

Gabriel H.: A university student with philosophy interests
Gabriel Interview 9

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the January 30 interview with Gabriel that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/QTis00Resxo>. 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 AG: Today is day 9. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] Um, when did you wear the beeper?

0:03 Gabriel: So, I wore the beeper last night, and this morning. I had, um, four last night, uh, and then three this morning.

0:13 AG: Okay. And any questions? Problems?

0:17 Gabriel: Uh, no.

0:23 RTH: So seven beeps total? [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] Why don't we start with this morning's beep as being [Gabriel: Okay] fresher.

0:30 AG: So it'd be number 5?

0:31 RTH: Number 5?

SAMPLE 9.5 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE (beginning with Sample 9.5 because it is more recent)

0:31 Gabriel: Yes. Starting with number 5. [clears throat] Should I go over the beep? [RTH: Yep.] Okay. So, uh, for context, I was in class and, um, what was in my experience was my professor speaking the words, "Mark Twain is Mark Twain." Also, in my experience, I was visually searching for the letter C on a piece of paper. And there was also, um, in my experience, a mild annoyance that, um, uh, we were still going over the same topic in that class that we had been going over, uh, for a, like two days in a row or something like that. [Pause while AG, CK, and RTH write notes]

1:22 RTH: [To AG] So, are you the primary? Am I the primary? How are we gonna do this?

1:25 AG: Uh, you, you usually start, so...

1:28 RTH: So, three things present in your experience. [Gabriel: (Nods)] Any one of the more prominent than the other?

- 1:35 Gabriel: Um, the visual search, uh, was the most prominent.
- 1:39 RTH: And by “most prominent,” 50 – 30 – 20? Or 70 –...
- 1:44 Gabriel: It was probably, uh, [RTH: ... 20 – 10?] It was probably like 60, uh, – 20 – 20 or, or maybe 60 – 30 – 20.
- 1:44 Russ comments: Note that the numbers add to 110, not 100. That is not a problem. I take Gabriel to be saying that the visual was much more prominent than the others, and that of the other two, one was somewhat more prominent.
- 1:56 RTH: And which was the 30?
- 1:58 Gabriel: Uh, my professor speaking.
- 2:00 RTH: Okay. Then let’s start with the searching. And so what’s in your experience about that?
- 2:06 Gabriel: In my experience, um, there is the vi, there’s the visual experience of looking at the paper, um, and seeing like, uh, some text. But I wasn’t reading the text, what the, uh, it was just, there was text there. Um, and the goal of finding the letter C, specifically looking for like an indentation where a list starts, and I’m looking for like item C on the list.
- 2:39 RTH: So does that mean I’m not really looking for the letter C, I’m looking for the Cth entry on this list.
- 2:45 Gabriel: Um, [RTH: Or, or is it,] I’m looking for the Cth entry, but I’m, I am specifically in my experience doing that by looking for the letter C.
- 2:45 Russ comments: Note that Gabriel is making a confident distinction between the task/intention (looking for the Cth entry) and the experience (looking for the letter C). Such a distinction would be difficult or impossible with something like the DES procedure that identifies the specific moment.
- 2:54 RTH : Okay. And, and what is, what is your experience of that? What...
- 3:04 Gabriel: Of, which part?
- 3:07 RTH: How do I know I’m looking at the letter C. What i, how does that present itself to me?
- 3:11 Gabriel: Um, well, I wasn’t looking *at* the letter C I was looking *for* the letter C. [RTH: Okay.] Um, and, uh, all, I mean, all I can say really I don’t, uh, I don’t think I was imagining like the, the letter C visually [RTH: Okay.] or anything like that. I think I was just looking for an indentation. And, that was my goal, to find an indentation and then the letter C among it. Um, and I would, I would say just presented itself as like a goal.

- 3:44 RTH: Okay. And, and so is the, is this like a visual goal of the indentation and C, not just for C, but the vis, the pattern, the visual pattern [Gabriel: Yes.] of an indentation and C? Alright. And it's not like I have a mental picture of indentation and C, it's that that's what I'm looking for, and there's no more thing, no more to say about it.
- 4:03 Gabriel: Well, actually, I, I, I didn't have necessarily a mental picture, but I did see an indentation in the paper, because there's white space where there wouldn't normally be. And I was using that as like, *oh yeah, find another one of those*. So I did, I, there was the, a visual aspect of, uh, like the visual of an indentation that was present in my experience, and it was sort of like a r, a reminded me, *oh yeah, look for another*.
- 4:37 RTH: Okay. Anybody else have any questions about that?
- 4:44 CK: So just th, is, so at the moment is what's in my experience the, the [car horn starts to sound repetitively in the background] indentation? Am I, am I taking that in at the moment? Or is that sort of, that, that's context, that happened before, now I'm looking for something like that again now?
- 4:59 Gabriel: The indentation I, if as, as far, as best I can remember, was in my experience visually, and I was thinking *there's one find another*.
- 5:11 AG: Okay.
- 5:13 CK: And is it fair to call this *I'm seeing an indentation* or *I'm seeing white*?
- 5:18 Gabriel: Um,
- 5:19 CK: ...or something else?
- 5:24 Gabriel: I think it's, uh, I wouldn't, I wasn't thinking of it as an indentation. I was probably, I was thinking of it as, um, [pause]
- 5:38 RTH: Something to look for.
- 5:39 Gabriel: Yeah. I, I would say maybe a white block, probably. Not just white, but like a white block. Yeah.
- 5:50 AG: So is white block just you putting that into words? Or am I physically looking for it? Like we say block, what does block mean?
- 5:59 Gabriel: I mean, um,
- 6:01 AG: Or like s, [inaudible]
- 6:03 Gabriel: It didn't feel like a diffuse kind of just white that I was looking at or looking for. It, it was like a kind of shaped white, like a, uh, there was something definite about the white that I was looking for, like geometrically.

6:20 AG: Okay.

6:26 RTH: And then I hear my professor speaking. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] More to say about that?

6:32 Gabriel: Uh, yes. So, uh, he was, he said, "Mark Twain is Mark Twain." And, um, it was the voice of my professor, uh, in that I was experiencing it as, I *wasn't* experiencing it as his voice. I was just experiencing it as *my professor*. Um, and I wouldn't say there's anything more to it than that.

6:59 RTH: And do I understand what he's saying?

7:01 Gabriel: Uh, yes.

7:03 RTH: So it's not the words, it, it's, I'm not paying attention to the professor-ness of it. I'm paying attention to the, what he's conveying?

7:12 Gabriel: Uh, actually, I think, uh, I think as a matter of the universe, I understand what he's saying. In that moment, it wasn't on my mind. So it was just my professor saying words.

7:28 AG: Is it, so he's just saying words? Or is he saying the "Mark Twain is Mark Twain"?

7:34 Gabriel: I think it, I think he's saying "Mark Twain is Mark Twain." Uh, let me think about that. [long pause, looks down] Hmm. I don't know the answer to that question.

8:02 AG: Okay.

8:02 RTH: So I hear my professor, or I hear my professor speaking meaningfully?

8:09 Gabriel: Um,

8:11 RTH: And what I'm really trying to get at is, am I into this sort of the sound, non-semantic characteristics of the speaking? Or am I into the, this is a semantic interchange between the professor and me?

8:28 Gabriel: Y'know, it's probably not the semantics. It's probably just the fact that he's speaking. Um, yeah, it's probably just the fact that he's speaking, not, not the meaning of what he's saying

8:44 AG: Or even *what* he's saying?

8:48 Gabriel: Um, yeah, I don't think it's specifically what he's saying.

9:00 RTH: And then at the same time, there's a mild annoyance.

9:03 Gabriel: Yes.

9:03 RTH: And how do I experience that?

- 9:07 Gabriel: Oh, well, the, the mild annoyance *was* over what he was saying, which makes me want, think that actually no, I was taking in what he was saying. Um,
- 9:07 Russ comments: Gabriel is beginning to voice an analytic conclusion (something like *X therefore Y*) rather than a description. RTH will try to head that off.
- 9:18 RTH: So let me interrupt that train of thought. It's definitely possible to take in what he is saying and, and respond to it in a skillful kind of way, but have that not be in my experience at the moment of the beep.
- 9:30 Gabriel: Okay.
- 9:30 RTH: So, for example, I'm sitting here right now and I'm taking in, in some way what the, [lets right arm fall off table] where my arms are on the, [lets his arms fall back onto the table] on the thing, but I'm not, I'm not experience, I'm not experiencing that. I'm processing it intelligently, so I don't fall over or whatever, but,
- 9:45 Gabriel: Okay, sure. I, okay. So in that case, maybe, uh, I guess to use your terminology, I'll bracket that and, and I'll say, uh, yeah, there was, there was annoyance over the fact that he was, um, like the, the whole class was, we were still going over the same kinds of sentences that we were last time. And, um, yeah. And that, that's how it manifested. It was an annoyance that we were talking about the same kinds of sentences. That wasn't verbally present, it was just the knowledge that this is the same kind of sentence, and that annoys me.
- 10:26 RTH: And is the annoyance experienced in any way other than to say, well, I was annoyed and that, that's, no, no, nothing further to say about that?
- 10:36 Gabriel: Hmm. I don't think there's anything further to say about that.
- 10:42 RTH: Bodily, mental?
- 10:44 Gabriel: Um, [RTH: ...Can't say?] I think it's probably just mental. Uh, I mean, I, I can't really say because every time I, every time I, I have a frustrated or annoyed beep, and then I try to think about how it manifested, I always feel, I, I can't ever tell. Like, uh, part of it makes me think that maybe there's something bodily, like I focus more on the things that are, uh, like uncomfortable, like the way I'm sitting or something. But I think that's a retrospective thing. So I, I don't think I can say.
- 11:16 RTH: Okay. Fair enough. And, and, and I think lots of experiences are hard to describe any farther than, well, this is what was going on. I was annoyed, or whatever, and that's... [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] Some people, sometimes, will say, I was annoyed and it's in my body somehow, and other people will say, I'm annoyed, and that's just, that's it.
- 11:35 Gabriel: Right. Okay.
- 11:37 RTH: So I'm good about, number 1, er, number 5.

11:41 CK: Yep. Yep.

11:43 AG: Yep, number 6.

SAMPLE 9.6 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

11:44 Gabriel: Okay. Number 6. So I was, uh, for context, I was taking notes in the same class. And in my experience, uh, where, was my inner voice, uh, saying the words “limited knowledge.” And, uh, and that was because, for context, I had just written them down on a piece of paper. And, uh, there was the sight of the black ink of my pen writing those words on a page. Uh, the, the sight of the black ink was, in my experience, I wouldn’t say the page was necessarily. And also in my experience was the professor talking.

12:28 AG: And, um, out of all of these things, is there any that’s more salient to you?

12:35 Gabriel: Uh, “limited knowledge,” the inner voice.

12:38 AG: Okay. And then, um, is there, uh, I guess percentages or numbers that you could put to it? Or...?

12:44 Gabriel: Okay. Uh, I would say...[pause]

12:51 RTH: We don’t have to be careful about the numbers, we’re just trying to figure out whether more means 90 or [Gabriel: Okay.] [AG: Yeah.] 61 or 51.

12:57 Gabriel: Um, I would say, um, uh, I, so of my experience, probably “limited knowledge” was like, uh, 70 or something like that.

13:15 AG: Okay. And then the other things?

13:17 Gabriel: Uh, my professor talking would’ve been, uh, it was probably 15 – 15.

13:24 AG: Okay. So let’s start with, uh, “limited knowledge”. Uh, tell me more.

13:32 Gabriel: Uh, that was my inner speaking voice that I’ve talked about before. Um, because I, y’know, I was reading it as I was writing it. Um, so, or, or maybe I wasn’t reading it, but I was, um, just saying it and then, then writing it. Uh, so... Yes. Anything else?

13:53 AG: So just to clarify, the writing is context, that’s not part of the experience? Or is it?

13:58 Gabriel: Um, the writing is context.

14:03 AG: Okay. Um, so this is being said? Or [Gabriel: Yes. Mm-hmm.] Okay. And, and then your inner speaking voice, what, what does that mean?

14:19 Gabriel: Um, that just means that, y'know, this is me, like actively producing these words internally.

14:28 AG: Okay. And tell me again about what that voice is.

14:34 Gabriel: Uh, well, it's, it's my voice, but it's not my, uh, it's not the same, it's not experienced, the same as the voice, uh, that I have right now, like when I'm speaking to people.
[AG: Mm-hmm.] Um, it's, it's experienced differently auditorially.

14:49 AG: In what way?

14:50 Gabriel: Uh, it's, it's, it doesn't really have any tone to it. It's kind of, um, uh, airy or raspy maybe.

15:00 AG: Okay. Um, anything else about that?

15:07 RTH: I'm good.

15:08 AG: I'm good. [CK: I'm good.] Okay. So, uh, next, uh, move on to the black ink. Uh, [Gabriel: Right.] tell me more.

15:15 Gabriel: So, uh, this was, this was the sight of, uh, the black ink writing, uh, those particular words. And, um, it wasn't the, actually, it wasn't, I wasn't experiencing it as the sight of the ink writing the words. It was just like the ink on the paper. Uh, and it was also the ink at the tail end of the last word, specifically. It wasn't the, um, wasn't anything that came before. So, y'know, it would've been on *E* I guess, of knowledge, but I wasn't, um, I wasn't thinking of it as *E* it was just the, the ink at the end of the word.

15:54 AG: Okay. So just to clarify, is it, it's it, in my experience, it's the ink of just that portion? Or is it the whole thing or...?

16:02 Gabriel: It's, it's just the ink of the, that portion.

16:05 AG: Okay. And

16:07 RTH: So let me make sure I understand that. [AG: Yeah.] So are we talking about, it's just the ink, and it happens in the, in the universe to be the last portion? Or is it my experience is of the ink of the last portion?

16:20 Gabriel: Well, uh, it's definitely not the ink of the entire word. Um, uh, it's just a, and I, I'm not thinking of it as the ink of the last portion, but it's definitely not any other ink except for the ink that is at the end.

16:41 AG: And another question on that end. Is it, is it that the ink at the end is more salient than the whole word? The whole thing that I'm writing is the ink, all of it is in my experience, it's just the last part I'm into? Or is it, that's it, it's just that last part?
[Gabriel: Um] Does that question make sense?

17:00 Gabriel: Yes, it does make sense. [AG: Okay.] I, I would say it's, I guess it's possible that the other ink was in my experience, but if it was, it was really, really small. [AG: Okay.] Um, so I, I would say sa uh, salient or maybe *entirely* just that last bit of ink.

17:16 AG: Okay. [Pause] And is this, I understand this, that you're, I understand you to be saying that this is about the ink. So what, what about the ink?

17:30 Gabriel: Uh, I, I was just thinking of it as black ink at that moment. Uh, I, for context, the reason is because, uh, my pen is blue. Uh, it looks like a blue pen, but I refilled it with black ink. So it's, uh, that's *why* I was thinking about it. But that wasn't, the reason wasn't in my experience.

17:52 AG: Okay. Okay. And, this might be veering off, but is there anything about, I guess, the shape of what you're writing that's in your experience? Or is it just simply like you, you had said that it's the tail end of the last letter of what you had written. [Gabriel: Yeah.] So is there anything about that motion, what that [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] looks like? Or is it just simply just black ink?

18:22 Gabriel: Uh, I don't think that the motion was in there. I think it was just the black ink.

18:27 AG: And not even like what you're writing. Not even like that it's curved, not even that is a line?

18:31 Gabriel: I, no, I don't think so.

18:32 AG: Okay. So the tail end of the last letter, that's kind of more of a fact of the universe kind of a thing?

18:41 Gabriel: It's a fact of the universe. I, I guess I'm just using it to specify that this is a small amount of ink that is in my direct experience. [AG: Got it.] Uh, the, the rest of the ink was not in my experience.

18:55 AG: And what, um, so when you say a small amount of ink in, in your experience, how, I guess, what do you mean by that?

19:04 Gabriel: Well, uh, I mean that, I mean, so like for, I mean, uh, for example, uh, if like there was, uh, some ink in here, [gestures to something in the room, or perhaps the room more generally] when I was looking at the, my book that the ink in here wasn't in my experience when I was in the other room. Uh, so I'm just specifying what, which ink on the page was the ink that I was experiencing. [AG: Okay.] And I'm just talking about like a really tiny millimeter of ink that was, uh, I wasn't experiencing it as *one millimeter*, but

19:50 AG: Right. [Gabriel: Okay.] Yeah. Okay.

19:54 Gabriel: Maybe that distinction isn't, uh, useful, but...

20:01 RTH: And is the, is my experience about the *ink* of it or about the *black* of it?

20:08 Gabriel: Um, it's a, it's the, the *black* of it.

20:13 AG: So the black *of ink*?

20:15 Gabriel: Uh,

20:16 AG: Or is it the black ink?

20:16 Russ comments: RTH's question at 20:01 had separated out two different aspects: the ink-ness from the black-ness. That question recognizes that it is possible to experience black-ness without any regard whatsoever for its source. At 20:08, Gabriel said it was the black-ness, and it would have been desirable to have followed up on that. However, both of AG's alternatives (20:13 and 20:16) make reference to the ink. That will make it difficult or impossible determine whether Gabriel's experience had indeed nothing to do with the ink (which of course was present in actuality).

20:17 Gabriel: The, the black ink.

20:20 AG: Does that question make sense to you? The distinction?

20:22 Gabriel: I, I, I under, yeah. I mean, it's not like my experience is just of a black thing or just black. It is, [AG: It's black ink?] it's black ink. [AG: Okay.]

20:31 RTH: And does it make sense to say it's more of the black than it is of the ink, or more of the ink than it is of the black?

20:37 Gabriel: Mm. That does not make sense to me. Not in this particular instance.

20:37 Russ comments: I think the inartful questioning (see the comment at 20:16) makes it difficult to credit the answer here.

20:44 RTH: All right.

20:49 AG: Oh, and it's, uh, sorry, I just wanna make this one more distinction. Is this of the last word or the last letter?

20:56 RTH: Neither one of those. We've been on, I think we've got that established. Just a little piece.

21:00 AG: Yeah. [Gabriel: Yes.] Yeah? That is?

21:03 Gabriel: Ye, uh, yes. It wa- it wouldn't be, [AG: It wasn't that, it wasn't even that] I wasn't experiencing the letter or the word.

21:06 AG: Got it. Okay.

21:11 Gabriel: And was my distinction, like, I want to know, was that distinction where I was talking about it, this is just the last little piece, was that like a useful distinction? Because I kind of felt, was wondering if maybe that was just redundant information?

21:25 AG: No, it's all useful. [Gabriel: Okay.] It's always, everything is say is useful. [Gabriel: Okay.] Yeah [laughs].

21:29 RTH: So I, I thought that the, I thought that we had established already before you asked about the last... So I, I'm guessing that the part that you were wondering whether that was useful, came from what I thought was an over articulated question. We can go back and look at the tape we'll, decide why I think it was a, over articulated, but I thought we'd sort of established that. And if you ask a question about something that we've sort of already established, [AG: Mm.] then it, it makes the person think, well, maybe I don't have, maybe I don't understand what's happening here.

21:58 AG: Oh, I'm sorry. That's my fault. I was just making sure I understand.

22:00 Gabriel: Okay, no worries.

22:01 AG: Yeah. Cuz we had said a few things and I was like, I had written down something [Gabriel: Okay.] and I was like, okay, I just wanna make sure I have it. [Gabriel: Okay, got it.] That's, that's my fault. That's it.

22:08 Gabriel: No worries. Thank you.

22:09 AG: So we good on that?

22:11 CK: Oh, yeah.

22:11 RTH: Then there's the speaking. [AG: Yeah.]

22:12 AG: Yeah. [CK: Mm-hmm.] So yeah, tell me more about the speaking.

22:17 Gabriel: Oh, um, [AG and RTH: (Inaudible)] my professor talk? [AG: Yeah.] Right. Um, yes, uh, this was ju, it, it, this was just, uh, y'know, my, my professor was, was talking. It was, um, it was, I guess I probably *knew it* auditorially, but it wasn't, I don't think it was experienced auditorially, it was just experience as like the knowledge that my professor is currently talking. So... and that, uh, and that I should attend to it once I, um, once I get, once actually the, the knowledge that I should attend to it once I get back to, once I finish writing this wasn't in my experience, but, uh, that was the reason that the knowledge that he was talking was in my experience.

23:02 AG: So you said this is not auditorially?

23:04 Gabriel: I think it was, it was, the knowledge was based on an audi, audio, but it wasn't an auditory experience.

23:12 AG: Okay. And when you say knowledge, um, tell me more.

23:20 Gabriel: Uh, [Pause] one second. Let me make sure I have this right. It might have been an auditory experience actually. Uh, but there was like, the fact of it being my professor talking was in my experience, and that was like the important part of it, not necessarily the, the actual like sound or anything like that.

24:00 AG: So, okay. So you say it's not the sound, do you mean in the sense that it's not like I'm into the voice? Or I'm not into the tone or something? [Gabriel: Yeah.] And, but, but there is, but the experience is: it is my professor speaking? Is that what you mean?

24:19 Gabriel: Yes. It, um, I don't know if the experience is, *this is my professor speaking*, or if the experience is *my professor is speaking*. Uh, I'm, I [AG: Okay.] don't know if I actually can remember.

24:33 AG: Okay. [Gabriel: Okay.] But it's something about my professor speaking. I mean, this is 15%, it's pretty low, but [Gabriel: Yes.] something about, okay. But it is specifically about my professor speaking?

24:41 Gabriel: Is specifically about my professor speaking, [AG: Okay.] yes.

24:48 AG: Okay. That makes sense. And, uh, and I'm, uh, and I take you to be saying that what is being said is not present in any

24:58 Gabriel: That is not present.

24:59 AG: Okay. Good.

25:05 RTH: I'm good.

25:06 AG: Yeah. Is there anything more to say about that? Other than

25:08 Gabriel: Um, I don't think so. I just wanna emphasize that I'm not sure if the, the sound was in my experience, and I could be wrong about that.

25:16 AG: Okay.

25:19 CK: But as you said, what's undeniably present is the knowing of my professor is talking.

25:24 Gabriel: Yes.

25:24 AG: Mm-hmm.

25:26 RTH: So the word knowing is problematic. [AG: Yeah.]

25:28 Gabriel: Okay.

25:29 RTH: I think. Because knowing is a lot of things, [AG: Yeah.] a lotta different ways, y'know, like I know that Washington DC is north of Memphis, [Gabriel: Right.] There's a lot of

things [Gabriel: Yes.] So is it fair to say I'm tracking my professor in some way and not, and not more about it than that?

25:49 Gabriel: Um,

25:51 RTH: Or is it a knowledge? This is my professor speaking, not Dr. Hurlburt speaking.

25:55 Gabriel: Yes, I think, I think it is, it's like the, the, the, the fact is that my professor is speaking *is present* to me. I'm experiencing the fact. Um, it might, it might manifest itself as like a nagging sensation that I need to get back to focusing on what he's saying. I'm not sure about that right now. Uh, that I, but if I, I think, I think if that was there, it would be part of it. It wouldn't be like the whole thing. So yeah, it's like a cognitive knowledge that is in my experience.

26:32 RTH: Mm-hmm.

26:38 CK: I think I'm good.

26:39 RTH: I'm good.

26:39 CK: Mm-hmm. [AG: Yep.] All right.

26:39 Russ comments: I think there is reason to be skeptical that we understand what is meant by "cognitive knowledge" here. Gabriel's initial description of this phenomenon (at 11:44) was "And also in my experience was the professor talking." That is quite different from experiencing "a cognitive knowledge" that my professor is speaking. As a general rule, the first whack at a description contains the kernel, but there are lots of exceptions to that rule. I thought that there had been too much water over the dam in our discussion of this sample (we've been at it for 15 minutes), so I elected not to try to make the distinction.

SAMPLE 9.7 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

26:40 AG: Number 7? [CK: Yep.]

26:42 Gabriel: Okay. So this, uh, this was the voice, same class. This was the voice of my professor speaking. Uh, and he, he had the, the words were in my experience, "strings of sentences." Uh, it was my professor, it was my professor's, saying those words. Um, it was, and it was experienced as it, it was those three words experienced as my professor. Not my professor speaking, necessarily, but this is my professor. I'm hearing my professor. Also, visually, uh, the whiteboard, uh, him writing on the whiteboard. Uh, but it wasn't, I don't think I was experiencing that as my professor writing on the whiteboard in that moment. I was just experiencing it as the, the action of writing is being done on the whiteboard. Um, and there was just a slight frustration in general. And that's everything.

27:45 CK: Okay. [Pauses to take notes] Any one of these more prominent?

27:57 Gabriel: Um, “strings of sentences.”

28:03 CK: By a lot?

28:05 Gabriel: Um, yes. Well, it, it’s definitely like at least 60, maybe 70%.

28:15 CK: It’s quite a bit more than the others.

28:17 Gabriel: Yes.

28:20 CK: So [Pause] could you say more about how that’s present?

28:31 Gabriel: Uh, so, okay. So there’s the auditory experience of “strings of sentences.” And, um, [pauses] I, uh, for context, I was kind of having trouble, uh, focusing on, uh, uh, like following everything he was saying continuously without like going back in my head. And, um, so, uh, [pauses] “strings of sentences” the, I... the *meaning* of “strings of sentences” in that moment wasn’t clear to me. So it was just the auditory experience of those three words.

29:28 CK: So li, uh, *hearing* without understanding, basically. [Gabriel: Yes.] Hearing, hearing the sounds of words, [Gabriel: Yes.] but no semantic grasping of what’s being said?

29:42 Gabriel: Uh, yes. I would say, I mean, each word had some sort of like, experience of meaning with it. But as a, as a matter of the universe, I knew that, uh, tho those were not necessarily the, the correct meanings... uh, that, uh, that the professor intended to mean. So, uh, it was sort of like those, the meanings that were attached to those words a, as I experienced them, were, uh, I wasn’t atten, I, they didn’t matter, basically. They were just like feeling, or like, uh, I guess meanings that sort of flew into my head, uh, involuntarily, uh, that I was disregarding.

29:42 Russ comments: This kind of description is, to me, what makes DES exquisitely interesting and challenging. Gabriel here seems to be saying that he is hearing words, but those words are *not* imbued with the professor’s meanings—they have other (extraneous) meanings attached. That is *not* how most people describe their experience of hearing someone speak. Is he mis-speaking? Do I hear him correctly? Does he have a like-everyone-else experience of hearing but an idiosyncratic way of talking about it? Does he have a genuinely unusual experience of hearing, and if so, what are the details of that? Is this an artifact of the DES process, and if so, is it the same kind of artifact that affects everyone? Perhaps we will be able to disentangle some of those questions. (See the comment at 50:29, also about the discontinuity between words and meaning.)

30:38 CK: And is that all directly present to me at the moment?

30:44 Gabriel: [pause] It, it does feel like it is, but I also fe, uh, logically I think that *it could not all have been* at the moment of, of the beep present to me. But it does, uh, it did feel like it when I started writing this down.

- 30:44 Russ comments: I take this kind of remark as good evidence that Gabriel is describing what he actually experienced. DES critics often say that our participants are just making things up. I think it unlikely that Gabriel would make something up that goes directly against what he believes should be happening. (See a similar comment at 54:25.)
- 31:00 RTH: Things in experience aren't logical.
- 31:02 Gabriel: Yes.
- 31:06 CK: So that makes it sound, what I'm hearing you, what *I'm* understanding of this beep is: I am h, most, I'm, I'm hearing my professor say "strings of sentences," and there's, as part of that hearing, there's some meaning of these words that I know. But I guess the important thing is I'm not hearing this as part of this cohesive presentation my professor is saying. [Gabriel nods affirmatively.] I'm, there's some things of like, "strings of sentences" that I understand, but it's not cohesive with this [Gabriel: Yes.] overall thing. It's just [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] I'm listening, but I'm not really comprehending the larger message that's trying to be conveyed.
- 31:50 Gabriel: Yes. Yes.
- 31:51 CK: And I'm trying, and, and that's... and and is that sort of...?
- 31:58 RTH: So, so can I ask a more specific question [CK: Yeah.] in, in that line? So did you intend to convey that when you say, when he said "strings," you had some reaction to "strings" that you're trying to suppress, and when he says "sentences," you had some other reaction to "sentences" that you're trying to suppress?
- 32:15 Gabriel: Uh, yes. Maybe not necessarily suppress, but just ignore, uh, or not use. But, uh, yes, there was *something there* that I think...
- 32:25 RTH: Word by word?
- 32:26 Gabriel: Yeah. Like for example, when it came to strings, I might, I don't remember what it was, but I might have thought of like, *thread*, which wasn't what he intended to mean. Uh, but, uh, I was, was ignoring those things that were popping in my head because of the fact that, uh, I, I knew I hadn't been paying attention and I missed something.
- 32:51 RTH: And by *thread*, do you mean the word *thread*, or do you mean the seeing of a spool of thread, or a kite string, or a
- 33:00 Gabriel: It would've been, it would've been visual.
- 33:04 RTH: So, so the, when he said the word strings you, in some visual world, visualization world, imagine like a spool of thread or a kite string or a, uh, something, something relevant? I can't remember now what it is, but, but something about the word *string*, which probably doesn't have anything to do with what he's actually saying?

- 33:27 Gabriel: Yeah. Something about, something about the word *string*, which doesn't have to do with what he's saying. And I do think, uh, it would've been visual because, um, that that's sort of the, I mean, I could be, that is the sense I get, and I'm kind of confident about that, that the stuff I was throwing away was visual. Um, but I don't really remember what exactly it was.
- 33:47 RTH: And is it throwing away word by word or, or just the main words, like *strings* and *sentences*?
- 33:54 Gabriel: Um,
- 33:54 RTH: Or just strings?
- 33:55 Gabriel: Uh, it would, it would probably have just been *strings* and *sentences*, but not of.
- 34:00 RTH: Okay. [Pauses] So there's something, there's something about the particular, particulari, particularity, visual particularities of these words (*strings* and *sentences*), that I'm not paying attention to because I don't think that's what he's really trying to say. [Gabriel: Yes.]
- 34:20 AG: And this *not paying attention to* is part of your experience at the moment of the beep? Or is that more of a fact of the universe? I, or is that more context, I guess even, even, not even a fact of the universe?
- 34:20 Russ comments: This question asks about a meta-awareness (whether Gabriel was aware of his lack of awareness), when Gabriel had said nothing that implied that there was meta-awareness. That question is likely to head us in the wrong direction.
- 34:32 Gabriel: Let me think about that for a second. [pause] The fact that I'm trying to not pay attention to them is not, uh, um, a piece of knowledge that I'm directly experiencing.
- 34:50 AG: Okay. [Gabriel: Okay.] And or, or even this notion of, I'm, I, I dunno, I, I don't want to put words in your mouth, but like, this notion of, I'm, I, I don't want to say *suppress*, but like, suppressing it or throwing out this, these ex, these extraneous meanings. Like, is there anything about that? Or is that more, well, that's what I must have been doing cuz I was trying to pay attention to my professor? Or does that distinction not make sense?
- 34:50 Russ comments: This is additional meta-awareness questioning, and is still likely to head us in the wrong direction...
- 35:17 Gabriel: Uh, um, I think the distinction makes sense. Let me th, try to figure it out. [pause] It's what I was *doing*, but I wasn't thinking about the fact that I was *doing* it. Um, the experience of doing it was still in my, I was still experiencing doing it. Uh, [AG: Okay.] but I wasn't like analyzing it on ano, like a layer up or anything [AG: Okay.] like that.

35:17 Russ comments: ...but Gabriel is not taken in by the meta-awareness questions.
Good!

35:54 RTH: And is the it of that sentence, I'm doing the suppressing or ignoring or whatever?

35:59 Gabriel: Yes.

36:00 RTH: So I am suppressing/ignoring it, and I somehow apprehend myself as suppressing and ignoring, but I'm not thinking about it?

36:07 Gabriel: Uh, yes, yes, exactly. I, I would say also I liked the word throwing away. I think that's probably the, the most, uh, accurate way of putting it as far as I can think of.

36:18 RTH: Okay.

36:19 AG: And is there anything more to say about how that is present in your experience? Or?

36:24 Gabriel: No, I don't think so.

36:27 AG: Okay.

36:32 CK: Are we good on that part? Any more questions? [RTH: I'm good.] Okay. Then there's the whiteboard, [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] which is, well, how is that present?

36:48 Gabriel: Okay. This is just present as, um, there, it is visual and, uh, the, the visual of there being, uh, there, there's like a marker and a hand on the whiteboard in the act of writing something. [Pause while the others write notes]

37:12 CK: And so when you say visual, [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] what do you mean by that?

37:17 Gabriel: So I'm seeing this and it's in the real world. [CK: Okay.] It's actually happening.

37:20 CK: So this is a seeing sort of a deal? [Gabriel: Yes.] Okay. And the hand, the marker and hand writing makes that seem like it's, this is a pretty specific seeing? And, and that's a question is, is that the case where I'm sort of, I'm, y'know, I'm looking at something that's, that's pretty, I'm kind of zeroed in on a certain part of this whole scene that my eyes are taking in?

37:49 Gabriel: Yes. Mm-hmm. It's a, it's a, yeah, like a one foot by one foot or something like that.

37:56 CK: Okay. But that which includes the hand writing it out, too? It's not like I'm just seeing what has been written or the?

38:06 Gabriel: Yeah, it's the hand writing it out and the fact of there being text that is in the process of being written. The, the, the whole of the text is not in my experience though. It's just a small bit of it, which is right where he's writing.

- 38:20 CK: Okay. So at the moment of the beep, I am seeing the, the, the action of writing, I guess. Or I see the, this hand writing out [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] text on the whiteboard?
- 38:38 Gabriel: Yes. Uh, the action of a hand writing on a whiteboard.
- 38:41 CK: And not of the, what's being written or anything like that? It's just [Inaudible]
- 38:45 Gabriel: Yeah. Not of what's being written. It's also not the experience of my professor writing, either.
- 38:45 Russ comments: This statement deserves substantial follow-up clarification, but the interviewers drop the ball—DES is a performance art, and omissions are not desirable but are accepted as a risk of the procedure. Here, subsequent discussion should have clarified whether Gabriel's experience was of an impersonal hand doing the writing, or just a zoomed-in bit of what was known to be the professor, and so on. Those are interesting distinctions which we cannot discriminate.
- 38:49 CK: Yeah. [Inaudible] Okay.
- 38:53 RTH: And is your experience of writing words? Or is this experience, could that be just as easily I'm drawing a picture? I see a hand drawing a picture? [Gabriel: Oh] I see a hand, I see a hand and a whiteboard and a, and a pen, [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] and ink coming out of it?
- 39:12 Gabriel: It's writing, it's writing words, not just drawing.
- 39:17 RTH: Okay. But the word, the word being written is not present to me?
- 39:22 Gabriel: No. [CK: Yeah.]
- 39:23 RTH: So this is not a semantic experience, but it's enough of an experience to recognize that this is words being produced?
- 39:29 Gabriel: Yes. [RTH: Okay]
- 39:33 CK: And then there's the frustra, [to AG] oh yeah go,
- 39:36 AG: Oh, sorry. Can I ask one more question? [CK: Yep.] Um, so, um, you had said zoomed in. Is there anything, is it just that I'm seeing just this, that I'm not paying attention to anything else? Or is there anything about zooming in?
- 39:44 Gabriel: Yeah, it's just, it's just that I'm [AG: Okay.] seeing just the hand [AG: Okay.] and the board, that little area.
- 39:49 AG: Okay. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] then that, I'm good.
- 39:51 CK: And then there was frustration. [Gabriel: Yes.] How was that present?

39:55 Gabriel: Uh, there was just, there was an overall slight frustration. Um, this one, I'm, I'm, uh, I can say somewhat confidently that there *was* a bodily sensation, like I was kind of physically, uh, uncomfortable. Like my stomach was hurting a little bit. Uh, and that was part of my frustration. And, and sort of like, also part of this was a, was a feeling of tiredness in my eyes, as well.

40:29 CK: So in terms of the stomach, [Gabriel: mm-hmm.] how does that go?

40:35 Gabriel: It's just like, uh, like a somewhat painful tension.

40:43 RTH: And is your experience of frustration, or is your experience of painful stomach and tired eyes?

40:50 Gabriel: My experience is of frustration. Those are aspects of one thing that I was, I felt I was experiencing, which was frustration.

41:00 RTH: A bodily manifestation or...?

41:02 Gabriel: Yeah. I w, I wouldn't say it was *only* bodily though.

41:05 RTH: Mm-hmm. A piece of it. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.]

41:09 CK: And when you say painful tension d, uh, is, tension can mean a lot of things, right? Like it can mean like,

41:17 Gabriel: Yeah, like, uh, like, like a muscle cramping, kind of.

41:26 CK: And does this have a location?

41:28 Gabriel: Yeah. Like right at my stomach.

41:30 CK: Like right middle, [gestures to spot on his stomach] like?

41:32 Gabriel: Yeah, a little lower.

41:34 CK: So a little bit, in the middle of my abdomen sort of?

41:36 Gabriel: Yeah, basically, basically on the belly button. [laughs].

41:38 CK: Okay. And *on* meaning, is this outside? Inside? [Gabriel: Inside.] Inside. Any more questions on?

41:55 RTH: And, uh, by on the belly button, do you mean like a region in here, [gestures out a baseball sized region] or do you mean like? [gestures out a pea-sized area]

42:00 Gabriel: Just the general area. Mm-hmm.

42:02 RTH: Mm-hmm. And I think I'm good on [inaudible]

42:05 CK: And then there were the, my tired eyes?

42:08 Gabriel: Mm-hmm. Uh, that, that was just like part of the feeling of frustration. Um, kind of like a, a watery feeling and like needing to close the eyes, that kind of thing. Like a weight on the eyelids as well.

42:27 CK: And all this is aspects of frustration?

42:32 Gabriel: Yes.

42:33 CK: And you were saying there may, there may be something here that's beyond just these physical things, that there's this frustration in other parts?

42:40 Gabriel: Yes. There was a mental, there was like mental frustration as well. Um, it wasn't just purely physical discomfort, it was also like maybe, um, annoyance that I think there's, there, there was still some annoyance that we were going over this topic uh, again.

43:06 CK: Okay.

43:07 RTH: I'm good.

43:08 CK: [Inaudible]

43:09 RTH: Back to beep, beep number 1.

SAMPLE 9.1 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

43:11 Gabriel: Alright. Number one. Okay. So the, these were, uh, last night. And, um, uh, so this was, uh, the words "it is called." And, uh, that, those were the words that, uh, for context, I was helping my mom change a lightbulb. And, um, the words "it is called" were, in my experience, uh, spoken by my mother. So it was my, and I was hearing it as my, uh, my mother saying "it is called." And, um, visually speaking, there was the, the, the visual aspect or the, the visual experience of like seeing my mother sit down in a chair and, uh, the general shape of her, like blue robe. [pause; jet flies overhead] Oh, yeah. There was also the feeling of the, a vague feeling of, of trying to find a light bulb, or like having the goal of finding a light bulb.

44:24 RTH: And is any of those more present than any other?

44:28 Gabriel: Um, I think at this moment, uh, it pr, I, um, I can tell, I can say that the feeling of trying to find a light bulb was the *least* present. I'm not sure about the other two. I'm not sure what percentage they were.

44:44 RTH: Okay, that's fine.

44:45 Gabriel: Okay.

44:46 RTH: So let's start with the, my, my mother is speaking [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] and she's saying "it is called," and, and I'm gathering that's a part of a larger sentence?

44:58 Gabriel: Yes.

45:00 RTH: And so is my experience of hearing my mother say *those three words*, or hearing my mother speaking?

45:06 Gabriel: Oh, sorry. It was, "is it called" I, I said it wrong. Um, it was, um, it was, it was the experience of a larger sentence in, in *meaning*, but I, I, I think *auditorially*, there was still like a, the, there was a *chunk* in my auditory experience, which were the words, "is it called."

45:33 RTH: And is that the beginning of a sentence, "Is it called" or, or,?

45:36 Gabriel: Yeah. That, that would be the beginning.

45:41 RTH: And so presumably she was gonna go on and say, "is it called an incandescent light bulb?" or whatever?

45:45 Gabriel: Yes, exactly!

45:46 RTH: Okay. But she hadn't yet gotten there?

45:50 Gabriel: Uh, yeah. She hadn't yet gotten there. [RTH: Mm-hmm.]

45:58 RTH: And so the, does it, does it seem like I'm hearing *three words*, or does it seem like I'm hearing the beginning of a sentence, which I haven't heard yet the end of the sentence? Is that, is that distinction, make sense?

46:12 Gabriel: Does it, uh, does it seem like I'm hearing these three words or, uh, I, I feel like, I do think that there's, like, there's an auditory experience to this *and* a semantic experience. [RTH: Okay.] So the *semantic* experience is, this is a sentence. Uh, I wouldn't say I was experiencing it as the *beginning* of a sentence, but it was like part, I guess, part of a sentence.

46:40 RTH: I'm taking in the meaning of what my mother is saying.

46:4@ Gabriel: Yes. [RTH: Okay.] And then there's the auditory, there was also an auditory experience of that, which were the words, "is it called."

46:54 RTH: And so without doubt, there is auditory experience going on. There's vibrations in the air, starting in your mother's vocal cords and ending in your ears or whatever [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] So there's no question there is auditory experience. The question is whether you particularize those three words as *just three words*, or whether you're just taking in the auditory characteristics of the beginning of the semantic sentence.

47:26 Gabriel: Um... uh, sorry, what, could you say that again?

47:37 RTH: I was looking for [looks at his notes]... So in the, in the previous beep, we were talking about "strings of sentences."

47:52 Gabriel: Mm-hmm.

47:53 RTH: And I understood you to be saying, well, there were, "strings" had some characteristics and "sentences" had some characteristics. And, and, and so I'm, I, my, I'm experientially processing those, those words, or word as, when this word with those characteristics, that word with this characteristics. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] Is that right? About that one? [Gabriel: Yes.] And now that, I'm asking that, is, is that sort of the same thing going on here? Or, or is this, I eh d, I, I don't have any particular character, examination of the word characteristics here.

48:33 Gabriel: Uh, do you mean the auditory characteristics? [RTH: Yeah.] I wouldn't say there was a particular examination of the auditory characteristics. Uh, but audit, I would just say that, eh, there was a single auditory chunk, uh, which I wasn't like *thinking* about the **characteristics** of it, but it was still an auditory chunk, which I was hearing in my experience, which was the words, "is it called."

48:59 RTH: Okay. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And so that I can understand what we're saying here is, was the rest of the sentence: "Is it called an incandescent light bulb? "Is that, is that really what it was?

49:09 Gabriel: Uh, I actually don't know what the rest of the sentence was.

49:12 RTH: Well, let's, let's *pretend* that that's what it was. [Gabriel: Okay.] And so if the beep had come a little bit later, is, is what you're conveying is that the chunk probably would've been, "is it called an incandescent light bulb," or does it really, does it seem like I have taken in *this particular* chunk regardless of what's gonna come next?

49:30 Gabriel: So if the beep had come at the, like, end of the sentence? um, if the beep had come at the end of the sentence, would I have experienced the whole sentence as the chunk? That's the question?

49:50 RTH: What I, what I'm trying to figure out is what you mean by: "I'm experiencing this as a chunk." [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] And a chunk could mean, it has a beginning, and it ha, has an end, and this is it. Or it could be, it has a beginning and the end isn't yet specified, but at the moment all I've gotten is here, but if I'd gotten later, it would've been here, and if it'd come later, it would've been...

50:13 Gabriel: Right.

50:13 RTH: So does the chunkiness seem like a discrete unit? Maybe that's what I'm trying to ask.

50:19 Gabriel: It does it, i, yeah. It seems like a discrete unit.

50:22 RTH: Okay. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.]

50:25 Gabriel: It's not, it doesn't feel open-ended.

50:28 RTH: Okay. That *is* the question I'm trying to ask.

50:29 Gabriel: Okay.

50:29 Russ comments: Reviewing what we have agreed to so far: There is a semantic meaning present, and there is also a heard chunk present. These are related but experientially distinctly separate—the semantic meaning has a logical completeness, whereas the heard portion has an arbitrary chunkiness. (See the comment at 29:42, also about the discontinuity of words and meaning.)

50:32 RTH: Okay. Anybody else have any questions about that? [CK: No.] And then I see my mother *sitting* down in a chair? Or *sit* down in a chair? Is this an action deal?

50:45 Gabriel: Uh, action. She's, she's in the process of sitting down in a chair.

50:48 RTH: Okay. And there was something about her blue robe.

50:51 Gabriel: Yeah. She had a blue, a robe on. And, uh, the, the general kind of shape of the blue robe was, in my experience, uh, particularly the way that it was touching the ground or about to touch the ground.

51:08 RTH: And is, in this portion of your experience, is the blue robe touching the ground more salient than the sitting down? So the sitting down is more mostly context and what I'm really experiencing is the robe on the ground? Or...?

51:22 Gabriel: Hmm. I think, um, I, I, sitting down *was* in my experience. The robe, uh, about to touch the ground was, uh, in my experience as well. But it would've been a smaller portion than the sitting down. It would, it would've been like, um, uh, like a, I don't know, like a 10% or something was I, was the, the general shape of the robe [RTH: Mm-hmm.] hit, touching the ground.

51:48 RTH: And the color of the same thing? The robe happened to be blue, but I wasn't into the particular blueness of it or?

51:53 Gabriel: Yeah I- [clears throat] Excuse me. Yeah I wasn't int, I wasn't, um, particularly paying attention to the blueness of the robe.

52:02 RTH: So I'm seeing my mother sit down, and details of that, pieces of that are the robe is blue, the robe crumples in this way as it hits the floor?

- 52:12 Gabriel: Mm-hmm. Actually, the blue was in my, the blue *was* in my experience. I *was*, I, I was thinking about the blue to *some* extent. Um, it was a very, very small, it was very small though. But it was there.
- 52:27 RTH: More so than the crinkle, crinkle-on-the-floor part?
- 52:31 Gabriel: Uh, no, it, the, the crinkle on, or the, the hitting the floor was, uh, a b, a bigger part of my experience. I, I think that the, I was sort of actively thinking, is it going to, when it touches the floor, is it going to, like, *is this bottom seam gonna touch the floor all at once?* Was, was kind of how I was thinking about it.
- 52:51 RTH: Okay. And by thinking about it, do you mean that ex, that explicitly cognitively? Which is I'm asking my question, which has a yes no answer: Is it gonna fold this way or that way? *Or* is it that I'm watching it with sort of particular interest of how the, how the fold is gonna happen?
- 53:09 Gabriel: I'm watching it with particular interest of how the, the seam is gonna line up with the ground.
- 53:14 RTH: Okay. And that's more interesting to me than the color, although the color is somewhat interesting to me.
- 53:22 Gabriel: Yes.
- 53:25 RTH: And all of that, well, those two things, the seam and the color, are *less* salient to me than the watching my mom sit down?
- 53:35 Gabriel: Yes.
- 53:41 RTH: I think I'm good about that portion. [CK: Mm-hmm.]
- 53:43 AG: And is there anything more to say about mom sitting down, or is that just it?
- 53:48 Gabriel: Um, that's, yeah, that's it. [AG: Okay.]
- 53:52 RTH: And then I have a sense of trying to find a light bulb?
- 53:55 Gabriel: Yes. [RTH: What,] um, I was, I had th, a goal, there's like this vague goal, uh, that I, uh, uh, to, to find a light bulb. Um, so I guess it wasn't the sense of trying to find one, it was just the, the, a goal, vague goal to find a light bulb, which also, uh, for context didn't make sense. I didn't need to find a light bulb then, but for some reason at that moment, it was just this vague goal that I needed to find a light bulb
- 54:25 RTH: And it didn't make sense because you already had a light bulb? [Gabriel looks uncomfortable or nervous throughout this find-a-lightbulb portion, perhaps because he is describing something that simply doesn't make sense.]

54:25 Russ comments: That Gabriel would describe an experience that doesn't make sense, and that apparently makes him uncomfortable in some way, is, in my view, powerful evidence that Gabriel is describing his experience carefully, not making things up and not overlooking aspects. (See a similar comment at 30:44.)

54:28 Gabriel: Yes. [RTH: Okay.]

54:35 RTH: And have you already installed a light bulb? [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.] So the task is done, and yet I still in some way have a feel like I have to do it.

54:44 Gabriel: Yes.

54:46 RTH: Mm-hmm.

54:46 AG: And when you say "vague," do you mean that, uh, is, do you mean like, this is not salient in my experience? Or do you mean something else?

55:02 Gabriel: Yeah, what, I guess by vague I just mean that it's a really tiny part of my experience.

55:06 RTH: Okay.

55:15 RTH: Okay. I think I'm good.

55:16 AG: Oh, and,

55:17 Gabriel: Oh, specifically by the way, when I, the, the goal of, uh, finding a light bulb was the goal of finding a light bulb on Amazon, I should mention.

55:34 AG: And then just to make sure that I understand fully that, that, that, um, I guess not-making-sense-ness part or like, this has already finished all that. Is, is that all, that's all context? Like

55:45 Gabriel: That's context. [AG: Okay.] Yeah. [AG: Okay.]

55:50 AG: Okay. I'm good.

55:51 RTH: And the context is I've al ,I've already found the light bulb on Amazon? I've already,

55:56 Gabriel: Uh, actually the context is somebody else already did, not, so I don't need to.

56:02 RTH: Okay. [Gabriel: Mm-hmm.]

56:06 AG: And the not like, um, and the, like, this goal doesn't make sense discussion we had earlier, that's all context?

56:12 Gabriel: That's all context. [AG: (Inaudible)] Yes.

56:14 AG: Okay.

56:16 CK: And is there anything more to say about how that's present? Again, I understand this is a small portion but,

56:21 Gabriel: Um, I don't think so. I don't think there's more to say about it. Uh, it's the goal. Yeah. It's just a vague, very tiny goal of finding a light bulb on Amazon. [CK: Okay.]

56:36 RTH: I'm good.

56:37 AG: I'm good.

56:37 CK: Yep.

56:39 AG: Um, just to be mindful of time, it is, we have been at this for one hour. So do we want to do one more? Cuz we do have something at one. I just wanted to ask the group.

56:49 RTH: So I think that's more or less up to Gabriel. I think we need to be out of here by 10 to one or something like that, so that we can

56:54 AG: Yeah that's why, yeah. [CK: Mm-hmm.] I'm just asking the [Gabriel: Okay.] group just to be mindful of time.

56:58 Gabriel: Yeah. I'm up, I'm up for, uh, I'm up for that. Okay.

57:01 AG: One more? Okay.

57:02 Gabriel: Also, uh, if you, if you guys wanted to, we could talk about the, the transcript. [AG: Oh.] But either, either is fine with me.

57:09 AG: [To RTH] That's up to you. I guess

57:13 Gabriel: We could, uh, do that on a day where you guys didn't have to get going as well, if you'd prefer that.

57:22 RTH: I don't, I don't know the answer to that. May I'll leave it up to you. We can talk about the transcript or we can talk about another beep, but, and, and, [Gabriel: Okay.] And I would, and I'm asking what you want to do, not what you think I want to do, but given that we've got 29 minutes here, we can, we can spend it talking something about the transcript, something about the beep.

57:41 Gabriel: Um, I, I'd probably prefer to get the transcript out of the way and like talk about that a little bit. [RTH: Okay.] Because, uh, it's been on my mind a bit.

57:48 RTH: Let's do it.

57:49 AG: Sure.

57:49 Gabriel: Okay.