

Kerry
Rectification Meeting Part 1 (excerpt, first 32 minutes)

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of excerpts from the January 23 rectification meeting with Kerry that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/NTLc7ebzUf8>. Video of the entire meeting is at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Nfg2ICRPC8k>. In brown are conversations about the Descriptive Experience Sampling process that took place during the interview. In green are Russ's comments, and in blue are Julian's comments about and explanations of the Descriptive Experience Sampling process inserted after the interview. If you have corrections, suggestions, or questions, please post them as YouTube comments.

RTH = Russ Hurlburt

JBK = Julian Bass-Krueger

MM = Mel May

- 0:00 RTH: Now I think we're recording.
- 0:02 JBK: We are now recording, yeah. [laughs]
- 0:03 RTH: And I'm gonna share my screen. [MM: Mm-hmm.] So now can you see a screen that has a fairly complicated looking spreadsheet on it?
- 0:28 MM: Yes, I can.
- 0:30 RTH: Alright, then I'll make this big enough so that we can see what's happening here. And I'm gonna tell you what, what these numbers mean. So if there's, if there's no, if there's no number, long number that starts with 9, that means we agreed on whatever. So on sample 2.1 for inner seeing, we all agreed that there was a 1 there. [MM: Mm-hmm.] [JBK: Mm-hmm.] This cell here: So the, the 9 code is a, is a code that should be thought of as the nine saying *there's something interesting here*. And then two digits and two digits and two digits. So that there's six digits here. And they, and they're, the order of those two digits is Russ, Julian, and Mel. So what this says is that Russ says 0.5, Julian says 0, and Mel says 0.
- 1:20 JBK: Okay.
- 1:21 RTH: And this one here is, Russ says 1, Julian says 0.5, and Mel says 1.
- 1:32 JBK: Okay.
- 1:33 RTH: You got that? Got the [MM: Yeah.] You got the code there. So our task is to figure out where it is that we disagree and why, and whether there's something important to understand about the, the, uh, phenomenon. So our, our goal is not just to agree; our goal is to refine what we think about as, as the phenomenon. And basically this is a

clue. This says, well, there's something about this phenomenon that *Russ* at least thought (or maybe he made a mistake--that's possible) that *Russ* thought should, he should make a 0.5 and everybody else said *no*. So the, so what we're gonna do is we're gonna look at that sample and I have the purple descriptions.

- 2:22 JBK: The purple and green? [RTH: Yeah, the purple and green.] I'll put it on my computer, cuz it's a little tricky to read and, and small.
- 2:30 RTH: Okay.
- 2:32 JBK: Actually,
- 2:32 MM: I did enjoy your email. Said something along the lines of, "and for your convenience, I'd attached this." And when I was doing it, I was like, this is a convenience. Thank you! [laughs].
- 2:42 RTH: It's the, the down the, the risk of the risk of that is that the more convenient you make it, the more it makes it about the words rather than the experience. [MM: Mm-hmm.] Well that's, and that, that's a risk. It's a risk that's worth taking, it seems, sometimes. And...
- 2:58 MM: Can I ask my, um, classic Mel questions as fast as I can before we get into this? Cuz I have a couple. One, why do you not have this (um, I suspect I know the answer). Why do you not fill out this grid as you're doing a green meeting? I suspect you're gonna say it's, because then we're at risk of probably all putting down the same answer as we go. But like when I was doing it, my brain would've liked to sort of do that concurrently as we were having that meeting.
- 3:28 RTH: So my logic there is: if the object was to get a proper description that would prob—or a proper *rating*, if the object was to get a, a proper rating—that would probably be good. But what I *really* want us to do is to get a high-fidelity view of these phenomenon. And that means that Mel has to have her own private fidelity and Julian has to, has to have his, and Russ has to have his. And the advantage is that by doing it in, in sep—one of the advantages of doing it in separate occasions—is that then Mel forgets, which what we originally said, and Julian forgets what we originally said, and then comes back and has to do it again, and then forgets, and then comes back and has to do it again. And each time Mel gets infected by her presuppositions or distract, distractions, or whatever. And the same for me and Julian. And so the, the process is, the process is coming at it, and then coming at it from a different direction, and then coming at it from a different direction.
- 4:30 MM: Yeah, that makes sense. And one more question. Um, do you use the same spreadsheet for every single person? Or d'you come up with different, um, y'know, things to rate against based on...
- 4:46 RTH: It's different for every for every individual person. Some of them are the same. The 5FP are the same. [MM: Yep.] Um, but for example, we had *nothing beyond*; that was pretty much a characteristic of, of, uh, Kerry, should... (other people do that as well)

but, and skillful clarity as well. These, these were... These, *these characteristics here* are the result of: we each wrote our own brief independent characterization, and then we collaborated and put those brief characterizations together into what we thought were the main features. And that has become this.

- 5:26 MM: Mm-hmm. But, but the first, the gray ones are there for everyone?
- 5:29 RTH: Everyone. The gray ones are there for everybody.
- 5:31 MM: Yeah. Because they're like, yeah,
- 5:33 RTH: Because, and that's all my
- 5:34 MM: Questions.
- 5:35 RTH: Okay. The gray ones are there. The gray ones are there for everybody because, because there's a lot of people who think that DES is about the 5FP, which it's not, but you gotta pay attention to what some people think.
- 5:50 MM: So what does FP stand for there?
- 5:52 RTH: "Five frequent phenomena."
- 5:54 MM: Ah, gotcha.
- 5:55 RTH: So the five frequent phenomena: inter speaking, inter seeing, uncivilized thinking feelings and sensory awareness. Sometimes I call inner hearing, put that in there inner,
- 6:04 RTH: But it's not really five; that makes it six, or whatever!
- 6:09 MM: Gotcha. Okay. As you were. Thank you.

Focusing on sample 2.1

- 6:11 RTH: So about sample number 2.1, the question is why would Russ say as a 0.5 *incorporation into reality?* And the que, and here's the sample [moves the purple description of sample 2.1 into view] [JBK: Mm-hmm.] So my recollection of this sample was that she saw him, she saw her father hiking in front, but there was something about that that seemed to be on the trail in the actual trail, but I wasn't sure about that. So I gave it a 5; a .5.
- 6:54 JBK: Well, why I didn't put anything was I thought it was just way too early in the sampling process to answer that at all. So I thought it, I dunno, maybe it would've been like a 0.1 or .2 for me, but I just, yeah...

7:09 RTH: Okay. So what, so what that means is I think, is that you and I are, are agreement about the phenomenon. The question is how, how we should credit the interview about it, or the, the recitation of it.

7:23 JBK: Yeah.

7:23 RTH: And I don't really care about that much.

7:28 RTH: So I would be happy to change my rating to a 0, I guess. I don't really care about the ratings. The care, what I care about is the *phenomenon*. I think. And I think we are in agreement in the phenomenon that at least sometimes she puts, [MM: Mm-hmm.] she merges together the... And maybe this isn't, maybe this is not; whether we count it is not that important to me. [JBK: Mm-hmm.]

7:51 MM: Yeah. Yeah. I think I was the same, Julian. Like, I doubted this sample enough to count it. But I think with what you're saying there, Russ, that makes sense. ,

8:00 RTH: So, so now, now is the, now is the time when we have to agree on what we're gonna do.

8:04 JBK: Uh, we have to agree, okay!

8:05 RTH: This is, this is the time of, this is the time of agreement and the counting. Cuz we're not gonna have another chance to come back at this. So the question is, should we call it a 0.5 or a one? And I don't really care . Now that we've talked, now that we've talked about it and we know what's at stake, what do we think?

8:24 JBK: Can I ask what's, what's the end phase here? Does, does what we code end up as in the final description, the final coding? The final...

8:34 RTH: [tentatively] Yes. In the sense that we're going to say the, these, these numbers, they're gonna be numbers that appear, that are gonna be counts of the, the thing, and it's going, it's gonna say inner speaking occurred 14 times or whatever. [JBK: Okay.] And we're going to say "in our sample of 39 samples (or whatever it is), inner speaking occurred 14 times." We're gonna say things like that. But we're *also* going to say, "[tentatively] Yeah, it is 14, but we're not really sure about some of 'em. So maybe we should call it 12 and four halves. Or maybe we should call it..." Whatever. I mean, we're, we're gonna try to describe the phenomenon. And our goal is *not*, is not really to count. It's *hardly ever* to count. And *yet* counting is a useful thing because we're gonna see that there's a lot more inner seeing. There's gonna be 14 or 15 inner seeings here. There's a lot more inner seeing than there are feelings. And what does *a lot more* mean? Well, it's sort of like 15 seeings and 1 feelings or something like that. So we're gonna use numbers. But we don't, what I think, what I think we are *not* is I think it would be a mistake to try to do something like a significance test on those numbers. [JBK: Yeah.] [MM: Right.] That's not the, not the point.

9:47 MM: I think that's what I found challenging about it when I was doing it, too. I was like, "oh, this feels so concrete!" [JBK laughs] Assigning a number is so serious.

- 9:58 RTH: Well when I, I think of the numbers more or less, like, I think of the numbers, like when I, when we asked, when we ask participants, well, which was more salient to you and how much more salient was it 60—40 or 90—10 or whatever. I don't give a shit about whether it's 60—40 or 90—10, but I *do* care about whether, I mean *very slightly* more or *really lopsidedly* more and 60—40 and 90—10 make that point pretty clearly.
- 10:27 MM: I get, I get where it has to be numbers. But can I just say for me, like something that feels more gentle would be like traffic lights, like green, orange, red. So green, it was present; orange it was a little present. Numbers feel scary, [JBK laughs] but numbers is better for scientific purposes. But...
- 10:27 Russ comments: I agree with MM about the communication of green, orange, and red. But if you go beyond those three, numbers are easier—55 is easier to say and interpret than “greenish-orange.”
- 10:45 RTH: Yeah, I, we, we could think about that. But, but what, what I would, what I would *say* is that the, for most people, most of the time they, they, they're pretty, they know the difference between 80—20 and 70—30. They, they intend to, they intend a distinction between them. Whether that's the exactly the same distinction that you would make or that I would make—different story. But
- 11:09 MM: Yeah, a distinction can be made.
- 11:11 RTH: And, and, and the other thing, the other thing about all the, all (the whole process, actually) is that the object is to get people to *confront* the samples—to *come back to* the samples. By “confront” I mean look, [holds his hand palm toward his face] look face-to-face at the, at the sample. And asking somebody, “well did you mean 70—30 or 60—40?” I don't give a shit about 70—30 or 60—40, but I do want them to think, well, which is it that what what, what do I mean by *present* here?
- 11:40 MM: Um, so the question is do we think that this was an example of it being incorporated into reality? Well, Julian and I have been a bit convinced now to feel 0.5-y.
- 11:54 JBK: Mm-hmm. We could 0.5 it,
- 11:57 RTH: I, I would be happy with 0.5 because at the, at the end of the day, we're gonna say something like, Kerry had some samples where, where, where, uh, we're inner seeing and, and external seeing get, get fused together. And the first sample, we weren't really sure about that. But that will be much easier for us to say if we make this a 0.5 than if we just leave it blank.
- 12:24 MM: Yeah, I, agree.
- 12:24 JBK: Okay. We could 0.5,
- 12:26 MM: 0.5. There's something there.

12:30 RTH: So I've changed this to 0.5 as if we agreed, now. And *then* whether this scene was clear: Russ said it was clear. Julian said it was half clear and Mel said it was not clear.

12:53 JBK: Um, I, I could see a point for it being clear. I'm fine with that. I dunno why I said half clear maybe just cuz we didn't discuss clarity, but

13:05 MM: Yeah, I think I just wasn't paying attention to clarity enough. Yeah.

13:09 RTH: So we happy with the 1.

13:11 JBK: Yeah.

13:11 MM: Yeah. It sounds pretty clear to me.

13:14 RTH: Okay. And then whether there is *speaking* going on, which was not inner speaking, is there external speaking, she's speaking aloud.

13:26 JBK: But speaking, but also that enters her the lights of consciousness. So, right. Not just that she's speaking. Right.

13:35 RTH: Well this is, this is the refinement that we need to make for this, for this category. Are we going to do we call *any* speaking and then soften it by saying, well sometimes this is not in awareness. This like what are we gonna do about *words rolling out*? Are there...

13:51 MM: Yeah, no, I wasn't, I was only counting it. I thought about this when I did it and I was only counting speaking as if I thought it was part of the awareness. So like *words rolling out* or just fact of the matter that she was speaking. I didn't, I didn't count that. I didn't find that interesting. I only counted speaking as if I thought it was part of her awareness.

14:10 RTH: Okay. And so, so what I want to notice here is I think there's gonna be no right answer to this discussion and that, which means I think we could, I think one could do it two ways. [MM: Mm-hmm.] One could say: speaking occurs on 12 occasions, let's say. And of those 12, only four of them were in her awareness. [MM: Mm-hmm.] If, if we're gonna go that route, then we want to, and we wanna count this as *speaking*.

14:38 Speaker 3: [MM: Mm-hmm.]

14:40 MM: Oh yeah. Then it's in this particular sample. Is that what you mean?

14:44 JBK: Okay. Um, we could go that route. I guess if you want to count this, count, like how many were really in the, in her awareness, we could mark it somehow as we go.

15:03 RTH: So whether speaking is in awareness? Don't we have a category for that?

15:10 JBK: Uh, speaking not inner..., for speaking. We just have

15:15 MM: No, we just have that.

15:16 JBK: We don't have a separate like the way we're speaking, but I feel like this could incorporate like *rolling out* and like I feel like this sample is a *words rolling out*. Right.

15:30 MM: Well I think that's exactly, that's the important distinction. It's that speaking as a fact of a matter is a very different thing as speaking words rolling out and speaking where we deem it part of her awareness. Like they're really different layers. That can't be the same category. They're, they're three different things.

15:53 RTH: So what we're saying is that we wish, we wish we had rated this as having speaking, but also speaking outside of awareness. Is that right?

16:14 MM: Yeah. And then outside of awareness, well, words rolling out, are we counting that as in that category?

16:19 RTH: Yeah.

16:20 MM: Yeah.

16:22 RTH: So maybe we should call this [edits the heading for Excel column W to read "Speaking outside of awareness (words rolling out)"] and then, under that logic then this speaking should have been a 1 and this should have been a 1.

16:43 MM: Yeah, I'm happy with that.

16:45 RTH: Or maybe a 0.5. We're not actually sure.

16:49 JBK: Wait, I'm confused. Aren't we still at sample 1? Why were you rating sample two already?

16:55 MM: No, he just put it in the wrong spot.

16:57 RTH: Did I put it in the wrong spot?

16:59 MM: Yeah. That one there needs to be in the top row.

17:03 Speaker 3: Yep.

17:07 RTH: So the, do we think this is *words rolling out*?

17:11 JBK: Yeah. Yeah. I think it's words rolling out.

17:13 RTH: I do. Okay. All right. Then we have fixed. Our rating

17:20 JBK: Are speaking not inner category is means just all speaking or it means just speaking in awareness.

17:27 RTH: So this is now going, this category is now going to be all speaking. [edits heading for column Q to be "Any speaking (not inner)"]

17:33 JBK: Well, do we want any speaking, do we want a category for speaking in awareness?

17:40 RTH: I think we can get that by subtraction. If it's speaking it's not, not an awareness, then it would be an awareness. If you like, we can have another category, but it....

17:51 JBK: Oh, okay. Okay. I see what you mean. That's, yeah, that's fine. No need to add too many categories.

17:57 RTH: Okay. So this is now gonna be "Any speaking not inner)."

18:04 JBK: Yeah.

18:04 MM: Yep. And then the, that later category is when we decide whether it was product awareness

18:09 RTH: And now this number value here means that *somebody*, one of us, which I think is probably gonna be Julian, wrote a note to himself or to herself about this sample.

18:22 JBK: Yeah, probably me.

18:24 RTH: And if we go looking for that. [scrolls] Okay, here's Julian. [scrolls the Excel file to the section that shows Julian's entry in cell DV7: "Probably scene though there's some talk of overlaying"] And he wrote this note.

18:33 JBK: Probably scene. So that relates to the overlaid thing. Okay. Like I was, I was kind of doubting if it was a scene or overlaid.

18:42 RTH: Okay.

18:43 JBK: Yeah. Which we addressed as we're not really sure

18:49 RTH: [Mel laughs] So we're not, so we don't need to agree, we don't need to do anything more about this. Is that right?

18:54 JBK: Yeah.

18:56 RTH: And now we're done with part with sample number 1 because we don't have any 9 codes in here anymore.

19:02 MM: Right. That's satisfying! Okay.

19:05 RTH: And now Mel, this is, now you, you would have an answer to the, your first question. Why do we do this again? Well, because we've refined a little bit of categories already [MM: Yeah. That's true.] looking at one, one, one.... So if you, if you're, if you care

about phenomena, you gotta, you gotta do something like this. [MM: Yeah.] So number two has no nine categories. So we probably don't need to worry about that.

19:05 Russ comments: RE "Mel, ... now you... have an answer to ... your first question"
RTH refers to Mel's question at 2:58: "Why do you not fill out this grid as you're doing a green meeting?" The short answer is that rectification is about refining our understanding of phenomena, *not* about getting codes correct.

19:30 MM: We all agree. That's nice.

19:30 Russ comments: There is no reconsideration of sample 2.2 because there is no disagreement and the phenomena seem straightforward: Innerly speaking and seeing her calendar.

19:31 RTH: Nice. We all agree about that. About that. And then number 3,

Focusing on sample 2.3

19:37 MM: It looks like a mess.

19:38 RTH: It's a mess. So Julian did not say that this was inner seeing.

19:45 JBK: Oh, that, that's a mistake. It's,

19:47 RTH: That's a mistake. And mistakes are frequent because we were doing a lot of ratings. So we're not holding mistakes against people, we're just fixing them. So the, that's a mistake that we can fix.

19:58 MM: Well, speak for yourself, Russ! For Julian, I've noted a mistake!

20:02 JBK: Noooo! [laughs]

20:04 RTH: [laughs] True enough. So whether there's sensory awareness going on here, this is, I say I say half a one...

20:14 JBK: You said half...

20:15 RTH: I said half and everybody else said no.

20:17 MM: Yeah. I think I was quite bullish on sensory awareness in terms of, well, whatever the opposite to bullish is. I, I'm, I was cautious with my sensory awareness-ness.

20:29 JBK: I was cautious, too, but I'm, I'm fine with half, cuz of the moody dark colors. And

20:36 RTH: My, my sense is that people, when, when people describe this things like that, they're really trying to tell you something about sensory awareness.

- 20:43 MM: Okay. But can we, this is good cuz I wanna, I wanna clarify my thoughts here, because my hesitation comes from, it's just, it's a very detailed scene. She's describing the detailed elements of the scene. I don't necessarily think that means she's particularly, uh, drawn to the colors or anything like that, that they're like, but, but if she's just describing a vivid scene, you count that as sensory awareness.
- 20:43 Russ comments: MM's question is hugely important, and its answer requires two understandings.
- First, the object of DES is to be able to say something with fidelity about Kerry's experience; it does *not* necessarily have to say something accurate about any particular sample. That is the heart of the iterative method. The interviews about early samples are understood and intended to be training grounds for interviews about later samples. So MM is absolutely right when she says "I don't necessarily think that means she's particularly, uh, drawn to the colors or anything like that." But what is at stake is *not* whether she is drawn to the colors in sample 2.3; what is at stake is whether we have profited from our discussion of sample 2.3 so that we can be better able to make such discriminations on day 3 or 5 or 9.
- Second, the object of DES is *not* to obtain an accurate *count*. We accept that the quality of interviews changes over time; that we are taking only a relatively few random samples from Kerry's experience; that our sampling periods are not random samples from all of Kerry's experiences; and so on. As a result, all DES counts are fraught. The DES aim is to use counts in a broad-stroke way, to say things like "Sensory awareness occurred in somewhere between 5 and 12 (8.5 for short, or 21%) of Kerry's 40 samples," as we did in our description of Kerry, and to notice that sensory awareness was more prominent than unsymbolized thinking or feelings (which had one or two clear instances).
- 21:15 RTH: Well, I, I, so that's why I gave it a 0.5. It's enough, it's enough for me to say *this early in sampling probably there's sensory awareness going on here, but she doesn't know how to talk about it*. Certainly it's not enough to say *for sure* there's sensory awareness. So I'm totally in agreement with about that. But it seems like she's given a more detailed description than just, I'm trying to tell you what the scene was, the scene was here. [Mel: Mm.]
- 21:45 JBK: Cuz Russ, you say that people can be shy to talk about sensory awareness?
- 21:49 RTH: Right. A lot of people take two or three days to figure out that they can talk about sensory awareness.
- 21:54 MM: How do you mean? In terms of they would just describe like, y'know, I'm seeing whatever it is that she was describing here without getting into the colors?
- 22:03 RTH: Right.
- 22:03 MM: Really!
- 22:04 RTH: A lot of people who have sensory awareness don't start identifying sensory awareness until like the third sampling day.

22:10 MM: Well, like I was that, too.

22:11 RTH: That, and I think, I think it's because maybe people, maybe people think it doesn't matter. [MM: Mmm.] Or that's one possibility. And another possibility is that the *sensory* awareness is *very* close to *sexual* awareness. This is, this is what you are attending to, what you are...

22:30 MM: Attracted to.,

22:31 RTH: Attracted to. Yes. Exactly. What you're attracted to. And, and people are shy about telling you (for good reason!), shy about telling you what they're attracted to.

22:39 MM: That's very interesting! And uh, well I'm convinced now I'm happy with a 0.5.

22:44 JBK: [laughs]

22:45 RTH: So we good for a 0.5 in sensory awareness.

22:49 MM: Yeah.

22:54 RTH: [points to the sample 2.3 cell in column *N* that holds 9100000] And then Russ said this was a clear inner seeing.

22:54 Russ comments: The 9100000 code indicates that Russ said it was clear but Julian and Mel said it was not clear.

22:59 JBK: Uh, well, some parts were, some parts had skillful clarity. [MM: Yeah.] So I, I kind of thought of those as opposite. If something had skillful clarity, it wasn't clear.

23:13 MM: Yeah, I tend to agree.

23:15 RTH: So lemme tell you what, lemme tell you about my logic there is. Skillful clarity for, for me is, is usually there's one part of it or some part of it that is not clear [MM: Mm-hmm.] But this is a clear image with a, with a, uh, an unclear example. And, and the, and the, the, the, my way of thinking about this goes back to a fairly early thing where, where a student was saying she was, she was offended by her roommate because her roommates are too "loose" with boys. And so she has a *picture* [an inner seeing] of her roommate sitting on a couch wearing a bra and panties, sitting next to a guy. And the, the *roommate*, and particularly her bra and panties, are clear. But the *guy* is sort of featureless because, and, [laughs] and what she's trying to convey is there's a lot of guys who are in this position, it doesn't matter. [JBK laughs] [MM: Doesn't matter! (laughs)] But *she* does this kind of stuff. [MM: Cool!] That's, that's, that's my quintessential...

24:16 MM: Skillful clarity. I think that's [inaudible]

24:17 RTH: ...skillful clarity deal. And I would say this is a clear image with the parts that need to be unclear, made unclear skillfully.

24:28 MM: Damn! That's... He's good, Julian! He convinces me every time!

24:28 Russ comments: This is a good example of how the DES rectification process is more about refining the descriptions of phenomena than about getting the ratings to match. Here, we have come to agree that we should call an inner seeing *clear* if it is at least partially clear and any unclarity seems to have some skillful motivation.

24:32 JBK: I'll, I'll go with that. I see that, especially for the one which is a super-clear room, but it has some blurry photos. [MM: Mm-hmm.] I would definitely call that clear with some. Yes. So by that logic...

24:45 RTH: The, the alternative is that there, there we will see, maybe not on with Kerry, I can't remember. Probably not with Kerry. But *some* people just don't have clear images. They have vis it's visual, but the whole thing is just not very clear, not very detailed. [MM: Mm.] Then that would go as *not clear*.

25:00 JBK: But this one I still, like, I see that for some samples, which have certain unclear elements, but it seems like this one is *mostly* unclear. Like the text is blurry or indistinct. The colors are kind of like a wash. The only really clear parts are the edges of the slide, right.

25:23 MM: But it's also got very distinct colors. Like her descriptions, y'know, it's got black with hints of royal blue and red. Like [JBK: Yep.] there's fine line [JBK: There's a fine line.] I'm, I'm with Russ on this. I think it's clear with skillful clarity, especially this early in the piece.

25:23 Russ comments: (See the comment at 20:43.) We might be mistaken about clarity here, but the object of DES is to be able to say something faithful about Kerry, which requires taking each sample seriously, not necessarily to be accurate about any particular sample.

25:41 JBK: Okay. I, I won't, I won't object then.

25:44 RTH: So we're gonna change this to a 1.

25:47 JBK: Let's do it.

25:48 MM: Yeah. Okay.

25:50 RTH: [points to the cell in column O (Sensory awareness of color)] And then we're, this is the discussion we already had. Change this to a 0.5?

25:56 MM: Yeah. Okay. 0.5. Yep.

26:02 RTH: And then we have now clarified our thinking about [MM: Speaking.] inner, about speaking. So Kerry is saying aloud, "That's so nice."

26:13 MM: Yeah. And I, I, I consider this words rolling out, which is why I hadn't included it. But based on our new distinction, while there is speaking here,

26:25 JBK: So outside of awareness or just slightly in awareness?

26:30 MM: Yeah, I think it's, I think it's fully outside of awareness, to be honest. But, but I'm happy with a 0.5 if everyone wants to meet in the middle.

26:39 RTH: So in our, in in the DES world, if this is out of, outside of her awareness, then it should have been inside the brackets.

26:39 Russ comments: RE "it should have been inside the brackets"
He refers to the brackets in the sample 2.3 description. In sample descriptions, DES puts in brackets anything that is not a description of directly apprehended experience.

26:50 JBK: Yeah. But I think it, it seemed like the, one of those cases where like, it might have been experienced.

27:00 MM: Yeah. It's day two. I don't think anyone knew yet.

27:03 JBK: I'm not quite sure

27:05 RTH: 0.5?

27:06 MM: Yeah. I'm happy with the 0.5.

27:10 RTH: So this is, this is this category over here. I don't have quite enough screen. [JBK: Mm-hmm.] We're on sample number 3. So this should be 0.5. And then [points to column 5] focus on a face.

27:39 JBK: I am the only one who put that. I was, cuz I went back to the video and, and I, I was convinced that she was looking at the face, because I asked um, like anything in particular, and she was very clear, like his smile, I was seeing his smile trying to figure out.

28:04 RTH: So in the green meeting it looks like we would've gone up 5,.5.

28:09 JBK: Yeah. But, so that's when I went back and looked at the interview, I, I was like, it seems like the face was part of experience and not, yeah.

28:26 RTH: So 0.5 or 1? Mel and I missed it.

28:33 JBK: Um, we could, I mean for, for me, for me I thought, I thought it was convincing. Um, but since we could 0.5 it, since I'm the only one who thought that.

28:57 RTH: And then seeing? By seeing we mean external seeing, I think.

29:09 MM: Yes.

29:10 JBK: Yeah. Oh, and if she's looking at the face, then that is external. [inaudible]

29:17 MM: Yeah. I mean if, if Julian's including face, well then there has to be seeing that. Can't be one without the other there.

29:23 RTH: So she's perhaps looking at Evan. So that's, that would be a seeing, I guess.

29:27 MM: There's an element of seeing, yeah. What did I do? .5

29:30 RTH: So 0.5-ish. Happy with that?

29:34 MM: Yeah, I think we gotta meet in the middle there.

29:36 JBK: Don't we? Yeah. I'm curious if you watched that part again though, in that section, if you would think it's more of a, a 1. But, um, we could, we could leave that, leave that for now. So the multiple...

29:59 RTH: And the multiple..

30:01 JBK: 0.5. Because if she, if she was seeing his face and had the, the, and was seeing the slide, like the

30:10 RTH: I'm buying that. I'm buying that. Yeah.

30:12 MM: Okay.

30:12 RTH: So 0.5?

30:14 JBK: Yep.

30:18 RTH: And then we're done with that sample.

30:22 JBK: Okay.

30:23 MM: Interesting.

Focusing on sample 3.1

30:25 RTH: Sample number 3.1 is where we're going to next. And about skillful clarity, Mel gave it a one and the rest of us gave it a 0.5.

30:44 JBK: Alright. One of them was less. Katie was blurry and less detailed. Why, why did we give it 0.5? It does seem like... Oh! I, I guess I was thinking like it would be skillful if there was a reason for Katie to be less blurred. Well, or maybe she just hadn't filled in the picture, like filled in her inner seeing. Like maybe she was adding more detail or something.

31:14 RTH: Well, that would be possible. Particularly if she were 10 years old as opposed to 25 or whatever.

31:14 Russ comments: He refers to sampling with children where he has observed that inner seeings can take a long time (minutes, perhaps) to be formed. With adults, it is very rare that DES observes an inner seeing that seems to be in the process of being formed.

31:21 JBK: Yeah.

31:21 RTH: I dunno why I give this a 0.5. I would give it a 1 today.

31:24 MM: I think it's a 1,

31:26 JBK: Could go with 1. Wasn't, wasn't there vaguely something like Katie, the relationship was with Katie was different. Like she didn't know Katie as well.

31:36 RTH: Katie was somehow mad at Sam.

31:38 JBK: Oh right. They heard...

31:40 MM: That detail alone at says skillful clarity.

31:42 JBK: But then why wouldn't Katie be less blurry and look mad?

31:46 MM: Oh, maybe, maybe she's shitty at Katie! and so she's not innerly seeing her.

31:53 RTH: Yeah. I, I think skill, we should have given it a 1. And this is the same discussion we've had about clarity, I'm guessing.

32:01 MM: Uh, yeah. I think I'm gonna be the one screwing up that rating the whole way through. But I'm, we can now....

32:07 RTH: So that finishes sample 3.1. [MM: Yep.]

32:07 Russ comments: Day 1 of the rectification meeting proceeds for another half hour, which, because transcription is hard work, we do not transcribe. The audio / video of the entire meeting is available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Nfg2ICRPC8k>. Then there are two more rectification meetings after that.