

Kerry
Sample Review (“Green Meeting”) part 1 (first part, through day 9)

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the first part of the first (January 3) “green meeting” for Kerry that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/BxG2gNWK91s>. In brown are conversations about the Descriptive Experience Sampling process that took place during the interview. In green are Russ’s comments, and in blue are Julian’s comments about and explanations of the Descriptive Experience Sampling process inserted after the interview. If you have corrections, suggestions, or questions, please post them as YouTube comments.

RTH = Russ Hurlburt

JBK = Julian Bass-Krueger

MM = Mel May

Kerry = Kerry U.

After completing sampling with Kerry, the investigators and Kerry met for the *idiographic sample review meeting* (sometimes informally called the *green meeting*), where investigators reawakened their independent grasps of each of the sampled moments of experience.

Together, they reviewed each sample (starting from the end and working backwards) and compared their individual impressions of it; together they generated a brief (typically 10-ish words) “caption” that captured the important aspect(s) of the phenomena present in that sample as each investigator understood it—that is, the caption could include differing opinions, if the several investigators had differing impressions. (Typically, captions are written in green font—hence the name *green meeting*). This idiographic sample review (as is typical in DES) spanned 4 or 5 hours of discussion spread across two days.

Because the meeting is long, we transcribed only the first half of the first day (here) and the last half of the second day (see January 14). You can watch and listen to the video of the entire meetings.

0:00 RTH: Okay, excellent. So lemme give a little bit of a lecture about what a green meeting is about from my point of view. And, uh, and, and the object of the whole exercise.... So we have spent, well, 10 days or something like that with Kerry. So 10 hours each, 40 hours plus however much preparation and what, and whatever has gone into it around that. So quite with a quite a bit, a chunk of time, we have spent trying to do something together. And that’s something I think is that we have tried to grasp what Kerry’s inner experiences like, given that we’ve got something like 50 samples of it

0:42 And, and, and, and that those 50 samples have come over, uh, a couple of months, three months, four months, maybe, something like that. I forget exactly, but sort of a long time. And now we would like to be able to say something about, well, what’s, what’s Kerry’s inner experience like? If somebody were to say to us, what is her experience like? What, what can we say about that? *And*, and not only would we like to answer that question, but we would like to answer that question in a way that, that there’s some warrant to behind as being sort of faithful to Kerry’s experience.

- 1:16 And so the green meeting is, is designed to further that, because (a) it takes into account, it accepts, that we more or less a *forgotten* what happened on the first few sampling days and (b), that what happened on the first few sampling days were not necessarily in line with Kerry's experience at that time because we didn't know Kerry very well or at all. And so we had some practice to do it. So we're gonna go back and we're gonna review all of the samples, and uh, uh, and try to bring them back to life in a way that then we can re remember them. And, and, and when we do that, we're gonna have the reverse probability that we had the first problem that we had before. And that is that as we go through the samples today, then we're, by the time we get to the end of this review, which might take us several hours, we might have forgotten what has happened at the beginning of *this* review.
- 2:09 So the object is to try to come up with some way of fixing these things in our memory so that we can deal with them and the way, and what we're gonna do, [clears throat] excuse me, I have a cold and it's showing up here what I have to talk for more than 30 seconds at a time. The um, what we're gonna do is we're gonna start at the *end*, which I think is the samples that we have the most likelihood of, of having been faithful to Kerry's experience in the first place. And we're gonna reawaken those and then we're gonna work backwards from get day nine to day one. And uh,
- 2:57 And, and, and when we do that, that we're gonna write what I call a *caption*. And the caption is supposed to keep in mind for us what happened in that particular sample in ways that we can then remember when we try to summarize.
- 3:12 So that that's sort of the general sense of what I think we're gonna do. Any questions or comments about that? Maybe we should just *do it* and people get chance, have a
- 3:19 MM: Question, see it. I always have a question. Um, why do you not do this as you go?
- 3:28 RTH: Because we presume that we did not understand Kerry's samples at the outset.
- 3:35 MM: Yeah.
- 3:35 RTH: That we think is, that it's at least *possible*, if not likely, that by the time we get to day 9 we will understand something about Kerry's second day samples that we didn't understand at day 2 or day 3 or day 4, or whatever. I'm not sure that's sort of true. In Kerry's case, I think it was definitely true in Mel's case because we had to bash some of Mel's characteristics back and forth for, for quite some time. Kerrys were, I'm thinking somewhat simpler to, to grasp and uh,
- 4:06 MM: Yeah, but you're saying you, you need a more holistic approach, or holistic understanding before you can probably go back and characterize things?
- 4:17 RTH: Uh, that's close. I'm not sure. I would say *holistic*. I would say *more faithful*. I think holistic that and visions that you can sort of keep the whole thing in mind, which I don't think is possible actually. [MM: Yeah.] And, uh, but I think we can do, I think we can do better on the day night on the ninth day than we did on the second day [inaudible].
- 4:38 MM: Yeah, agree.

- 4:42 RTH: So first off, [he refers to some text on the screen that he is sharing] this, I should have deleted before I sent this to you [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] This was notes to myself. So I'm gonna delete that and then we're gonna go to day 9, and we are going to find the beginning of day 9. [scrolls down] I guess I'll search for it.
- 5:20 So we're gonna, we got, we've got some color coding in in mind here. So the, the purple display is what we have more-or-less agreed is a description of the sample (and we can change that as, as, we go). What we're, what we're gonna write something in green at the same time here. So we're gonna write in green what was gonna be called the caption. And we're gonna look at the sample and all the conversation that we had about this sample. And then we're gonna write a caption. And the caption is gonna try to convey what the characteristics of this sample is. It's, it's sort of a content free, mostly content free, thing. So if she's got imagery, we're gonna talk about imagery or whatever, not because we want to know what the imagery *is*. The imagery would be in the green, in the *purple* characterization. So let's let, let's just launch into it and let's, so take a look at this. [scrolls to center sample 9.1]
- 6:26 And we, and, and I guess I would, I would also like to say that the, the point of the whole exercise, the whole DES exercise, is to get at Kerry's experience. It is not to get at *what we've said* about Kerry's experience. What we have said about Kerry's experience (in purple or black or whatever) is a tool that aims back at Kerry's experience. We're trying to get past us, using the purple display, display and the, what we have, what conversations we have had about it. We're trying to get back to Kerry's experience *as it was*. And we're gonna write, we're gonna accept that that's not, we're gonna fall short of perfection in that, but that's our goal.

REVIEW OF SAMPLE 9.1 STARTS HERE

- 7:11 So what I would say about this [referring to sample 9.1] is that this is words rolling out, maybe not even words rolling out, maybe it's just saying out loud, speaking out loud. And then there wasn't much else. [Types in green into the onscreen document as a caption "*Speaking aloud*"]
- 7:37 JBK: This one, I actually was going back to the video today doing some transcript stuff and um, and Kerry was looking at her roommate's face, you look, you were looking at your roommate's face and then, uh, we, we talked about how we didn't like go into that enough in the interview, and Russ, you wrote that too, that we kind of didn't go into that enough. Um, in that case, do you think we should try to include it here or just say it's water under the bridge?
- 8:17 RTH: How about including that in the green meeting, in the green caption? [Continues to type in the caption "*(maybe looking at face)*." Does that do it?
- 8:30 JBK: Sounds, sounds good to me.
- 8:33 RTH: So we can go back and look at a video. Everything that, everything that we do takes time. And the question is whether it's profitable to, to do that. By putting it in the green meeting, [he means "*in the green caption*"] if, if it were to turn out that when

we've gotten through looking at all 40-some samples that we will have seen a lot of maybe lookings at the face, then, then maybe we'll have to go back and look at it. But if this is the only one,...

8:58 JBK: Okay, then,

9:00 RTH: ...then it seems like we can sort of slide on it, but we're not *sliding* on it. We're suspending judgment about it.

9:00 Russ comments: The captions are designed to be tools that will be useful in organizing our thinking about the entire set of experiences. It is better to *include* things that *might* be useful and allow their utility either to emerge or disappear as we reconsider this sample in the context of all the other samples.

9:06 JBK: I remember at least one other. Yeah, we can.

9:10 RTH: Okay.

9:10 JBK: Or the dog [laughs].

9:12 RTH: So, so you said a minute ago, Julian that I said that we didn't check on that. Is that in the transcript or something?

9:18 JBK: Yeah, that's in the transcript and your commentary. Yeah, because Kerry's original description was much more about, you were looking at your roommate Gracie, at her face and then...

9:34 Kerry: Yeah, I would say, I can't remember how I split it, but I would say

9:39 JBK: I think, um,

9:40 Kerry: Reconnect con inflection, I would guess that that's like around 50—50. Like I was looking at her base but also speaking that, but I don't know if it's helpful to say you

9:50 JBK: [he gets up and moves from room to room] See better wifi.

9:53 RTH: So I've got a couple of comments about that. One is that Kerry is clearly in a different position regarding these experiences than the rest of us, but I *don't* agree that that makes her the best that that, that she's in a *better* position. There are quite a few philosophers that think that she's got absolute perfect recollection and things like that. I don't think that's true. I think she has a perspective that's different from ours and *valuable*; maybe in some situations more valuable, maybe in some situations less valuable. I'm not trying to make a judgment about that. I'm trying to, what I think we should be doing is *accepting* that we have, we have one person who's a different anim, a different animal from the others of us here. And that Kerry had access to her experience at, at least that one time. On to number 2?

9:53 Russ comments: Participants do not usually participate in DES green meetings. If they do participate, then (as in all other aspects of the DES process), they are *not* understood to have infallible or incorrigible access to their own experiences—across all of the DES procedure, we accepted that Kerry (as with each of the investigators) has presuppositions, blind spots, sensitivities that interfere with her (our) ability to apprehend her experience with fidelity. We have worked to bracket those aspects, but we don't presume that that effort has been entirely successful, nor that it will have been maintained in this new perspective. In short, we will *value* what Kerry has to say; but we will not blindly accept it.

10:51 JBK: Sure.

REVIEW OF SAMPLE 9.2 STARTS HERE

11:28 RTH: [pause while they read] So what I'm gonna say about this is at the end we're gonna say "words rolling out." So I'm gonna start with [types in green ", words rolling out"]

11:42 JBK: Words rolling out.

11:44 RTH: Words rolling out, but I put that as a comma, which means that's the *last* thing, but we have to figure out what we're going to say about this thing here [uses cursor to highlight the description's second paragraph].

11:52 JBK: Like looking at text.

11:54 RTH: Yeah.

11:56 JBK: Text.

11:59 RTH: It's not just *looking at* text, it's *wonderingly* looking at text, it seems to me.

12:04 JBK: Yeah.

12:17 RTH: [Types in green "*Wonderingly looking at text*"] And *maybe* a separate wondering

12:25 JBK: Mm-hmm. Although I don't, I don't think so. In in the transcript you were more leaning away from separate wondering to

12:38 RTH: Okay.

12:39 JBK: But it's possible. Above. Did we wanna include, um, "surprise," "surprisedly" in somewhere in there? Can we go up to a sample, the sample above? [RTH scrolls to sample 9.1] Do we want to capture something of the surprise, like "surprisedly speaking out loud". So like that's not *my* experience about like dating on Hinge. I'm just wondering how much we want to capture in these captions.

13:22 RTH: So that [inserts "*surprisedly*" into the 9.1 caption.] That, that's, that's a good question. And the answer to that is, uh, I don't think anybody knows the answer to that

question. [JBK laughs]. What I think is that *the caption has to satisfy everybody*. And that *doesn't* mean that it has to *equally* satisfy, or it has to satisfy everybody for the same reason. What I, what it means is that *Julian* has the responsibility for making this caption *mean something to him* about what we're talking about here. And *Mel* has that same responsibility, and *Kerry* does, and *Russ* does. But that does *not* mean that we have to *agree* about it. If K, if Julian thinks that the surprisedly is an important deal, then he's gonna wanna get that into the caption. [Kerry: Hmm.] So it, it, this is *not* a *let's agree on things* exercise. This is a *let's commit ourselves as individuals* to what we, what I thought. Let's.... Each one of us has to be, *this caption conveys what I thought*.

- 14:32 Kerry: I would say, for this one, uh, maybe a small element of surprise, but what I think is maybe more accurate would be like *exacerbation*, [laughs]. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] I don't know if that, um,....
- 14:51 MM: All of that feels so fraught with danger to me here, Russ. Um, in terms of like, this is someone coming, this is the first time I've seen green-meeting-ness happen. [JBK: Mm-hmm.] But like, geez, that's a how do you ever...? What every sample I'm gonna go, oh, "she excitedly said!" "She disappointingly....!" Like that feels like a can of worms that never end, if you're getting emotive.
- 15:17 JBK: From my perspective, it, it would mostly be for these first two because we, we like discussed a lot in the interview, like if there was surprised there or if it was kind just part of the speaking. But I see that as, as a thing with these first two samples. But I, I don't see that every sample we're gonna like "shockingly said!" [MM laughs].
- 15:40 MM: Yeah, yeah, yeah.
- 15:42 RTH: And, and I would say the same thing I think that Julian said except a little bit more general. And that is that I, I think, I think we can *trust the process*.
- 15:52 MM: Okay.
- 15:53 RTH: That, that *if* surprisingly or exasperatedly or, or whatever turns out to be an important thing [MM: Yeah.] then we'll see that frequently. [MM: Yeah.] And if it's not, then it'll then well, well we worried about it this time and maybe, maybe we overemphasized it. Maybe, maybe we did.
- 16:11 MM: Okay.
- 16:11 RTH: But that's gonna, that's that I think will fall away.
- 16:15 MM: Okay.
- 16:16 RTH: I do think that it's better if, if if when in doubt it's better to put something in because then it can fall away. If you *don't* put something in, then you are, then you're going to rely on the ability to remember: *Well I think we should have put that in back there in sample 9.1*, and that's, that's a harder thing to do.

16:37 MM: Mm-hmm

16:37 RTH: When, so maybe I should talk a little bit about what's gonna happen. So when we're, when we're done, we're gonna have a, we're gonna have a whole list of all of the, all of the captions and all the verbal stuff (and all the rest of the stuff for that matter). And then we're going to, then, then I'm gonna ask each of us when we're done with that, I'm gonna ask each of us to characterize Kerry's experience *independently*. I'm gonna ask you, you know, within a day after we're done with this process, within a day, I'm gonna say write in, write a characterization, brief characterization of Kerry's experience, what you think the highlights are. And that can be an outline or it can be 10 words, or it can be a hundred words or whatever. The object isn't to be loquacious. The object is to capture what you think are the, what I call the, idiographic characteristics of Kerry. If we're gonna describe Kerry's 50 experiences, this is what we've gotta have in there.

17:30 And then, so Mel's gonna do that and I'm gonna do that. Kerry's gonna do that. Julian's gonna do that. Then we'll put 'em all together and we'll come up. What? We'll, *now* we have to start to be sort of jointly about it. Well, actually not even yet!

17:30 Russ comments: RE "*now* we have to start to be sort of jointly about it. Well, actually not even yet!"

The end goal of this DES investigation is to write a description that we all jointly and each individually believe characterizes with fidelity Kerry's experience. But a sub-goal of that end-goal is genuinely to honor and maintain all the individual investigators' (or participant's) differing perspectives on any sample or any characteristic. That is, DES values *postponing as long as possible* any pressure toward consensus. That is in itself an art: the several investigators differ with respect to status, experience, skill, loquacity, and so on; the art is to foster an environment where fidelity to Kerry's experience is held to be of more value than any of those potential distractions.

Even the final end-goal description may contain explicitly stated minority opinions—that is, even then, the aim is not to value consensus over fidelity.

17:42 RTH: [continues] But, so we're, we're gonna get a *list* of the characteristics that *each of us* think are important and then all, *all done individually*, but then together we're gonna make a document that has all these things in it. And then we're gonna have one more task. And that is for each of you, I'll make up a, a document that gives you a chance for each of one to apply all those characteristics to all the samples. So for example, we might end up with a, with a characteristic like *Kerry is reacting with emotion with something that she sees in the environment*. And for sample 9.1, people will say, well, yeah, that's, that's true. We'll give that a 1. We'll, we'll say that was present there, but it wasn't present in all the rest of those things. That's gonna give us the sort of, the way of counting into Kerry's idiographic experiences.

18:41 Kerry: And then is the idea that after we've characterized each individual one that you have a general breakdown of like, uh, not percentage I guess, but because I don't, I don't know if you like doing percentages [JBK: Mm-hmm.] But, but a general, oh, you're kind

of majority visual versus auditory, and you thought you were auditory because that's kind of my general takeaway, but Yeah.

19:09 RTH: Well there's one, there's one more step that I haven't yet described and that is so, so I've asked that you're, you're, you're all gonna rate, I'm gonna make a spreadsheet basically. And every, everybody will have rated this is present, this, this ideographic characteristic is present in sample 9.1 and a 9.5 and 8.2 and whatever. Everybody gets a chance to do that. And then we're gonna have what we call the *rectification meeting*. If, if we were to do the whole thing and the rectification meeting is we would get together and we would discuss when we disagreed about these things. And that will, and, and the purpose of the rectification meeting is not just a rate of reliability issue, but it's a *ideographic characteristic* reliability issue. Should we, did we, did we have an idio? Did we, *between us*, have a different opinion about what this characteristic of Kerry was and now we have to hash it out because on sample 8.5, Kerry thought that she was surprisedly whatever, and Mel thought she wasn't, and so what's that about? That's, uh...

20:16 And *then*, after we're done with **that**, which is to say, *after we know what we're talking about*, that that's, that's the way of determining that we know what we're talking about because we're in agreement that we can rate these things or, or we've hashed out the disagreements. Now we know what we're talking about as best we're gonna know, and *then* we're gonna do what Kerry asked us to do, which is to say, I'm gonna characterize what her experience is.

20:40 So the whole, the whole procedure is basically all aimed at, can we describe Kerry's experience?

20:48 MM: It's dense, Russ! [JBK: Mmmm.] [Kerry: (Inaudible)]

20:52 RTH: That's the risk of trying to know what you're talking about!

20:55 MM: Yeah, I know, I know! [laughs].

20:58 JBK: But then it *can* involve percentages at the end, like we can say

21:00 RTH: And then it *can*, yes. And then at the end we can say we have agreed that 14 out of the samples who are are, uh, visual imagery, and we know what we're talking about by visual imagery. 14 of 'em were like that, then we'll be able to say 14 out of 46 or whatever it is. [those are made-up numbers]

21:20 Kerry: Cool.

21:22 RTH: Now whether we all get that far, far as a group, that's, that's another, another question. But that would be the procedure.

21:30 JBK: Have you ever done it with this many people and with the interviewee before?

21:35 RTH: Yes.

- 21:38 MM: Actually. Yeah. That's a good point. Is the, is the, is the Kerry-person usually present in, in
- 21:43 RTH: This school? Usually not. No. But not all. But, but I don't have a rule about that. [MM: Okay.] If the Kerry-person is particularly interested in it for whatever reason, then I have no objection to having the Kerry-person there. I don't think that screws up the process. [MM: Yeah.] But most of the time, the most of the time it just doesn't work out that way.
- 22:06 MM: Most of the time they say, "come back with the percentages!" [laughs].
- 22:10 RTH: Right. Or most of the time they were subjects in the research and they, they, they think we're done, or we think we're done, or whatever it does, it does add the risk that Kerry has a different perspective and then we have to deal with that. And that takes time. And you know, time is money, and whatever.
- 22:30 JBK: Shall we go on?
- 22:31 RTH: So are we happy with this?
- 22:37 Kerry: Yes, I am.
- 22:41 RTH: And I and, and when I say "are we happy?" what I really mean is, "are you happy, Kerry?" and "are you happy, Mel?" And "are you happy, Julian?" I *don't* mean it as are, "do we have some joint understanding here?" Joint under,... the joint understanding is gonna happen. But that doesn't happen until after the rectification meeting, really. As, as it is now, disagreement is a, is a *desirable* thing.

REVIEW OF SAMPLE 9.3 STARTS HERE

[RTH scrolls to sample 9.3; there is a pause while reading]

- 23:25 Kerry: This is such a niche-like moment! [laughs]
- 23:42 RTH: [pause] So I think this is an inner seeing, which my code for is ISee. Like that ISee means for me, inner seeing the advantage of that is that if I search for I-S-E-E, I get this. [He types "*ISee*,"]
- 24:06 Kerry: Do you, do you, would you include that I was also listening and doing the dishes? Or is it more about the inner seeing?
- 24:19 JBK: What I...
- 24:24 RTH: The dishes, as I understood it, was **not** in your experience.
- 24:29 Kerry: I would say that's pretty accurate. Yeah.

24:32 RTH: But the hearing of the podcast was; I'm hearing this podcast. [Kerry: Yeah.] But I think I interrupted you, Julian.

24:39 JBK: I, I was gonna say the same.

24:45 MM: I have a question about the inner seeing. Like this one is one of the ones where she said like, she could see it in front of her, if I remember correctly. I don't necessarily think they were always in front. Or like there was differences in, in how she was seeing things in front of her in terms of like transparency and size and things. And I think that that feels like a relevant characterization to make. [While she speaks, RTH types "*no borders, in front of her, smaller, transparent, listening.*"] I don't know how, but... "I see, no border in..." Yeah, yeah, yeah.

25:22 JBK: [laughs] I like how whatever you said, Mel, appeared in text as you spoke [laughs].

25:25 MM: That's great. [laughs].

25:33 RTH: So I agree with that. All, all of those things is, I think we're gonna have to figure out what, what all these things mean. But this is,

25:42 Kerry: Is *transparent* the right word? And I know I, I don't know how to, um, explain this, but it doesn't seem *trans*, it doesn't seem *translucent* when I'm seeing it, but I can also see behind it. I don't know how to explain that.

25:59 MM: Did we get to, does *opacity* feel right for you? Some level of *opacity*? Or that's still not right? It is like literally the same as apartment. Yeah. You know, yeah. We, we did discuss that. Hey, like,

26:11 Kerry: It feels like a hundred percent opacity, but I, [MM: Mm-hmm.] I guess because I know it's not...real.

26:18 JBK: Yeah. I don't remember this one being lower opacity. Some of them you did describe maybe the <inaudible> we get to that I remember. Yeah. I don't remember this one having lower opacity.

26:31 Kerry: I, I have definitely had like lower opacity, uh, inner seeing before and this one does not.

26:41 RTH: [He changes on the screen "*transparent*" to "*does not block.*"] So this, is *does not block* better than *transparent*.

26:45 Kerry: Yeah. Cuz it's not like I, yeah, I think that's right. Cuz it's, it's at 100% opacity, but it's not obstructing my visual portion, [RTH: That's...] which sounds like it directly contradicts itself, but that makes sense to me.

26:59 RTH: Perfect. And that, and this, this is an example of what the, what the advantages of the green meeting are. This is, we, we are trying to take a step towards being able to describe Kerry's experience. And I put some characters out here [indicates the green

text] transparent and Kerry says, no, it's not transparent. And she's right about that. We got a chance to fix the words, improve the words, and maybe later on we'll be able to make it even better than that.

27:30 JBK: Kerry, I'm wondering. You have a different perspective than us. Like, do these come back to you or are they vivid? Like do you

27:37 Kerry: Yeah, I can. I like, so now when we're talking about this moment, I am now seeing my same perspective. Like I'm like taking myself visually back to where I was in that beep where the fridge was, which was diagonally left, um, in my field of vision. And so I'm trying to recreate that. Obviously it's probably not perfectly accurate because memory's not accurate, but that's what I'm doing right now.

28:04 JBK: That's, that's the video's for.

28:05 Kerry: What I'm doing

28:05 MM: I love you saying that before Russ could do it! [laughs] [Kerry laughs]. Um, wait, another thing, because I really struggle to understand this version of, you know, inner experience. So a thing that would be helpful for me, and I can't remember if it was different or not all the time, but in terms of like whether it's 2D or 3D, was it ever different for you? Like were they always 2D or were there differences? But if there are differences, I feel like something like that is a helpful note for me to try and understand what this is.

28:05 Russ comments: RE "I love you saying that before Russ could do it!"

I love it, too, because Kerry's 27:37 is a highly sophisticated turn: she carefully describes what she is experiencing now; and describes that she understands the now-experience as being the same as the then-experience; but she happily accepts that she might be mistaken about that correspondence. That, in my view, is the essence of careful description.

28:33 Kerry: Yeah. Um, mo, most, most are 3D. I would actually, I don't think I've ever had, I'm trying to think back. I would say there are some instances where it feels like, um, an image with no crisp line, [gestures a rectangle with her hands] so it feels like a scene and sometimes it, it feels like thinner and less immersive. So the immersive ones would be like clear 3D, whereas this one I would describe as 3D, but it's not as immersive, which in a way sometimes feels like 2D, which is really hard to explain. [laughs], I'm so sorry [laughs].

29:22 RTH: So I'm, so I'm not sure that I understand what the difference between 2D and 3D is. So let me, let me try it this way. Does it seem... Well, I'm, I'm guessing asking Mel is, is 2D is by 2D. Does it mean I'm not looking at my refrigerator, I'm not seeing my refrigerator, I'm seeing a *picture* of my refrigerator. That would be 2D. [Kerry: That's how I] , I'm seeing my refrigerator. Neither one of them are present to me. Of course. But if I'm seeing my *refrigerator*, then that's 3D. Is that, is that a correspond to what you mean, Mel, by the difference between 2D and 3D?

- 29:58 MM: Um, what I'm trying to say is, again, and I think it's because it, like I don't experience this so I'm trying to understand, but like in my head it feels like: okay, she can see an object in front of her that is like real. So like, I'm trying to understand whether it's flat or whether it's got depth to it in the way that the, the book that's next to me does have depth [holds up the book] and I can tell it's a real object. But I guess the more I speak, the more I'm suspecting that it looks like every other real object based on the way she's described things. So they're all 3D, then.
- 30:38 Kerry: I also think, maybe just ignore what I just said about 2D / 3D, I think the, the real distinction for me in terms of like depth of field is actually the *size* of the inner seeing. So when I saw the car driving along the street [she refers to sample 4.2], that to me felt very 3D because it was relatively the same size as the car, the *physical* car driving in front of it. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] But when I'm visualizing this fridge, I'm seeing it outta the corner of my eye and it's small. It's just like a smaller image. So it feels, it feels like it's 2D in a way, but it is 3D, but I know that it's not, I'm not seeing a physical fridge that's life size. So
- 31:18 MM: That yeah. But it could still be smaller than life size and be 3D.
- 31:20 Kerry: Exactly. So that's, that's what I'm, that's what I'm clarifying. Yeah. Like it's not ignore what I said about 3D. They're all 3D, it's just different sizes. Yep,
- 31:27 MM: Yep, yep, yep,
- 31:28 Kerry: Yep. And, and the smaller ones feel less immersive. So kind of feels less 3D, but they are technically 3D.
- 31:36 MM: Okay.
- 31:37 JBK: There is the thing of it not being a full scene, it's just the fridge. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] And I remember some other samples that were like, just an object or whatever should, uh, we include that somehow.
- 31:51 RTH: And that's what I meant by "no borders." Does that...?
- 31:53 JBK: But the immersive scenes also don't have borders. But, but it's different from my perspective.
- 32:01 Kerry: You could say new is just fridge
- 32:04 JBK: Something more general like fragment a fragment like partial or
- 32:12 RTH: How about "nothing beyond"? How about "nothing beyond it"? [Types "*nothing beyond*" replacing "no borders".]
- 32:15 JBK: Nothing beyond.
- 32:18 RTH: Does that do it for you?

32:20 JBK: Sounds good to me.

32:22 MM: Or I would say “just the object.” It’s just the fridge. [Kerry: Yeah.] It’s just the object. [RTH overwrites “just the object.”] This is very challenging. Yeah. This would be surely faster for me because there’s [inaudible] [she refers to her own sampling (see Part X), where her own samples are relatively simple.] [laughs] It’s hard for you, Kerry, cuz there’s lots!

32:40 JBK: [To MM] Your experience wasn’t that easy to describe it. [MM: No.] At least for me. [laughs].

32:54 RTH: So does this care. So, so right now what we’re trying to do is to get words down onto paper, so to speak, [MM: Mm-hmm.] that satisfies everybody that we’re reawakening the right recollection of what’s happening here. What’s happening here is that the refrigerator, she’s seeing the refrigerator. That’s all there is. There’s nothing beyond that,

33:15 MM: [reads green text] Does not block.

33:18 JBK: For me. I’m, I’m happy. Yeah, I guess so. Yeah,

33:21 Kerry: I feel good.

33:23 Kerry: Okay.

33:32 RTH: All right. [scrolls across many pages] So did we take care of, well we had a long conversation about “beat up,” but I think, I think we’ve sort of solved that.

33:42 JBK: [laughs] We chatted!

33:47 Kerry: Whoa,

33:47 JBK: [laughs],

33:48 Kerry: Is that all about the refrigerator? [RTH: Yeah.] Oh my God!

33:53 JBK: You shoulda seen I talks for Mel! [laughs]. It would be me just going on a tangent. [laughs].

34:00 Kerry: That’s so funny.

34:04 RTH: The issue, the primary issue as I recall it, for people who can’t remember this or didn’t read it at the, at the first time was: Was it the case that Kerry saw a beat up refrigerator and then recognized it to be her childhood refrigerator? Or did she see her child refrigerator from the get-go, and when asked to describe it could say, well, you know, it’s got scratches and it’s sort of beat up on.

34:28 JBK: I think we more agreed on the fridge, but it was about the yur and I, I put a yurt that you had previously been to and Russ didn't think it would previously been to, was important enough to leave in there. And then [laughs], we

34:45 RTH: We'll get a chance to get there.

34:47 JBK: Yeah, we got into, [Kerry: Oh my God!]

34:49 RTH: So were we just doing sample 3? Is that

34:52 Kerry: Yeah. Uh, was that 3?

34:56 RTH: Was that 3 or 2?

34:56 JBK: I feel like we've only done two so far,

35:00 RTH: So let's find 9.3.

35:06 Kerry: Hmm.

35:06 JBK: Yeah, I feel like we done three.

35:08 RTH: So did we do 9.2

35:08 Kerry: There two hinge ones then the, then the fridge, correct.

35:12 RTH: Yeah. Did we do 9.2?

35:14 JBK: Did I just misnumber these?

35:21 Kerry: 9.2 was Geneva, Lake Geneva,

35:25 JBK: We've done them all. We've done 'em all.

35:26 RTH: So now we're going to nine point what, what are we doing at 9.4? And, and all, all this is a, the reason that we have to go through this exercise is because that none of us have good memories. That's just [laughs]. That's you...

35:47 MM: But, so this is why I'm, it's curious. I understand what you're saying, but I also think like I'd be better equipped to try and do this week by week and then *review* it almost, you know, of like, I, I feel like each session we do this, this is what I'm craving to do at the end of all the samples. And then I'd arguably wanna revisit it as you go with the greater knowledge I have or something. Because right now I feel like really too far away from it all. That's just my personal...

36:20 JBK: Experience from, from my perspective. When I did DES before doing it with Russ, I did this kind of thing much earlier. Like I would code, like do the inner-seeing thing, like code the samples right after the interviews. And it wasn't a good idea. I was thinking

too much about coding and then the next day I would go in and my questionings were, I just wanted to get to the code. Like, is it a feeling? Is it inner seeing? So from that perspective, I think it makes sense to put it at the end of the process. Like first just focus on really understanding Kerry's experience. And then at the very end just, y'know...

37:00 MM: That is a good rebuttal. You have changed my mind.

37:06 RTH: I, and I couldn't have said any better. I think that that is why, that is why it is the, the, the, the risk is I would've said it all, all of what Julian said, and I would've said the risk is always that you take forwards what you, what you already think, you know. And that's a, that's a bad risk, that's a confirmation bias, uh, that's enacting confirmation bias. And I think confirmation bias is one of the biggest problems of life in general, probably, but, but, uh, the scientific method.

37:06 Russ comments: Mel's 35:47 question is a good one, and I don't think there is just one correct answer to it. We could have provided captions for the samples earlier, but then we would have had to devise some other method for avoiding confirmation bias, etc.

37:42 MM: No, that makes perfect sense. I agree with you. You've convinced me. [RTH has scrolled to sample 9.4.]

REVIEW OF SAMPLE 9.4 STARTS HERE

37:47 RTH: Number 4. So we're gonna agree that this is an inner seeing. [types "ISee."]

38:06 JBK: And also inner speaking,

38:09 Kerry: This was the one that was behind me.[JBK: Yeah.] [RTH types "ISpeaking," then types "(seer/seeing behind me)" then types "mashup"] I would say

38:42 JBK: This was somewhat lower. I think in the original description I wrote "somewhat lower opacity," but I didn't make it into the final description. But I wasn't, yeah, I wasn't entirely sure about the lower opacity.

39:04 RTH: Yeah. I didn't think it was lower opacity, which is probably why I didn't make it into the description. [JBK: (laughs) Well, there you go.] I, I thought it was the, the opacity deal was a sort of a red herring. I think Kerry probably *called* it a lack of opacity when she didn't know what she was talking about. But when it, when it turns out that she's got sort of several different seeings going on, all of which are opaque, but they don't, they take place in different realms or something like that.

39:30 JBK: Okay.

39:34 Kerry: I think I might've in this instance said "lower opacity" because of the, per the, it happening behind me. And so I was still like, the phone was still like right in front of my face. So like it, I I think that was just like a bad way of, of explaining it.

39:34 Russ comments: The discussion of *opacity*, both here and between about 25:00 and 27:00) is a good example of why words should not be taken to mean what Webster says they mean. Kerry has used *opacity* in two very different situations, and in neither does Webster's definition have anything, really, to do with her at-the-moment-of-the-beep experience. (This is not a criticism of Kerry—that's just the way it is in general.) It requires very careful interviewing to understand what people are *trying to say*, rather than being dazzled by what they actually say.

39:53 JBK: So seeing the seeing the phone was experiential. [Kerry: Yeah]. I would say seeing or how would you say that?

40:20 RTH: [continues to type "*mashup of imported/recalled scenes*"] So I'm not sure I tracked the discussion that we were just having.

40:23 JBK: [laughs], we were talking about seeing the phone. The phone. So to put seeing in the description

40:31 RTH: And is that about this?

40:34 JBK: Yeah.

40:36 RTH: Oh, she is, she is seeing the phone. [JBK: Yeah.] [RTH types "*seeing phone*"]

40:38 Kerry: [Kerry: Mm-hmm.]

40:46 MM: I think there's your *surprisedly* element here, cuz that was very relevant. Cuz she's going, *oh, I didn't realize they had any huts*. Like that was definitely that feeling. Whatever that however we're characterizing that was present here for sure. [RTH types "*surprisedly*"]

41:02 JBK: The kind of trying to place where it is, like where was this [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] But not as a separate thought itself, I don't think, but as part of the seeing.

41:15 MM: Yeah, part of the seeing the phone.

41:24 JBK: Yeah. It wouldn't go so far as to say surprisedly [RTH adds question marks to "*surprisedly??*"]

41:36 Kerry: I, I don't know how to explain this, but I would actually say that the wonder or the surprisedly element was tied to the speaking.

41:47 JBK: Oh,

41:49 Kerry: Inner speaking. Sorry.

41:55 RTH: So you were saying that in a surprised tone, is that what you mean?

41:58 Kerry: Yeah. I was kind of like, I forgot the exact words, but it was like, oh, or I was just saying the name, but it was like "Jenny, Jenny Creek Arestua." Like, and a confused tone because I just didn't realize that that existed. Confusion might not be the right word,

42:18 JBK: But I think if that's true, we didn't ask about it well enough

42:22 RTH: Right.

42:24 JBK: It'd be hard to complete.

42:29 RTH: That's why we've got the question marks there.

42:40 RTH: So this is the discussion. We did have a long discussion about this and have we resolved it? Part of the discussion had to do with the placement of the image. Part of it had to do with the mashing up. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] It was a mashing up. And Kerry does that. We we're gonna have some other mashups where she imports, imports things and puts 'em into the, the scene as best she can.

43:06 Kerry: Is the pink circle my head.

43:09 RTH: Yeah.

43:09 Kerry: Yeah. That makes sense.

43:11 RTH: I, I'm not an artist!

43:14 MM: It was sim, it was an undertone of judgment! [they laugh]

43:19 RTH: I'm guessing she didn't like the way, the way I characterized her nose. I think she probably, probably objected to that.

43:28 MM: Um, yeah. Wait, so sorry. The mashup is in regards to that there were elements of this that are from a different, like Yeah. Yes. Yes. Okay. That you getting

43:39 RTH: A better way of saying it?

43:40 MM: No, but I know what we're trying to say and I'm not satisfied by how we're currently saying it. [laughs] Um, should I put, um, um, yeah, right. Um, I like *recalled* better than *imported*. Imported confu or like, recalled is almost there. What am I, I

44:03 Kerry: Think technically both of these, like both elements of the scene are recalled because I've seen Eldora and I've seen this yurt in Wyoming. And so those are two recalled memories put together. I don't know if that fits that definition, definition, but

44:25 RTH: What what makes it somewhat interesting and, and I think a characteristic of a couple of other, of other samples is that your interest is in Arestua and you have imported, (which is why I like the word *imported*, but I'm not wedded to that word). You've imported, uh, Wyoming scene [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] As, as part of that. It doesn't fit

there. [Kerry: Yeah.] It, it comes, it comes from somewhere else, which is why we had this discussion about the Stukas somewhere. The what? From, from my, is there a book 2015 book? [He misspeaks: it is 2007 book] So the, in my, in my black book, the one with Eric Schwitzgebel, we had a, the, the subject had a sample where she saw, she was reading about World War II and she saw Stukas in some kind of a formation, bombing something or whatever. And when we asked her what the characteristics of these were, the, what those skuas actually looked like were modern jet fighters. [Kerry: Umm!] But she didn't see them as modern jet fighters. She saw them as Stukas, in much the same way. I think as, you didn't see this as a yurt in Wyoming, you saw this as a hut in Eldora, [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] even though it's physical characteristics, visual characteristics were somehow different.

45:50 MM: Okay. I get, I get it. Well that's sort of what I was thinking. Like, is it not every time you have to visually imagine a scene, is it not always taken from a recalled, imported thing, Kerry? Like I can't think of a time which it's just been a random thing that hasn't been linked back to a previous real-life scene.

46:14 RTH: Well, there's a full philosophical tradition about that. There are some philosophers that say that all imagery is that way, and it might very well be. [MM: Yeah.] What... I don't have a position on that. What I think is, is, that we're gonna see, so this is gonna be a question for Mel, whether we're gonna see a bunch of other imagery from Kerry, we've got, I think there is a fair number of other imagery and some of those are gonna be specifically imported from some other place, and others are going to be created on the fly, no doubt spawned by, spurred by informed by, some other kinds of characteristics, but not as explicitly as here. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.]

46:54 MM: Gotcha. Yeah. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.]

46:56 RTH: And so I think when we're gonna get there, we're gonna say, well *this isn't like that yurt thing!* when we get there, I think.

47:04 MM: Yes. Cuz some things are very explicitly... Right. Yeah. Yeah. I get you

47:09 RTH: Kerry's. No, not making up everything from her experience. She didn't, she didn't, she wasn't born with yurts or whatever. Everything that she experiences, she has got to have somehow it, it serves as the ingredients for what she has created. But, but that's not our job. That's the philosopher's job. So we good with number 4?

47:37 JBK: For me, yeah. Did we mention for the, the fridge that it was a childhood memory? That part of it in our caption?

47:50 Kerry: Mm. I don't think we did.

47:55 JBK: I think that it could be interesting, cuz as you said, there might be a lot of these.

48:01 RTH: So I don't, if, if your, if your question is did we, did we think that the fridge [scrolls] I guess I should have searched for fridge.

48:11 Kerry: It's number 3.

48:12 RTH: Number 3,

48:21 RTH: The fridge is *not* the same as the yurt, in my, in *my* thinking about it. And the difference there is the same as a Arestua is not the same as the yurt. She was thinking about a Arestua and created an image of a Arestua and while doing so somehow imported something el, *else* to it. And about the fridge, she was thinking about the fridge and created an image of the fridge. Didn't import, did *not* import anything else. [JBK: Yeah.] So the fridge is more like the seeing of Arestua rather than the seeing of the yurt.

48:55 JBK: Yeah. I'm not thinking of it in terms of a mashup control thing. In terms of a, a memory thing. Kind of also thinking about the flower crown thing. Maybe that's jumping ahead.

49:08 RTH: Okay.

49:08 JBK: I think there were maybe a lot of these things from memory. Um, or like, and if that's something to include.

49:20 MM: Yeah. But this is sort of the philosophical thing that I was saying. I don't think there are many that *aren't* directly linked to her memory. And then we'll find out as we go along.

49:34 RTH: I think, I think we'll find out as we go along. That's right. And so, so what we're trying to do is to keep things alive here, keep possibilities alive rather than answer questions. [types "*resurrected from memory*" into 9.3 caption.]

49:45 JBK: I think for this one memory, or at least it being *your* childhood fridge, Kerry, was important. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] Through the fridge. It wasn't Yeah. Random Home Depot fridge.

50:06 RTH: So do we want to put "*resurrected from memory*" into here [refers to sample 9.4, and does so]?

50:13 Kerry: Um,

50:16 JBK: Sure. [laughs] kinda see your point, Mel, about the slippery slope is putting it in everywhere.

50:24 JBK: We'll be putting them everywhere [RTH: We'll see.] as we go.

50:24 Russ comments: A fundamental DES skill, which is not well articulated here, is to keep very separate what is theorized from what is experienced. The *philosophical theory* that MM states is that all thinking, or at least all imagery, is in some way built upon elements that were originally actually seen. That may or may not be true (I'd bet against it, but my job is to bracket that). The *actual experience* is that Kerry innerly

saw a mountain cabin in an unknown location. The source of the ingredients in that experience is not the central aspect (or, indeed, any aspect, of her at-the-moment-of-the-beep experience). The DES task is to cleave to *what* is directly apprehended and bracket any theory about *why* it might appear as it does.

50:25 MM: Yeah. But I'll end up with no words on a page if I keep going like this, Julian! [JBK laughs]

50:34 RTH: So there's no 9.5. Does that mean that all we had was four samples?

50:38 MM: Well, I think we spoke *a lot* about the yurt that day. [laughs],

50:44 MM: I think we did do a lot less that day.

50:46 JBK: Yeah. A year. I was watching *Real Housewives of Salt Lake City* a few days after, and they, they went to a yurt on a mountain. [Kerry: Really?] Oh yeah. That's a yurt. [Kerry: (laughs) Like an actual canvas, wooden slat, yurt?] A canvas yurt!

51:03 Oh my God. That's very, that's weird [they speak over each other]

51:06 MM: What does that mean, Julian? You've gotta quit it all and move to a yurt.

51:10 JBK: I'd never heard of mountain yurts before. [laughs]. [Kerry: That's hilarious].

51:16 RTH: So we finished with day 8 / 9, and we're on to day 8. Okay. We're gonna do that. We wanna take a break? We're [inaudible] do this for 55 minutes?

51:25 MM: No, that's fine.

51:27 JBK: I'm good. Keep going.

Russ comments: The green meeting continues for another three hours, 1.5 hours remaining today and 1.5 hours the following week. The transcripts are shown only for the first half of the first day (here) and the last half of the second (day 12) of the green meetings, but the entire video recordings of both days are available.