

Kerry
Rectification Meeting Part 3

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the February 6 third rectification meeting with Kerry that is available on YouTube at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RISDhqs9jCk>. 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

This is the third day of the rectification meeting (see January 23 and January 30).

0:01 RTH: So it looks like we are all assembled.

Focusing on sample 5.1 (again)

0:06 RTH: And, and where we left off, basically, was I had sent you all an email where I, where I thought that Julian was right about the yogurt sample. And I was gonna explain what I, why I had come to that conclusion, which was basically a, whether, whether we should, the.... The question, the, the question was at, at, at issue as I recall it was should the, the sample was otherwise clear, except that the Fage, if that's how you pronounce that word, Fage yogurt was not clear. There was enough that you could tell it was Fage yogurt, but the but the details of that were not clear. Yeah. And the question is whether we should call that *skillful*. And I was arguing at the time that the answer to that was no. And Julian was arguing that the answer to that should have been yes. That's, that's sort of what I remember of the, of the background. Everybody agree with that?

1:03 JBK: Yeah.

1:05 RTH: And in, in, and in contemplating that, what I decided was, if, if you think about Steph Curry, y'all know who Steph Curry is? [JBK: Yeah. Basketball.] Basketball player, maybe the best shooter in the ba in the basketball. And if you, you watch him, you watch him shoot when he takes a three, when he launches a three-pointer from 10 feet behind the arc, and he puts that in, you say, "wow, that was really a skillful shot." And when you watch him watch him take a shot from 10 feet out and he makes it, you *don't* say, "well, that was really a skillful shot." [MM: Mm-hmm.] But it was equally skillful, I think. That this is what, this is what is in sort of the new thinking for me. It seems to me that Steph Curry is a skillful shooter whether he's shooting a 40-foot shot or a 10-foot shot. It might be that the audience would say, "that's a really skillful shot" at 40

feet, and *not* say that at 10 feet. But Steph Curry is equally skillful at 40 feet as at, and as at 10 feet. [JBK: Mm-hmm.] And so if, if Steph is shooting, then you should say that was a skillful shot because we know from watching Steph Curry shoot that he's a skillful shooter.

2:20 JBK: Mm-hmm

2:20 RTH: Even if e even if, y'know, I were out there and I were to take a 10 foot shot and make it or miss it or whatever, you wouldn't say, "well, he's a really skillful shooter, cuz he's not! And uh....

2:34 So what I think, now, about is that I think that we have established that Kerry has some skillful in, uh, visual imagery. She has visual imagery skills. And one of the ways that that demonstrates itself is that she sometimes blurs things that are not just inattention at the edge of the, the edge, at the edge of the world, the edge of the visual world, that they're not skillful. But there are little, there are pieces of un, pieces of unclarity in the middle of an inner seeing. And we would sometimes call that *skillful*. It seems to me if there, the, (and this is the, this is the, the finally gotten to the end of the story here) it seems to me that if she is partially clear, but, and partially unclear, even if it's about a detail that it's, that that doesn't *strike us* as being skillful. We should still give her credit for being a, a skillful for this being a skillful seeing. And I'm guessing that's more or less in the ballpark of what Julian was saying, but I'm not a hundred percent sure about that.

3:52 JBK: Yes, certainly. But would you say that any, any seeing that has some degree of blurriness or lack of clarity would, would then count as skillful?

4:04 RTH: No. What I think is that the, the lack of clarity has to be somehow *delineated*. Like when we, one of her samples is about picture frames. Inside the picture, inside the picture frame is not clear. The picture *frame* is clear. So it's not just like she's blurring as she gets farther away from the center of the attention. She has *patches* of, of, of unclarity. [JBK: Yeah.] And anything that has a patch of unclarity, I think should probably be called *skillful*. Whether *skillful* is the best word for that, I don't know. Maybe, maybe it's more *specificity of unclarity* or something like that. But I think *skillful* is probably in the ballpark.

4:52 JBK: I mean, yeah, I see, I see that case for here like that there are samples that are like, where blur blurriness or lack of clarity is used to do more. But here from like, we had multiple samples where she's talking or thinking about branding or logo design, and here it seems like she conveyed just enough to see that it was clearly this kind of yogurt, like had the red and blue logo or whatever. But she didn't feel the need the spell out the letters individually. [RTH: Right.] So that's why I thought it was skillful.

4:52 Russ comments: RE "it seems like she conveyed just enough to see that it was clearly this kind of yogurt"

I suspect that JBK misrepresents the *why* of the blurriness. He makes it seem that the blurriness is a shorthand—she doesn't *need* any more detail—when I think it quite possible that Kerry's blurring of the spelled-out *Fage* is because the pronunciation ("fah-yeh") conflicts with the spelling and she doesn't want to see that

conflict, or because she doesn't know how (or isn't confident about how) to spell *Fage*. However, as I said in the comment at 5:49 in Kerry rectification meeting 2 excerpts, we recognize Kerry's blurring or otherwise failure to elaborate a part of her seeing as being skillful without needing to know (and even Kerry doesn't need to know) *why* she blurs or doesn't elaborate.

As an aside here, I suspect that it would be valuable for Julian to meditate on the extent to which his *just enough* theory is an intrusion of the natural attitude: *just enough* suggests a *lack* of skill or a *lack* of attention or a *lack* of resources, when I think it likely (or at least possible) that Kerry's blurriness is the result of an *abundance* of skill, attention, or resources—that she *purposefully* and specifically blurs the letters.

- 5:30 RTH: So I'm, I'm compelled by that. And we, and we should change that to *skillful clarity*.
- 5:39 JBK: Okay.
- 5:41 RTH: So is there anything more to say about that? Or should we continue on to ?
- 5:47 JBK: I'm, I'm good on that.
- 5:47 RTH: So, so Mel, I think I convinced you the other way around the last time around. Have I convinced you back to this position? This one?
- 5:54 JBK: Yeah. You convince me every time! [laughs]
- 5:54 RTH: It's a dilemma.
- 5:57 MM: Very compelling! No, I think that makes sense to me. I mean, the only thing that gives me some hesitation in the Steph Curry and sort of this example is that, um, uh, it feels like there's some element of like, um, (I dunno how to, I dunno what the word I want is) but like, what is the word that I need? Anyway, but like, not in bringing some knowledge of the person to the sample, but I guess that's what we're, we're sort of doing each time. But in terms of it feels a little bit editorializing or like bringing too much knowledge along. If you're going, well, *Steph Curry's a great shooter, so anytime he shoots, it's skillful*. Or like *anytime Kerry's a bit blurred, it's skillful*. Do y'know what I'm trying to say there? I'm not being very articulate.
- 6:55 RTH: Yes, I do. And I, so I, I think it the word, it's the word *skillful* that's getting into, into trouble there, I think. [MM: Mm-hmm.] If we were to call it *localized unclarity*, then, I think, you wouldn't have that problem. We could say, well, this is, the picture frame was *localized unclarity*. [MM: Yeah.] And the yogurt was un, localized unclarity. And the, the boy visitors next to the bra, bra person would be localized unclarity. All those things would be localized unclarity. [MM: Yeah.] And then out of the percent of those we could say, well, this is,
- 7:31 MM: Yeah, I think you're right. And, and it's just me hung up on a word, which is ridiculous. But I think you're right. If even just that little distinction was better in my brain. Yep.

The recording interface shuts off RTH's audio, and they spend a few minutes sorting out the problem. The recording pauses, and then resumes...

- 7:42 RTH: I, so I dunno what I, I dunno what I did, if anything to deserve that! [they laugh] It's a new, I get a "heads up re new recording track" created.
- 7:53 JBK: Yeah, that's fine. I just gotta edit it because they're getting harder and harder to edit. But [laughs], it's all good.
- 7:59 MM: Oh no!
- 8:00 JBK: Just cuz we had all the screens now and then.
- 8:03 MM: Oh, true. [inaudible]
- 8:07 RTH: So I'm going to share my, I'm going to try to share my screen again. [MM: Yep.] I'm going to share my screen, the entire screen. And now can you see my screen?
- 8:30 JBK: Yeah. [MM: Yep.]
- 8:33 RTH: And I just entered a 1 here. [JBK: Mm-hmm.] And we're gonna change this title from *skillful clarity* to.... What did we decide it was gonna be?
- 8:44 JBK: Localized clarity?
- 8:46 RTH: Localized *un*clarity.
- 8:48 JBK: *Localized unclarity*. [RTH changes the heading of Excel column K] I like that too, because with *skillful*, we were wondering, *well, is she doing it for a purpose?* or is it just random? And then that involved speculating [RTH: Right.] what her purpose was.
- 9:12 MM: *Speculating*! That's, sort of the word I wanted earlier, Julian. Yeah.
- 9:16 RTH: Right. It takes the speculation out. [MM: Right.] Specula.
- 9:20 MM: It was too speculative. Correct. It's too early. My brain's not working properly yet, apparently.
- 9:27 JBK: [laughs] Early!

Russ comments: These conversations take place across the world. It is very early morning for MM and very late at night for JBK (and midday for RTH).

- 9:31 RTH: So this is this, this is now the heading. Does that seem reasonable?
- 9:38 MM: Yeah. Yeah. That feels better.

Focusing on sample 8.4

9:43 RTH: All right. Then we are ready to press ahead. And we were halfway through day 8. And in day 8 we were at 8.4. And in day 8.4, I said half a *sensory awareness* and nobody else agreed with that.

10:11 JBK: All right. I've gotta read through this and make my screen bigger because it's so small. Um,

10:16 RTH: So I could make this bigger, make this text bigger. It's 130.

10:22 JBK: Pull it up on my screen, too. Oh, right. If... It's the red we're considering

10:34 RTH: Yeah. The question is whether the red...

10:40 JBK: I thought the red was experiential, but it wasn't about the redness of the red. It was about the unchanged-ness of the edits.

10:50 MM: Mm.

10:51 JBK: In the end. But

10:54 RTH: I guess

10:55 JBK: Still thought 0.5, like 0.5 be

10:58 MM: Yeah, I agree. I'd, I'd give it a 0.5.

11:02 RTH: 0.5 is happening. That's reflects what we said in the green meeting.

11:07 JBK: Yeah.

11:09 RTH: All right. .5 for that. And then that would be of color.

11:15 JBK: Oh, I also put 0.5 there. I just forgot it before.

11:27 RTH: And then it definitely was *seeing* [MM: Mm-hmm.] Mel just overlooked that.

11:32 MM: Mm-hmm.

11:38 RTH: Okay. We good with that? [MM: Mm-hmm.]

11:40 JBK: Yep.

Focusing on sample 8.6

11:43 RTH: And we were all right with 8.5. And 8.6. The question was about *feelings*, and whether they were really experienced or half experienced

11:56 JBK: I thought this *was* a clear feeling.

12:08 MM: But what am I reading? 8.6. Hmm.

12:29 RTH: So the question is: What led you, Mel, to think of this as only a 0.5?

12:33 MM: Well, I did 0.5. Everyone else did a 1.

12:40 RTH: [inaudible]

12:40 MM: I'm not sure. I didn't really feel strongly about it.

12:45 JBK: Mm-hmm.

12:46 RTH: Well, there it is. The question is more whether there's a conversation to be had about why one would call this a feeling ,or why one would only *halfway* call this a feeling.

Russ comments: That's the heart of the rectification process and what makes it different from a rater reliability exercise. The object here is *not* to agree about the *rating*; the object is to use the disagreement about a rating to provide a perspective that may help us refine our focus on the phenomenon.

13:00 MM: Yeah. Uh,

13:05 RTH: And one possible answer to is, *I don't know at this particular moment, seemed like the right thing at the time, but I don't remember. Or* there might be some sensitivity that you have that the rest of us could profit from.

13:18 MM: Yeah. I think there is some degree of that, of sensitivity that I have. Like I think this is very relevant to how... Thi, this feels like I'm bringing too much of my own perspective here. [RTH: Okay.] Um, cuz this feels like something that could be sort of close to my experience. So I just felt like, I dunno, it didn't feel as strong as the capacity that I know is possible for like, something that I would be like, *oh, that's definitely clearly feeling* a lot. I don't think it's anything particularly grandiose on my end. I think I was just like, yeah, there's some feeling there. That's all. I, I can give you a 1..

14:03 RTH: So I can, I can buy, I can buy all that. And, uh, and I think it does, this conversation does highlight the fact that that inner experience doesn't fit clearly into categories. We can call, we can say that there's a category *feeling*, but that's really pretty arbitrary at the edges. Whether this is a 0.5 or a 0.7 or

14:28 MM: Yeah. I think that's all.

14:33 RTH: And then whether there's some *other than semantic* speaking going on.

14:39 MM: Oh yeah. True. Well see, I think that's, uh, I guess I was doing the, "uhhh,"

14:45 RTH: You,

14:48 MM: But I don't, I don't think that's really reflective of where we've agreed that that category goes.

14:54 RTH: I think the, the, uuuhh, is a retrospective verbalization. Yeah. She, she was not, uh, at the moment of the beep, she was saying, if I want to tell you guys about what this experience was, it was as *if I were* feeling,

15:09 MM: Yeah, I'm fine with that.

15:11 RTH: Just a blank for here.

15:13 MM: Mm-hmm .

15:17 RTH: And then whether there was seeing pretty clearly seeing

15:20 MM: Obviously is, so that's just wrong.

15:24 JBK: Seeing the guy's face.

15:26 MM: Gee, that wasn't my best sample, was it?!?

15:29 RTH: Well the, if one, if one were to say that the object is to is to reach agreement, then the answer to that question would be *Yes—it wasn't your best sample*. If the object is to spawn discussion, then it *was* a good sample.

15:50 MM: Thank you.

Focusing on sample 9.1

15:54 RTH: And we're, we're gonna have the same thing about here. [MM: Oh, the same thing.] Something about 9.1

16:00 JBK: Feeling.

16:01 MM: To be honest, I think feelings like these haven't come up that much. That category hasn't come up that much for Kerry. And I feel like it's, um, a category that I have some sort of issue with for exactly the reason that you've just said, Russ. I think I just find it too, it's like so wide and ambiguous. So I'm just prefacing this chat with that.

16:27 JBK: This is interesting. I could see some case where some feeling lurking or being part of, or reacting and saying, that's not my experience. That is not just a totally neutral thing. Like I don't think there's a whole separate feeling.

16:45 MM: MM. I think reading it right now, I agree. Like if we were doing a sliding scale thing, there might be a 0.2 there. I don't think it's enough to even award a 0.5.

- 16:58 RTH: For me, it is something like a sliding scale, but something like a, she, I don't think there's any, I think we all agreed that she was surprised. [JBK: Mm hmm.] There's no, no disagreement there. The question is whether.... And, *and* there's no disagreement that that surprise affected her in some important way. She was laughingly saying, she was reflecting that surprise. The question was whether she *experienced* the surprise. And the answer to that is, *it's really hard to tell*.
- 17:35 MM: Yeah. I agree. This is a 0 for me now.
- 17:40 JBK: Okay.
- 17:44 RTH: Okay. So this becomes a 0, and we're done with sample 9.1. Feelings are very often hard in that re in that regard. [MM: Mm-hmm.] And I think it, I do think it's important if, if you're trying to understand experience, you try to keep those things separate, because there are sometimes when, when you can feel surprised and it's directly in your face *I am feeling surprised* [MM: Mm-hmm.] And other times when you're just expressing it without feeling it.
- 18:14 MM: Which I think is, y'know, almost always the case with Kerry, too. Like there hasn't been an overwhelming amount of distinct feelings, but her..
- 18:26 RTH: [scrolls to the top of the spreadsheet, which displays the totals] Two of them, yeah, exactly. Two out of however many samples we've got.
- 18:31 MM: It's just like not feeling
- 18:32 JBK: The Staples one was the, the strongest, from what I remember.
- 18:36 RTH: Which one?
- 18:36 JBK: I don't remember what the other one was. The Staples looking at the guy's face and just the disgusted issue.

Focusing on sample 9.2

- 18:46 RTH: Oh. So 9.2. It's this kind of, oh, Mel thinks, maybe unsymbolized thinking.
- 18:56 JBK: Alright. I could see how it might have been, but I don't think the interview was adequate to, to uncover that.
- 19:07 MM: Yeah.
- 19:11 RTH: So this is where Mel gets her 0.5.
- 19:15 MM: It's the wondering-ness. This again, I'm, I'm happy to die on my, I was gonna say die on my sword. I think
- 19:26 RTH: That's, I'm happy, I'm happy to go back up to, to 0.5.

19:31 MM: Are you? I was gonna give you a 0!

19:32 RTH: In the, in the green meeting. In the, in the green meeting, this is... If this had been one, if we had written this as one question mark, we would've said 0.5 for sure. [JBK: Mm.] And this, this is, this is one of those where, where from my point of view, it's not so much about *counting* as it is about recognizing that this unsymbolized thinking as a phenomenon may or may not be present. It's sort of hard to tell. And this is an example. So I'm, I'd be happy to count this as a 0.5.

20:06 JBK: I'm, I'm happy with that too.

20:08 MM: Okay.

20:09 JBK: At least it lets us know [RTH: Right.] there's something interesting about it to go back and look.

20:12 RTH: In the unsymbolized thinking realm. *And* there are not very many unsymbolized thinkings. Even if you count this as a 0.5, there's only one other place where there was possibly one other. [MM: Mm-hmm.] [JBK: Yeah.] Or maybe two half places we could look.

20:28 JBK: And what I remember in the interview, she was saying, well, there wasn't a clear thought with the words. So I was thinking, well maybe there was a thought, but without words it was hard to not be suggestive. And, and there yeah, the interview had a lot of uncertainty.

20:47 RTH: So... was there speaking?

20:51 MM: Was there speaking?

20:55 RTH: I'm looking at 9.2. Yes. Was there speaking,

20:58 MM: She says "where's Lake Geneva?" Yes.

21:01 JBK: Yeah. Rolling out.

21:04 MM: I just missed that.

21:08 RTH: So now the question is whether we should, whether this is now a 0.5 or a 1. There was speaking. We're, we're in agreement that there was speaking going on.

21:20 MM: Oh yeah. But

21:21 RTH: The question is whether that was experienced.

21:24 MM: Well, didn't we have a different category? Don't we have two?

21:28 JBK: Yeah. *Speaking outside of awareness* three [(inaudible); laughs], I feel like we started doing it where we would put a 1 because there *was* speaking and then we would also put a one for outside of awareness. Yeah.

21:43 RTH: I don't, I don't think we're too, too clear about that. But then so what are we, what, what are we gonna do this time? And then we can go back and further

21:49 MM: That. So I think that's what we've been doing, haven't we Julian? So like yes, there's speaking,

21:53 JBK: We switched to doing, I think we occasionally did a 0.5 and then a 1. Oh, but I dunno, maybe just a 1 and 1.

22:04 RTH: So there's a lot of 1's, not very many .5's.

22:08 MM: Yeah, I think it's, I think we were doing, wait, can you scroll off again? So in the speaking category, oh yeah. One, there's some 0.5. So there's a 0.5 when there's a one, there's a one when there's, so it doesn't look like there's consistency on that

22:24 JBK: [laughs]. I think we agree that there was physical speaking, but just rolling out maybe not experienced at all.

22:36 RTH: So if I were to think about it today, I would give it a 1. [MM: I agree.]

22:39 JBK: 1. And a 1 for outside awareness.

22:44 MM: Yeah, I think so, too.

22:46 RTH: Yeah. So where's that one? Outside awareness,

22:49 MM: The, the green one to

22:50 JBK: The right.

22:52 MM: Ah, right. Yeah. That's outside of category for where rolling out. And then what's this

23:03 RTH: And *speaking other than semantic*. So the question is whether there were just meaningless words rolling out. And that doesn't seem like meaningless words to me.

23:17 Speaker 5: I think so

23:18 RTH: This is, this is probably my

23:21 MM: Category of what's rolling out

23:25 RTH: So this is gonna be a blank.

23:28 MM: Yeah. Then what's this?

23:30 RTH: And then is there any seeing and

23:34 JBK: Staring at the text

23:38 MM: Wondering, like staring at the text? It said like, yeah, that feels like seeing to me.

23:44 RTH: Okay. So why did you and I say a 0.5. It seems like it's pretty clearly a 1. All right. Onward to last two. [JBK: Mm-hmm.]

Focusing on sample 9.3

24:04 RTH: 9.3. / say there's inner speaking, but you all don't. [MM: Mm.] And you all say there's inner seeing and I don't, so the chances are good I made a mistake here.

24:16 JBK: Yeah. It's

24:16 RTH: The 9.3. So this is inner seeing and I put it as inner speaking. So this should be a blank and this should be a one.

24:36 RTH: And now this is our skillful, what we used to call *skillful*. Now we're calling *localized unclarity* and Mel and I say there is,

24:47 JBK: I thought this was more of a *nothing beyond*. What's the.... Because everything is clear, right? I don't think there's anything unclear in this one.

25:13 RTH: So I agree with that. So I don't know why I would've said 1. So I'm willing to go take this down to a 0.

25:22 MM: Yep.

25:24 RTH: Do you agree with that, Mel?

25:26 MM: Yep. I just feel like when that category started, it also was reflecting when things were smaller and things like that. Like see how it says it's "small, not life-sized." I think that's where I came to that of that was the skillful element. Alright.

25:43 JBK: That's interesting.

25:43 MM: The way we've defined this category sort of changed.

25:50 JBK: I wonder if there's if unusual perspective that could fit for that.

25:58 MM: No, there isn't an unusual perspective when we're talking about like her literal perspective of the seeing.

26:05 JBK: Yeah.

- 26:06 RTH: Right. I wouldn't call it
- 26:07 JBK: Something as small or life-sized or big could count as that.
- 26:12 MM: Well that, but that we've definitely had previous examples where we've been including the, that in this definition of skillfulness. Have we not?
- 26:27 JBK: The smallness thing?
- 26:28 MM: But I'm hearing what you're saying.
- 26:36 RTH: So I'm in my head. I've never, I never was clear about what she meant by small. Whether it was the refrigerator that was small, whether it was the image of the refrigerator that was small, whether that was small because it didn't cover up anything else. I don't, I never could figure that out.
- 26:54 MM: I thought it was really clear. It's just that the, the fridge that she was innerly seeing wasn't a regular sized fridge. It was, it was a smaller version of a fridge in her head.
- 26:54 Russ comments: I have now (several months later) gone back and watched the original interview about fridge sample (9.3), with these conclusions:
1. Kerry was pretty clear and consistent about what she was saying about smallness; the interviewers, however, didn't understand it during the interview and shortly thereafter.
 2. It was the *seeing itself* that was small, not the *fridge*. That is, the seeing itself did not occupy what Kerry understood as her entire inner visual field (which generally goes from horizon to horizon)—instead, her seeing of the fridge occupied only a small portion of the inner visual field, a portion roughly the size of a spatula held at arm's length.
 3. RE MM 26:54 "It's just that the, the fridge that she was innerly seeing wasn't a regular-sized fridge. It was, it was a smaller version of a fridge in her head." That is not correct. Kerry *is* seeing a regular-sized fridge, but the whole seeing of that fridge is small.
 4. RE the purple paragraph that is displayed on the rectification video (the paragraph that begins "Mostly, Kerry is innerly seeing her old refrigerator..."): That paragraph is not correct. It should read:

Mostly, Kerry is innerly seeing her old refrigerator from her childhood. It's white, a bit beat up, long silver handles, some rust, and with a textured pattern on the white panels. She sees it in front of her. She sees just the fridge, not a whole scene. Although there were no borders around it, she's seeing only the fridge. This seeing is small; that is, the seeing itself occupies a smaller portion (roughly the visual size of the spatula she is holding) of what Kerry understands as her entire inner field of view.
 5. I also went back and watched the interview for sample 7.1, and I now think that the "small little Zoom squares" that she described there also refer to a small *seeing* (seeing in only a small portion of the inner visual field) rather than small

squares. Similarly, I think sample 7.5 (innerly seeing the dog with the flower crown) is very likely also a small seeing rather than the seeing of a small dog.

27:10 RTH: So you're, you're breaking up. Your audio is breaking up for me.

27:17 JBK: So more that the whole scene was small.

27:26 JBK: Well, we could just leave a note. It says small.

27:34 MM: I think. Um, hang on. Yeah. So I, I can you, can you hear me or not?

27:43 RTH: We can now, yes.

27:45 MM: And nothing changed. I dunno. Um, yeah, so I thought it was just that the, the object that she was seeing (in this case the fridge) was much smaller than what, uh, she knows the size of a fridge to be. So she had skillfully made that smaller than necessary. And I feel like there are other examples of that where things have been much smaller than what they are in the real world. And therefore there's some sort of skillful aspect to that. Because then also if you look at, I, I didn't remember this before, but if you look at our *localized unclarity* skillful section that now feels dangerously close to our other a category which we have, which is *clear, at least in part*. So I feel like the lines there are blurring because now I don't have a way to categorize this skillfulness that I think is present in making the fridge smaller. Or am I overcomplicating things?

27:45 Russ comments: RE "the object that she was seeing (in this case the fridge) was much smaller than what, uh, she knows the size of a fridge to be"

It is the *seeing* that is smaller, not the seen fridge (see the comment at 26:54).

But I agree with MM's main point here: that the small-ifying of the inner seeing should be thought of as skillful.

RE "our *localized unclarity* ... now feels dangerously close to ... *clear, at least in part*"

I don't agree. The most common inner seeings (outer seeings, too) are clear, or clear in the center and somehow fading off at the periphery. Those should be called *clear, at least in part*; the *at least in part* qualifier recognizes that a seeing doesn't have to be absolutely clear in all its details to be recognized as clear. A small subset of those *clear, at least in part* seeings have patches of unclarity, *not* merely at the periphery, *not* merely because of general inattention or disinterest, *not* merely a matter of figure/ground contrast. Kerry's picture frame sample (5.4) is without doubt *clear, at least in part*, but what makes it noteworthy is that Kerry specifically blurs (or does not attend to, or whatever) the picture *content* while keeping the picture *frames* clear. That is, sample 5.4 deserves to be called *clear, at least in part* and at the same time deserves to be called *localized unclarity*. Those two aspects are not at all close to each other, in my view.

28:58 JBK: It's interesting that those categories are sim, more similar now.

29:02 MM: Hmm.

29:03 JBK: I dunno what to make of that.

29:05 RTH: So, so there's a lot there. So this in this inner seeing seems to me to be clear, at least in part, this should be a 1. Why I didn't say it as a 1 before, I don't know. So it seems to me that this, that this cell here ought to be a 1.

29:29 JBK: I, yeah, I agree with that.

29:32 RTH: And then this ques, the question that Mel is raising about whether there's some kind of a skill of making it small. I could get behind that. That's maybe why I gave it a 1.

29:46 JBK: I could get behind that too. But I feel like we redefined that to be more about blurriness,

29:53 MM: Correct. Yeah.

29:54 JBK: That's necessarily that skill. But I could see like, I don't know if it's another code or just a note in the notes column or something that there's something interesting about making it small.

30:06 MM: Well now I feel like our, our new term for it just doesn't, it's not broad, like broad enough in a sense. Like now it's like, well, *skillful* describes that better! [JBK: Uhhuh!] Cuz then it incorporates them again. But I didn't like that word before!

30:25 JBK: I could make one more case for *unusual perspective* as a category. [MM: Okay.] Like, it is the case that she, she sees it not how you would normally see it. If you're just looking at it; like here it's smaller. And in, in the yurt sample [sample 9.4], like she's physically behind her, like she's seeing it from behind. Um, but I feel like although they're different, they're both, I can make a case for both being skillful and both being about seeing things in a way that's different from, y'know, just looking out at the world.

31:05 RTH: So this I think is an example of, of the pie is, can be sliced in a lot of different ways. [MM: Yeah.] I personally would re would reserve *unusual perspective* for taking a position that is not where, where my, where my seeing usually is. [JBK: Hmm.] Like, I've had (not with Kerry, I, well Kerry had the one example, the yurt example) that, that her, her, she was seeing the local, the *seer* [JBK: Mm-hmm.] was behind her. That's what I would talk, talk as an *unusual perspective*. And I've got samples where, where somebody, y'know, is seeing the room from, *as if* they were up in the corner in the, in the corner of the room looking down on the, on the room. *That* is what I call an unusual perspective. [MM: Mm-hmm.] So it's the question, the question is whether *unusual perspective* re refers to the *seer* or to the *thing seen*. And in this case it's more the *thing seen*. And in the yurt case it's more the *seer*. [JBK: Okay.] And those are very different from my perspective.

32:14 MM: Mm hmm. I agree.

- 32:15 JBK: Well, do you think a new category would be worth it? Like change in size? Because there are, there's just that one other sample with the dog. I think with the dog, with the flower crown [sample 7.5]. The dog is also smaller. And oh no, one of her dad is smaller, too [sample 2.1]. Um, but we never fully figured it out. But
- 32:41 MM: Or is it, um, me being too literal here and like more often than not with inner seeing, the seeing of a life-like of a real-life thing is gonna be smaller, and I'm not actually gonna use up all this space in my inner-seeing world to have a life-sized fridge or a life-sized dog. And like that it's actually not really relevant that they're smaller, cuz perhaps that's a fairly normal part of the phenomenon. I don't know—I don't do it! [Mel herself has no experience of inner seeing.] So am I making too much of a thing that's not really part of the most important thing?
- 32:41 Russ comments: RE "gonna use up all this space in my inner-seen world to have a life-sized fridge or a life-sized dog"
That reflects, to my ear, natural-attitude thinking. In the experiential world, the seeing of the fridge has no size-relationship whatsoever with an actual fridge. Experientially, I generally see a fridge as normal size whether it is close to me or far away, and neither of those has anything whatsoever to do with the size of the activated regions of my retinas or my brain.
See the comments at 26:54 and 27:45.
- 33:19 JBK: But I think, but some of her scenes were lifelike. Like she described it like being there, it's around you, you're, you're in it. And some of, or some of them weren't. [MM: Yeah.] The three of them. The first one with hiking sample 2.1, um, and sample 7.5 with the dog and the flower crown.
- 33:46 MM: Yeah.
- 33:47 JBK: She talked about that being the dog being smaller. I feel like if we made a category for that five shift, either category or at least maybe a note, y'know, in the notes column.
- 33:47 Russ comments: RE "She talked about that being the dog being smaller."
See part 5 of the comment at 26:54.
- 34:05 RTH: Yeah. Maybe a note column. The, the problem, the problem with the smallness from my point of view is, so in, in 2.1, this is 2.1 that we're looking at now on the screen, the, is she seeing a small dad or is she seeing her dad, and then in some natural-attitude ways saying, well, y'know, compared to the rest of this stuff, if if this were the real world, then my dad would have to have been small. I could, I don't, I don't think we could figure that out at least on day 2. And I'm not sure we could figure that out even a day, even at the, in the refrigerator sample.
- 35:00 JBK: Do you think that's generally a hard thing to try to figure out? Or, because I'm kind of wondering like for the, yurt seeing it from behind her. Like, we, we accepted that this wasn't metaphorical. She sees it this way,
- 35:18 RTH: It was not metaphorical. That's what, is that what you said?

35:20 JBK: Yeah. Yeah. It's not metaphorical. [RTH: Right.] So what, so why do you think the smallness like to take it less literally? Or what, or do you think there's more risk of natural attitude seeping in for that? Like our mentally seeing it, it has to be smaller?

35:20 Russ comments: RE "Like our mentally seeing it, it has to be smaller."

I think that sentence reflects the natural attitude. There is absolutely no connection between the size that something is understood to be and the size of anything in the brain or mind or whatever. I can innerly see a Coke can and it seems like I am seeing a life-size can; I can innerly see the Eiffel Tower, and it seems like I am seeing a life-size tower. The size of an object in reality has no connection to the experienced size.

RE "do you think there's more risk of natural attitude seeping in for [innerly seeing size]?"

I'm not sure, but I doubt it. I don't know why didn't we appreciate what Kerry was saying about smallness, but I suspect there were multiple factors involved.

35:49 RTH: I, I, I think [pause] I, I think the taking of the, the yurt perspective is, is weirder [MM: Mm-hmm.] But ease in some ways easier to describe unambiguously. [JBK: Um.] This perspective is not from *here*, this perspective is from *back there* somewhere. Whereas the, I, I think the size of an image is just, is just problematic. Because if you think of it as an *image*...

36:37 JBK: Yeah. Then it makes sense. It could be a big or small.

36:40 RTH: ...then it makes sense to be big or small. So the question and, and that, so I think that's just, I think it's difficult. So am I seeing like a model refrigerator? Am I seeing like a miniature refrigerator or am I seeing an, an image of a refrigerator and the image of the refrigerator—it's a real life-size refrigerator, but the image itself is small? I think those are hard to sort out, because the *image* is such an ingrained natural attitude....[JBK: Yeah.]

37:18 MM: But as someone, if I, if I think the [inaudible] here, right? Clearly I have no capacity to do any of these options in *my* head. So if we *don't* categorize it in some way, like it's interesting to me to know the, the differences where sometimes it was this real-life size thing, and other times it felt distinctly smaller or just not, not the size I see it in real life. Like that's interesting as a phenomenon to me to know a little bit about that. As opposed if we don't categorize it at all, then I have no, there's, there's none of that referenced for me. And because I can't do that in *my* head, I have no idea that there's any difference sometimes.

37:18 Russ comments: I agree, but I also think it is better to sort out the difference between seeing something that is small and having a small seeing of something that is life sized. Those are very different phenomena, neither of which is, apparently, part of *Mel's* imagination.

38:01 RTH: So I think, I think that's fair enough. And it, and it, it is part, part of Kerry's skill that she can, she has a lot of different ways that she can innerly see something. [MM: Mm-hmm.] Sometimes it makes sense to call it small. Sometimes it, sometimes it's not. And that's different from Mel [MM: Hmm.] who doesn't have that skill or doesn't use that skill very often anyway. And uh, so I've got, I, y'know, whether we want a new phenomenon for a small, I don't really care about that. I think it comes down to when we wanna describe Kerry's inner seeing, we're gonna wanna describe it and in a way that it is informative to somebody like Mel who doesn't do that kinda stuff.

38:58 MM: Correct. Yeah. So that's where I think there's some skillful aspect to it, but it doesn't fit in what our, doesn't fit into what our skillful thing has now become. So perhaps it does need a new category as much as I...

39:13 RTH: So maybe what we need to do is put this back into skillful clarity. [JBK: Mm-hmm.] Or put this back to skillful, put this back to "skillful imagery including localized unclarity or indeterminate arrangement." How does that grab you? "Or size." [Types "Skillful imagery including localized unclarity or indeterminate arrangement or size" as the heading of column K.]

39:45 JBK: Sure. Bigger category.

39:48 MM: Yeah. Feels broad, but it's important. And I think that making a new category just feels like getting too in the weeds. So Yes.

40:03 RTH: And then we would agree that this is definitely one of those.

40:05 MM: Yeah.

40:07 JBK: Yeah.

40:09 RTH: And are there any other ones that we wouldn't have? Maybe number, this one here?

40:18 JBK: Yeah, that one may be a 0.5. Point five. The dog with the flower crown 7.5. The dog was smaller.

40:31 MM: [inaudible]

40:34 JBK: I mean .5, too.

40:32 Russ comments: Having gone back and rewatched the video, I think the *seeing* in sample 7.5 is small (that is, it is *not* seeing a small dog), so I now think column K for sample 7.5 should be a 1.

40:42 JBK: What else? Uh, what else is small? Search is small.

40:56 RTH: All right, we good about that? Number 9.3. [JBK: Okay.] On to 9.4? We just got one cell left where Mel says something was incorporated into reality. [scrolls to sample 9.4]

Oh, this was the yurt! [JBK: Mm-hmm.] Oh! *Incorporate into reality* in a *mashing up* sense as opposed to a incorporation sense.

41:55 JBK: I think it's incorporating reality in the scene. It's taking places...

42:00 MM: Yeah. It's like a reverse incorporated reality.

42:03 JBK: Yeah. It's kind reverse.

42:10 RTH: This is using is that a piece of Go ahead,

42:15 MM: Sorry. I was gonna say, but then is that also fraught with danger to view that as that way like, y'know, well in the dog sample it's uh, her a flower crown from her childhood. So that's a part of that reality incorporated. Y'know, like every seeing is probably taking something from somewhere. So is this a slippery slope?

42:38 RTH: Right, I agree with that.

42:40 JBK: Yeah. Yeah.

42:42 RTH: So this should be a blank?

42:43 MM: I'm [inaudible] myself. Yeah! Yeah, I think so. I think it's too dangerous. It's a really nice, obvious example of that. But then I think that just opens a whole lot of problems.

42:58 RTH: So now, we have, we have removed all of the differences of opinion. [MM: Wow.] And what we can see now by, by looking at the numbers [scrolls to the top of the spreadsheet, which shows the sum for each column] is she had a lot of inner seeing—19 out of 40 some samples, it looks like however many samples there were, the first samples starting with seven and 40, 39 samples, maybe? 38 or 39 sample half of them involved inter seeing.

43:33 JBK: That's

43:34 RTH: Interesting. And inner speaking, over a quarter and sensory awareness,

43:46 JBK: Fair amount. [RTH: Yeah.]

43:52 MM: Interesting.

43:53 RTH: But more, more important than the numbers is that this map now gives us, if we want to talk about inner seeing when we described the phenomenon of inner seeing, we wanna incorporate the kinds of inner seeings that we're seeing in these, in these samples.

44:10 JBK: Mm-hmm

- 44:10 RTH: And when we wanna talk about inner speaking, we're gonna go back and refer to these speakings. And, and then when we're describing those phenomenon, we're gonna see, we, we, while there phenomenon of inner speaking broke down or didn't work or whatever for this sample and this sample and this sample... [points to cells with .5] [JBK: Hmm.] which is the next step for, for Kerry: to describe her experience. So basically, basically we, we have now done as good a job as, as we are capable of, I think, jointly, of coming to terms with Kerry's phenomenon.
- 44:53 JBK: Mm-hmm.
- 45:02 RTH: And now the question is we want to, if we want to make that available to somebody else. For, if we, for example, if we're gonna put Kerry on the web and we're gonna have a summary of what, what we found, now. We're in a position to do that as best, as best, as best any people can possibly have to characterize Kerry's inner experience. It seems to me we are now in that position. And the way we, the way I generally do that is now I would task a student to write a draft of Kerry's inner experience and then bring it back to the group, and then we would polish it and uh, and call it done.
- 45:45 MM: Nice. It is very like—even just, y'know, top line looking at those numbers right now, like at the totals, just casting my eye over them—it is very satisfying to be like, *Yeah! That, that does feel really reflective* of like yeah, it's mainly inner a seeing and there's quite a lot of inner speaking and then off there's this really present skillful element and very often her inner, inner seeing is really clear. Like, y'know, you're like, yeah! This does feel really reflective of Kerry. It is cool. We're getting to the bit that I want, which is conclusions! [laughs]
- 46:17 JBK: Mm-hmm. Is there a part where we're meeting again with Kerry and, and presenting this? Or does that come after?
- 46:25 RTH: Well I, I think we ought to write it, first. [MM: Yeah.] And so, so Julian, do you want to take a crack at writing it?
- 46:35 JBK: I could take a crack. Sure. Write a description. Is there a like, just as long as it takes to adequately describe, you say? Or,
- 46:47 RTH: So I, I, the task is to say something like, "the most prominent inner experience that we saw was inner seeing" [JBK: Mm-hmm.] And then to describe what inner seeing was most of the time, like what Mel just said: most of the time it was clear and much of the time it had this skillful aspect. And by skillful aspect, I mean this and this and this. So that, so that basically the, the object is to put into plain English [MM: Mm.] [JBK: Yeah.] that, what we know, what the three of us know with pretty much agreement, (not, probably not exact agreement) but pretty much agreement so that somebody reading it who doesn't know Kerry and who doesn't know us and doesn't know the process would, would understand what we're saying.
- 47:39 JBK: Okay.

47:39 RTH: And that means, that means giving enough examples so that you can't just say, well, y'know, part of the time is skillful. You have to spell that out and with enough examples so people can understand that.

47:50 JBK: Give some examples. Okay. Yeah, I, I'm interested in trying a description. [RTH: Okay.] Um, also I'll have time starting next week. I wanted to start working on some short videos about, um, yeah, about this project. [MM: Great.] Y'know, maybe each video focusing on a couple samples or like, um, but yeah, I can do that in tandem because I think writing it out would also be a good way to just spread it.

48:24 RTH: So I, I think I'm trying to figure out what I have to do to stop sharing here. There's a thing that's called *Stop*, but I'm not sure that that means Stop Sharing.

48:33 JBK: Yeah. That that that does it. Yeah, it

48:35 RTH: Does. That, that is,

48:37 JBK: Yeah.

48:38 MM: Yep.

48:39 RTH: Okay. So I, I, I do think that the writing it out is, is in large part the same kind of an exercise as what we've just been going through here in the sense that it, it forces us to rethink phenomenon as and how they're related to the words. Y'know, we use words and we think we know what they mean, but other people don't. And does this do, do these words fit [JBK: Yeah.] faithfully to the pheno, to the phenomenon. Y'know, we had a long discussion about whether *skillful* was right, and decided it wasn't. Then we decided it was, and that that will occur in the writing as well. And uh,

49:23 JBK: Yeah.

49:24 RTH: And, and the task is not, not to take that personally. It's not like it's wrong or right or whatever. It's that we're, we're gonna try to refine it until we can, until we're satisfied with it.

49:37 JBK: An understanding Yeah. I can, can get cracking on that. I, I was also wondering about next steps in general and about doing this kind of analysis thing for Mel's samples. Um, and it's, it's farther in the past, but I think it, I think it still would be interesting. Um, would you guys think about that?

50:02 RTH: I think there's something to be said for that.

50:05 MM: Yeah. I think it would be helpful from a broader project perspective for me to have this level of detail and analysis on my samples, to then bounce off Kerry to then help me go to the next step of putting something together. So I would be interested in that.

50:26 RTH: So let's see what, okay, so let's see what we, what we would have to do about that. So we need idiographic... Did we ever write idiographic characterization, personal ideographic, characterizations of Mel's samples?

50:42 JBK: No. And we didn't do the green meeting. I think we have

50:48 RTH: That. So it would have to description

50:49 JBK: Of each sample, but we should do the green meeting step.

50:52 RTH: So we probably have to revert to the green meeting for Mel.

50:57 JBK: Yeah.

50:58 RTH: Go back to where we left off, which would be green meeting for Mel.

51:05 JBK: Yeah.

51:06 RTH: Okay.

51:07 JBK: And Mel, would you wanna be a part of that or, or come back when the process is done?

51:17 MM: Uh, I guess be a part of it. I dunno. I don't have strong feelings either way. Do you?

51:24 JBK: Um, I think, I think it would be interesting to get your perspective. I, I think as you said before about Kerry, as Russ said, like you might not be the authority about something because you might be attached to thinking of yourself as a certain way or a sample a certain way, and memory can change. I think. I think you, those are interesting conversations now. I think it's really you and your time availability. I mean it is long process.

51:58 Speaker 5: There's,

51:58 RTH: There's no, there's no perfect way of doing DES, I think, so this is... What we're, what we would be deciding is that we would think that this would be an interesting, worthwhile thing to do because Mel's, Mel's experiences are pretty much, pretty much in the past—a fair amount of water over the dam since we've seen Mel's experiences, which is not ideal. So that would've been better to have done the green meeting back when, right at the end of Mel's sampling. But we didn't. So now I think we're gonna go back and we're gonna do the best we can for a green meeting and Mel might as well be there if she wants to be there. And if we get halfway into the green meeting, we might say, *well that was a mistake*. Either to do the green meeting at all or to have Mel there or whatever. [MM: Mm-hmm.] It's not just a matter of going through the motions. It's a matter of *do we think and our best judgment, our best joint judgment, do we think that we are advancing the ball towards an understanding of Mel's experience?* If the answer to that is *yes*, then we should do it.

53:10 JBK: I think it would, um, and to have you there, I think that would I, but I ultimately just think it's up to you.

53:22 MM: Yeah, yeah. I'm interested. I think I agree with all of that.

53:27 RTH: Well, do we wanna finish a writing of Kerry before we get to that? Or do we want to schedule a, schedule this, schedule another joint meeting for the three of us, which could then be either a green meeting for Mel or a discussion of the writeup?

53:47 JBK: I find this [inaudible]

53:47 RTH: Writeup, discussions are very often done by email, passing documents around, tracking changes and whatever.

53:55 JBK: I'm fine for scheduling something. Now what with the time zones? A week?

54:07 RTH: A week from today would be Thursday, the 13th. Our, Thurs, our Thursday the 13th, which is Mel's Friday the 14th.

54:18 MM: Works for me.

54:18 RTH: I can do that.

54:20 JBK: That's good. Now would you do an hour later, would that that also be good?

54:26 MM: I mean, I'm, I'm definitely open to an hour later. It gets me an extra hour sleep, but I'm conscious that it gets late for you.

54:33 JBK: No, but it's, it's fine for me. Yeah. Fine.

54:36 RTH: So 45 minutes, 45 minutes later than we started today would be one o'clock on the hour for me,

54:43 JBK: 10 for me. And then that's 8, 8 for you. Should we do that? Yeah.

54:48 MM: Are you okay with that Julian?

54:51 JBK: Yeah.

54:53 MM: Then I will *gladly* take that!

54:57 JBK: Yes. Uh, what should I even call this? I'll just call it a DES meeting. We talked about.

55:08 RTH: Well you should probably put in there as a green meeting, cuz that'll remind me to have the documents together for what we need to have.

55:17 JBK: Okay. Alright.

55:20 RTH: But it might not be a green meeting. We may, we may change our mind if we have something to say. And in the meantime, when you make a document, Julian, you should just email it to us and then we will pass it back and forth with track change comments in it till we agree.

55:38 JBK: [MM: Mm-hmm.] Okay. Sounds good.

55:40 RTH: Sounds good to me. Fabulous. I have lost, I have lost us here. We must be here somewhere. There. We're

55:47 JBK: Alright, I'll stop the recording.