

Kerry 3.
Kerry Interview 3

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the June 21 interview with Mel that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/6fVs8Aguf8s>. 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

Kerry = Kerry U.

0:00 RTH: So this is gonna be Kerry's day three. And we decided that there wasn't much to say before the recording started except that, that Kerry had said that she's not using the rubric that she had originally been using. And we will see as to whether that was a good idea or bad idea. [Kerry laughs] My guess is that it's a good idea, but keep an open mind in that department. Anything else that we should be saying before we look at beep number 1? Then I say, let's go for it. Beep number 1.

SAMPLE 3.1 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

0:33 Kerry: Cool. Um, so for context, I did this entire beep session over the course of a long run. So I was outside, not listening to music the whole time, and I was with a friend. Um, so beep one happened at 8:35 in the morning. Um, my friend Drew, who I was running with, was explaining a story. And so in the moment before the beep, um, I kind of had a scene in my head based on the story that, um, he was telling, um, about people that we knew. So, um, yeah, it was just my entire experience was very visual in this moment. Um, I was kind of pulling together the pieces of the scene that he was describing, which was basically, um, a chef—so we worked in hospitality together—so a chef that we knew was behind the bar in this restaurant, talking to two girls that we were both friends with.

1:36 Um, and then the third girl was kind of off to the side and silent. Um, I wrote "visualizing Sam, who's the chef, um, behind the bar on the left, and then Tami, Ali, and Katie are on the right." So it's almost as though I'm sitting on the end of the bar with those three girls, kind of looking in on this scene. Um,

1:58 And then I said, based on how focused I was on this scene, it was actually like "70—30," I would say, leaning towards the scene rather than my surroundings. Um, I was like very, very, it felt very detailed. I knew exactly where everyone was sitting. I could see the bar. Um, interestingly it was, he was talking about a bar that I'd never been to, but I chose a bar in Jackson Hole and like placed the scene at that bar, even though that's not where they were. Um, so yeah, in the moment I was just very, I was listening to him speak and talk, talk, tell the story, but I was very in the visual scene.

- 1:36 Russ comments: The main skill of DES is distinguishing between directly apprehended experience and all else. This turn is a mixture of directly apprehended experience (innerly seeing the friends at the bar) and much else: background (about where we worked), self-theory (deriving the 70—30 from the degree of focus), interesting explanation/observation (wrong bar), and so on. My does-she-adequately-distinguish-directly-apprehended-experience-from-all-else? antennae jangle.
I don't know whether she makes that distinction adequately—there are lots of good reasons why she might talk about all-else kinds of things (e.g., it *is* interesting that she visualizes the wrong bar)—but my antennae suggest that I will have to (a) be prepared to do some iterative training on this distinction; and (b) that there may be some grounds for skepticism about the seepage of plausible details into descriptions.
- 2:42 RTH: So tell us exactly what you see in this seeing.
- 2:47 Kerry: So the bar is a wooden bar. It's a nice restaurant. Um,
- 2:54 RTH: [interrupts] So I don't, I don't really care about the actual restaurant [Kerry: Okay.] or the actual bar. What I, [Kerry: Okay.] at this moment at least, I'm interested in what, what, what your experience, experienced seeing, seeing is.
- 2:54 Russ comments: I don't generally interrupt, so I suspect that my antennae had pretty significantly grabbed me. But for whatever reason, this is the beginning of this sampling day's iterative training about distinguishing between directly apprehended experience from all else.
- 3:06 Kerry: Yeah. Um, so Sam is kind of leaning over the bar talking to, um, Tami and Ali, which is two of our friends. And then our third friend, Katie, was kind of silent, um, because I think she was kind of mad at him, so [laughs]. Um, so I was more intently focused on I think the social dynamic, um, more than anything, because that's what the story was based upon. So I was really intently focusing on Sam speaking, Tami and Ali listening, and Katie sort of ignoring everyone. Does that [RTH: Okay.] help?
- 3:06 Julian comments: I wonder if focusing on the social dynamic is directly experienced. Or maybe it's more context—explanation for why Kerry is innerly seeing. But I wonder if there's a way to ask about it that doesn't fall prey to a problem I often have where my questions snowball, bringing up confabulations about experience. If I ask about it and it's not directly present, I risk reifying it and distracting us from what is actually there.
But it could be possible that some social dynamics are part of the seeing. Some Katie-mad-at-Sam-ness could be part of it. I'd compare this to sample 2.2 where Kerry was seeing a social block on her calendar. "Social block" is something more conceptual than just seeing a yellow rectangle on a computer screen. Although at this moment, Kerry doesn't experience it as a concept. She experiences it as directly visual. Katie-mad-at-Sam is more conceptual than just seeing four people at a bar. Maybe conceptual is the wrong word. It involves the relation between people and Katie's feelings. It's complex. But I don't think for Kerry, if it even is experienced at all, it's conceptual. I think it's directly visual.

So I'm wondering if there's a way to ask about this stuff without confusing context and experience.

Russ comments: RE "Sample 2.2... 'social block' is something more conceptual than just seeing a yellow rectangle on a computer screen."

The issue in sample 2.2 was not whether the block was conceptually a social block; the issue was what was the natural occurring unit of the perception. For example, when driving do you see an octagon that is mostly red with some white on it above a long narrow appendage, or do you see a Stop sign? I think the answer is that the natural unit of perception in that situation is the Stop sign. Doubtless there is some neural processing of edges and colors, and so on, but that is far below the natural unit of perception. In sample 2.2, the natural unit of Kerry's perception at that moment was not a yellow rectangle but rather a social block.

The issue here in sample 3.1 is what are the natural units of Kerry's perception, and I think she does a pretty good job of describing them as "Sam speaking, Tami and Ali listening, and Katie sort of ignoring everyone." It is not more granular than that (the unit is *not* a tall individual in a white shirt wearing glasses and with short hair—it is *Sam*; etc.). But it is not more conceptual than that (the unit is *not* social dynamics—social dynamics is an abstraction).

RE "I'm wondering if there's a way to ask about this stuff without confusing context and experience"

I don't think there is a general answer to that, other than to practice at not confusing context and experience.

3:49 RTH: And, and is this a in-motion seeing? Or, or a still picture?

3:55 Kerry: This one was more still. Um, I think I could see like Sam's lips moving, but everything felt very still overall.

3:55 Russ comments: There are at least three possibilities: (a) Kerry sees in motion but the seen scene is mostly still except for Sam's lips; (b) Kerry sees a still scene but plausibly injects Sam's moving lips; (c) RTH has asked a more specific question than Kerry was prepared for at the moment of the beep. I don't know which is correct, but my antennae still jangle.

4:04 RTH: And in color? [Kerry: In color, yes.] Black and white? [Kerry: In color.]

4:06 RTH: And clear?

4:09 Kerry: Clear. Very, very clear. Very sharp.

4:11 RTH: As sharp as, more sharp than, not as sharp as if you were actually seeing this kind of a scene?

4:18 Kerry: I would say, um, it would be like a photographed with again, sort of, um, almost loses focus as you get to the edge. And then that's where my surroundings begin. Um, yeah. But very sharp, um, [RTH: Okay.] in terms of detail.

4:39 RTH: Okay. So I'm happy with the visual aspect, at least for the moment. Julian, wanna ask any questions about that or shall I move on?

4:46 JBK: Um, so Sam is on the other side of the bar and Tami, Ali, Katie are, are on the other side from him or on the same side as him?

4:58 Kerry: On the other side from him, but kind of on the same side as me. It's almost as though I'm viewing this from a, a fourth bar seat. So I'm looking down the bar.

5:07 JBK: So you're looking kind of down.

5:09 Kerry: Yeah. And Sam's on the left

5:11 JBK: Is there order to where they're sitting like Tami, Ali, Katie. [Kerry: Yeah. So who's like closest to you?

5:17 Kerry: Closest to me was Ali then, then Tami, then Katie.

5:23 JBK: Okay.

5:25 Kerry: Which is actually, ironically, I don't know if this means anything or is helpful, but that's probably the order in which, how close we are as friends. I would say I'm closest with Ali, then Tami, then Katie.

5:42 JBK: And, um, and is it, what's kind of like the space of this image? Is it just like you see them or is it like you're looking at a image with, with them in it?

5:42 Russ comments:
RE "...of this image?"

This question presumes that there is an image, which implies a Cartesian understanding of consciousness: that there is an image and, separately, a seer of that image. That's probably not true, and if it is true, the question assumes what is at issue.

The culprit is nounification: you have transformed an action—innerly seeing her friends—into a thing—having an image. Having an image/thing implies all sorts of unwarranted aspects for example, that the image exists as a thing among other things, and so it would be plausible to explain what is next to the image.

It is almost always wrong to say "having an image" or "seeing an image," but there are exceptions. For example, in my book on schizophrenia I described experiences where the patient innerly saw an image curl up and float away, or an image that was spattered with black ink (and the ink was on the image, not on the people who were in the image). In those cases it is indeed appropriate to say "having an image"—the image had its own characteristics. But such cases are by far the exception.

The bottom line: unless the image itself has seen characteristics (borders, glossiness, etc.), then it is not correct to say that you are "seeing an image."

5:56 Kerry: Um, I, sorry, the, the spacing of it, is that what you said?

- 6:02 JBK: Like kind of, uh, the visual space? Like is it like you're looking at something in front of you or is it just like you're in the scene immersed, you see them, you see Sam?
- 6:02 Russ comments: "Visual space" is an abstraction, and it is not possible to describe an abstraction. (As the *D* in *DES* suggests, *DES* limits itself to descriptions; *visual space* is in the *all-else* category.) JBK could have asked something like: "Does it seem like you're seeing a *picture* of this bar scene? Or does it seem like you're *in the bar*, seeing your friends around you?" That would have been a request to describe the phenomenon. The good news is that Kerry doesn't respond to the abstraction and instead describes the phenomenon.
- 6:11 Kerry: I sort of see it as though I'm sitting next to them, so I can't really see their lower half. I only see their upper half. Um, and, and it, yeah. And we're kind of in a line sitting next to one another.
- 6:29 JBK: Okay.
- 6:30 RTH: And is there sound involved? Or do you, do you hear anything? Or....? [Kerry: No.] You know they're speaking, but, but, okay.
- 6:40 So now I would like to move on and talk about the surroundings. So I, it's obvious that you're listening to what, uh, Drew is saying because you're creating a scene, but that doesn't necessarily mean that that's in your experience. So you can, you can be *processing* what he is doing and have your experience entirely wrapped up in this visualization that you're doing. You're obviously processing it because you're making a, you're making your own private movie about it or whatever, [Kerry laughs] but, uh, but that doesn't necessarily mean that it's experienced. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] So I would like to know, about the rest of the scene, what is and what isn't directly in your experience, given that none of it *has to be* in your experience or all of it *might be* in your experience?
- 7:22 Kerry: Um, you mean more broadly in terms of what I'm physically experiencing as well?
- 7:29 RTH: So I don't really care about what you're *physically* experiencing. What I care about is what is *directly apprehended*, which *might be physical*. [Kerry: Okay.] So for example, you're running [Kerry: Yeah.] And you're not tripping over the, over the curb or wherever it is that you are. So obviously you're visually processing the, the roadway or path or whatever it is that you're on. But that doesn't necessarily mean that you are, you are experiencing that directly, in a directly apprehended sense. [Kerry: Yeah.] You're obviously skillfully processing it cuz you're not falling down or running into Drew.
- 8:02 Kerry: Yeah. Um, I would say, so I would say this scene in my mind was most dominant. I wasn't looking at Drew or really like, I, I think he was to my left when he was speaking, but that was not my focus or really part of it. I was like hearing his voice. Um, that was a huge part of it, cuz I was listening to the information, um, and visualizing, visualizing the scene. And I think I was taking in my surroundings enough to not fall. But I did feel more immersed in the scene, I guess, than, um, than where I was stepping. Um, I have

a general idea of where I was, but not a general idea of like what exactly I was stepping on, if that makes sense.

- 9:06 RTH: So, so this is really, I think, part of the very difficult portion, or one of the things that has to be mastered, about DES and about the, about experience. Because obviously you are in some manner experiencing the, the roadway and, and the voice. There's no question about that. [Kerry: Um-hmm.] But the question is whether that's directly apprehended by you, that, that you're, you're obviously experiencing it in enough way to navigate and understand and whatever, but, but it's, but it is, it is entirely possible for that to be taking place automatically. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] While, because your interest for whatever reason is in the, the, uh, visual space that you're creating, the bar that you're creating.
- 9:59 And I'm not trying to talk you out of that. What I, what I'm trying to do is to sort of level the playing field about, about it. I'm trying to break us of the habit, I guess you would say, of saying, *well, because my friend is talking, I must be hearing that*. I don't think that's true. [Kerry: Mmm.] Your ear, your eardrums are processing it, your brain is processing it, you're creating a picture based on that. But that doesn't mean you hear it at all experientially, directly apprehended experientially. And that's the, that's sort of the distinction that I'm trying to get across here at this particular moment.
- 10:36 Kerry: Can you give an example of what it would be like to hear something experientially versus hearing something non experientially [laughs]?
- 10:46 RTH: Well, for, for example, right now, I'm guessing that your left elbow is on the desk or the chair or whatever. [Kerry: Yeah.] And it's been there the whole time and you've been processing it directly because you haven't fallen off the chair [mimes falling over] or whatever. [Kerry: Yeah.] But I'm guessing that over the last five minutes, you haven't been paying attention to your left ear, [corrects himself] your left elbow, excuse me, your left elbow. It hasn't, it hasn't been part of your directly apprehended experience. [Kerry: Mmm.] You've been skillfully processing it, doing whatever it has to do in, in order to keep, keep track of that, but not in your direct apprehension.
- 11:21 Kerry: Okay.
- 11:22 RTH: And I think the same thing can happen with a, with a voice. I mean, you, you could be skillfully processing Drew's voice because you're creating this peer, this picture that in your head, but that doesn't mean that you're, you are experiencing *directly* his voice in a *directly apprehended* sense. That could be just sort of, I'm entirely wrapped up in the scene.
- 11:50 Kerry: Hmm.
- 11:51 RTH: But it's *also* possible that I *am*, I *am* experiencing that. I'm not that, and, and my, my goal in this conversation right now is to, is to try not to convince you that it has to be one way or the other, [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] but to convince you, I guess, to convince you that it *could be* one way and it could be *another* way. [Kerry: Yep.] And, and most people most of the time take it for granted that, well, y'know, *if he's talking and I'm*

understanding, well, I must be paying attention to his voice. But that, I don't think that's necessarily true. *Might* be.

- 12:26 Kerry: I think in this particular instance, um, I would say I was experiencing his voice because I was very intently focused on the story. I have had plenty of times in the past because I do get sort of lost in scenes and my own thoughts that sort of my own audio talking to myself while people are talking where I'm definitely not experiencing, um, their voice. But I think in this particular case, in this beep, I was. It felt like part of my
- 13:03 RTH: Okay. And I'm not, I'm, I'm not at all gonna try to talk you out of that. What, what I would say is that the last five minutes that we've spent here has been more aimed at *next week's* sampling than at *today's* sampling. Because I don't think you're in a position to have adequately made that discrimination on this particular beep. [Kerry: Mm-hmm!] It's water over the dam, so to speak. [Kerry: Right.] And so I'm not disbelieving you, I'm also not believing you. [Kerry smiles] I'm, I'm holding that, I'm holding that as one, one possibility. And that next, next time when you sample, it'll be easier, probably, for you to attend to whether that auditory phenomenon is actually present to you or whether you're skillfully processing it even though you're not paying attention.
- 13:48 Kerry: Mm-hmm. Okay.
- 13:51 RTH: My, my, what, the way the world is, as far as I can see, is that there's thousands or millions or whatever of phenomenon that are going on around us all the time. And we destroy most of those, even though we process them that skillfully. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] Y'know, there, there's all of your body and then there's the sound of the air conditioner and the scene outside your window and, and, uh, whoever's in the next room and all, all that stuff, most of the time you're just filtering out, *probably*. You're processing it because if somebody in the next room said, "Hey, Kerry," you'd hear that. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] But, most of the time it's filtered, or whatever.
- 14:32 Kerry: Okay.
- 14:34 RTH: For *some* people. Actually, some people don't filter at all. [Kerry laughs] They got all those things going on, all at the, all at the same time. So I'm not trying to say it has to be this way or it has to be that way. I'm just
- 14:45 Kerry: Got it. Okay. It's kind of a hard thing [inaudible]. [RTH: So...] It's a hard thing to, um.... It's like breathing, y'know. You don't think about breathing, you just breathe, almost. [corrects herself] So no, not *almost*. That's what you do. So it, it's hard to, I think, distinguish between how, how much a person's voice is part of your inner experience, but maybe knowing that, all this will be easier.
- 15:18 RTH: So I think that's a great example. The breathing, the breathing is a great example. And the, and, and so I'm guessing that at the moment of the beep, it would be *easy* for you to say, "well, I'm particularly paying attention to my breathing," or "I'm not particularly paying attention to my breathing." [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] That's a skill that you have. And I think you can master the, sort of the same kind of a skill about, about

listening to somebody. I'm either, I'm paying, either I'm attending, I'm obviously breathing and breathing skillfully and doing, doing whatever, getting exa—, exactly the right amount of oxygen and whatever; my, my body is a complicated machine doing its thing.

15:56 Kerry: Yeah.

15:58 RTH: And I think, I think there's lots of things like that that can be happening skillfully without attending to it and some *with* attending to it. So, I'm good about this beep. I think, I think I'm ready to go on the next one, unless Julian has,

15:58 Russ comments: We have spent 15ish minutes talking about this sample, and probably 11ish (maybe more) of those minutes was RTH talking about skills that have to be acquired for DES to be successful. RTH within a couple of minutes had become convinced that Kerry was innerly seeing, and after he became convinced of that he was much more interested in the threats to fidelity than he was in details of the inner seeing itself. (He had already gotten enough details to satisfy him that the experience was inner seeing.)

But there had also been enough antenna-jangling talk that RTH apparently felt the necessity to devote most of his (and Kerry's!) energy to the bracketing of presuppositions and the support of Kerry when she tries to do so.

DES is about describing the directly apprehended experience that was ongoing at the moment of the beep, and avoiding all else. If the *all else* appears in Kerry's description (see the comment at 1:36), then it is more important to start the process of bracketing whatever *else* has appeared that it is to describe the experience itself. Otherwise, the description is a mixture of description of directly apprehended phenomena (which I would call diamonds) and something else (which I would call glass, see the [Mel May Interview 1](#), 0:10), and a mixture of diamonds and glass is glass (see [Mel May Interview 4](#), 1:13:31).

16:19 JBK: Um, I did have another question. I was wondering if we would come back to it, but we didn't. Um, but you mentioned something about one of your friends being mad at Sam. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] And, um, I'm not, I, I didn't write down which one it do— is. Tammy, Ali, or Katie. [Kerry: Katie.] Katie? [Kerry: Yeah.] Katie, yeah. Um, but is that context? Or is that at this moment, like that's part of your experience somehow? Or is it just too hard for you to say like, it's too far in the past?

16:19 Russ comments: That question worries me because I don't think Kerry adequately discriminates between directly apprehended experience and all else, and this question invites an all-else conversation.

16:53 Kerry: Um, I think, I think I mentioned that because visually, um, she was almost in less detail. Partially because she was blocked by T, uh, Ali and Tami, but also because yeah, she just wasn't as sharp because it almost felt like a, a, my brain was pulling together the dynamic of what Drew was describing. So I, I felt like that context was important because it, um, it is what informed my visual.

16:53 Russ comments: This is a combination of description (“less detail”) and an *else* (speculation about causation). As I said at 15:58, we will have to help Kerry bracket this particular *else*. This context is indeed interesting, but it would be even more interesting if we could keep the description (what does “almost in less detail” really mean?) separate from the explanation (“because my brain was...”). To *bracket* does not mean to ignore; to bracket is to limit the influence of the natural attitude in the descriptive task.

Here, I suspect that it is true that Kerry has blurred the seeing of Katie for some motivated reason. This is, if memory serves, the second time this kind of motivated blurring has occurred: in sample 2.3, she blurred the inner seeing of a slide deck because, I think, the details of the particular slide deck was unimportant. So I suspect that it is likely that Kerry is a skillful manipulator of the degree of focus of her inner seeing. But I do *not* want Kerry to tell me about such things—I would never be able to figure out whether that is accurate or faux generalization. However, if we can structure a situation where Kerry can carefully describe the experienced details, then I can (perhaps eventually) make a true generalization that has warrant to be believed.

The bottom line: I pay much more attention to potential confluences of experience and all else, and spend much more energy trying foster the distinction between experience and all else, than I do to getting the experiential details. The attempt to gather the details of the diamonds in a mixture of diamonds and glass is glass.

17:42 JBK: Okay. Um, I’m, I’m good on this beep.

17:42 Russ comments: If you take it, as I do, that the main skill of DES is helping Kerry to distinguish between diamonds and glass so that she can eventually describe diamonds with fidelity, then JBK has missed an important opportunity. RTH will try to capitalize.

17:46 RTH: So that raises an issue that I would like us to, to talk about. So the, the question, “what do you *see*?” is apparently, “well, I see my friends clearly except for Katie who’s not so clearly.” That’s what I *see*. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] And *then*, so that’s the phenomenon that’s present to me [snaps fingers] right at the moment of the beep. I’m, I’m seeing this scene, [Kerry: Yep.] these guys are clear and those guys aren’t. *Then* there’s the explanation or the background or the context [Kerry nods affirmatively] or whatever about the scene. And I would like us to keep those things separate.

18:16 Kerry: Okay.

18:17 RTH: So when, when we ask about what you *see*, then we’re talking about the phenomenon. This’s, y’know, I, I see Sam clear and I see Tami, Tami clear, and I see Ali clear, and I see Katie not so clear.

18:28 Kerry: Mm-hmm. Got it.

18:31 JBK: But I think it, I think that’s a great point to keep them separate if they’re totally separate. Um, but if there’s something here about the part of this image is figuring out the dynamic or something, and it may well be part of it, and then, um, then you could

say that. I think it's gonna be really hard to tell for this one, honestly. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] But I, I think that's something we could keep. What, what do you think about that, Russ?

18:31 Julian comments: This is in line with my comment at 3:06. But the phrasing is worrying. I say "part of this image is figuring out the dynamic or something". First of all, it's not helpful that I'm still talking about an image rather than about what she sees. Second of all, "figuring out the dynamic" may be context and what's directly experienced is seeing four people and Katie's blurry.

Russ comments: I agree.

19:06 RTH: I, I think as we develop the skill of keeping track of the difference between context and phenomenon, then it will get to be easier for us to be able to say, well, I was seeing Katie unclearly, or, or I was seeing Katie mad at [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] Sam. [JBK: Um hmm.] And that could be part of the, part of the phenomenon that presents itself. [JBK: Alright.] That's part of the, that's part of the skill. That's that, that's, that's why that we need to practice this stuff over some number of days because we have to figure out...

19:49 Kerry: What is important,

19:51 RTH: ...what, what's important for *you* and what, and the way you do it, which is not gonna be the same as I did it, or Julian would do it, or Mel did it, or whoever else would do it. We have to, we have to figure out how to communicate about Kerry's experience, which is what's interesting and what we're doing. Beep number 2?

20:13 JBK: Two.

SAMPLE 3.2 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

20:16 Kerry: Cool. Um, so beep number 2, the time was 9:11 in the morning. Um, I was visualizing [laughs] an Instagram post, which was an ad for a, a thrifting shopping event, um, that is scheduled for tomorrow. Um, so I was trying to almost read the details of the ad to remember what time it was starting and stuff, but it was very much the visual of the ad.

20:55 JBK: Um, just a context thing, you got these beeps this morning? [Kerry: Yeah.] Okay. Okay. So when you say for tomorrow?

21:03 Kerry: Yes. Yeah, sorry, [laughs].

21:05 JBK: Okay. So you have, uh, you're visualizing an ad, but it is a mental picture. You're not like looking at your phone seeing the ad.

21:16 Kerry: I had previously seen the ad on my phone, and I was almost trying to bring that up in my mind again.

21:23 JBK: So what, what do you see?

21:27 Kerry: It wasn't as sharp as I wanted it to be, um, which was annoying [laughs]. So I can see almost like a slightly abstract or slightly blurred version of the ad. The ad had, um, cream and sort of light red background and then Western style, um, headline text. So I could see the blobs of cream and red, and I could see like the structure of it, like the, the way that the, the brown text kind of curved over in a semicircle at the top. And I knew that there was text on the bottom, so I was trying to get there, but it wa—, it kind of was just showing up in blurry colors. Um, this was in the, [laughs] in the shape of a, of an Instagram post. So it was, um, 1080 by 1920 pixels. (I only know that, cuz I used to work in social media), but it was, it was a much smaller, it wasn't a scene, it was like, it was as though there was a card in front of me or, or an Instagram sized post in front of me. Um, [JBK: Mm-hmm.] centered in my vision and I was trying to read it, but it was very blurry.

22:43 JBK: And it's a still, still thing, right?

22:46 Kerry: Still? Yeah. No, no movement or anything.

22:50 JBK: So Western text, brown Western text on top. Western, is that as in a font or like a style of font?

22:56 Kerry: No, a style. Kind of like what you see if you were to pull up, I don't know if you've ever been to Jackson Hole before, but, um, a lot, there's a lot of like saloons and the cowboy bar,

23:06 JBK: Ye ol' wagon wheel salon

23:07 Kerry: Yeah. Yeah. Kind of what we'd like on a *wanted* poster, almost. Um, so that [JBK: Okay.] style of, um, serif text.

23:16 JBK: Is, does any of the text say anything at this point? Or is it just kind of nondescript?

23:22 Kerry: It's very blurred. Yeah. It, I wouldn't even describe it as,... I know it's text because I had previously seen this exact image, so I knew it was text, but in my mind in this moment, it was very blurred.

23:37 JBK: Okay. Do you mean *blurred* literally? As in like, like a blurry photograph where things are, have these kind of bokeh or whatever? Or do you mean blurred as in indistinct, not filled in or something else?

23:52 Kerry: Um, I mean, blurred, uh... It's kind of hard to describe because, uh, I'm thinking of it from like a design, like a Photoshop. But you can, you can literally in Photoshop put like a blur layer over an asset and it will slightly, it will just slightly make stuff illegible. So it's, it's like everything is just softened slightly, if that answers that. Um,

24:26 JBK: Yeah.

- 24:27 Kerry: Or y'know, when you're looking at something and you can have you, have you ever blurred your eyes? Like you can blur your vision?
- 24:33 JBK: Yeah,
- 24:34 Kerry: That's what I was kind of seeing almost that,
- 24:38 JBK: Okay, Uh,
- 24:38 Kerry: blur layer over something I had originally seen in a sharp sense.
- 24:44 JBK: Some people might mean blurred as in *Oh, just the detail isn't there*, but, or sometimes it could be like the literal, yeah, the Photoshop blur effect. [Kerry: Yeah.] Um, so cream and cream and red background and kind of western style brown font and something at the bottom, blurry colors at the bottom. But do, do y'know what the, those colors are or?
- 25:08 Kerry: It was a thinner text with details about the event. So it wasn't the same as the headline text, it wasn't as bold. Um, but it was the same colors, so it was the same brown, um, with two lines towards the bottom that were blurred though. So it kind of just [JBK: Mm-hmm.] looked like two, two very fuzzy rectangles, almost.
- 25:29 JBK: And the scene is, it's, it's not like you're fully there immersed in it. It's like it's in front of you?
- 25:36 Kerry: Yeah, almost, almost like a, a honestly, like an Instagram post size in front of me. So I would say I can see more of my surroundings and I'm trying to [JBK: Okay.] read an ad that I had previously seen that was quite small.
- 25:53 JBK: Is it somewhere, is it overlaid on your surroundings or is it in its own kind of space? Like the image, the image is in a separate thing? A separate thing from the surroundings? Or does that not make sense?
- 25:53 Russ comments: Recalling the comment at 5:42, this is an instance of the nounification of *seeing* into the *it* of "is *it* in its own kind of space" and *the image*. There is no *it*. There is no image. Any question about them destroys, for me, the believability of any answer that follows.
- 26:06 Kerry: For, for me? Yeah. No, no, it makes perfect sense. For me. It's overlaid in my surroundings. It's as though it's as though it's layered. So if this, if these are my surroundings, [holds the back of her hand up] um, it's like that. [places a credit card vertically over the back of her hand] So I can't see what's behind it. It's not see-through. [JBK: Okay.] It's a lot smaller because my surroundings are bigger in this example, but it's as though it's layered over top of it.
- 26:06 Russ comments: Yes, it makes perfect sense, and that's the problem! The rest of the turn makes perfect sense if you conceptualize the seen Instagram post as a thing, as an image. But whether that reflects her actual experience is another thing altogether.

26:35 JBK: And, um, are you paying attention to the surroundings at all at this moment? Or is it really just about the image?

26:35 Russ comments: This is a Cartesian question, through and through. It presumes that there is a seer separate from the image and the surroundings (part and parcel of the nounification of the seeing). The problem with such questions is that (a) it makes the answer unintelligible and, worse, (b) it is iterative training in diametrically the wrong direction.

Said another way, I'm no mind reader but it would appear, for the reasons I have stated, that there is a Cartesian presupposition operating in Julian, which to the extent that he wants to be able to hear what Kerry (or anyone else) is saying, he will have to bracket.

26:43 Kerry: Um, I think I'm, I mean, I'm processing my surroundings cuz I was running on a trail and I wasn't falling. Um, but I would say as an example, I, I wasn't quite aware Drew was either to my right or behind me. I wasn't really paying attention to him. I was really trying to focus on the details of this. Um,

27:13 JBK: Yeah. Just kind of the question Russ was asking before about how much the surroundings is part of it and here [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] it does seem to be much more, or maybe even entirely on, on the image rather than surroundings.

27:13 Julian comments: I think I realized I was heading in the wrong direction and tried to walk it back. My prior questioning did not help Kerry separate what was directly experienced from what wasn't. But rather than ask about that in an even way that helped Kerry on the next day and the next, I instead just announced my own conclusion: "it does seem to be much more, or maybe even entirely on, on the image rather than surroundings."

It would be better to give Kerry the chance to ponder this. And the alternative that she's seeing the ad, and processing her surroundings skillfully in some way, but not directly apprehending them.

27:28 Kerry: Yeah, I think it felt, in this instance it felt less immersive. Sorry, this scene, [air-quotes for scene] it wasn't really a scene cuz it was just one thing that I was really trying to [JBK: Mm-hmm.] bring up in my mind. So that felt less immersive than other scenes that I have, um, put in my mind previously. So my surround-, it felt, I could see more my surroundings. [JBK: Mm-hmm.] And I think I was slightly more aware in this instance just because it wasn't a full scene. It was just one thing.

28:05 JBK: Yeah. Is, is there like a, a, *trying to remember* as part of this? Is this a kind of remember-y seeing? Or is that just context, like you're trying to remember but at this moment it's really just visual, like you're just seeing this thing?

28:20 Kerry: I, that's exactly what I was doing. I was, I was trying to remember the details. Um, and this is actually how I would take exams for context. So I used to write everything out and then I would read my notes, um, when taking exams. [laughs] So it was almost as though I was testing myself to remember the details of this event. So I was trying to

see it so that I could tell Drew whether or not I would be going to the event based on the time, but I couldn't see the details and therefore I couldn't commit to the time.

- 28:55 JBK: Okay. So, so it's yes, in terms of one option is it could just be a visual experience. You're just seeing, y'know, the red background and the brown font, whatever. And then it could be like this visual as, as part of like a, trying to remember. So you think, you think it's more the, the second option?
- 29:22 Kerry: Yeah. Or I mean the visual I think was only pulled up in my mind so that I could give an answer as to whether or not I would be attending. And, and that to me was part of remembering the time. So if I could remember the time, then I could make a decision, but I couldn't remember it at the time.
- 29:46 JBK: Okay. Yeah, that's another thing about, on the question of context and experience, like, um, it could be that *trying to remember* is just the context or it could be that it's part of it. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] So yeah, I think that's a really tricky question. [Kerry: Yeah.] Um, and yeah, we can keep looking into that. Ru, Russ, do you have something to say about, about this right now?
- 30:19 Kerry: Sorry, I'm just gonna plug my laptop in.
- 30:22 JBK: [RTH is seen to be speaking with no audio] You muted, Russ? I think you're muted.
- 30:24 Kerry: Oh, I think he's, yeah,
- 30:27 JBK: You are *muted*. [Kerry laughs]
- 30:32 RTH: Sorry about that. [JBK laughs] What I was saying was that, uh, we've talked quite a bit about colors, cream color, red color, brown color, whatever. Are you particularly interested in the colors? Or is that just a, a fact that the, I'm I'm telling you what color this was, I'm seeing this scene and they happen to be cream color and red? Or is it like I'm somehow particularly interested in the red or the cream color or the brown?
- 30:58 Kerry: I wouldn't say I'm particularly interested. I think my, I typically, I think in this instance it was really trying to refer back to what it was in reality. [RTH: Ok.] So like what, how it looked like when I was trying to...
- 31:16 RTH: ...recreate the original scene...
- 31:17 Kerry: ..., it's almost like I was trying to see something that I couldn't see without context or something. Um, and it just happened to be those colors. I wasn't particularly passionate about [RTH: Okay.] those colors.
- 31:27 RTH: And, and I would say, we talked a little bit ago about, well this is a small thing and so there's more there surroundings to be seen or something like that. I wasn't immersed in it. [Kerry: Yeah.] That I would, I, I would say that that's a plausible story and it might very well even be true. And I'm, I'm not saying it is or it isn't. What I'm, what I'm, what I'm trying to get us to do, I think, is to bracket away (what I call *bracket away*) the

plausibilities. That *because something seems like it ought to be that way, that's the way it must be*. That that's the kind of thing I *don't* want us to do. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] I would like us to pay attention to what actually happens, whether it's plausible, or reasonable, or unusual, or wacky, or whatever. This is the way. So this is just the way the, the experience is. So it *could be*, it's, I think it's *entirely possible*: I've sampled with people who have a very small thing, very small visual thing, and they're *entirely* into that. That's only a piece, a little small piece of their visual field. The rest of the visual, their eyeballs are no doubt processing that the retina and LGN and whatever else that processes of your visual experiences are doing their thing. But as far as my directly apprehended experience, it's just this little postage stamp that I'm looking at. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] So I'm, and I'm, I'm not saying I'm not believing you. What I'm saying is it takes some practice to be able to set aside the, what seems like the natural world, [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] to pay, pay attention to what's there.

33:05 And I would say we're doing a good job. We're doing, we're doing exactly what it is that we need to be doing here. [Kerry: Good!] So I'm, I'm happy as a clam [Kerry laughs] as to what's going on.

33:13 Kerry: I don't know if this is bad to say, but I was kind of taken aback at how visual all of these beeps were. Cuz normally it's a lot of *audio* going on in my brain, but this morning it was almost exclusively visual, which is very interesting. Um, I don't know why! [laughs]

33:13 Russ comments: There is a hugely important moral to be drawn from Kerry's comment here, because all of her samples from day 2 (3 out of 3) involved visual imagery, and one of the three samples discussed on day 1 involved visual imagery. Therefore it is possible that her experience is actually predominantly visual (as our samples so far suggest), so her self-characterization is mistaken (is what I have called a faux generalization). Or it is possible that our samples so far are unusual and we will never again encounter an inner visualization. Or the visualization is an artifact of the DES procedure. It's too soon to know with confidence. I don't really care which of those is correct; I do care that we figure it out.

 The important moral is that we simply should not (or at least not yet) blindly trust Kerry's self-characterizations of her inner experience. She could, and no doubt would easily, give a plausible "explanation" for why her inner experience is predominantly audio and rarely visual, but the plausibility of that "explanation" is not at all evidence for its fidelity.

 The bottom line is that we need to continue to iteratively train Kerry to discriminate between plausibility and actual experience (between glass and diamonds) and to convey that difference reliably. *Then* we may be in a position to say with fidelity something about Kerry's experience. Until then, we should have no confidence.

33:35 RTH: So what I would, what I would say about that is yes, I agree that it's interesting. And it could very well be that you've got more visual stuff going on than you thou—, than you thought, [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] so you're mistaken about being think, thinking that you're always audio. Or it could be that this was an unusual day and for whatever reason that today was an an a visual day. And all of those things would be *equally interesting* to me. I I don't, I don't favor one of those approaches [corrects himself] or one of those

results over the other. [Kerry: Mmm.] What's *interesting* to me is to try to get each individual one *right*. [Kerry: Right.] And then after we've sampled for half a dozen days or whatever, then we can go back and say, *well, I, I do have a lot of visual stuff*. Or we could say, *well, that was a crazy day. I had a lot of visual stuff* then, [Kerry laughs] *but I don't have any visual stuff any other*. We'll have the *data* about that, [Kerry: Right.] as opposed to what I call a faux generalization, what seems like a reasonable story about myself, which might be true, y'know, might, might not be.

34:34 And so I would, I would like us to set all those things aside. My technical term for that is to *bracket* that, put all, all those theories—that *I'm an audio person, well maybe I am*—but, but let's, let's put that in brackets, which means let's not go *looking* for it. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] And let's not, let's not try to color, color, our actual experience with some expectation about that. That's what I mean by putting into, put that stuff in brackets. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] We'll see whether it is or see whether it isn't. [Kerry: Cool.] That's what makes this stuff interesting, actually. [Kerry: Yeah.] On to number 3?

32:34 Russ comments: That, to my ear, is a good example of leveling the playing field, of encouraging us to bracket presuppositions. The comment reflects that Russ will be personal with Kerry (he is not giving an abstract lecture about presuppositions in general); he will be personal about himself (yes, he *did* find it interesting); he forthrightly advances the possibility that Kerry as an individual might be mistaken; he does *not* claim that *he* knows the answer but *she* doesn't; he is equally happy to have the results go either way; he values fidelity to Kerry's experience over any pet theory of his own. (Viewers can judge for themselves whether he conveys those things.)
DES is simple. Get yourself into a position where all those things are genuinely true about yourself, and then say whatever comes to mind. But pretending to do so is not adequate, and being genuine about all those aspects is not easy. Simple, yes; easy, no.

35:14 JBK: I gotta run for a charger, so sorry.

35:15 Kerry: No worries. Do you want me to wait?

35:18 RTH: Yeah, we probably oughta wait.

35:20 Kerry: I'll wait. It's okay.

35:20 Russ comments: The upcoming chatting, while JBK is gone, is intended to stay away from sampling issues so that Julian doesn't miss anything.

35:24 RTH: So are, are all the beeps today in, on, in the running?

35:28 Kerry: Yes. I think except for the very last one I was home, um, and not running. But all the first five were on this run. It was a long run [laughs].

35:40 RTH: Okay. And I'm, and I'm, I'm, I'm just filling time here. I'm not saying I like one set of beeps, one one one or the other. [Kerry: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.] Where, where were you running?

35:51 Kerry: Um, actually at the base of the Tetons, um, in this, on this really beautiful trail around Jenny Lake. Um, I can try and show you a photo. I don't know if this will pop up, but it's very pretty. Yeah.

36:08 RTH: That's cool. That's very pretty.

36:15 JBK: Alright.

36:16 Kerry: All good?

36:17 RTH: Number 3.

SAMPLE 3.3 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

36:18 Kerry: Okay. Number 3 was at 9:28 in the morning. Um, and this one was actually just, I, I was just playing the chorus of a song [laughs] from a band that I like. Um, I wasn't listening to any music on this run; Drew and I weren't talking. Um, and I was just, I don't know if you've heard of the band Always before, but I'm, I'm seeing them in September. So I've been listening to their music a lot, just generally. And this chorus was playing over, over and over in the moment before, um, the beep. And it was just saying "there's no holding"—I'm not gonna sing it! [laughs] Um, but I was hearing it sung in my mind, [laughs], but the line is, "There's no holding back." Um, so I, I think it went off on "holding." [RTH: Okay.] And I was repeating that.

37:12 RTH: And by repeating do you mean just that section? "There's no holding back," "there's no holding back," "there's no holding back," "there's no holding back." [Kerry: Yes.] And by hearing, do you mean I hear the band the way I would hear it if I were listening to a recording of it or whatever?

37:26 Kerry: Yes. It sounded, it sounded as though the song, like I had headphones in my ears even though I didn't.

37:33 RTH: Exactly? As far as you can tell?

37:35 Kerry: Exactly. Yeah. The same. I've playing this song generally on repeat. So I felt like I had a pretty good recollection. And so to my knowledge it was as similar as the band's.

37:51 RTH: Okay. And that, and, and I'm, I'm, I don't think you're in a position or anybody else is in a position to know whether things are *really* veridical. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] But they, you are in a position to know whether *it seems like* that's veridical, and that's really what I'm asking.

38:01 Kerry: To me it seemed like it. Yeah.

38:01 Julian comments: The actual lyric is "There's no turning / there's no turning / there's no turning baaaack." Kerry reported that the lyric was "no *holding* back."

Russ comments: There are at least four possibilities: Her inner hearing at the moment of the beep was not an exact copy of the actual song, even though it presented itself as veridical; at the moment of the beep she heard “holding” but on retrospection she recalls “turning”; even when she is listening to the real song she (mis)hears “turning” as “holding”; the line Julian quotes is not the line Kerry is referring to. We are not in a position to sort this out. Perhaps we will encounter other samples on later days that provide a clue as to which is correct.

In an important sense it doesn’t matter: all four of those options accept that at the moment of the beep Kerry is innerly hearing a (seemingly veridical) repetition of the band’s performance.

In another important sense it matter’s greatly: We shouldn’t uncritically accept that Kerry is giving (or can give) a veridical account of the relationship between her experience and the outside world. This is not a criticism of Kerry in particular—it’s the way it is for all of us (except, perhaps, for those who have achieved nirvana, about which I have no personal knowledge).

- 38:03 RTH: Okay. And so you’re hearing it, you’re hearing it just the way, just the way this band actually sounds. [Kerry: Yes.] And are there any distinguishing characteristics about it? Or is this the, the experience the same as hearing it on, in headphones?
- 38:17 Kerry: Um, I think the only distinguishing, uh, factor about it was, would be that I, uh, only knew the next line. So I, I didn’t, I couldn’t like, couldn’t continue with the lyrics, if that makes sense. Or, or in the minu– minute leading up to it, I couldn’t remember any other lyrics. So I was just singing this one loop of the chorus. Um, because I, I couldn’t remember the other words. So that’s the only distinguishing factor is that it was a bit of a loop rather than the full song.
- 38:49 RTH: Okay. And so what, what I’m understanding you to be saying is, is not like I’m experiencing myself as not loading, not knowing, so I have to go back; but I don’t know it and so the fact of the matter is that I *am* going back. But what I’m hearing is this section of the song, and then this section of the song again, and then this section of the song again. And while I’m hearing it, it seems like I’m hearing the band playing it.
- 39:11 Kerry: Yes.
- 39:13 RTH: Okay. And is there anything else in my experience at this particular moment?
- 39:18 Kerry: Um, I felt more present in my general surroundings. Um, it was a really beautiful section of the lake; Drew was right behind me; I didn’t have any visuals laying on top of my surroundings. Um, it was very much, I felt very, I wasn’t really thinking. It felt like I wasn’t thinking anything. Um, and I was just a little bit more present in what was going on. This was the closest thing I’ve ever felt to not thinking anything [Russ laughs] [laughs]
- 39:56 RTH: Think, thinking is a, is a, is a, turns out to be a strange word, actually in, in my wor ,in my world. But yeah. So, so would you say that you are more into the song that you’re

hearing? Or more into the scene around you? 50—50? Or that question doesn't make sense?

40:14 Kerry: No, it makes perfect sense. I think I was, it's probably 80—20. It was almost, as in terms of surroundings to the 20% of the song, um, the surroundings were definitely more dominant. Um, I guess it's a little bit hard to say cuz it did, like I was *hearing* it, but it, [exhales] it didn't feel, [perhaps something extraneous occurs on computer screen] oh my gosh, sorry [inaudible]. Um, it didn't feel as dominant as some of my other thoughts. It felt like background music or, um, yeah, background music is probably a good way to explain it.

40:14 Russ comments: Kerry's initial description (36:18) made it seem like the inner hearing was the dominant feature of her experience. Why the discrepancy? Perhaps I misunderstood the first salvo; perhaps there are several ways of looking at this; perhaps Kerry's presuppositions about context have overwhelmed the actuality of her experience over the course of the intervening four minutes. I don't know. An object of the iterative training is to help Kerry become more efficient and secure in her opening descriptions so that there is less ambiguity across the descriptions.

41:02 RTH: Okay. And then about the surroundings, what is present to you?

41:11 Kerry: Um, the trail, the rocks on the trail, the brush slash the mountainside is on my left side. I noticed the, how clear the water was and I could see the rocks through the bottom of the water, even though I was at a distance. Um, I could see in the horizon where the trail was going to eventually turn and kind of end, cuz we were approaching the end of our run. So I felt like I was taking in a lot of visual detail. Um, I know exactly where I was, um, in that moment.

41:43 RTH: Aaand that, that's quite a lot of detail. Is all of that directly present to you? So I, at the same time as I'm seeing the rocks, I'm also seeing the water and I'm also seeing the boulders underneath the water, and I'm also seeing the trail all present to me at the same time?

42:03 Kerry: I would say it was probably more focused on the, or *most* focused on the water, um, and how clear it was and how I could see the bottom, even though I was technically on a trail that was about 30 feet above the water and I could still see the bottom. So I was visually more focused on that. But, um, because you're trail running and you could hit a rock at any time, I'm kind of looking out and then down to make sure that I don't fall. So I, I wouldn't say they're necessarily equal in that moment that the beep went off. I was looking at the water... mainly

42:46 RTH: So that that, that, that's a, a good example of what we were talking about a little bit ago. So there are mountains around you and whatever, and, and those mountains are clearly in your experience in *some* way, but that doesn't necessarily mean that you are directly apprehending the mountains at this particular moment. [Kerry: Um hmm.] You *could be* sharing your experience between the, sharing your *direct, directly apprehended* experience between the rocks under the water and the trail, in which case you've sort of annihilated experientially [Kerry laughs] the mountains—they're,

they're gone *for you* at that particular moment. [Kerry: Yeah] They'll be, they'll be back a little bit, a little bit from now, but, but for that particular moment, it's possible that you've destroyed them. [Kerry: Yeah.] Or it's possible that the mountains are still some kind of a presence for you experientially. I don't want to rule out either one of those things, but, but I want to use it as an example of, of of how it's possible, all the things that are around when you, you, your original description was of, of sort of the whole landscape, which was probably a true story. The mountains were over there, the trail's going this way, it's turning off to the left. I'm 30 feet above, whatever. All those are, are facts of the universe that you were in at that particular moment. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] But that doesn't necessarily mean that all those things are experientially present to you at that time.

44:11 Kerry: I think that's a really solid point. And in this moment in particular, the mountains were not, I was not experiencing the mountains. I was experiencing 80% of the water, 20% of the trail in terms of the visual, what I was taking in, in this exact moment.

44:30 RTH: Okay. And anything else in your experience?

44:30 Russ comments: It should be noted that RTH's "Okay" does *not* mean that he accepts as true Kerry's 44:11 account. Kerry was not adequately skilled at the moment of the beep to make that distinction, and what she says about it now might be true but might be just plausible. The present conversation has been far more about *next week's* samples than about *yesterday's* samples, and RTH has made the important distinctions clear.

Here again, this should not be taken as a criticism of Kerry; it is the way attempts at fidelity have to proceed.

44:39 Kerry: No.

44:40 RTH: So for example, you're running, your feet are moving, your feet are hitting the ground, your arms are swinging, you're breathing.

44:49 Kerry: Yeah. All of that's happening. And I, I guess the only other thing is, yeah, heavy breathing at this point was, but that felt very physical. I don't know if that's relevant. [laughs]. I don't know.

45:03 RTH: So the, the question is whether it's directly apprehended, [Kerry: Hmm.] which it, um, which it could be or it might not be. So it's, it's, and and I don't think that, I don't think we're in a position to be able to answer that question looking back. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] This conversation, most of the conversation today is mostly about tomorrow rather than this [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] yesterday, basically, [Kerry: Yeah.] or this morning. And, and so what I, what, what I, what I'm trying to get us to do is to recognize that there's a lot of stuff that's going on that I'm skillfully processing: my breathing, and my footsteps, and my arm swinging, and where, where my partner is, and how tired I am, and what time it is, and I gotta, meetings are coming up, when, and how hungry I am, and all that stuff. I'm, I'm, I'm processing all that stuff, but not necessarily before the footlights of my consciousness at any particular time.

- 45:58 Kerry: Mm-hmm, that makes sense. I'm, I'm, as you're talking, I'm changing my rubric. [laughs] [Russ laughs]. I dunno if that's helpful or not.
- 46:13 RTH: I don't know whether it is or not. We're, we're gonna what we're what I think what I think we're about here is we're trying to, we're trying to figure out how we can talk to each other in a way that we know what we're talking about.
- 46:24 Kerry: Right.
- 46:25 RTH: And, and, and it's, it's a challenge. It, it's, and it's not like I'm trying to hold something back and I'm only telling you what're what, what it's, y'know.... I don't, I don't *know* what's important to talk about *with Kerry*. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] Kerry doesn't know what's important to talk about with *us*. We gotta we gotta try to figure that out. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] And one of the distinctions that we're gonna have to try to make, make clear is to what extent things are what I sometimes call *before the footlights of consciousness*, which in this particular case sounds like might be the clear, clear lake with the, with the rocks underneath it and the trail; and the rest of that stuff is context or whatever. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] But we gotta get practice at, at noticing that.
- 47:19 And, and it could be that next time we will, you'll come back and you'll say "All the rest of all that stuff that I, that I said was, was there, [Kerry laughs] it wasn't really there at all! It was just the, it was *just* the picture and that's it." That might be true. [Kerry: Yeah.] Or it could be the next time you'll come back and you'll say, "Y'know, all those things that I said probably weren't there. Well they, they really *were* there. I've got the mountains. I *am* seeing the mountains and the, *and* the trail and the, and the water *and* my footsteps *and* all that stuff are all directly present to me at the, at a particular moment." Either way would be fine with me. I don't have a, a preference other than we try to get at the, at the way Kerry's experience actually is
- 48:00 Kerry: Mm-hmm. I think, I think this is all making more sense to me. So that's, it's, it's a good learning process.
- 48:10 RTH: It *always is* a learning process. So I, I, *for sure* I don't want you to think to yourself, *oh, I'm a I'm a dummy. I should have been able to figure that out. That's not true. It's not possible.* We, we *have to* go through this kind of a conversation.
- 48:25 Kerry: Mm-hmm.
- 48:26 RTH: And, uh, and most people don't, which means most people don't really understand each other, but we're trying to work it out and it, and it takes some effort.
- 48:38 Kerry: Yeah.
- 48:42 RTH: On to number 4?

SAMPLE 3.4 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 48:44 Kerry: I think this is [JBK: Yeah.] oh yeah 4. Okay. [laughs] Number 4. The time was 9:39. Um, and I was still running. And um, I in this moment was visualizing my neighbor's dog's

face [laughs a lot]. I'm trying not to give you too much context cuz I don't wanna like project things, but that's what I was *seeing* in that moment. [laughs]

49:17 JBK: Along you separate context from what you, you're seeing you would you think is useful. [Kerry laughs]. So the, so the neighbor's dog's face. So what exactly do you see?

49:29 Kerry: Um, the dog specifically? It, it's an older dog. So it has a bit of, um, gray hair on its jawline. It's kind of an orangey color. It looks like a, it looks like a yellow lab, but with like a slight red tint. Um, he has sort of big brown eyes and he constantly makes a face where it looks like he's smiling really big. So he's kind of like this all the time. Um, and so that's kind of the,

50:00 RTH: So, so can I, can I interrupt this story to make, there's a big distinction between the way he always is, and the way he usually is, and what you saw at this particular moment.

50:00 Russ comments: RTH is hammering home the same distinction that he has been making throughout today's sampling: let's distinguish between directly apprehended experience and all else.

50:09 Kerry: Okay.

50:11 RTH: So what Julian was asking you about [Kerry: That's what I was ge— ...] what, okay.

50:16 Kerry: Yeah.

50:18 JBK: So here is he doing the smile thing or

50:18 Russ comments: That is an unnecessary (and undesirable) nounification, making the smiling into a thing. It would be better to stick to the action: "Was he smiling?"

50:20 Kerry: He's doing the smile thing? Because I was specifically, I was telling Drew about his smile. So, um, yeah, I was visualizing that as I was commenting on it.

50:35 JBK: So there's a dog, he's orange-y like yellow lab, reddish. He's doing the smile. Are you, is focused on any particular part of this picture or is it just you see a dog? Or is it like, I'm more seeing the smile of this dog or the eyes?

50:35 Russ comments: There is no picture, so she is not possible focusing on some part of it. She is seeing the dog. There is no image in 51:17. See the comment at 5:42.

50:56 Kerry: I would say the facial expression was the most important part. Um, I wasn't, but I, and I, I didn't have any of his body but his ears and the top of his head and stuff were less of my focus. Like the focus really was the smile and kind of his, his eyes.

51:16 JBK: Okay.

- 51:17 Kerry: His expression
- 51:17 JBK: You're not focused on his body. Is isn't there in this mental image of body, a background stuff, but it just, you're not focused on it? Or is there not?
- 51:28 Kerry: There's no body. It was, it was uh, almost like someone cut his head out of a photo or something and I was just looking at his head.
- 51:38 JBK: Mm-hmm. So this dog with his facial expression smiling. Is is there anything else at this moment?
- 51:51 Kerry: I was in the middle of, of a sentence, um, telling Drew I'm late to walk a dog or I'm, I'm late to walk this dog that I had previously been describing as a very smiley, happy dog. Um, and so I was speaking in this moment, I said, "I'm late." I think it beeped at... . So I I it beeped at when I said "dog" after "I'm late to walking this dog."
- 52:21 JBK: Alright. I actually, I, I wanna go back to the visual thing. I think it was too quick moving on from that. Um, so you're seeing this, this dog's expression. Um, it's not, it's more just the expression, there's no like body whatever. Um, what, what is that like? Is it like, is it overlaid on whatever you're act, whatever's actually in front of you, like a trail or whatever that is? Or, or is it just in its, is it its own thing? Or something else?
- 52:21 Russ comments: This whole series of questions assumes the thing-ness of the seeing, which is not warranted. See 50:35.
- 53:04 Kerry: This was overlaid, um, but also I'm kind of the least, I would say I'm the least confident in this visual, um, compared to the other ones, which are very clear in my mind. Um, I can't really remember. Like, I, it was hard for me to me to discern how big his head was in comparison to everything. Like in the other ones, I felt very confident in what I was saying about how dominant they were. This one was kind of, I don't know if it was cuz it was just his head, um, and rather than a scene or, or what, but I, I was the least confident in this visual if that makes, if that's an issue. I don't know.
- 53:04 Russ comments: I'm no mind reader, so I don't know where the lack of confidence comes from. But at least one possibility is that JBK has asked about the *image* characteristics, and there is no *image* so there are no image characteristics. Because Kerry no doubt has the same thing-y presuppositions about images as does JBK, but the *seeing* does not have *image* characteristics, she loses her confidence in the experience. In short: her lack of confidence might arise not from a failure to notice her experience with fidelity, but because her noticing conflicts with her (and JBK's) presuppositions. I don't know whether that is true, but it is certainly possible.
- 53:50 JBK: So, so confident about what like the, the size of it or what was in it or the clarity?
- 53:56 Kerry: Um, just how dominant it was in my brain. Um, I think originally I wanted to write that it was small cuz it was just his head, but then it felt larger as I was writing that, so I didn't write that down. Um, but yeah, it was, was just his face and, and I was thinking about and focusing on his visual expression. Um,

- 54:26 JBK: Yeah. I guess what Russ was saying before, like just because something *should* be small doesn't mean it *is* in your experience. Like, just because [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] it's just a phone picture doesn't mean like all of your attention can't be there. Like, just because it's just his face and not his body, it doesn't mean it has to be smaller. It could [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] take all of your attention. So
- 54:49 Kerry: This one felt bigger, but I, yeah, I think it was bigger, but I'm just not as confident on the, on this one.
- 55:00 JBK: Okay. So and bigger could mean like visually bigger, like just bigger in front of you. Or it could just, it could be that just all of your attention is somewhere and it doesn't matter how visually big or small it is because just your attention is there. Does, does that make sense? [Kerry: Yeah.] Or is there more you could say about how this image appears?
- 55:31 Kerry: I think I was pretty immersed in his facial expression, and therefore it felt more dominant in my experience and it felt bigger, even though technically speaking his head would've been if I was looking at him in real life, smaller.
- 56:00 JBK: Mm-hmm. And you... Ru, Ru, Russ?
- 56:05 RTH: Yeah. Can I, can I, I wanna make sure I understood about the con. You mentioned that I'm not confident about this one. Are you, and I wanna know what, what it is that you're not confident about. Do you, is, are you saying I'm not confident whether I'm actually even seeing this? Or are you saying, well, I'm seeing it but I'm confident—I'm, I'm seeing the dog clearly, but I'm not confident about some other stuff.
- 56:28 Kerry: I think I feel less confident about this one because the beep was going off and Drew was still talking. So I was, as I was writing it down, I was kind of frazzled and trying to go back to the exact millisecond to right before the beep. So that is where the lack of confidence comes from. I definitely was visualizing his face in that moment. Um, but I, because I was, y'know, the beep was going off and Drew was talking, I was like, wait, wait, wait, stop, stop, stop. I need to focus. Um, and I can't, I couldn't even remember in the next like few seconds how dominant this image was in my mind.
- 57:10 RTH: So there's no question; I'm, I'm totally confident that at the moment of the beep I was seeing something about the dog's face [Kerry laughs]. [Kerry: Yes.] Is that true?
- 57:19 Kerry: Yes.
- 57:20 RTH: And what I'm not confident about is some of the aspects of that, some of the, how that fits in or how dominant it's or something. [Kerry: Yeah.] And I would, and I would say that the, this, things happen and we we're, we're not shooting for perfection here or trying to do it as good a job as we can. And sometimes we'll fall short of that.
- 57:47 JBK: Um, so because it was maybe harder for you to tell how much was in your experience, I'm, I'm gonna drop the, the line of questioning about if it's overlaid on, on the world,

like what you're seeing in front of you or not. I think those are really hard things to distinguish. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] But, uh, I would like to move on to the sentence "I'm late to walk this dog." Uh, are, are you speaking that or hearing yourself speak that in your head or,

57:47

Russ comments:

RE "I would like to move on to the sentence 'I'm late to walk this dog.'"

That cleans up the original, which was (51:51) originally "I'm late" and then was altered on the basis of a plausibility argument to "I'm late to walking this dog." That is, there were substantial qualifications that lead to (or should lead to) substantial skepticism about the account. It is risky to ignore the qualifications on a description. At the very least it conveys that you didn't hear or don't care about the qualifications; worse, it makes it difficult to discover what led to the qualifications in the first place. Here, for example, it is possible that Kerry wasn't really attending to what she was saying to Drew—the words are coming out as she innerly sees the dog. I don't know whether that is true, but cleaning up the account makes it unlikely that we will discover whether it is true.

58:19 Kerry: I was speaking, I was saying that out loud to Drew. Um, so speaking [JBK: Okay.] that sentence.

58:25 JBK: You were speaking it out loud, um. But you're unsure how much of your experience was the dog image and how much was the speaking? Um,

58:37 Kerry: Yeah, it, i I mean it feels like it would, it would've been 50—50. Cuz it's like I'm, I'm looking at this image of the dog and I'm telling my friend in response to this image of the dog in my head that I need to wrap things up because I need to go walk this dog. Um, but again, I, I think I was just like kind of a little bit frazzled at, at this beep. So, um,

59:09 JBK: Okay. Yeah.

59:09 Kerry: it's hard to discern.

59:13 JBK: And, and it could very well be 50—50 or it could be that just because, oh, it should be 50—50 cuz both of these things were happening, so it must be.

59:22 Kerry: Yeah, that's what I'm nervous about saying that.

59:24 JBK: But It doesn't necessarily have to have to be 50—50. Um,

59:28 RTH: So I would, I would amplify that and say it could very well be 0—100. So it is quite possible to be speaking a coherent sentence and not, not have that in your experience *at all*. I'm, in my experience, I'm totally wrapped up in the face of the dog. I'm telling my friend Drew about that and the words are coming out of my mouth, but I'm not paying attention to the words *at all*. The fact of the matter is those words are coming out and the beep happened at the word *dog* or whatever. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] But that doesn't have to, that doesn't have to be experienced. Just like you were running at

that time and you were putting your left foot in front of your right foot and then in front of your left foot and in front of your right foot and, and you weren't paying attention to that at that particular time, probably. You're doing it skillfully. It was coming outta your body. You were doing it. [Kerry laughs] You're, you're... A sentence can work the same, same way. And I'm *not*, again, saying that's the way it was, I'm saying [Kerry: Right.] what I want us to do is to bracket the, the notion, *well if I'm talking I must be paying attention*. Excuse me. Cuz thing things in the, in the imaginary world don't necessarily work that way.

1:00:31 Kerry: Hmm. Makes sense.

1:00:35 RTH: And my role as timekeeper, we've hit, we've hit an hour, so we probably oughta...

1:00:39 JBK: Mm-hmm. Wrap it up?

1:00:41 RTH: ...decide whether we're gonna do this again. And,

1:00:46 JBK: Uh, I'm, yeah, I would like to

1:00:48 RTH: Me too.

1:00:49 JBK: Great. Me too.

CONVERSATION AFTER THE INTERVIEW ABOUT SAMPLE 3.1

While writing a description of sample 3.1, Julian wrote some methodological Notes. Russ inserted some comments (in green) into Julian's text.

Julian comments: A lot of the session was spent distinguishing content from experience. Just because Kerry is jogging doesn't mean that was before the footlights. Just because Drew was talking doesn't mean Kerry directly apprehended that.

RTH: RE A lot of the session was spent distinguishing content from experience.

First, do you mean *context*, not *content*? [JBK: Yes, I did.] If you really meant *content*, perhaps that might shed some light on our difficulty in discussion content in the Mel descriptions.

Second, and more importantly, I would say that a better description of what I did in this interview was to try to distinguish directly apprehended experience from all else (where *all else* includes content, context, theory, presupposition, plausibility, facts of the universe, etc.).

JBK: I also did want to find out more about the visual space of images and asked about this throughout. I don't think I was ever especially clear. I also didn't want to push too hard because it could me more detail than we can really get out of these samples (iterative training). We did ask about stuff like this before but there was a long break in sampling, so we should take a step back. I don't quite know the best way to proceed because even a phrase like "visual space" may come with presuppositions. That images arrange themselves in some kind of space. Kerry has reported elements being overlaid on the world in front of her. [RTH: I think it likely (or at least possible) that the overlaying is presuppositional. There were lots of occasions in this interview that suggested that Kerry did not

distinguish adequately between facts of the universe and directly apprehended phenomena.] JBK: But Russ, I remember you previously writing to me that we have to be careful with this because it may indicate participants not knowing how to report on visuals. It may be the case though. [RTH: I think “visual space” belongs to the category of abstractions that are confused with phenomena, and therefore it is always (or almost always) misleading or worse to inquire about it. You can ask “what did you see” (as you did, which was good), and then you can ask “As you see it, was Drew to the right or the left? And Ally? And Katie?” etc. Those are questions about phenomena, about what Kerry (innerly) sees. It is absolutely OK to inquire about that. But if you nounify visual space and then try to inquire about the characteristics of the visual space, then you don’t know what you are talking about, and neither does Kerry, but because you are both nice guys you will likely maintain the conversation about it. The resulting conversation will be collusion, not description.]

Still, I wouldn’t trust reporting from this day on how exactly Kerry saw these images. I do trust more the reporting on what was in them.

I also asked about Katie being mad at Sam and if that was part of Kerry’s experience. Katie was less detailed. But is this a purely visual experience? It may be that there is a cognitively figuring-out part of it that’s inseparable from the image itself. For that reason I put “Kerry was trying to picture the scene” outside of the brackets. I think that was part of the experience.

CONVERSATION AFTER THE INTERVIEW ABOUT SAMPLE 3.2

After the interview, Julian wrote this description of sample 3.2:

Sample 3.2 [Kerry was still running on the trail with Drew. She had previously seen an Instagram ad about a thrift shopping event.] Kerry was trying to conjure an image of the ad to remember details like the event time [or time and location?]. She saw a cream and light red background [or light cream and red?]. There was curved brown Western-style text on top (like on a Wanted poster or saloon). There was text at the bottom too. The image was blurry though and nothing was legible.

It was unclear if running on the trail was part of Kerry’s experience.

Russ comments: Exercise 1 for the reader (answer before you read farther) My answer below.
Which is better? Why?

- A. Kerry was trying to conjure an image of the ad to remember the details
- B. Kerry trying to remember the details

Exercise 1 for the reader (Russ's answer)

Which is better? Why?

- A. Kerry was trying to conjure an image of the ad to remember the details
- B. Kerry trying to remember the details

B is better because she was not trying to conjure an image; the conjuring was a tool that she used or a byproduct of the trying to remember.

Julian's answer: B is better. Kerry isn't trying to conjure the image. She sees it. She may be trying to remember or maybe that's a description of the broader context. I like the phrasing "*In* trying to remember where and when the event was" because it leaves this ambiguous.

CONVERSATION AND EXERCISE ABOUT SAMPLE 3.4

After the interview, Julian wrote the following description of sample 3.4:

Sample 3.4 [Kerry was still running on the trail] She was telling Drew "I'm late to walk this dog." She simultaneously had a mental image of the dog in question. She was seeing his face and his smiley expression. The dog was an older reddish-yellow lab type. He had grey hair around his chin [or jowls or whiskers?]. Kerry was focused on his expression. She didn't see his body or background.

Russ comments: Exercise 2 for the reader (answer before you read farther) My answer below.

Which is better? Why?

- A. She had a mental image of the dog.
- B. She innerly saw the dog.

Exercise 2 for the reader (Russ's answer)

Which is better? Why?

A. She had a mental image of the dog.

B. She innerly saw the dog.

B. is better because Kerry is involved in an action—innerly seeing—rather than a collection—having an image. A. nounifies an action, and by doing so implies a Cartesian understanding of consciousness: that there is an image and, separately, a seer of that image.

Furthermore and similarly, referring to the image leads to such incorrect writing as “Kerry was focused on his expression,” which implies that there was an image (like a photograph) of the dog, and Kerry was zoomed in on the expression. That is not true. She is (innerly) seeing the expression, and that is all there is.

It is almost always wrong to say “having an image” or “seeing an image,” but there are exceptions. For example, in my book on schizophrenia, I described experiences where the image curled up and floated away, or the image was spattered with black ink. In those cases it is appropriate to say “having an image”—the image had its own characteristics. But such cases are by far the exception.

The bottom line: unless the image itself has seen characteristics (borders, glossiness, etc.), then it is not correct to say that you are “seeing an image.”

Julian's answer: B is better. A imposes a kind of Cartesian separation between Kerry and what she sees. The image is separate from her, something that she is looking out on. That's not the case. She's just seeing the dog.