it just so that, yeah, go ahead.
- 20:53 RTH: So, so the cube is *motherhood*, and then there's a concept that I'm not exactly sure what the concept is. The concept is the *ambiguous woman*? Is,
- 21:05 Gabriel: No, uh, the cube and, and everything in there is the *ambiguous woman*. The concept of motherhood is part of the experience of the cube and the cube and the concept of motherhood together makes the ambiguous woman.
- 21:28 RTH: Would you say that one more time, cuz I...
- 21:33 Gabriel: Okay, Okay, I will. So we got the cube. [Holds up right hand in a fist] [RTH: Yeah.] And we also have [Holds up left hand in a fist] the, uh, the sense of motherhood, which includes this like vanilla smell. These two [Brings hands together] things together make the ambiguous woman. [RTH: Okay.] So I experienced these two things together as a whole, as the ambiguous woman.
- 21:53 RTH: And at the moment of the beep, are you experiencing those together? Or are you experiencing them as the cube here [raises right hand in a fist] and [raises left hand, some distance away from his right]...?
- 22:01 Gabriel: I'm experiencing them together.
- 22:04 RTH: Okay. Okay.
- 22:12 AG: Do you have any more questions about the, that, uh because I'm good? We're good? Okay. And then there was the other 40% of this experience. Uh, could you tell me again what that was?
- 22:30 Gabriel: That was, um, uh, the words on the board and my professor saying them. So, [AG: Okay.] I had, uh, I just read "some woman," uh, uh, and instead of my voice sort of

being the voice in my head when I read the words, it was a, the professor's voice because he had just said those words. So it was kind of like, I looked at the words and I, I didn't need my, my internal voice. It didn't go off. I, I just had the professor's words still in my head. So I was looking at the words, "some woman," visually they were there. And also the auditory experience of my professor having said them.

23:20 AG: Okay. So is this a seeing and hearing deal *externally*? Or is there anything, or is this like a hearing, I'm hearing this in [Gabriel: Okay.] my inner voice, or? I don't know it made sense.

23:39 Gabriel: I, uh, so it was, I said that it was like the voice of my professor is, was *echoing*. So there's a sense in which it was internal, which is that at that moment he was not saying those words. He had *just* said them, but they were still auditorially being experienced. Uh, so I guess it's a combination, maybe, I would say. Um, and the seeing is entirely, uh, e external—I'm looking at them on the board.

24:23 AG: Okay. So I'm trying, uh, okay. So, um, I'm just trying to get this professor's voice. So is it that I'm hearing like an echo of, of what my professor just said? Or I'm reading it in my professor's voice? Or something else that, I'm trying to get a grasp of what that experience was like for you.

24:43 Gabriel: Okay. So it's like I'm hearing what my professor said. It's not, I'm hearing what my professor *is saying*. It's, I'm hearing what my professor *just said*.

24:55 AG: Got it. Okay. [Gabriel: Okay.]

24:57 RTH: So I'm seeing on the board in real time and I'm hearing my prof, professor delayed by a second or a few seconds or whatever?

25:06 Gabriel: Something like that. Yes. [AG: Okay, mm-hmm.]

25:10 RTH: And does it seem like I'm hearing my professor read what's on the board or does it seem like I'm hearing my professor as he had said it a little bit ago, more

25:22 Gabriel: It seems like I am hearing my professor *as he had said it* a little bit ago.

25:28 RTH: And as he had said it, did he say "some woman"?

25:34 Gabriel: Yes. [RTH: Mm-hmm]

25:46 AG: Any more questions?

25:48 Gabriel: I think, uh, I did, I will comment. It's when I said *delay* or when you said delay, I, I, I agree to that, but I don't know if I would use the word delay because it's not like I felt like I'm only finally now hearing him, because in my opinion, that's sort of what delay seems like. It's like, oh, I *should* have heard him, now I *finally am*. It's like I *did* hear him. Uh, I'm just continuing to hear him.

25:48 Russ comments: Gabriel is confidently making a subtle experiential distinction.

26:14 RTH: Still hearing him.

26:15 Gabriel: Yes.

26:25 AG: Any more questions? Anything else?

26:26 RTH: And, and is he talking about the concept of, I forget what you called it, *generalized woman*?

26:33 Gabriel: The *ambiguous woman*. Yeah.

26:35 RTH: Ambiguous woman. So that's his subject matter? He's

26:38 Gabriel: Mm-hmm. [RTH: Okay.] Yeah, that's what we're going, that's what we were going over.

26:43 RTH: Okay. No, I think I'm good.

26:47 CK: Me too.

26:49 AG: Yep. Uh, number 3?

SAMPLE 11.3 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

26:54 Gabriel: Okay. Beep number three. Oh, that's on my phone. Let me turn that on. [Gets out his iPhone] So, okay. beep number three. So, uh, for context, uh, I was getting ready for bed last night and, um, uh, I was recalling a conversation that I had had with a, uh, professor of mine. So in, uh, in my experience at the moment of the beep was, was the word, uh, auditorially, "Chalmers" with a question mark. So it was like "Chalmers?" Um, that was a, and it was experienced as, um, part of a sentence. Uh, so the meaning of the sentence was also in my experience. It's just that, that last word was all that was in my experience, auditorially. But the meaning of the exp, uh, sentence, which was in my experience, was a question. It was, "you know Chalmers?" question mark. And, um, also with the word "Chalmers," there was sort of a surprised tone to it. Um, additionally in my experience were, um, the words auditorially, "electromagnetic radiation." Um, and that is because, uh, for context, I was watching a video at that moment, or there was a video playing, uh, in the background. And, uh, those words just came up in the video. And visually, uh, I was imagining in my, in, in internal seeing, there was the, uh, image of a, a black, um, uh, like a black piece of charcoal, or like just a sort of black outline of a, of a shape, just a black shape. And, uh, in, I, it was experienced as a black body with radiation coming off of it. So there was also visually, like arrows coming off of it to indicate radiation.

29:26 CK: Okay. Is any one of these things more prominent at the moment?

29:35 Gabriel: Uh, the question was most prominent.

- 29:43 CK: [AG: Mm-hmm.] And you had said a little while ago, this was, you described this as being auditorily present.
- 29:51 Gabriel: Uh, [CK: Inaudible] so, yes. The, the last word of the question was auditorially present, uh, which was “Chalmers?” question mark. Um, the, um, the rest of the sentence was present semantically in meaning, but not in text or, or audio or anything like that.
- 30:24 CK: And so is there a particular voice to this? [Gabriel: Yes.] I understand there’s this tone...
- 30:32 Gabriel: Uh, yes. Uh, so this was me remembering, uh, my, my voice in the past. And, um, so it was, it was my voice.
- 30:49 CK: And when you say your *voice*, is that, is this sort of like, I’m, I’m remembering a time when I had said this out loud and sort of what that sounded like? Or, [Gabriel: Yes.] In my inner voice, the raspy, whispery voice.
- 31:04 Gabriel: It was my, it was my, uh, external voice, my actual real life speaking voice.
- 31:12 CK: Mm-hmm. And you had said the, so this is this, this word “Chalmers?” question mark is part of a longer sentence. And the, but the longer sentence, it’s not like I’m, it’s not like at the moment of the beep, it catches the whole sentence. It’s just this word?
- 31:37 Gabriel: Uh, it’s just that word *auditorially*, but *semantically*, it catches the whole sentence.
- 31:47 CK: And that’s sort of two separate things?
- 31:50 Gabriel: I, yes.
- 31:54 CK: Okay.
- 31:54 AG: Mm-hmm.
- 31:56 RTH: So I may have missed something at the beginning here, so (cuz I got distracted by something else on my computer. Sorry about that.) But the, and is the, is the point here that I’m recalling a conversation that I had with somebody else where I was saying to that somebody else, “you know Chalmers?”
- 32:12 Gabriel: Yes.
- 32:13 RTH: And at the moment of the beep, what I hear is “Chalmers?” but I know that to be the whole sentence, “you know, cha, Chalmers?”
- 32:21 Gabriel: Uh, yes, I know. So auditorially, I hear “Chalmers” at the moment of the beep, but that word “Chalmers,” uh, uh, the, the, the meaning of the whole sentence is present to me as well.

- 32:35 RTH: Okay. So is it your sense that if, if the beep had come second before you would've heard maybe the, "you know" portion of this? Is that? So what I'm, what I'm trying to get at is, is your impression that the word "Chalmers" is there and that's all that's there with the implication that it carries, "you know Chalmers?" Or does it seem like you have heard, "you know Chalmers," and the beep happens that get you at the end of it? Or maybe you can't make that distinction? I'm not,
- 33:06 Gabriel: I, I would say, um, so the, the second the la, the latter option was, um, was that I heard the whole sentence. I, okay, I'm not sure I understand the distinction.
- 33:26 RTH: So let me, let me ask a more basic question, and then I'll ask that question. [Gabriel: Okay.] So I, I understand that I'm hearing, I'm rehearsing my voice, I'm hearing what had been said in that conversation. I'm not speaking it again, I'm hearing it. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And so what I wanna know is whether in a, if we expand a, away from the moment, maybe is a way to ask it, I heard my voice say, "you know Chalmers?" which is what I said back in the real, in the real time. But at the moment, at, in this in, broadly defined moment, I'm saying, "you know Chalmers?" Or do I just hear the word Chalmers and the rest of that stuff isn't there auditorially, I just,
- 34:13 Gabriel: Oh, okay.
- 34:14 RTH: I just know what this means.
- 34:15 Gabriel: Okay. I see. So yes, you, you know, uh, was there auditorially, uh, a moment before.
- 34:15 Russ comments: Notice that Gabriel has been describing this sample as an auditory experience, but the upcoming exchange will clarify the experience as being *speaking*, not *hearing*. See the comment at 2:38.
- 34:25 RTH: Okay.
- 34:27 Gabriel: And I will say, although I am remembering this conversation, it still does feel like I'm producing the words in, in this remembering.
- 34:42 RTH: And by producing, do you mean producing in a hearing kind of a way? Or do you mean I am *saying* those words again?
- 34:49 Gabriel: It means I'm speaking them again, like I'm *reciting*, basically.
- 34:54 RTH: So this is the, the *experience* is more of innerly *speaking* than it is of inner *hearing*, even though this refers to an event that's happened whenever it happened.
- 35:06 Gabriel: Yes.
- 35:07 RTH: Okay. So it's, it's as if you are recreating the *speaking* of that, not recreating the *hearing* of that.

35:16 Gabriel: Yes.

35:17 RTH: Mm-hmm. And, and I wanna make abundantly clear. I don't, I don't care one way or the other. I'd just like to know which it is. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] I don't it's alright with me if you were *hearing* it, and it's all with me, if you were *speaking* it, I just want to clarify the

35:30 Gabriel: Yes, I understand. Yeah, it's definitely, uh, *speaking*. [RTH: Okay.]

35:35 CK: Okay. and then there was the "electromagnetic radiation"? [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] Right? And is that coming from the video? Is that correct? [Gabriel: Yes.] This is like externally coming over the speakers or whatever. [Gabriel: Yes.] And that is directly in my experience at the moment? Not just the fact that this video was playing and that's what was being said?

36:01 Gabriel: Uh, yeah, that was in my experience.

36:03 CK: Okay. And is the, is there anything really more to say about how that's present?

36:11 Gabriel: Uh, well, I mean, it is directly connected to the image, so I think that's the *more to say*.

36:22 CK: And is that, is that to say that sort of like, in my experience, there's sort of o, one chunk of my experience is the whole deal with the previously spoken sentence, right, you know Chalmers thing and the other chunk is this electromagnetic radiation bit? Or sort of like three chunks. There's the inner speaking deal, hearing "electromagnetic radiation," and then this thing I'm seeing in my imagination?

36:53 Gabriel: Right. Okay. I would divide it into two.

36:55 CK: Okay. So the, the heard, "electromagnetic radiation" and the image in my imagination both kind of go together. Those are sort of one [Gabriel: Yes.] bit. And so of the, the what I'm seeing, could you say, could you say again how that, how that goes?

37:17 Gabriel: Right. So I'm seeing a, a black object and uh, there are visually there's just this sort of pure black object, uh, with, with nothing to it except the outline. Uh, because it's a purely black object, so it doesn't have any details. And uh, and then there are like arrows coming off of it, uh, pointed, y'know, upward and to, the upward, and to the right. And those represent. And then, so the black object represents a black body in the sense of black body radiation and the arrows represent the radiation.

38:02 RTH: Two arrows, 10 arrows, a hundred arrows?

38:06 Gabriel: It's um, it's like, uh, around six arrows. [RTH: Mm-hmm.]

38:16 CK: And are the arrows in any particular, is like, is this thing black and those are black arrows too? Or is there a color to the arrows or?

38:21 Gabriel: Oh, the arrows are orange.

38:23 CK: Okay. And you had said ba, basically, what these stand for is like the black object stands for black body radiation and the arrows represent the radiation coming off of that. Is that most, is that stuff where it's like to explain this to these guys, I have to say that so it's clear, and at the moment it was just this object and the arrows, or...?

38:48 Gabriel: At the moment I *was* experiencing the black object as a *black body* and the arrows as *radiation*.

39:00 CK: So sort of seeing with u, with understanding, it's not like I'm just seeing a abstract shape or something like that.

39:05 Gabriel: Yes! Exactly.

39:12 CK: And is there, is there anything else to be said about this seeing? Like, I know in the past one there was the deal with it being sort of in a room or there's a, the background was somehow salient [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] Is, is there anything like that...

39:23 Gabriel: There is, um, [CK: here?] there is, it's on this, this uh, black object is on the ground and it's on the ground outside. So, uh, there's some, I think, I think it's on dirt, like a dirt ground. Um, and then there is a blue sky behind it with, with some white clouds.

40:03 CK: [Pauses] And I'm sorry, we did say, you had said that the "Chalmers" deal was more present than this, the electromagnetic-radiation deal?

40:13 Gabriel: Yes.

40:13 CK: By about how, 51/49 stronger? 99/1 stronger?

40:22 Gabriel: Um, I think it's pretty close, so it's, um, it's probably like 60/40.

40:34 CK: Okay. And I think I'm good. Anyone else have any other questions?

40:43 RTH: I'm pretty good with one question. Is, are the arrows in motion? Or this,

40:47 Gabriel: They're *not* in motion.

40:49 RTH: Okay.

40:52 AG: Could [RTH: [Inaudible] you also spell, oh, sorry, go ahead. Finish.

40:55 RTH: Oh, go ahead.

40:57 AG: Oh I was going to ask him, could you spell Chalmers for me?

41:00 Gabriel: Yes. C h a l m e r s.

- 41:06 AG: Okay.
- 41:13 RTH: And, and you described the background with pretty much detail: dirt and blue sky and clouds or whatever. Was that present...? So the, this work is always, is always subject to the fly-on-the-wall skeptic who says, "well, y'know, he is making up that image. He didn't say anything about sky and ground or whatever at the *beginning* when he said that he was a black body. Now he's saying that, but he's probably making it up as, as it goes along." You have, what? You have a sense of what I should say to a skeptic like that?
- 41:47 Gabriel: Uh, well, I'm sorry, what was that? What's the question?
- 41:50 RTH: So, so my question, my question, my question is sort of double a question. Do you think that the sky and the ground were there at the present of the beep? You just didn't *say* about it, for one reason or another? Or is it possible that you're making that kinda stuff up as the [inaudible]?
- 42:06 Gabriel: What I know for a fact is that at the beginning of me giving you this information, I know that I was thinking about whether or not to mention the sky and the ground, uh, but I, I just hadn't gotten to it yet. [RTH: Okay.] So, before, uh, it wa, I didn't make it up just then. If I, but I guess I could say it's possible that I made it up before then.
- 42:32 RTH: Right. Or it could be that you're making it up then, but including the details of making it up then are that you had thought about it making it up before.
- 42:39 Gabriel: Right. Yeah. That, I guess that's [inaudible] true as well.
- 42:42 RTH: I don't think there's any possible way to, to, uh, confidently getting, get out of that.
- 42:50 Gabriel: Yeah, I suppose it's, uh, [RTH Inaudible] it's *Last Thursdayism*.
- 42:57 RTH: Yeah, it's a, it's a brain-in-the-vat kinda a thing from my point of view. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] *Could be*. I doubt it. Could be.
- 43:06 Gabriel: Right. Yeah.
- 43:06 RTH: Number 2.

SAMPLE 11.2 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 43:08 Gabriel: Okay, number 2. Uh, so this is a similar thing as the last one, where there was a sentence and uh, uh, (I was actually hearing this on a video) uh, but there was a sentence and two words of the sentence were auditorially present, but the *meaning* of the sentence was *semantically* present. So the *semantic meaning* of the sentence, actually it wasn't a full sentence that was semantically present, but, uh, the semantic meaning that was present to me was the following phrase: *because a steak is definitionally*... [blank]. Uh, and what was auditorially present to me were the words

“is definitionally.” There was also a visual element here. Um, uh, there was the image of a steak with a ring of fat around it. And, uh, I was wondering this, I was also wondering if the person who was speaking, which was a cook, I was wondering if the cook, uh, was, was going to claim that the chef he was speaking of. I feel like I need to give more context now that I think about it. Um, so I’m gonna give a little more context. The, uh, y’know, yeah. Okay. So the, I was watching a video, there was a cook, and he was talking about another cook. And he was,

- 44:50 RTH: So let’s give these, these, let’s give these guys names. So Abel was talking about Baker or somebody, I don’t care which,
- 44:55 Gabriel: Okay, I got it. All right. So there’s a cook named Adam. [RTH: Okay.] Adam was talking about, uh, another chef, Marco Pierre White. And Marco Pierre White (this is all context), Marco Pierre White had just said something like: he knows a good steak by how much fat is around it, because that tells you what’s inside it. Adam was, was in the midst of sort of mocking that claim while debunking it. And uh, that mocking/debunking sentence was the one that was interrupted by the beep. [RTH: Okay.] Okay. So, uh, auditory, uh, so the sentence was: “because a stake is definitionally,” uh, and, uh, the beep in my experience happened, uh, on the word, on the words “is definitionally.” So,
- 46:13 RTH: So do I, do I understand that to mean that Adam is saying this on the, on a video?
- 46:17 Gabriel: Yes. The full sentence was: uh, “because a steak is definitionally a muscle.” And, uh, the beep happened as I experienced it *before* “a muscle.”
- 46:30 RTH: Okay.
- 46:32 Gabriel: Uh, so,
- 46:33 RTH: But, but your experience is of Adam *saying that*?
- 46:36 Gabriel: Yes. Uh, well, my experience is of Adam saying semantically: *because a stake is definitionally*. And my experience is of Adam *auditorially* saying “is definitionally.”
- 46:53 RTH: And do you hear that? I got two questions about that. One is, does that seem like it’s in sync with what’s actually out there vibrating in the room? So I’m hearing Adam saying that? *Not*, I am hearing it after a delay or whatever. One of our beeps had a delay in,
- 47:07 Gabriel: Right. Yes. Uh, it, it is what he actually said. It’s [RTH: At the time it’s?] it’s like as at the time he’s saying it. Yeah.
- 47:15 RTH: Okay. And, and so do you, and then I’ve got the question that I’ve asked before. Do you hear just the chunk “is definitionally”? Or do you hear sort of the, the whole, the whole thing and the beep happens as, at in dep-, “is definitionally”?

- 47:31 Gabriel: Well, I *had heard* the previous bit of the sentence. So if the beep had come during the previous bit, like “because a steak,” I would’ve probably auditorially had “because of steak.” Um, but in this moment, all that was auditorially present to me was, “is definitionally.”
- 47:51 RTH: So what I hear you saying, and I wanna know whether this is true, I’m, I’m, I’m just, we’re translating it for each other and, from English into English, here basically. [Gabriel: Right.] What I hear you saying is that I hear these words sort of a chunk at a time. I don’t hear a flow of words which are punctured, happens to be in, in the vicinity of “is definitely.” But I hear a chunk and then I hear another chunk, and then I hear another chunk. And the chunk that I’m happen be hearing right now is, “is definitionally,” is that [Gabriel: Yes.] Is that correct?
- 48:23 Gabriel: It is correct that, uh, that’s at least how it felt at the beep.
- 48:28 RTH: That’s all we’re talking about. That’s [Gabriel: Okay.] It’s *exactly* what, that’s exactly what we’re talking about. [Gabriel: Okay.] What’s actually happening in your neurons or whatever, don’t know anything about that.
- 48:36 Gabriel: Okay, got it. But my main, the, what I’m contrasting that with is the fact that I don’t feel like that, uh, what I’m talking with people normally, but of course that doesn’t actually, y’know, that that’s not the question. So, I understand.
- 48:53 RTH: Well, y’know, that that’s what makes this this work really sort of interesting. Because it’s, it’s fairly common. People will say, “y’know, you, the beep always catches me doing this kind of thing, and I know I never do that in real life!”
- 49:06 Gabriel: Mm-hmm.
- 49:07 RTH: We, the, the beep’s *random*—I’m not, I’m not *aiming* [Gabriel: Yeah.] it at special, special kinds of things. So, so I think there’s room for people to be fairly mistaken about their own everyday inner experience. And I’m [Gabriel: Yes.] not saying *you are*. What I’m really saying is let’s bracket that. Let’s, we’re going, (and I think you’re doing a good job of it) let’s, we’re going one, [Gabriel: Right.] one beep at a time. Whether or not that is typical or atypical of what...
- 49:35 Gabriel: Yes, I, uh, I, I understand and, uh, I agree. I, I definitely could be wrong. Part of me, like about what’s normally in my experience, uh, but also part of me wonders. Uh, *part of me definitely wonders if maybe there is, uh, we discussed this before, some sort of chunkification going on, which is caused by the beep. [pause] And I’m def, I’m very curious about that. But, uh, it’s maybe it’s impossible to know, but*
- 50:12 RTH: *I’m, I’m curious about that too. I haven’t figured out how to tell how to, how to know that. Maybe there will come a time when fMRI is better; then, that, that we’ll be able to figure that out.*
- 50:21 Gabriel: Hmm.

50:23 RTH: Right now I can't think of if I, if I could have thought of a way to, to have figured that out, I'd be doing it. [Gabriel: Okay.] But what I, what I can say is that most people don't chunkify like that.

50:40 Gabriel: Okay.

50:40 RTH: Or maybe I shouldn't say most people cuz I don't really, I shouldn't, I, I shouldn't be so bold as to presume that I've had a random sample, which I haven't. So I would, what I should say is not everybody chunkifies.

50:52 Gabriel: Okay.

50:55 RTH: Some people chunkify.

50:57 Gabriel: Okay. Good to know.

50:58 RTH: Whether, whether that's as the result of the beep. So it could, I think it's quite possible that the beep is pro, that that the way the beep is processed *in some people* is different from the way the beep is processed *in other people*. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And it's not like the inner experience was this, was different from those people that the, that the beep process, I'm pretty sure that's actually different from people to, from person to person. And that would be, that would be interesting, too. It's another way of looking at it, another way of looking at the problem. And it's not that we're looking for, it's not that we're *able* to get at inner experience the way inner experience exists before the beep came. I don't have any qualms about pleading ignorance about that. That's just the way it is.

50:58 Russ comments: It is worth emphasizing the distinction we are making here. It is common, across many DES participants, to say that there was a flow of words (either innerly spoken or innerly heard) and that that (smooth) flow of words punctured by the beep. If the beep had happened to occur a second earlier, the smooth flow would have been punctured earlier. That is *not* what Gabriel is experiencing, as best he can tell. Gabriel experiences a chunk ("Because a steak") and then another chunk ("is definitionally"), chunk and then chunk and then chunk. That is *not* a common experience, but it is not the first time we have seen it (see, for example, "Alex" in Chapter 2 of Caracciolo & Hurlburt, 2011).

51:42 Gabriel: Right. Okay.

51:53 RTH: [pause] So I think I'm... Well, I guess I, so I see a steak as well.

52:01 Gabriel: Mm-hmm.

52:03 RTH: Is this my beep? Am I supposed to be asking about this beep?

52:05 CK: This is your beep.

52:07 RTH: Yeah. So what do I see?

52:11 Gabriel: Uh, so I also see a, um, a steak, um, now this is actually on the video. So this, uh, is a real world seeing. Uh, I see a steak. It's, uh, a, a very deep red and it has a ring of fat around it. So like a, a kind of thick off white, um, ring of fat around it.

52:38 RTH: And, and you take this to be what is out there on the screen? [Inaudible]

52:43 Gabriel: Um, I don't, I'm not experiencing it as something on the screen.

52:52 RTH: So the question I'm trying to ask is whether this is in your imagination or out there?

52:57 Gabriel: Okay. Yes. It's, it's actually out there on the screen in, in the real world.

53:01 RTH: Okay. And, and, and a and, and your take, your understanding is that I'm seeing what's there to, what's there to be seen. It's not like I've put this ring of fat around a steak that didn't have a ring of fat, or something like that?

53:17 Gabriel: Uh uh, yes. It's, uh, the fat is actually there, um, on the thing and I am making a note of the fat.

53:28 RTH: And by "making a note of the fat," does that mean I'm visually aimed mostly at the fat? Or does it, [Gabriel: Uh] I'm thinking something alongside the seeing of the fat.

53:40 Gabriel: I'm thinking *about* the fat, alongside of seeing it.

53:48 RTH: Okay. So let's stick with the scene just a little bit more. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] You said it was deep red or something like that. Is that part particularly present to you or is that just a fact that the screen hap, these pixels happen to be dark red?

54:04 Gabriel: Um, it's just a, it's just a fact of the matter that it's a deep red steak.

54:10 RTH: Okay. So I'm interested mostly in the fat, and somehow I am noticing that, and that noticing is *more than* just a perceptual aiming at the fat portion. And so, so tell me about that.

54:28 Gabriel: Um, so I think that connects to the next part of the beep, which is the wondering. Uh, so should I go into that? [RTH: Okay.] Okay. So at the moment, uh, I was, while I was looking at the, the steak, I was wondering if, um, Adam was going to, um, explain that Marco Pierre White is wrong, because people often take the ring of fat *off of* the steak. And so it can't be a, a valid judge of what's on the *inside* of the steak [laughs]. And this doesn't actually make sense, but that's what my thought process was.

55:29 RTH: Okay. So how does that thought process come to you? [inaudible]

55:34 Gabriel: Okay. Uh, the thought process comes to me as, [pause] um, as the idea of the, the steak getting chopped off, or the *fat* getting chopped off, specifically chopped off with a knife on a cutting board. And, and, um, the fact that once this occurs, it would be indistinguishable from a steak that never had fat around it. So,

- 56:29 RTH: And, and is all that present to you in words? Or in pictures? Oor neither one or?
- 56:35 Gabriel: It's, yeah. Uh, so there might be, it's possible that the chopping off of the fat was present visually. Um, and I'm *tempted* to say it is, it was, like there was another picture somewhere of the chopping off of the fat happening. Um, but I'm really not sure about that. What I can say is that, um, the whole indistinguishable thing, uh, and wondering if this was the point that Adam was going to make, um, I can say that that was *not* present in words and that was *not* present visually.
- 57:16 RTH: So that's a quite specific and complex thought: is Adam I'm gonna say this? And the this is pretty complicated about what it is. It couldn't be this way because it's indistinguishable from that [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] So somehow that relatively complex thought is present without either *any* visual imagery or words, or with possibly a visual imagery of the chopping off of fat, but none of the rest of the complexity. Is that, [Gabriel: Right.] is that right?
- 57:48 Gabriel: Yes.
- 57:51 RTH: Okay. And I would, I would say that is a textbook example of a fairly complicated unsymbolized thinking. That's what, [Gabriel: Okay. If you ever read about what I say about unsymbolized thinking, well that's it.
- 58:05 Gabriel: Okay.
- 58:06 RTH: Here's a guy who's saying he's thinking about something. It's, it's, it's specific. Is Adam gonna say this to Marco Pierre? And the *this* that he's gonna say is specific, it's, y'know, sometimes the fat's there and that's not, [Gabriel: Right.] it can't, [Gabriel: Yes.] whatever. And yet there aren't any words that are conveying that specificity.
- 58:27 Gabriel: Yes.
- 58:28 RTH: That's what I call an unsymbolized thinking.
- 58:31 Gabriel: Okay. Good to know. Yeah, I, I sort of guessed that that was probably unsymbolized thinking, but uh, I didn't, I didn't say it, uh, just cuz I wanted to, I don't know, I didn't wanna [RTH: Right.] Uh, [RTH: And, and, I would, I] poison the waters or whatever.
- 58:47 RTH: Right. And, and I would say we, we haven't we're, this is our 11th sampling day and I, I haven't tried to teach you, or we haven't tried to teach you to say "unsymbolized thinking" on day two or three or whatever. [Gabriel: Nods.] I think it's now I. So I, so descriptive experience sampling is *not* about trying to teach you a vocabulary that you should use.
- 59:09 Gabriel: Okay.
- 59:10 RTH: But I, we've been at this for a long time now and I think you have a right to know, well, *y'know, we've seen this kind of phenomenon before. We call it* [Gabriel: Okay.]

unsymbolized thinking. That doesn't mean that it's unsymbolized thinking for you, for you, but, but I think we can, we can talk about it this way without risk of, of Gabriel saying, well, I'm gonna go looking for unsymbolized thinking.

59:32 Gabriel: Okay. I see.

59:33 RTH: I think we've been down the road *far enough* that that is a relatively small risk.

59:38 Gabriel: Okay. That's good to know. And uh, there was another aspect of the beep as well, by the way. Okay. Um, so there, there was all at the same time, at least, uh, I feel at the same time, at the moment of the beep, uh, I was also wondering if, uh... So he had said "is definitionally" there was something that was gonna come after that. And, uh, I was wondering if he was going to say, uh, that the, the steak is definitionally the thing in the middle, *not* the fat around it. And thus, uh, looking at the fat around it tells you nothing about the steak because the fat is not the steak. Now that wasn't there auditorially. Um, and it, it sounds, it does, it sounds complicated when I say all those words, uh, but it, it seems much more simple, uh, in my head. It also doesn't make sense logically, but...

59:38 Russ comments: This wondering is also a textbook example of unsymbolized thinking.

1:00:46 RTH: So the good news is, is that we don't care about that. But, uh, [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] so does it, does, does this seem like two separate sort of trains of thought?

1:00:54 Gabriel: Yes, it does. Uh, it does seem like two separate trains of thought that are sort of staggered after one another, um, in, in their initiation. Uh, this wasn't in my experience, but what I can say is that the, um, the first wondering where I was wondering (if he was wrong, because people can take off the fat), that was initiated by his general incredulity about this claim that Marco Pierre White had made, not necessarily the words that came after. And the wondering if the middle of the steak is what the steak is and not the fat, the second wondering, the one that I just described, was a response to the words "is definitionally."

1:01:46 RTH: And, and as far as your experience is concerned, do both of those seem like they're happening at the same time, even though one started before the other? So one starts and is continuing and then the other one starts and is continuing and for a while they overlap? And the beep happens then?

1:02:02 Gabriel: Yes.

1:02:04 RTH: Okay. And I, I *think* I understand what you're saying about, it doesn't seem complicated, because I'm *guessing* it was, we're sort of, y'know, this is not the same as that. It's... [Gabriel: Right. Exactly.] But to put it, if you have to put it into words, it's sort of complicated about what this is and what that is or whatever [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] but, but you know what you're talking about this and that, so

1:02:26 Gabriel: Right.

1:02:32 RTH: Then I think I'm good.

1:02:34 Gabriel: Okay.

1:02:35 CK: Me too.

1:02:37 RTH: And I would say we have passed our hour. And today I don't have more than an hour, so I think we have to, we have to call it good here. And uh, and I would, I would, I would say you're doing great. I think this is totally interesting, still. [Gabriel: Okay.] And, uh,

1:02:55 Gabriel: Thank you.

1:02:58 RTH: And some sometime I'm gonna have a leisure, we're gonna have a leisure talking about all this stuff and what happened and whatever, and that, and that's gonna be interesting.

1:03:07 Gabriel: Okay. Got it.

1:03:09 RTH: But in the meantime, I'd say we ought to pick a time next week or something and do this again.

1:03:17 Gabriel: Okay. Sounds good to me.