

Kerry 4.
Kerry Interview 4

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the June 26 interview with Mel that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/OSbvONhJNGE>. 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.

Mel = Mel May

0:00 JBK Alright.

0:00 RTH: And this is gonna be Kerry 4.

0:04 JBK: Day 4.

0:07 RTH: Anybody have anything that we need to say before we launch?

0:14 Kerry: Um, oh, I just wanna,

0:16 JBK: [to RTH] Am I doing this one? Or you?

0:19 RTH: It's up to you, Julian.

0:22 JBK: Guess I could take the first one. [RTH: Okay.] Kerry?

0:26 Kerry: Um, I just wanted to say two things. Um, one, I did these yesterday, but I was very scatterbrained. Um, so I missed two beeps and didn't write them down. So the times are a little bit further apart for this one. [JBK: Okay. Um, that's fine to skip a beep, that's ok.] Yeah.

0:43 And then the other thing that I wanted to clarify, I keep talking about, um, like I do have a, a very visual brain and I keep talking about sort of the visual side of my inner experience and, and how those visions are overlaid the scene. And they are, but they're also see-through. And I just wanted to clarify that. So I do, I am processing to a smaller degree the stuff behind it, and I'm more in the vision, but I just wanted to, it's not like I'm, my vision is fully blocked and I can't see what's behind it, if that makes sense. But I just wanted to clarify that.

- 0:43 Russ comments: That comment jangles an antenna: it suggests a confusion between seeing an *image* and *inner seeing*. RTH will file that away as suggesting the likelihood of necessary iterative training.
- 1:21 JBK: Well, let's, let's go moment by moment for this one and then [Kerry: Okay.] we can look into that.
- 1:27 Mel: Um, wait, can I just ask one question? When you say you missed two beeps, what, what do you mean? As in they went off and you didn't even notice it? Or like what?
- 1:33 Kerry: They went off and I was in the middle of doing something and I, I, the beep like threw me off. I paused the beep and then I literally couldn't remember what was going on in my, my brain. So I discounted it cuz I didn't wanna make it up. [Mel: Um hmm.] [JBK: Okay.] Cool.
- 1:56 JBK: Uh, yes, we can. I, I will say if you can't remember at all a beep, you could also, you could also treat it as a beep and say, because it might be interesting why you don't remember or maybe we [inaudible] it. So,
- 2:16 Kerry: Okay.
- 2:17 JBK: So in the future if a beep comes and you don't know, it's still your choice whether you want to deal with it as a beep, but yeah. [Kerry: Okay, cool.] Alright, let's get into number 1 then.
- 2:17 Russ comments: My preference would be stronger: we should treat a difficult beep as a sample to be discussed because (a) what makes a sample difficult is often a characteristic of the experience; (b) skipping samples reduces or eliminates the nature of randomness; and (c) it makes the procedure seem sloppy or unimportant. (Sometimes there are good reasons for skipping samples, for example, the content is none of our business or taking notes would be dangerous to record.)

SAMPLE 4.1 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 2:29 Kerry: Okay. So beep 1 went off at 4:00. Um, I was holding my phone and reading an email out loud, so not just in inside my head, but actually speaking it out loud. Um, the line I was reading was quote, "working to embed the form." Um, and honestly this was the closest I've ever, uh, been, I think, to thinking sort of nothing. I was just literally reading the sentence out loud and there wasn't really much going on inside. So I was seeing the phone in front of me. I was generally aware of my surroundings (cuz I was on a walk while I was reading this email. Um, so I was walking forward.) But there were, there was no, um, there visual in my brain that was conjured up. There was no audio because I was speaking out loud. Um, so really my, I guess, my inner experience was just hearing my spoken voice.
- 3:28 JBK: Mm-hmm. [Kerry: If that makes sense.] So, so nothing visual. You are speaking out loud. And so it could be that your experiences is of speaking or hearing your voice. Uh, I wanna give another possibility that just because you are physically speaking doesn't

mean that's necessarily entering your awareness directly. It could be like, [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] you're, you're sitting in a chair now or a couch or something and you're doing it skillfully. You're not falling over. But before I called your attention to it, it was maybe just happening automatically. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] Um, so is your speaking out loud "working to embed the form"? Would you say it's more just fact of the universe you're saying this? Or are you also, y'know, is it before the footlights of your consciousness?

3:28

Russ comments:

RE "I wanna give another possibility that just because you are physically speaking doesn't mean that's necessarily entering your awareness directly."

In the interview (and now when preparing the transcript), I reacted to your raising this possibility by noting I hadn't heard anything from Kerry to suggest that. So I worried that that was coming from Julian, not from Kerry.

RE "Would you say it's more just fact of the universe you're saying this?"

This is a leading question, implying a preference for the fact-of-the-universe option. That (a) reinforced my worry that it came from Julian; and (b) jangles my is-that-confirmation-bias? antenna.

Confirmation bias is among the most pernicious biases of the human condition. Sometimes (rarely) it is okay to ask arising-from-Julian questions, but if you do, I think you have to genuinely be indifferent to the answer, and because genuine indifference is probably not attainable, you have to somehow indicate that you would prefer the *opposite* answer.

(See the comments at 39:26 and 59:50.)

Julian comments: I don't think I had a preference for speaking being just fact-of-the-universe. It was the only thing she reported as being directly in her experience. I think I was just being pedantically doubtful—*since it's possible to be speaking and for the words to roll out unaware, I have to ask about that*. It's taken me some time to realize that doubt in DES is not some pro-forma, checklist kind of thing. Instead, we have to base it deeply on what Kerry is saying. We have to be attuned to her experience and have our doubt, uncertainty, clarifications, and follow-ups come from that.

- 4:26 Kerry: I felt because I, so this was an email, that what I was reading out loud, this was an email that I had written and was sending to a client. So I was really trying it for it to make sense. Um, and so I felt more conscious of I guess the words that were coming outta my mouth.
- 4:46 JBK: Okay. So it's not fully automatic. You are conscious, you're, you're speaking, "working to embed the form" is, and you're speaking it out loud. Is this experience about, uh, producing the words, like, y'know, making those words come out? Or is it more about hearing the words or more about the meaning behind the words or none of the above?
- 5:17 Kerry: I think the meaning behind the words. I wanted to make sure that I was making sense. Cuz I was also speaking about something [laughs] I didn't really know that much

about. Um, so it was more, it was less about... Yeah, it was, it was more, does this sentence make sense? Um, yeah.

5:38 JBK: And, and what's, what's that like at this moment?

5:45 Kerry: What is it like trying to make sense of a sentence?

5:49 JBK: Or at this very moment? Um, uh, what, what, what is, what is that like, this, this speaking, trying to make sense? If [Kerry: Um...] [inaudible] your, your answer at any time?

6:07 Kerry: Yeah. It's kind of hard to explain. I would say I, when reading out loud, I try [laughs], I try to listen to the words as though I don't know anything about the subject. So,

6:26 JBK: But, but let's stay away from reading out loud in general and just... [Kerry: Okay.] Because it could be that every time it's like that or it could be different for different times. So [Kerry: Yeah.] let's stick to like this specific beep. And, and if you don't, if you're not sure for this one, that, that's okay and, and maybe on the next days we can see more closely.

6:52 Kerry: Right.

6:53 JBK: Do you have an idea [inaudible] specific beep what, what this experience is like?

6:59 Kerry: For this beep? It really felt like a listening exercise. So it, it felt more like, I'm hearing the spoken word. [JBK: Okay.] The dis, I think we've talked about the distinction between hearing and speaking. [JBK: Yeah.] And in this instance it felt more like, um, hearing [laughs].

6:59 Russ comments: Exercise for the reader #1 (my answers at the end of the transcript; no fair peeking)
Watch/listen to Kerry's 6:59 turn a few times. Then characterize what she said.

7:25 JBK: So more hearing "working to embed the form." Uh, are you hearing any specific part? Or listening to, closely to any specific thing? Or is it more, more broad, just hearing, hearing those words?

7:25 Russ comments: JBK cleans up "hearing"—that is, he does not honor the distress / unsureness that I think was evident in Kerry's 6:59 turn. That is, he transforms *I'm not sure but maybe hearing* into *hearing*.

This is, in my way of thinking, a form of confirmation bias. Hearing is easy, so let's confirm that we're talking about hearing.

7:41 Kerry: Really just kind of taking in my own voice.

7:45 JBK: Mm-hmm. Is, and is it taking in, in order to see that it makes sense? Or to see if a word sounds right, or, or, or not anything like that?

- 8:02 Kerry: Um, I think, yeah, just trying to make, make sense of, yeah, make to ensure that my email made sense.
- 8:13 JBK: Okay. So so you're speaking, "working to embed the form and, and you're hearing it as you speak it. Is it your, your normal voice, normal tone and pitch and everything? Or is there anything...
- 8:27 Kerry: Yes.
- 8:28 JBK: ...different? Okay. And, and then besides that, you said there wasn't really much, like you don't have a mental image, you don't have, you're maybe seeing your phone? Is seeing the phone more background just like you're sitting in a chair now, like it just happens to be happening? Or are you more, is it more present to you?
- 8:53 Kerry: I think my, my broader surroundings were more like the comparison to the chair because I was on a walk, so I was still walking, but I was not like... I was zeroed in visually on the phone, cuz trying to read an email while on your phone while walking in the phone was pretty close to my face. So
- 9:11 JBK: More zeroed in on the phone. And uh, so it could be that just because the phone is close to your face and you're looking at the email that that could still be background even though you might, you would say, *oh, it's close to my face, so it must be a big part of my experience*. That's not necessarily the case, although it could be the case. Um, do you think here it was, it was a big part of your experience? Or maybe not necessarily a big part, but was it part of your experience?
- 9:47 Kerry: I think the words themselves were the most dominant part of the experience, whereas even looking at my phone close up, I wasn't paying attention to like the lower half of it. I wasn't paying attention to the battery life in the top right corner. [JBK: Yeah.] I wasn't paying attention to how much service I had or anything. I was really like, the words themselves were the most dominant part of the experience.
- 10:11 JBK: Okay. So, so the main thing is speak out, speaking out loud "working to embed the form." And um hearing that as you speak it. Uh, [Kerry: Yes.] Does anybody else have questions on this? [RTH speaks with no sound] Russ, I think you're muted.
- 10:32 RTH: Sorry about that. I'm, I'm ready to move on.
- 10:35 JBK: Okay,
- 10:36 Kerry: Move on?
- 10:38 JBK: Alright, fine.
- 10:38 Comment: There is a comment called "POST-INTERVIEW CONVERSATION ABOUT SAMPLE 4.1" at the end of this transcript.
- 10:39 RTH: Number 2.

SAMPLE 4.2 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 10:40 Kerry: Okay. Uh, beep 2 was at 4:07. Um, I had a visual [laughs] of a silver Subaru driving on the road where I was looking, so I was still on the walk. Um, and audio of me asking a question in my own voice, um, the sentence, “would it be an issue to go higher?” Uh, I think the word *higher* was when it beeped.
- 11:10 RTH: So two things simultaneously. I’m seeing a silver Subaru and I, and there’s something about the audio: “would it be an issue to go higher?”
- 11:20 Kerry: Yes.
- 11:22 RTH: Equally present to you? One more than the other. Or...
- 11:26 Kerry: Honestly, this, the
- 11:27 RTH: ...the question doesn’t make sense.
- 11:28 Kerry: Uh, 50—50 in terms of, yeah, I was focused on the, on the visual, but the audio was tied to that as well. So equally [inaudible].
- 11:41 RTH: So let’s start with the vi. Let’s start with the visual. What do you see?
- 11:45 Kerry: It’s a 2008 Subaru Outback, um, with a cracked windscreen that I just bought two days ago. [laughs]. Um, it is, um, it’s got smaller tires. It, um, would, so it’s
- 12:01 RTH: [interrupts] Let me, let me, let me interrupt the story here for just a, just a second. So there’s two things that are at stake here. One is the actual Subaru. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] And, and the other is what you saw at the moment of the beep. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] And, and so let’s start with the part about what you saw at the moment of the beep, regardless of whether it conforms to what is or isn’t the actual Subaru.
- 12:22 Kerry: Okay.
- 12:23 RTH: So, so for example, the actual Subaru has a cracked window, but that doesn’t necessarily mean that you see that at the moment of the beep. [Kerry: Right.] Maybe it’s going in the other direction. So the question is, what do you see?
- 12:33 Kerry: At the moment of the beep I’m seeing the Subaru driving on the road. So slight movement to it.
- 12:41 RTH: Right to left? Left to right? Going towards you? Going away from you?
- 12:41 Russ comments:
Q: Why do you ask about direction with such specificity? Does it really matter what direction the car is going?

A: You're right, I don't really care which direction the cars are going. But I *do* care that we focus on *experience* and not on *actuality* (see the turn at 12:01 and 12:23), and I have found that inquiring about direction/perspective is a good way to encourage the participant to talk about experience.

- 12:44 Kerry: It's coming towards me. I guess technically speaking, kind of, so I was on the right side of the road, so sort of from right to left on my left side.
- 12:54 RTH: So it's sort of at an angle coming?
- 12:57 Kerry: Yeah, it was at an angle, yeah.
- 13:00 RTH: Okay. And, and are you, when you say "I'm on the road," do you mean I'm, I'm physically on the road at this particular moment? Or do I see myself on the road as well? Or is that the just the
- 13:10 Kerry: I'm on the sidewalk. Um, I'm not part of the visual.
- 13:13 RTH: In real, in real, in real life or in the seeing?
- 13:16 Kerry: In real life. Sorry. In real life I'm on the sidewalk.
- 13:18 RTH: So in the real life I'm on, I'm on the sidewalk, [Kerry: Yes.] on the right hand side of the road. [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] Okay. And then I see a Subaru on its right-hand side of the road, but it's coming, coming towards me. [Kerry nods affirmatively] Okay. And it's in motion?
- 13:35 Kerry: Yep.
- 13:36 RTH: Okay. And, and tell me, tell me anything more about what it is that you see, regardless of what, where, what, where you actually are or the actual Subaru.
- 13:49 Kerry: So the speed of the Subaru was going the same speed as an actual physical car that was driving past as well, on the same side of the road. Um, there was a physical real life Jeep and the Subaru in my mind was following that Jeep at the same speed.
- 14:08 RTH: So let me see whether I understand that. [coughs] Excuse me. The... and your *real* eyeballs are seeing a Jeep [Kerry: Yes.] driving towards you down the road. [Kerry: Yes.] And your *imaginary* eyeballs are seeing the Subaru (your Subaru) driving on the same road?
- 14:27 Kerry: Yes.
- 14:29 RTH: But, and, and is it in front or behind the, the, the Jeep or doesn't it... or overlaid on...
- 14:34 Kerry: The Su, the Subaru is behind—at a respectable distance—um, the Jeep [laughs].

14:40 RTH: So, so there's two different seeings, I understand two different seeings going on here. One real, of a real Jeep, and one imaginary, of a of a, an existing Subaru, but, but the Subaru isn't there on your eye, real eyeballs. [Kerry: Yes.] Is that, got that right? And, and does it seem like you are seeing traffic coming at you? One of the traffic is a real Jeep and the other is an imaginary Subaru?

15:08 Kerry: Yes.

15:13 RTH: And does that, as far as your experience is, is involved, does that seem like two separate seeings, I imaginarily see the Subaru and I real-life see the Jeep? Or does it seem like I'm just seeing real traffic and the real traffic has, has a Subaru in it?

15:32 Kerry: Uh, the latter, so it feels like real traffic and there happens to be the exact Subaru, um, that I bought [laughs] [RTH: Okay.] driving towards me.

15:44 RTH: Okay. So I'm walking down the, the street and I, and as far as my experience is concerned, I see traffic coming towards me. And in the reality, the traffic is partially real (the Jeep) and partially imaginary (the Subaru).

16:00 Kerry: Yes.

16:00 RTH: Is that right?

16:01 Kerry: Correct.

16:02 RTH: So I don't experience as right at this moment the beep I don't experience myself as seeing an image or a imaginary Subaru. I experience myself as seeing a real Subaru, even though it's not there.

16:14 Kerry: Yes. But I am aware that it's not there. I'm not like I I'm not actually thinking that it's there, but

16:23 RTH: So it's not a hallucination?

16:25 Kerry: No! I'm not hallucinating! [laughs extensively]. [RTH: Okay.] Sorry.

16:29 RTH: But it, but it's but it's a realistic superimposition.

16:33 Kerry: Yes.

16:37 RTH: And I somehow *know* I'm superimposing it. I'm that's in my ken, I guess you would say, that I'm, I'm superimposing this, but as far as the, my experience is concerned, it, it seems real. Is that right?

16:37 Russ comments:
RE "it seems real"
That is stronger than what Kerry has said. The good news is that Kerry corrects it.

- 16:54 Kerry: Yeah, I mean in terms of the detail and I guess the pace at which the car is moving, it feels like a natural flow of traffic. Everything about it feels realistic. I can, as I spoke to at the top of the meeting, I can technically see through that image of the Subaru. So I, I can at a lower level process what's happening on the road, which is nothing because there's no second car. However, there's also a very detailed vision that is moving towards me at the same time.
- 16:54 Russ comments: The image / inner-seeing antenna jangles again (see comment at 0:43). I file it away again.
- 17:32 RTH: Of the Subaru.
- 17:33 Kerry: Of the Subaru.
- 17:36 RTH: And in this imaginary vision, do you, does the imaginary vision include other aspects other than the Subaru, the road, the sidewalk or whatever? Or is it the imaginary vision is just the Super- Subaru and everything else is real? Or can't you tell because it's the same scene?
- 17:55 Kerry: Um, to my knowledge, it was just the Subaru that was imagined and everything else was just the road, the sidewalk that I was on, the ground.
- 18:09 RTH: Okay. So what I'm, the way I'm understanding this so far is: I'm walking down the road, there's traffic coming at me, I see the traffic coming at me. I see this, the traffic coming at me that I *see* includes a Subaru, which *looks like* it's part of the traffic—I'm experiencing it as sort of part of the traffic, but I'm also experiencing this as being an, an imaginary creation. This is somehow understood by me to be a Kerry creation. [Kerry: (laughs) Yes.] The Subar, Subaru portion of it. [Kerry: Yeah.] Okay. And I...
- 18:45 JBK: [crosstalk] I have one other question on this. Alright, go ahead Russ.
- 18:52 RTH: And, and we've been talking about the *seeing through* and I think the, see this, the seeing I want, I would like to understand what the *seeing through* means. Does that mean that I see through the Subaru to the road, to the road on the other side of the Subaru? Or
- 19:15 Kerry: Yes, I can still see the road [laughs]. This is really hard to describe. I can still see the road to the point where I would feel confident after the real car passed walking into the middle of the street, and I'm not fearful that I'm going to be hit by a second car. You
- 19:31 RTH: Hit by a Subaru! [laughs]
- 19:32 Kerry: Right! So I can see the road, and I understand that there's not a second car there [laughs], but at the same time I have a very, very clear, like the actual visual of the Subaru, if I were.... The visual... (ohmigod!...) it doesn't seem see-through in the sense that the image isn't at a lower opacity or it's not, it's not, um... The, the image

of the Subaru seems very bright and sort of like a normal photograph, but I'm still aware that it's not real and therefore processing the stuff behind it. So to a degree it feels see-through because I know that there's a road behind it. Or I know that there's that scene in real life behind it. Does that make any sense?!?

19:32 Russ comments: My image / seeing antenna, which had been jangling (see 0:43 and 16:54) are now clanging. We have to do something about this, which leads to the upcoming.

20:33 RTH: So let me, let me give a little lecture here on, on seeing and imagination or what, whatever, which might, might help things out here. So in, in in common parlance it is, it is, people say I'm seeing an image, but the actual fact of the matter is (at least in the world according to Hurlburt) that's not really true. What, you're seeing a Subaru and you're *not* seeing an *image* of a Subaru because seeing an *image* of the Subaru would imply, well out there somewhere in my brain, I have made this Subaru thing and then *somewhere else* in my brain I'm seeing that. So that it's a mistake made by Descartes and a lot of philosophers on, on, on, down, down from that, but I don't think it's really the way it is.

21:13 What I think happens is that you are *seeing* a Subaru in your imagination. That does not mean you're seeing an *image* of a Subaru—it means you're innerly seeing a Subaru. And when you think of it that way, then you don't have to worry about things like, well *how opaque is the image*? Well, the image, there's, *there's no image to be opaque or not*. There is a *seeing* and the question is whether you see in the same direction of your visual field, whatever that is, the Subaru and the road that would be behind the Subaru if there were a Subaru there. And I'm gathering the answer to that is *No*. When I'm seeing the Subaru, I don't see a transparent Subaru with a road behind it. I see a Subaru like it was the real Subaru.

21:57 Kerry: Yes, that's correct.

21:59 RTH: And uh, mm

22:04 RTH: So some, some people *do* see images and, and so I, I, I don't wanna say you can't see an image. Some people, some people when when they say I see an image, they say, I mean it, I mean I would see an image of my Subaru and this, I could take this image of my Subaru out and move it around and bend it up and tear it up or whatever. I could do that with the image. I haven't heard you to be *saying* that. What I've heard you to be saying is, well I'm, I'm seeing the Subaru. The Subaru isn't there.

22:04 Russ comments: RTH didn't explain himself very well. He is trying to say that when *some people* say "I was seeing an image of X," they mean that the image *itself* has qualities, for example, a border, glossiness, rips, curliness, smudges, and those characteristics apply to the *image*, not to X itself. For them, it is faithful to say "I am seeing an image of X." But I haven't heard Kerry say anything about features of the image itself—she has described the Subaru. So it makes sense to say that she is *innerly seeing the Subaru*, not that she is *seeing an image of a Subaru*.

Q: Aren't you just being picky about the words?

A: It's not about the words. If Kerry thinks of herself as seeing an image, then she will give *the image* qualities like transparency, behindness, blocking the view, etc. But if she thinks of herself as innerly seeing, then she can innerly see and externally see in the same direction and the confusion about transparency, behindness, blocking the view won't occur—she simply (innerly) sees the Subaru in the same place as she (externally) sees the road.

I described examples of seeing an image in Chapter 11 of my 1990 book *Sampling normal and schizophrenic inner experience*.

22:31 Kerry: Yeah, just the Subaru.

22:34 RTH: Okay,

22:38 Kerry: That does make sense and I feel a little bit less crazy now! [laughs]

22:42 RTH: It's a, it's a, it's a common, I think common misconception and it gets, and it makes, it makes explaining things like you're explaining difficult if you buy that [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] if you buy into that misconception, but almost everybody does. Okay, I'm done with my questioning about this and Julian had a question.

22:59 JBK: I have one more question. Um, so you're seeing the Subaru, and it's not like a lower opacity or anything. Um, and you also mentioned seeing, seeing what would be behind or under the Subaru, like the road of the street or whatever. Um, but that could be like a different kind of seeing. That could, that could be seeing as in *Oh yeah, I kind of know that if I walked there I wouldn't be hit by a car*. Like you're somehow processing it, but it doesn't, doesn't enter your, y'know, directly what you're seeing. Or it could be you're, you're seeing the Subaru full opacity and you're also seeing the road. And even if that doesn't make sense physically, it could still make sense in your imagination. Does that, do you understand what I'm saying?

22:59 Russ comments: I don't understand this turn.

22:59 Julian comments: Kerry has said she sees the Subaru but can also see the road behind it [at 19:15 for example]. I want to find out if both of these are directly experienced. Is she experientially seeing the road or is she just automatically processing it?

By now, it's clear that Kerry does directly see the Subaru. How about the road? One option is that seeing the road is in her direct experience. This would seem impossible in the natural attitude because Kerry would be seeing two things at the same time, even though one is in front of the other.

The second option is that Kerry does not directly see the road behind the Subaru. She might be processing it so that if she stepped into the street she wouldn't get hit. But seeing it is not in her direct experience.

I think this distinction is related to what Russ was getting at in the 24:04 comment. Only Russ took a step back. To make a distinction like this, Kerry has to disabuse herself of the notion that she's seeing an image of a Subaru. If she thinks of herself as seeing an image, notions of transparency and superposition become an issue.

- 24:02 Kerry: Are you asking, uh, how at what level I was processing the road or at what level I was, um...
- 24:13 JBK: So does what's behind the Subaru, are you seeing that directly or are you seeing it in the sense that like you wouldn't be hit by a car if you walked into the road but you're not seeing it directly?
- 24:13 Russ comments: I still don't understand.
- 24:30 Kerry: Um, I would say, I think I'm seeing it directly. Um, [exhales] it's, it's really hard to describe. I, I see it to the point, yeah, where I know I'm not gonna get hit by a car if I walk in the middle of the road. I see it in that I could paint you a picture of it right now. Um, but I am more, I would say, immersed in the detail of the Subaru than I am, uh, the potential cracks in the road or, or the way the road turns or something. Um,
- 25:17 JBK: [inaudible] More about the Subaru,
- 25:19 Kerry: I would say more, yeah, more of the Subaru. But I'm aware that the Subaru, uh, I'm aware of what's going on behind the Subaru.
- 25:27 JBK: Okay. Um,
- 25:32 Mel: Could I ask a question? [JBK: Yeah.] [RTH: Sure.] I'm, I feel like this might be hard to answer, but my question is: You keep saying that you know the Subaru is not there in real life. How do you know that? If you're seeing it so clearly and it's part of.... Like, is there a differentiation? Like how is that experienced? You're very sure of that. How?
- 25:32 Russ comments: That is a meta question in the sense that it is not inquiring about experience itself, but inquiring about something that is (or may be) related to experience—the cause that explains, the how do you know?
- 25:55 Kerry: I think it's because I'm still processing the road behind it. So, um, [laughs] yeah, it feels like I have a lot of visual overlays, but imagine, imagine looking at your hand and still being able to see what's behind it. So in real life I can't do that. If my hand is here, I can't see, I can't see you right now. But if I were to visualize my hand, I can still at a lower level process my screen in front of me. So it's kind of like, yeah, because I can see past it, I'm aware that it's not real.
- 25:55 Russ comments: (Probably because Mel asked a meta question,) Kerry gives an explanation of causation rather than a description of experience. That explanation, while plausible, is probably entirely false. (See RTH's 27:05 turn.)
- 26:40 Mel: Yeah. It might be hard to [inaudible]
- 26:41 Kerry: Whereas if there was, yeah. And, and that's I think the difference between, I guess, my visual brain and hallucinations. Whereas halluc, hallucinations (to my knowledge have never hallucinated) feel real, um

- 26:54 Mel: [gesture moving her flat hand in front of her face] The only version as opposed to [inaudible]
- 26:57 Kerry: um, right. It would block your vision [places her flat hand in front of her eyes] of, and it'd be harder to process, I think, what's behind that.
- 27:05 RTH: So I would like to comment on that question before we get too far down the road here. And, and that is, I, I don't think it's necessarily the case that there's any feature of the imagination of, of the *seeing*, that says *this is an imagination and that one's, that one's real*. But there's no meta-awareness required to know the difference there, I think. I think, I think people know when they're imagining (some people) and some people and, and know what that that's a real thing. And that's just the way it is. It's, there's no feature of the seeing that can, that that is *necessary* to tell the difference.
- 27:47 Mel: Um! That's very interesting to me!

There is a computer glitch that we straighten out. We gray out the recording-based talk.

- 27:49 JBK: Well, I need to say something technical before we go on. I got an issue warning that Mel's browser is preventing recording. So it's saying that maybe if you refresh the page, Mel, or if you have ad blockers or maybe ad blockers, maybe. Okay.
- 28:35 RTH: So are we still recording?
- 28:37 JBK: We yeah. Still recording. [RTH: Mm-hmm.]
- 28:41 Kerry: I have a record symbol next to my name on the right side. So I think we are.
- 29:08 RTH: So while,
- 29:15 Mel: All I did was refresh, Julian. I don't know, I don't have ad blockers or anything. Hopefully that fixed it.
- 29:18 JBK: So you're back, uh, should be good. I'm not getting a warning signal [laughs]
- 29:25 RTH: And I'm getting a, the red dot in the upper corner that says that she's being recorded, too. So [JBK: Yeah.] I'm guessing that's right.
- 29:34 RTH: But I was about, I was about to say: I think the thing to think about is that the, the real world, we don't actually see the real world. We're... You're actually, when you, when you're seeing, you are creating a visual something for yourself. You're, you're, I don't want to get too technical about it, but you're, you are creating these things. You're seeing these details, not seeing those details. And that's of the real world as well. And, and somehow your system keeps track of what it is that you're seeing and what it is that you're don't see. Y'know, your eyes, for example are saccading all, all over the place [waves his hand back and forth rapidly] and you see the world as being stable. And, uh, and you, you see this page as being a rectangle, [holds up a sheet of paper]

even though it's tilted like this [changes the page's angle], it still looks like a rectangle for you. Your, your system does a whole lot of visual processing. And in this particular case, it processed the, some stuff that was, whose input was coming through your retina—the real car in the road—and some stuff that's coming from somewhere else—your recollection of the Subaru you just bought—and putting them together into one visualization for the moment, which attests to the compli, complication that your visual processing can do. Which is pretty interesting.

29:34

Russ comments: The study of illusions makes the constructive nature of visual processing apparent. In the figure, there are no reddish pixels anywhere in the photo. Your brain *constructs* the red out of the actual gray, blue-green, and green pixels. Illusions are just one part of the evidence that we are always constructing every scene based on our own interests, skills, proclivities, experiences, and so on. We don't see the world as it is; we see our construction of the world. That is true for both real external seeing and inner seeing.



Fig. 2 The window area of this train appears red; however, none of the pixels have a red hue; they are all gray, grayish blue-green, or grayish green.

RE “somehow your system keeps track of what it is that you’re seeing and what it is that you’re don’t see.”

I think RTH intended to include in that sentence “somehow your system keeps track of what it is that you’re seeing with your real eyes and what it is that you’re seeing in your imagination.”

The figure is from

https://www.psy.ritsumei.ac.jp/akitaoka/Akiyoshi_Kitaoka_Proc_4th_Internl_Symp_for_Color_Science_and_Art_2023.pdf

30:55 Mel: It's crazy, to be honest! That's wild!

30:58 Kerry: I fully thought that everybody else did that! [laughs]

31:02 Mel: Well, I don't! [laughs]. [everyone laughs hard]

31:09 RTH: Let's, let's just leave it at that. So, so I, I didn't wanna be implying that your, your visualization was substantially unusual. It has its unusual characteristics and its usual characteristics, like every, like everybody else. But let's just try to get at what it *is* and then after we've seen enough of 'em, then we can talk about whether everybody does that or nobody does that. Mel, Mel didn't do that, let's put it that way.

31:38 Mel: Yeah I would guess that I'm the unusual one here. [inaudible] self-conscious! [Kerry and Russ laugh]

31:42 RTH: That's what makes life interesting. People are different from each other. Number 3?

31:42 Russ comments: Note that we never returned to the second part of this sample, which involved Kerry asking in own inner voice the question, "would it be an issue to go higher?" I suspect we had lost track of that because of the complications of the discussion of the seeings.

31:42 Comment: There is a comment called "POST-INTERVIEW CONVERSATION ABOUT SAMPLE 4.2" at the end of this transcript.

31:47 JBK: Number 3.

SAMPLE 4.3 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

31:48 Kerry: Cool. Um, okay, I'm gonna have a really hard time describing this, but beep 3 went off at 4:28. Um, [JBK: 4:23?] I, 4:28. [JBK: 4:28. Okay.] Um, I, there was a song playing off the radio, um, that I didn't know. So I was intently trying to listen to the, to the lyrics. Um, so I wasn't quite speaking the lyrics, cuz I didn't know them, but I was following them, is how I described it. I was following them and intently listening to try to understand each word. Um, it sometime, yeah, in, in this instance, it kind of felt like I was li—, very lightly saying the word kind of as it was coming out, like almost predicting, but it wasn't... Normally I have a much stronger, I hear my own voice very loudly and it's clearly my voice, whereas this sounded like a more muted version of that. And I was just more following, so it wasn't even fully formulated words. Um, I was, yeah, don't really know how to describe it. [laughs]. Um, and then I was also, I was like staring off at a tree. So like visually it was very like focused on the tree. Auditorially, um, I was following along the lyrics but not fully articulating each word cuz I didn't know the words.

33:33 JBK: Could you give a percentage between tree and lyrics? Like 99—1? 50—50?

33:41 Kerry: I would say like 60—40 audio to tree.

33:51 JBK: So a song is playing that you, you didn't know the song.

33:55 Mel I, I have this browser thing again, that your browser's preventing recording. I dunno why we have so many problems this time. [Mel: I don't know.] Should we refresh again or should we just, just deal with it for now?

34:12 Mel: I mean, I mean I'm not crucial to this. I'm a background player, so if I'm not recorded it's not the worst.

34:19 JBK: And, and now it says you're recording again. Yeah. I don't know what's up, but let's, let's just go on for now.

34:23 Mel: Let's leave that and persevere. I'll investigate it.

- 34:28 JBK: Okay. So you're listening to the lyrics. What, what are you hearing right now? Not unnecessarily what are the exact lyrics of the song? But like what are you hearing at this moment.
- 34:43 Kerry: A breakdown of the audio would be like 90% of the song: I'm just hearing. But then 10% is this almost sort of like muted I'm, I'm almost trying to predict the words that are coming out. So it's like, I'm like, I'm not even singing. It's like I'm speaking along with it, but it's because I don't know the lyrics. It's not really well articulated. [JBK: Mm-hmm.] Um, but it is my voice. Um, but it's just not fully, it's not as clear, I would say, as it is normally.
- 35:26 JBK: Is it an out-loud thing or a in-your-head thing?
- 35:32 Kerry: The song's definitely out loud and then the words or, or or me attempting the words is in my head.
- 35:40 JBK: Okay. And, and for the part where you're hearing the song: At this moment, are you hearing a specific part? Does that, does that register? Do certain words register? Or is it just? Or No.
- 35:57 Kerry: Um, I was hearing, it was the chorus line, um, so it was kind of doing the same line over and over again.
- 36:08 JBK: Is it important to experience what that line is at this moment?
- 36:13 Kerry: Um, it was "Meet me down at the Blue Café" [laughs]. [[JBK: Meet me down at the Blue Café.] Um, it was kind of like, yeah, I had never heard this song before. So
- 36:28 JBK: Are you, would you say you're listening to something specific? Like just the words? Or the words and the melody or the words and the melody and the background music and the drums, or,
- 36:28 Russ comments: Kerry *did* say she was listening to something specific—that was the whole thrust of her opening salvo (31:48). So to my ear this question strongly implies that there must be something more than that.
- 36:46 Kerry: Um, it was
- 36:48 JBK: Or does that not make sense? It's more general.
- 36:50 Kerry: No, I think I was focused actually mainly on the words and then, um, sort of the style, the overall style. Like, it, it was kind of, it sounded like there were maracas in the background, so I was trying to work out what kind of genre this would be in. So it was, it was in the moment I was, I couldn't even sing you the melody. It was more so like the style and the instruments involved and the words were what I was focused on.
- 36:50 Russ comments: It is not possible to say whether this was part of her experience, or whether JBK's 36:28 question led to this talk.

37:21 JBK: Okay. But, but maybe I asked a question that got us too broad [Kerry: Okay.] because you, you didn't mention style until now. So maybe my question got us like maybe at a different, maybe like two seconds before you were trying to figure out the style or maybe it was here but you just didn't mention it till now. Um, but would you say here it's, uh, more in the words or the style or, or both or

37:21 Russ comments: JBK apparently sensed the same thing as my 36:28 and 36:50 comments. Good. One fine point: In general, after you realize that you might have polluted the waters (and we all sometimes ask bad questions and in the asking realize the question is bad), it is better to avoid the pollution altogether. So here I would replace the last sentence of JBK 37:21 with something like "So let's stick to the words."

The good news is that Kerry (37:46) figures that out for herself.

37:46 Kerry: The words more than anything? For sure. [JBK: Okay.] Yeah.

37:49 JBK: You're more on the words. Um, so you're, you're listening to it, uh, to "meet me down at the Blue Café," and you're kind of in your head singing, singing along? or speaking along? or, or muttering or, it's not fully formed?

38:07 Kerry: It would, I would describe it as speaking, but almost like muffled and very quiet. So like, it's my voice, but I'm not singing. Um, I, yeah, it's purely me figuring out the words.

38:28 JBK: Okay. So your voice, muffled speaking, figuring out the words. Are you, and can you, can you hear that? At least innerly hear that? Or is it diffuse and not really heard, but kind of there?

38:28 Russ comments: Kerry has never said anything about hearing. Nor has she said that it was just kind of there. Her inner voice has been described as a speaking. So this jangles my it-came-from-Julian-not-Kerry antenna.

38:52 Kerry: This is, yeah, that's exactly why I was like, I'm gonna have a really hard time describing this one because I, it doesn't necessarily feel like I'm *hearing* my voice. It kind of just, yeah. Even though it, it's still there, it doesn't feel like it normally feels, so you describing it as like, it's just sort of there as kind of, I would say accurate, but I, I'm having a hard time describing the difference between this and my normal inner monologue.

39:26 JBK: Yeah cuz it could be muffled and quiet as if it's your actual voice just quiet and more muffled. Or it could be muffled and quiet means that it's somehow less clear, less, less there. So yeah, I was trying to figure that one out. And, and you think like it's, it's more the second option or more the first, the first option being like audibly quieter, um, [inaudible] and the second option being just less clear.

39:26 Russ comments:

RE “And you think like it’s, it’s more the second option or more the first?”

This is a leading question, implying a preference for the it-came-from-Julian option.

As I said at 3:28: Confirmation bias is among the most pernicious biases of the human condition. Sometimes (rarely) it is okay to ask arising-from-Julian questions, but if you do, I think you have to somehow indicate that you would prefer the *opposite* answer.

So I have to discount the upcoming conversation. It might be true, but we have no way of knowing because the waters were polluted.

(See the comments at 3:28 and 59:50.)

Julian comments: What to you betrays confirmation bias? Is it asking “and you think like it’s it’s more the second option” instead of “and *do* you think”? Dropping the “do” is just vernacular. Like asking “you wanna go to the movies?” instead of “do you wanna go to the movies?”

Or is it putting the second option first? When the logical presentation would be option #1 then option #2?

Or is it in how I stress the words and how much enthusiasm I put behind the different options?

By the way I’m not denying that I’m not communicating clearly. I’m not sure Kerry totally got what I meant.

Russ comments: I’m not sure I can reliably answer that question, although I suspect it comes more from the stress/enthusiasm than the word choice or order. What I can say is that my *Is this from JBK?* antenna jangled; that my antennae are less than perfect; I have worked at honing such antennae because I think confirmation bias is a huge problem.

40:00 Kerry: I think it’s the second option. Um,

40:03 JBK: Okay.

40:06 Kerry: Yeah. I, it’s there but it’s not really there. Um,

40:12 JBK: Okay. Uh, any questions on this before we go on to the tree?

40:20 RTH: Yeah, so lemme lemme say what I understand and see whether this is right. I’m hearing the music, it’s a new song that I haven’t heard before. And so I’m intently at the aimed and mostly at the lyric, maybe also at the style, but mostly at the lyric. And I’m somehow shadowing the lyric, and that shadowing is sort of in my own voice, but it’s hard to say what the details of that is, except that the, what I’m calling shadowing is tracking the words as I’m ferreting them out of the song.

40:56 Kerry: Yes, that’s exactly, it’s a much better [laughs] description.

41:01 RTH: Okay. And, and it’s my voice, but I’m not really into my voice. I’m into, into the words on the screen and I’m, I’m producing these ferr–, shadowed words, modeled words by

beside, beside the other words words. But, but that's not central to my experience at all. I'm doing it, but, but my, my aim is at the words that I'm hearing on...

41:31 Kerry: Yes. Yeah.

41:34 RTH: And if everybody else is agreeing with that, then I'm happy.

41:37 JBK: I'm good. Um, yeah. And you're, you're staring at a tree and that's, that's not just background, your eyes happen to be pointed, but you're, are you taking in anything about this tree or

41:52 Kerry: Yes.

41:53 JBK: what's this experience like.

41:56 Kerry: Um, specifically, I mean I would describe this as like zoning out. So like, just really intently staring at a specific, the top end of the tree where the leaves were blowing the wind. So I was mainly focused on the leaves, um, and kind of just locked in a gaze. Um, yeah, but that was not any sort of internal visual. That was real life.

42:24 JBK: Real life. So the leaves blowing in the wind. Is it, um, [Kerry: Yeah.] is it just kind the whole top, the whole leaves? Or is it even be zoned in on one specific leaf or would y'know at this exact moment what it was?

42:41 Kerry: Yeah, it was sort of, um, the middle, the bulk middle section of the tree. So it was a larger section, almost all the leaves, but maybe not as focused on the ones kind of on the edges. [gestures to emphasize the middle, not the whole]. Um, so it was really focused on the middle section of the, of the whole leafy area.

43:05 JBK: And so you're seeing the leaves blowing. Is it more about the motion of the leaves or the color or is everything just altogether?

43:18 Kerry: Um, the motion just there, it was a birch tree and I just really like the way the leaves move on birch trees. So, um, mainly the motion in the wind. And then I would also say color would be maybe secondary. Um, just cuz it's, it was like the sun was kind of starting to set or go, starting to go down. So the colors were pretty as well. [laughs], [Mell sneezes and says "sorry."]

43:46 JBK: So you're looking at a tree, you're seeing the leaves blow in the wind, kind of the middle bulk, middle part of the tree, uh, birch tree. Is there anything specific *about* how the leaves are moving or just that it's

44:04 Kerry: It's, um, they kind of remind me of like, um, [laughs], disco ball squares, how like they sort of twinkle, um, so spec-, I just like get really mesmerized by that. They're almost like a slightly square shape in my mind. So, um, I think that's why I get like entranced by them sometimes. [laughs]

- 44:30 JBK: So kind of a kind of twinkle twinklish. But I, I get it that at this moment you're not like thinking of disco balls, too, but this is kind of just your way of describing them now, right? Here you're just really looking at the leaves, but
- 44:46 Kerry: Yeah, no, no, actually there's no disco, disco ball, visual [laughs] just kind of like reminds me of that, I guess. [laughs]
- 44:52 JBK: That's just a way to describe it. [laughs]. Alright. [Kerry: Yeah.] Um, so I'm clear on this. Any questions on this part or just in general?
- 45:04 RTH: I'm good.
- 45:06 JBK: Alright.
- 45:06 Russ comments: Exercise for the reader #2 (my answers at the end of the transcript)
As part of the description of sample 4.3, Julian wrote
Sample 4.3 (part): Kerry is also simultaneously watching a birch tree's leaves blow in the wind. The leaves are twinkling as they catch the light. [Kerry didn't mention catching the light, but that's how I understand the twinkling. Or something else?]
Rewrite that part so as to focus directly on Kerry's experience. Does it matter?
- 45:07 RTH: On to number 4? It is 10:57 my time. So we're at this...
- 45:11 JBK: We had a lot of tech difficulties.
- 45:12 RTH: We had some issues. [JBK: Yeah.] People have time and energy to keep going?
- 45:17 Kerry: My, uh, my meeting got canceled, so, um, I'm flexible on time.
- 45:23 RTH: Okay. Number 4. [JBK: Okay.]

SAMPLE 4.4 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 45:25 Kerry: Cool. Um, yeah, so I think I missed a beep in between these, but beep 4 was at 5:23 PM. Um, I, I think I said before that that was the closest I've ever thought to nothing, but I actually think that this is the closest I've ever thought to nothing. I was reading code and I'm not a coder, and so it meant *literally* nothing. And I wasn't it, I wasn't it, yeah, I wasn't thinking anything it meant, it meant nothing to me. Um, I didn't know what I was looking at. So there weren't thoughts to formulate any sort of meaning. Um, I said very visually focused on the right side of the screen, which is where the code was located. Um, yeah.
- 46:19 RTH: So at the moment of the beep, I am seeing code and I'm understanding that that is, I see it, but I'm not reading it. I'm not reading what it says, let X do Y or whatever. I'm just, I'm just seeing it.

46:41 Kerry: Yeah. I'm literally just seeing it. There's no, I'm not, um, nor— yeah, when I read normally I, I say the words in my head, but this, because there was no meaning to derive or no words really. There was nothing going on in my head [laughs].

46:58 RTH: And yet I'm looking at it,

47:00 Kerry: I'm looking at it, yeah.

47:01 RTH: And seeing it. So it's not just, well this is a question. Are my eyes just looking at it and I'm not processing at all, I'm not even seeing it at all? Or am I seeing it, I'm just not processing it.

47:11 Kerry: I think the latter, I'm, I'm seeing it, but I'm not processing what anything means. [RTH: Okay.] The closest, I guess the most I would've processed, it's that certain sections of the code were highlighted in different colors. So my eyes were skimming that. So the bulk of it was in navy blue. There were a couple of red, um, sections and then like yellow highlighted sections. But apart from that, that was like the closest thing to me deriving any, any sort of thought.

47:42 RTH: So does it seem like it's more, I'm seeing this patch of code and not processing at all? Or does it seem like I'm sort of drawn to the yellow and the red and the green of the code colors?

47:58 Kerry: I, I think I was drawn to the colors cuz I was hoping it would, like my eyes naturally went there hoping that I could understand *something*, but I was, it didn't help. So I, I was seeing and *nothing* was coming.

48:20 RTH: So in the previous beep you were seeing the trees, and we didn't make as maybe as explicit as we could have, but the, I, I understood you to be saying I was sort of drawn (40% of my experience or whatever) drawn to the twinkliness of the leaves. So it wasn't so much that I was seeing the trees, it was more, I, I was into the twinkly display that the tweet that the trees were making. Is that right? Is that my understanding of that beep correct?

48:51 Kerry: Correct. Yes.

48:52 RTH: Okay. And so now I have the same sort of the same question here. It's not so much that I'm seeing the code, but I'm seeing the red and the green and the yellow pack, pass, parts of the, the code.

49:03 Kerry: Yes. I think that's a of an accurate way to describe, um, [RTH: Ok.] what I'm seeing.

49:12 RTH: And so, and un under that understanding it would be, it would be: I'm, my interest, for whatever reason, is in the colors of the code rather than in the code.

49:26 Kerry: Yes.

- 49:31 RTH: Okay. And then... then I, I would say I'm, I'm happy with that description. And I, and I would also say that things like the twinkly of the leaves and the colors of the code count as inner experience as I define it in, in every bit as much as inner speech or seeing an image of a Subaru or whatever. Though that's, of all the things that you could have been doing at that particular moment, *it seems* you were interested in the red and the green and the yellow of the code.
- 50:10 Kerry: Mm-hmm. Yeah. Correct.
- 50:12 RTH: And it turns out, actually, across a lot of people, that a lot of people are, are interested in things like colors and shapes and, and whatever have, have nothing to do with anything. And there's, there's no reason that you should have been interested in the green or the red or the, but for some reason the colors attract me, the twinkling of the leaves attract, attract me. The, that's the phenomenon I call sensory awareness. But it's, it is something which *occurs* sort of frequently actually for a lot of people. And, and a lot of people—like you have here—sort of discount it and say, *well that doesn't, that doesn't count. He couldn't possibly have been interested in that!* And yet that if, if that's what is the center of your experience, which is what it seems it is, then that's what is the center of your experience and that's what we're interested in.
- 51:05 Kerry: Yeah. This is slowly making more sense to me. So [laughs]
- 51:10 RTH: And, and, and I would say it takes time. It's, I'm, I'm not in the slightest criticizing Kerry for not having told us about this. This is, I've, I've actually written a paper about the sensory awareness, and in that paper I say, y'know, people don't usually tell us about that on the first or second or third or whatever day. And it takes a while for them. Happened with Mel too, I think, actually, if I'm not mistaken about that. [Mel: Yeah. (nods affirmatively)] So it's a common, a common occurrence. But I'm happy with that.
- 51:43 Kerry: Cool. Do we wanna do the fifth one or are we... Yeah? [Mel: Yeah.]
- 51:48 JBK: Uh, wait, wait, sorry. I was, I was muted, but I, I have one other question on this. [Kerry: Yeah.] This, uh, experience, so the code means nothing is not understanding the code, but is that like there's no, no experience at all about the, the code and its meaning? Or are you like *trying* to figure it out but it's not meaning anything? Or are you thinking like, gosh, this is, I don't understand this [laughs] or...?
- 51:48 Russ comments: I don't understand this question, unless JBK didn't hear or for some reason discounted the portion of the interview that was summarized from 48:52 to 49:26.
- 51:48 Julian comments: Yes, it's unwarranted.
- 52:17 Kerry: Yeah, it wasn't, I think normally I'm kind of, I hear my, I like, I hear my voice thinking through things and because I literally had no understanding whatsoever there was [laughs], there was no thought, like I wasn't criticizing myself for not knowing. I

wasn't, um, there was, there was literally *nothing* going on. Um, which is *very*, very rare for me, [laughs].

52:49 RTH: So in my understanding of that, it's not that there's nothing going on, it's that there's pretty colors going on. [Kerry: Right. Yeah.] And the pretty colors happened to be in code, but for whatever reason, at the beginning of this conversation, we didn't think it was a worthwhile thing to talk about the colors. So we said there was, I was seeing the code and not seeing anything.

52:49 Julian comments: You mentioned pretty colors. I didn't see the "pretty"-ness of the experience in her description.

Russ comments: As you say, Kerry did not on her own mention the pretty-ness of the colors of this sample—I mentioned it first—so I would not include it in a characterization of this sample. (She did refer to "pretty colors" of the birch tree in sample 4.3 (43:18), so I was not too far out on a limb.) I mentioned "pretty" here not as an exploration of this sample but as an iterative attempt at leveling the in-the-future playing field: she didn't mention colors at all at first, and then only reluctantly, but then with what I took to be a bit of affinity. I took that as something of an initial reticence to mention colors. As a result, I called the colors "pretty" as an attempt to normalize the willingness to mention colors on future sampling days.

Said another way: I understood the green twinkly of sample 4.3 and the colors of 4.4 to be sensory awarenesses, both initially described with a denial/reluctance of the sensory aspects, so I was working to ease through that denial in future sampling.

53:05 Kerry: Yeah, I'm saying nothing because normally, normally I would have a lot of, honestly probably negative audio going on in my brain about how, oh my God, I'm so stressed, I need to figure out this coding problem. I'm not a coder, et cetera, et cetera. But I wasn't even at that level because I just didn't know where to begin really.

53:29 RTH: Or because you were interested in the colors.

53:32 Kerry: That true. Uh, yeah, I, I guess I don't really know why [laughs].

53:35 RTH: That's, that's right. We, we don't, we don't know why. Yeah. So the question is what the experience is. And experience, it seems to me, is I'm seeing colors that are, for whatever reason, attracting my interest.

53:50 Kerry: Does that, does that answer your question, Julian?

53:53 JBK: Yeah, absolutely.

53:55 Kerry: Cool. Um

53:55 Comment: There is a comment called "POST-INTERVIEW CONVERSATION ABOUT SAMPLE 4.4" at the end of this transcript.

53:58 RTH: Number 5.

53:58 Kerry: Number 5 was at

53:58 RTH: 4? 5?

SAMPLE 4.5 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

54:02 Kerry: Uh I think we, yeah, we're at 5. Um, I, this was at 5:49. Um, I was, uh, visualizing a hike (that I've never been on, um, but I've seen a lot of photos of) called Lake of the Cracks. Um, and I was hearing my voice saying "we could wear bug nets." [laughs].

54:32 JBK: Okay. So visualizing the hike and hearing your voice, "we need to wear bug nets"?

54:40 Kerry: Yes. Yes. So in like the

54:46 JBK: 50-50? [waves hands] 80—20?

54:46 Kerry: 30 sec. Oh, in terms of, yeah, the breakdown. Um, I, it was very much, uh, ooh, I would say like 60—40 or 70—30 leaning towards the visual. And then my voice was kind of in the background, but the visual was pretty detailed. Um. Yeah. So I think more focus on the visual.

55:10 JBK: So, and what do you see?

55:15 Kerry: Um, I see the mountains as I imagine them. So, um, there's, it's rocky. There's, uh, a little bit of wet snow leftover from winter. There's a lake to my left, and like really overgrown grass, um, in my immediate foreground. Um, and kind of less in focus... Like my, the, the overgrown grass was like the most in focus and then a little bit less in focus to, to my right was, um, a couple of like tents, um, because I'm planning a camping trip there. So it was kind of like an imagined future state, even though I've never been to this place before.

56:05 JBK: Okay. Um, by most in focus, do you mean capturing your attention mostly? Like, you're mostly seeing that? Or do you mean like things are kind of blurry? Like literally, literally blurry.

56:23 Kerry: Uh, I think it's less, yeah, not, not blurry, but, um, I was most focused on the foreground because I was, I was worried about, um.... So this whole visual was in response to my sister saying, "you will get eaten alive, um, in this area in July." And so I was focused on the foreground because I was thinking about the bugs where we would physically be. So, um, yeah. It was, it's not blurry, but my attention in, within the visual, was because of the concern of the bugs, um, in the immediate grassy section.

57:10 JBK: Okay. Is, is that part of the, the visual, are you seeing bugs? Or not...?

57:17 Kerry: Really, no. No bugs! But, um,

57:23 JBK: You're seeing the overgrown grass and then there are mountains in the background that are rocky, have wet snow in them; to the right are some tents, but the [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] y'know, the, the attention or the focus is more on the overgrown grass. Um, there's a lake to the left. [Kerry: Yeah. Yeah.] Um, and, and it's, it's more like a, a full scene? Or more like just a photograph with borders or something else?

58:02 Kerry: Um, this was, I, I would say like the most expansive or like the largest scene that I think I've visualized since starting this. Most, I think I've described sort of like blurry edges, whereas this was like to the edge of my periphery.

58:20 JBK: Okay. So kind of as if you're actually just there?

58:26 Kerry: Yeah, yeah.

58:28 JBK: Okay.

58:29 Kerry: But also aware that I'm not there, so...

58:32 JBK: So you're aware that you're not there, you're not hallucinating,

58:35 Kerry: But yeah.

58:36 JBK: [laughs], as far as you're concerned, it's, it's like being there.

58:36 Russ comments: "Like being there" (here and at 58:20) is out ahead of Kerry. She has said that the seeing occupies her entire visual field, but that is not the same (or at least not necessarily the same) as being there. For example, her description is more consonant with a point of view, rather than with *being at* that point of view. Experientially those are two very different things. For example, at 58:20 JBK could have asked something like:

I understand that this occupies your visual field. Is this like you're seeing what a video camera would see if placed at that location? Or is it like you are actually there seeing this scene?

That would be an even-handed question that would have allowed us to explore the being-there aspect of the experience. Without it, I see no warrant to credit the being-there-ness.

58:41 Kerry: Yeah.

58:42 JBK: Or, or less clear or slightly less clear or hard to say.

58:48 Kerry: Uh, no, no, no. I, I mean, it's very clear that I'm not there. I'm still, I'm looking at my sister. I, I, I was in my living room at the time, like I can see everything, again, behind it. But, um, it was just a larger visual than usual.

59:05 JBK: And you're also in your, in your, you're innerly speaking, "we need to hear bug nets"? Or you're hearing this? Or what's, what's that part like?

59:18 Kerry: Um, I am innerly speaking in sort of like, in a positive tone. Um, I, I was sort of, this voice is the voice I was sort of imagining myself saying it to friends, being like, [speaks animatedly and happily] “We’ll be fine! Like, we can wear bug nets!” like very positive tone, but it was in my voice, inside my head. And so it felt like I was speaking it, but trying to be optimistic [laughs], um,

59:46 JBK: “We need to wear bug nets” in a [Kerry: Yeah.] positive, optimistic tone.

59:49 Kerry: Yeah. Yeah.

59:50 JBK: Is that, is that more about, um, like speaking it or hearing it, like we use the example speaking into a tape recorder versus playing back a tape recorder or, or both.

59:50 Russ comments: Kerry has said a half dozen times that the experience was of speaking. JBK’s question, to my ear, (a) would suggest that he doesn’t believe it (a schematic is: Kerry: “I’m speaking, I’m speaking, I’m speaking, I’m speaking.” Julian: “Are you more hearing?”); and (b) arises from Julian, not from Kerry—her 59:18 description is of herself talking to friends, without a hint of “I’m hearing myself say to my friends....” That is, there is no ambiguity in Kerry’s description.

This is a different scenario from the more common inner speaking/hearing instances where speaking / hearing is ambiguous, such as when “Jorge” says “I was saying in my head what I should buy at the grocery: ‘bananas, milk, bread’.” In that situation, there is no reason (other than the *word* “saying”) to suggest that Jorge is describing speaking rather than hearing, so there is warrant to inquire about whether he intends hearing or speaking.

Here, there is a strong suggestion *from the situation* (not the word) that she intends speaking: she is exhorting her friends.

Even so, it is fair to ask the speaking / hearing question, but in that question you somehow have to level the playing field so that you are not implying the speaking isn’t good enough.

For example, you could have started by saying something like: “It is natural to describe such a situation as speaking, and I am not doubting that that is what you meant. But sometimes people say ‘talking to friends’ when they actually mean ‘hearing myself talk to friends’. I’m not suggesting that that is what you mean, but if it is, I would like to know about it. Either way is fine with me.” Or something like that.

(See the comments at 3:28 and 39:26.)

1:00:07 Kerry: Yeah. Um, I, it’s hard to say the way I’ll describe it. Um, like with this audio, I was, it was almost as though I was preparing to convince people to still go on this hike. And, and it, to a degree it feels more like hearing because it was like, oh, I can say this. Like, it was almost like that’s an idea that I can say, or that’s something I can say. So like, it’s still in my voice, so I’m speaking it, but I guess it also feels slightly more distant because it’s the use case for that voice would be in a different scenario that I’m not in talking to a different person. So it felt a little bit more distant than normally where I feel closer to my voice and I’m like literally having a conversation in my head. It was like almost playing a soundbite that I can use later to convince my friends to still go on this hike. Um, if that makes any sense.

- 1:01:21 JBK: [laughs], well, kind of in convincing, preparing mode. [Kerry: Yeah.] It's a pretty positive voice. "We need to wear bug nets." [Kerry: Mm-hmm.] Just, "we need to wear bug nets," or is it really more about like, "it'll be fine, we need to wear bug nets."
- 1:01:35 Kerry: Or "we could wear," I think I said "we could," lemme look at the quote. Yeah, "we could wear bug nets" [laughs], but like, trying to make that sound enticing almost like we could wear bug nets. It'll be fine. Um, yeah, so this, I would say felt like a tape recorded version in my voice that I'm like, oh, I'll just use that later.
- 1:01:58 JBK: Yeah. Which is, so do, do you think it's, "we could wear," "we could wear bug nets, it'll be fine." Or "we could be fine" no, "it'll be fine. We can wear bug nets." [laughs], or you, you're not sure. Uh,
- 1:02:12 Kerry: No, the, I didn't say I didn't, the words weren't, um, like, I was sort of implying that we'll be fine, but the words were just, "we could wear bug nets" in an optimistic tone. But the implication was that we would be fine if we did so.
- 1:02:29 JBK: Yeah. Yeah. Alright. I'm, I'm good on this one. Any questions?
- 1:-2:37 RTH: Me too. [Kerry: Sweet.] I'm good. And we're now an hour and 15 minutes in.
- 1:02:45 JBK: We're outta time. So should we do it again?
- 1:02:50 Kerry: Yeah.

Answers to exercises for the reader

Exercise for the reader #1 (from 6:59)

Watch/listen to Kerry's 6:59 turn a few times. Then characterize what she said.

Russ's answer: I think she was quite squeezed / distressed / uneasy / unsure when she talked about hearing.

So my characterization of what Kerry said: *I'm not at all sure about this, but I am going to say "hearing" because that is how I understand your distinctions.*

Julian's answer: It sounded like: well, you want me to make a distinction and give more detail. I don't really know what to say. I remember we did the speaking/hearing distinction before. I guess, if we go by that, it's more hearing.

Exercise for the reader #2 (from 45:06)

As part of the description of sample 4.3, Julian wrote

Sample 4.3 (part): Kerry is also simultaneously watching a birch tree's leaves blow in the wind. The leaves are twinkling as they catch the light. [Kerry didn't mention catching the light, but that's how I understand the twinkling. Or something else?]

Rewrite that part so as to focus directly on Kerry's experience. Does it matter?

Russ's rewrite:

Simultaneously (40%) Kerry is drawn to the twinkly dark green-ness of the middle of a tree.

Does it matter? Yes, a lot, if the object is to describe experience. The aim of DES is to describe experience and not to confuse it with anything else. (This is part of the diamonds vs glass series.) The original description is more about real physics than about Kerry's experience:

- Was the birch-ness part of Kerry's experience at the moment of the beep? No, so don't include it in the description.
- Was the wind-ness part of Kerry's experience at the moment of the beep? No, so don't include it in the description.
- Was the explanatory physics of the situation (catching the light causes the twinkling) part of Kerry's experience at the moment of the beep? No, so don't include it in the description.

So all of that is glass, and none of that should be part of the description (diamonds). A main DES skill is the facility of separating diamonds from glass.

POST-INTERVIEW CONVERSATION ABOUT SAMPLE 4.1

After the interview, Julian wrote this description of sample 4.1

[Kerry was hiking and reading off her phone.] She was speaking out loud "working to embed the form" (this was mostly about hearing the words, trying to make sense of them).

Russ comments: I agree that she said that it was hearing, but I thought there was reason to be skeptical. The choice Julian presented was between speaking and hearing, but that would be a choice relevant to inner speaking. I thought the relevant choice here was between reading focused on the words and reading focused on the meaning, but I don't think that distinction was adequately explored.

POST-INTERVIEW CONVERSATION ABOUT SAMPLE 4.2

After the interview, Julian wrote this description of sample 4.2.

[Kerry is standing on the right side of a road] She sees the road at an angle. She sees a Jeep drive down it, from her right to her left.

Simultaneously she has a mental image of a silver Subaru, driving behind the Jeep. (This mental Subaru is on the real physical road, as if it's actually there. It's detailed and moving at a similar pace to the Jeep. Kerry intrinsically knows it to not be there. And she can also see or at least process the road under and behind it. Still, for all intents and purposes, she sees the Subaru driving down the road.)

Russ gave these comments:

RE “she has a mental image of a silver Subaru”

There is no image—that is a nounification of an action.

RE “This mental Subaru”

There is no mental Subaru—that is a nounification of an action.

RE “This mental Subaru is on the real physical road, as if it’s actually there.”

She does not see it *as if* it is there; she sees it as *there*. (She also understands that it is not there.)

RE “And she can also see or at least process the road under and behind it.”

I don’t think that is true.

RE “Still, for all intents and purposes, she sees the Subaru driving down the road.”

That is true but it can be worked into the description.

With those incorporated, here is Russ’s revision, with his edits in green:

[Kerry is standing on the right side of a road,] seeing the road in front of her going off at an angle to the right. She sees two cars (typical traffic) coming toward her—a black Jeep and then (appropriately distanced behind) a silver Subaru. She imaginarily sees the Subaru; that is, the Jeep is real, the road is real, the surroundings are real, and the movement is real, but her seeing has inserted the Subaru moving along the road behind the Jeep in the real scene. Kerry intrinsically apprehends the Jeep, road, and surroundings as being real and the Subaru as being imagined. [The seen Subaru is the Subaru that she purchased two days ago.]

Simultaneously Kerry was asking in her own voice the question, “would it be an issue to go higher?”

POST-INTERVIEW CONVERSATION ABOUT SAMPLE 4.4

After the interview, Julian and Russ worked on a written description of Kerry’s sample. They then, with Mel, collaborated on a general description of Kerry, taking into account all of her samples. The following conversation stems from an edit made in the following passage:

Sensory awareness is the focus on an inner or outer sensory quality for its sensory interest, not its instrumental value. We coded sensory awareness occurring in somewhere between 5 and 12 (8.5 for short) of Kerry’s 40 samples.

The wide range reflects that often it is difficult to determine whether Kerry’s interest should be considered a particular focus on the sensory. For example:

Sample 4.4 [Kerry was looking at programming code on her computer screen.] She was noticing the blue, red, and yellow colors (of the elements of the code).

So Kerry was unequivocally seeing the blue, red, and yellow of the code. But was she drawn to the blue, red, and yellowness of it (that is, was her interest in the colors themselves, which would make it sensory awareness)? Or was she seeing the colors as reflecting the functions of

the code syntax (that is, the colors were seen as instrumental indicators of the code function, in which case it was not sensory awareness)?

Julian made the following edit to the last sentence

Or was she trying to glean some meaning. The code happened to have those colors, but Kerry's experience was more about trying (though here not succeeding) to figure out what it meant. In this case, this would not be sensory awareness.

Russ comments: You deleted "seeing the colors as reflecting the functions of the code syntax (that is, the colors were seen as instrumental indicators of the code function, in which case it was not sensory awareness)?" I think that is far better than your alternative, which is, in my view, on an unwarranted track.

Here's a more prosaic example, fabricated to be parallel but more obvious:

Sample 4.4X [Kerry was looking at the fruit in her supermarket], seeing the blue grapes, the red apples, and the yellow bananas (the fruits on the market shelves).

So Kerry was unequivocally seeing the blue, red, and yellow of the fruits. But was she drawn to the blue, red, and yellowness of them (that is, was her interest in the colors themselves, which would make it sensory awareness)? Or was she simply seeing the colors as reflecting the type of fruit (that is, the colors were seen as indicators of the fruit type—she recognized the *bananas* in part because they were yellow, etc.

RE "Kerry was clear that she wasn't getting any meaning out of the code at this moment. So I see it as impossible that she was getting any kind of syntax meaning like red=string or whatever."

I think that is entirely wrong, perhaps out of lack of experience in writing code. Any experienced code writer will see a page of code, and (for example) if there's a lot of green on it, and she knows that green indicates that the text is comment, she will see a page with a lot of comments on it, even if she's not getting any meaning out of the code or the comments. There is nothing whatsoever about *trying* involved in this sample, so I think there is no warrant for introducing anything about *trying* into this description. [As an aside, in one of the Kerry interviews that I edited in the last few days, I wrote a comment about trying (interview 5 at 13:22). In that comment, I debated writing a note to recommend that Julian should consider what aspects of *Julian* led him to insert *trying* into a place where it didn't belong. I finally decided not to write that note—maybe it was too personal, to mind-read-y, too much work. The present example seems very similar—so I will say now what I didn't say yesterday: I recommend that you consider what aspects of *Julian* led him to insert *trying* into a place where it didn't belong.]

Julian comments: RE: I debated writing a note to recommend that Julian should consider what aspects of *Julian* led him to insert *trying* into a place where it didn't belong.

Touché. I won't take much convincing here. Even when I wrote the original description with "trying" I was wondering if this came too much from me. Since I have the self-perception of having to *try* during social interactions.

I am not committed to *trying* for this coding sample either. But I'm still not sure about your original phrasing: seeing the colors as reflecting the functions of the code syntax. I'm not sure of your

supermarket example either. Kerry clearly knows what grapes, apples, and bananas are. Here she stressed that she didn't know coding at all. I don't know if that's modesty. Maybe she does know a bit. But from the interview I got the impression that she wasn't getting any meaning at this moment.

For my original edit, I didn't want to overstate how much Kerry was getting out of the code. So I landed on *trying to glean meaning*. Sure, maybe this stems from me as a trying guy (or at least from my self-perception). But what else could it be? It could be seeing the code with colors indicating those parts mean *something* even if that *something* isn't present at this moment, and without any separate *trying* to get at that *something*. I rephrased the section.

The final edited version is as follows:

Or was she seeing the colors as part of a process that resulted in her seeing code (not merely seeing text, for example). In this case, seeing these colors would not be sensory awareness.