

Michael D.
Michael D. Interview 7
Sampling Day 7

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the February 26 interview with Michael that is available on YouTube <https://youtu.be/WGuy4iSTtZI>. If you have corrections, suggestions, or questions, please post them as YouTube comments.

RTH = Russ Hurlburt

AB = Agnes Bolinska

Michael = Michael D.

- 0:00 Russ comments: The comments that I have inserted in the transcript below are intended as commentary about what I think at the time I write the comment, which is generally within a day or so of the interview. They are not to be confused with the Truth with a capital T; there is no guarantee that I will agree with them if I review them at some later time, at which time I might revise or extend them; they are invitations to Michal and/or Agnes to disagree, or to amplify, or to say they don't understand, and so on. If they wish to insert their own comments, they should pick a color other than this green, and then do so. They should also feel free to correct the transcript.
- 0:05 RTH: So this is gonna be day 7, I think.
- 0:09 Michael: Yes.
- 0:10 RTH: Anything that we should be talking about before we launch in?
- 0:15 Michael: Um, I don't know if this is the time to talk about it or not. Um, I, so I got, I got the, you can tell me to stop talking if it's not, uh, once you realize what I'm talking about. [laughs] Um, I, I got the documents that you sent. Uh, I responded to one by email. There was nothing much to say there. The other document you sent had a question that I think was directed towards me. Um, and I can answer it now, or I can write you the answer.
- 0:15 Russ comments: The document Michael is referring to is the contemporary descriptions of sampling day 6. See the comment in interview 6 at 25:39.
- 0:43 RTH: I don't remember the question.
- 0:45 AB: Answer it now! Well, cuz I wanna, I wanna know the, I was curious about the answer!
- 0:49 Michael: Actually. Okay. Tell me,

0:50 RTH: Tell me what I asked! [laughs]

0:52 Michael: [laughs] You asked why did Michael, um, readily volunteer a pseudonym for one voice, and even when sort-of, kind-of, invited to, for a different, did not do that.

1:05 RTH: Okay. Well, now I do remember that question. And so the, I didn't, I was, that, I wasn't asking that question to get an answer.

1:13 Michael: Okay.

1:14 RTH: I, I was asking, I put that comment [interview 6 25:39] in there because I thought it would be a, I thought people might be interested in what the, what the logic is. And then, um, and, and, y'know, I'm, I have in mind making what, what the high-fidelity description of inner experience is about. And this is one of the, and that was one of the, considerations. Y'know, when you, when you write something, well, well, how do you do it? When do you write it this way? Or do you write it that way? Or do you write it this other way? And, so that was a rhetorical question about. And the, and the answer of which I'm interested, I would like to know what the answer is, *but* more than liking to know what the answer is, I would like to protect your interests in that. So,

2:01 Michael: Uh, yeah, I will protect my own interests there. [RTH: Okay.] Um, ah, it's a, I'm not gonna give the long, there's a very long discussion that we could have for the next hour, which we don't wanna do. Um, and Agnes, you and I can have that discussion sometime if you wanna know.

2:16 AB: Okay, because I want to do that!

2:17 Michael: That's fine. [they laughs] y'know how to find me. Um, [AB: laughs] I mean the, the, the, the very short answer is, that in my view, naming things is a way of, I mean, I, I'm not doing ontology here. I'm not, this is, I'm not doing philosophy here right now. I wanna be clear about that! In fact, [laughs] Agnes and I did talk about the fact the other day that every, every time I do ontology, I get in trouble. Philosophers hate me when I do that! So I just wanna say, for any future philosophers that are paying attention, this is not ontology! [AB: laughs] But, what, what I'm, what I'm, but, but it is true in everyday life, not in philosopher's life, that when you give a name to something that, that confers some kind of status on it. Um, like if I say, *what is this?* And I point to the guitar, you say, *that's a guitar* that, because guitars are things in the world that have a certain status. But if I point to some, like, y'know, square inch of the spruce top of the guitar, and I say, *what is this?* The answer is, that's *not anything*. It's just part of the guitar. Because we'd, we haven't conferred any kind of status on that little thing. And I don't, I, I'm fine for John to have some status. I like John. He's fine. The other voice I do *not* like, I, I will not, I don't call it by its name even to myself.

3:48 RTH: Okay.

- 3:50 Michael: And I don't want it to have a name. It has a name. Unfortunately, I can't, I can't change that. But it, I don't want it to, I don't want its name to be used.
- 3:58 RTH: Okay. And that's fair enough as, as far as I'm concerned. And, and I would say if you have a commentary on, y'know, I, I think I provided three or four options of what I, the way I could have written that?
- 4:13 Michael: I, I remember that you did. I don't remember what they were.
- 4:15 RTH: Yeah, I don't either. But if, but if there, if either one of you appeals, well, y'know, there's a, there was another alternative that would've been better, I would say by all means, add that to the list. And that's, that's what those, those commentaries are about.
- 4:28 Michael: Okay. The one thing that I think maybe *is* worth saying here, because if I've got this wrong, you need to correct me. Um, so it does *not* feel to me. So, so at the very beginning we agreed to something like, *if there's an aspect of an experience that you don't wanna talk about, just skip the whole thing*. And I, I don't really foresee that happening, but I, I, appreciate that the option is there. Um, the, it didn't feel like that was necessary in this case (but now here's where you can correct me if I'm wrong) because the actual name was not any part of the experience. I wasn't *thinking* of it, the voice was not *saying* it. They never say their own names; they, they don't talk about themselves. Um, and so, o, so it was not a kind of explicit part of the content of the experience itself. So it's not like there was something that I was hearing, but I'm not willing to tell you it wasn't there.
- 5:25 Now you could say, and this is, this would be totally fair. And I think if I recall some of your options, it might point to one or the other of the options that you had as being more appropriate. But I'm not, I don't remember exactly what they were. So I'm not gonna, I'm not gonna swear to that right now.
- 5:40 So we did have another conversation at the very, very beginning, maybe on day zero, about how there's, there are certain ways in which context colors experience. Um, y'know, if I, if I see, if I see an automobile that's a random automobile, I see it one way. If I, if it's *mine*, I see it a different way, even if it looks the same as the one that I know not to be mine. Um, and, and so, so, there is that *coloring* and that's, I guess that's why, apart from other, probably just conventional and psychological reasons, why we talk a little bit about context before we talk about what the experience is, so that you can have some sense of what that coloring looks like. And you *could say* that there's some coloring in this case too, but I don't think the coloring is by the, by the *name itself*. I think the coloring, it has more to do with the fact that I know this voice [laughs] it's familiar to me. And, y'know, the fact that it has a name could, could somehow be reflective of that. But the name *per se* was not a part of the content of the experience, if that makes sense?
- 6:50 RTH: So what I, I got a couple of reactions to, to that one. One is the, the instruction that I gave (*if, if there was a, if there was a piece then a piece that you wanted to hold back, then let's not talk about that*), that was, that was, more designed for your protection rather than mine. I, I would rather have you say, I don't wanna talk about this piece cuz there's a piece in there. So I would like you to, I would like you to feel

that you have control. I, because I think you have, you do have control. I would like you to feel like you have control. [Michael: Okay.] That was about that.

7:17 The second part is, I think, I think *everything* has context and, and I don't think I'll ever get the entire context. So, and, and that's part of why I consider DES about, a method, about *fidelity* rather than about *accuracy*. Because accuracy implies that I know everything about all the context. And I don't think I ever do that.

7:38 And, and in your example, I think, y'know, if you're walking towards the parking lot and you see *a car*, or you're walking towards the parking lot and you see *my car*, those are two very different experiences most of the time. Because one of 'em is the target that you're heading towards and all, all, that stuff. And, and I think, I think experientially it would make sense to say in that sense, *I'm walking towards my car* rather than *I'm walking towards a car that happens to be a Honda CRV*, or whatever your car is.

8:10 Michael: Well, but let, let me interrupt for just a second. What if, what if, uh, what if my car has a name? My car is called *Old Betty*. And, but I didn't want, for whatever reason, I didn't want to, I didn't want to let y'know that. Um, and so instead I just say I, I'm wa, I, I, y'know, I, I, I, describe it in terms that don't invoke the name of the car, but do make it clear that the car is familiar to me, it's what I'm heading for. I have that sense of like, oh, there's my goal and so on and so forth. Is that getting, is that enough for you? As long as I'm not thinking, *oh, there's Old Betty!*

8:52 RTH: When, the desirable thing for me is: if your experience is walking towards Old Betty, and that is different from walking towards this particular car that happens to be mine, then I would like to know that it's *Old Betty*. [Michael: Okay.] But, and, and, and I, I, and I think experience, because it's *your* experience and you're presenting it to yourself, it's probably, most of the time pretty clear to you as to whether you're walking towards *my car* or walking towards *Old Betty*.

9:24 Michael: Okay. That, that, that clarifies it for me. In that case, I don't think I have violated our agreement in any way.

9:31 RTH: That's good! [laughs]

9:33 Michael: Well, I mean, I would've violated it if it seemed like there was some crucial part of this experience that I wasn't revealing to you. But that doesn't seem to be, to be the case.

9:41 RTH: I, I agree. And I was making a little light of it there. But the, the pristine experience is *not* an objective fact, I think. Pristine experience is Michael's experience as Michael presents it to Michael in Michael's way. And, I'm guessing that most of the time he presents his car to him, himself as *I'm heading to my car cuz I'm gonna get in and drive home, or I'm heading to my, I'm heading to Old Betty because for whatever reason I'm thinking about the history with old Betty* or whatever. [Michael: Right.] And, and those are probably very different kinds of things, but they're, they're essentially Michael's way of presenting the world to himself.

- 10:30 Michael: That all makes sense. I just hope as a result of this conversation, I don't start calling my car *Old Betty*. [laughs]
- 10:38 AB: I was gonna say, is there something else you're not telling us, Michael?
- 10:40 Michael: [laughs] That, that, I made that name up right now, and I hope, an, and, and if everything goes well, I will have forgotten it by the end of the hour.
- 10:48 RTH: Me too!
- 10:49 Michael: [laughs]
- 10:51 RTH: So, anything else you, we should be talking about? [Michael: No.] On to beep, beep, number 1.

Sample 7.1 discussion starts here

- 10:56 Michael: Number 1, then. Um, okay. So I, um, this is all fairly recent because I did not put this thing on until after my class today, which might have been risky. Um, cuz there was not quite six hours between then and now, but it turned out that it was not at all risky. Um, so I was, um, walking, uh, back from class and, uh, it was raining. I had my umbrella up, but that wasn't, I wasn't paying any attention to that. It's just context. And I was kind of very softly singing a tune, and the tune was [sings] ba ba ba, ba ba badaba ba ba ba, and so on. And, um, I was also at the same time, um, (I'm just telling you what's going on in the world right now, and then I'll tell you which of this I'm actually paying attention to or attending to).
- 11:58 At the same time, I was (oddly with my right hand, I'll say why it's odd in a second cuz that comes up) I was fingering as if I was playing a French horn (which the odd part is you don't play a French with your right hand). But, I was fingering, um, but I was not fingering the actual fingerings of the notes that I was singing. I was doing it to the rhythm of them, and I wasn't really even paying attention to exactly what fingerings I was doing, but they were the same, I was repeating this phrase (and there's another phrase that comes after it in this particular piece) and I was, I was repeating that and fingering it. And I did finger it the same way every time, but I was not fingering the actual fingerings of the actual notes that I was playing. And also, every once in a while, my fingers would add little notes almost as if they were playing some of the other parts in the piece. Um, so that's what was going on.
- 12:55 I was, So what about experience? Oh, sorry! I was also thinking, I just... At the end of class this morning, a student had come up and asked a question, and I was also thinking about *did this student understand?* Like, y'know, did, did I succeed and did the student succeed, in, in figuring out the answer to this question together, after class was over.
- 13:22 So now *experience*. I was hearing my own singing. I, I wasn't really attending to the fact that I was doing it. So this was a "hear-y" rather than a "sing-y" kind of a thing. I was enjoying the kind of kinesthetics of, of the feeling of my fingers, my, my, so your, so your finger French horn with your thumb and your first three fingers, your pinky's not involved. And so, I, my, my first three fingers were on the base of my thumb like that. [gestures with thumb] And my thumb was kind of working this area

right here next to my forefinger. And so that's how the fingerings were going, um, or being realized. And I was, I was kind of in, just enjoying the, the pattern of the fingers. They weren't going this fast, of course, I was doing it to the beat. So actually I know what, I still know the pattern. I was going [sings] ba ba ba, ba ba badaba ba ba ba, and then right there, I would sometimes add a little bit like with my fingers, that wasn't, but there was no singing that went along with that. I was also at the same, so I was doing, I was, I was hearing my singing, I was feeling this, and I was intentionally, and I was aware that I was doing this, coordinating the cadence of my walking with the, the beat of the music and the, the fingers.

14:46 And, somewhere around the time of the beep, within a, a, second or three of the beep, but before it for sure, I said to myself, um, but I, well, I, I, I thought to myself, I should say, cuz there was no, there was neither spoken word nor heard word. It was just more like thinking the words. I thought "she gets it." So I'd, come, I had come to the conclusion on the basis of thinking through how that interaction went with the student, that she *did* understand what I... So prior to that, it, I, it, it had occurred to me, or I had remembered that she had offered an answer to a question before I actually a, asked the question, which told me that she knew both what the question was supposed to be, and the answer, and that, and that's what convinced me that she understands. And so I had said, or thought to myself, "she gets it." That's it.

14:46 Michael comments: For the record, I later figured out that it was the second theme of the third movement of Tchaikovsky's violin concerto (A E G#- F# E D DED C# B A, and so on).

15:49 RTH: So is the "she gets" it portion before the beep?

15:53 Michael: Yeah, but very close to the beep. I mean, thi, this is within two, two seconds or so. I had just said it, but I, so sometimes when the beep goes off, it feels like, I'm not sure, did it go off in the middle of what I was saying? Or did it go off after it? Or, it's not always clear. But this was pretty clearly after, but right after, not d, not several seconds later. Maximum two or three seconds later.

16:17 RTH: Okay. Well, I would say two or three seconds is enough to say that's before the beep.

16:21 Michael: Okay. Well then that wasn't part of the,

16:23 RTH: Un, unless it's, unless it's seems like there's some echo or continuation or whatever of that experience.

16:28 Michael: I mean, I think I was still *thinking* it, but I, but I had, I wasn't, I, I think I was, the, the thought was *lingering* in the sense that I had kind of reached this conclusion. And so I was kind of satisfied, that I had reached the conclusion.

16:42 RTH: So, what if,

16:42 Michael: I wasn't, I wasn't saying the words still though.

- 16:49 RTH: So if what I, what I understand you to be saying is: a second or two before the beep I had said "she gets it," or not *said* I had, I had...
- 16:58 Michael: *Thought*.
- 16:58 RTH: ...hought those words, I thought those words, "she gets it." And the residue of that thought, or the satisfaction of that thought, or the continuation of that was still somehow present, but no longer worded.
- 17:12 Michael: The fact that, the fact that, uh, what was... Yeah, that's right. What was, what was present was, kind of the fact that this line of inquiry has now been concluded. [laughs] I don't have to think about this anymore. Now none of that was in words of course, but there was a sense of like, *I'm done with that*.
- 17:28 RTH: The completion,
- 17:30 Michael: Yes.
- 17:31 RTH: Completion, It was articulated, worded. It was worded a little, second or two ago. [Michael: Right.] But the sense of completion remains.
- 17:41 Michael: Yes, that's correct. I hadn't yet moved on to the next thought. [RTH: Okay.] I was still kind of dwelling in the fact that that was, done.
- 17:48 RTH: Okay. And so that, from my point of view, that counts as, *at the moment of the beep*, because the, the residual satisfaction completion, or residual completion, satisfaction is part of the, part of the beep.
- 18:00 Michael: Okay. That's that's fair.
- 18:02 RTH: And I, *and* I think it, I think it is definitely true, that experience is not in, in well-defined chunks like sausage links or something like that, I don't think that's, I don't think that's the way it is. So, there's some arbitrariness about, what it is or what is not at the moment of the beep.
- 18:20 Michael: I make sausage sometimes, and sometimes they're not very well defined either. But that's a different story!
- 18:24 RTH: That, that would be a different story. [laughs] Okay. So, I think I understand that, there's still, uh, that portion of it is there's a residual satisfaction [Michael: Yeah.] that she under, she, I had been, I had been thinking about it, I articulated these words to myself, even though I didn't say them, "She gets it," and that sense is still somehow present to me.
- 18:46 Michael: Yeah. So, so I'll just say, [RTH: Inaudible] Sorry. I'll just say for the record that I just learned something, because I, what I wrote down was "I said *she gets it*," and that I did indicate also that I had actually that, that I thought that was a couple seconds

before. But, but now what's clear to me, is that the reason that still felt relevant, was not because the words were present, but because the, the feeling of completion was still present. And those words, of course, kind of express, express that feeling.

19:14 RTH: Got it. That is the way I understand it. So, then there's the. So is any of these more, more, most prominent, more prominent?

19:25 Michael: I think the fingers are the most prominent thing.

19:27 RTH: Fingers are the most prominent? And that I gather is the, sensation of rhythm. It's not so much the feeling of the fingers hitting the palm of pa, or pad or pad of my thumb, but the rhythm of that, is that right?

19:43 Michael: Well, uh, no, I, I don't think it's the rhythm that's all that present. Um, that was kind of happening on autopilot. The, this is a passage, I later figured out what the passage was, at the time, I didn't know what I was singing. Um, it, it was a, it was more really more kinesthetic. It was this kind of, just the nice feeling of muscular activity, co, coordinated muscular activity, was what I was enjoying.

20:16 RTH: So it's more, it's more the motion. More the motion than the action. Than the, than the,

20:21 Michael: Than the rhythm.

20:22 RTH: Yeah.

20:23 Michael: Yeah. The, the rhythm was *there*. I mean, it was definitely there, but I, but that's not really what I was enjoying. I was enjoying the, the feeling of it, the, the, the feeling of your muscles moving in a highly coordinated way.

20:36 RTH: And that, and that's more, it's, it's more about the kinesthetics of the motion than it is about the result. My fingertips are hitting the palm of my thumb, palm of my thumb. But that's *not* the important part. The important part is the motion.

20:49 Michael: Yeah! I mean, I, I'm doing it right now to try, to try to, I, I, it the, the spot where you've, where I, where I'm most attending to, and I think this was also the same at the time, is actually the *first joint* of the finger. And that doesn't, that makes sense cuz that's where the muscular activity is happening. Um, and that's what I'm feeling, mostly.

21:16 RTH: So as a general rule, I, the, the, the farther we get away from the moment of the beep, the less I like it. So, but, but,

21:16 Russ comments: RTH was not very articulate here, but what he meant to convey was that he does *not* want Micheal to recreate an action during the interview and then report the details of *that recreated action*. The DES aim is to capture the experience just after it occurs, and jot down notes about it *then*, and then to

describe that *at-the-moment-of-the-beep experience*. If we miss some of the details, that's okay, and preferable to providing details about a re-creation.

- 21:23 Michael: Understood. Although this was actually only a few hours ago. [laughs]
- 21:25 RTH: Right. And so I think I've got that portion. Are you happy with that portion, Agnes? Or the,
- 21:39 AB: Uh. Yes, I mean, so, when you say that the, it's like the, the kinesthetic motion. Is, is that like an active thing that you are experiencing rather than, passive? I don't...
- 21:54 Michael: Yes, nah, no, I know what you mean. It's, it's, I'm, I'm, I'm definitely the agent here doing this. [AB: Mm-Hmm.] Yeah.
- 22:03 AB: Okay.
- 22:05 RTH: And is my *experience* of the agency that I'm doing this? O is my experience just of the kinesthetics?
- 22:13 Michael: I think the, I think the experience of agency was more directed at the coordination between the finger activity and the walking. That's, that's where there was... So the finger activity was, was, was, I mean, I was the agent of it. It wasn't just like, somebody else was moving my fingers didn't, it wasn't like that! But it was also pretty automatic. But what was *not* automatic was coordinating that with my walking cadence. So there, there was some, some more intentional brain activity, if you like, putting those, getting those two things lined up.
- 22:47 RTH: And, and this is, French horn-y movement, but French horn movement is with the left hand.
- 22:57 Michael: [Laughs] Yeah.
- 22:58 RTH: And, and so, do, does this seem, at the mo, at the moment of the beep, does this seem like I am performing French-horn mo, mo, motions? Or, is that a part of a description thing? I'm, this is really just a motion, which I've never really practiced with my right hand, but, but, but, I'm feeling the motion. Does this, so does this feel like *motion* or does this feel like *French-horn motion*?
- 23:25 Michael: Just motion. I am, I am. the, yeah, it just, it is just motion. I mean, I'm doing it because I've, because I've been doing it, I've been doing that sort of thing for many, many, many years. But I'm not, there's, yeah, I'm not. I'm not certainly not picturing myself playing the horn, I'm not thinking about the horn. Nothing like that.

23:25 Russ comments: RE "it is just motion"

This is a tricky and very fine distinction. The finger motion *itself* is French-horn fingering motion. But the *experience* of that is more about the motion, regardless of its origin as French-horn fingering. Whether he is picturing it or thinking about it is not relevant.

23:50 RTH: Mm-hmm. Okay.

23:57 Michael: I mean, it's hard. It's, it's a little bit difficult to, so what I said is true. I wasn't thinking about the horn. It wasn't...Yeah, none of that. Wa, wa, It wasn't as if I, my fingers were on the, the instrument or anything like that. But of course the, these fingerings are burned into my skull, as the fingerings of a French horn. So somehow that's playing a role here. But I wasn't thinking about the French horn at the time. And, and I wasn't experiencing it as French horn playing.

24:29 RTH: So the fingerings burned into your skull are burned into your *right* hand? Not necessarily your *left* hand?

24:35 Michael: You mean the other way around? [RTH: Yeah, yeah. The other hand.] Well, yeah, that's true. I don't, I don't, I don't, I mean, it is relevant, you'll see in a minute that I was doing at my right hand, but not, I don't make a, I mean, I, I'm not a very handed person anyway. So things I can do with my right hand, I can also do with my left. Almost always. Like I can write with both hands. It's a, I, I don't pay that much attention to what hand I'm using to do things.

24:35 Russ comments: That is a very unusual ability being characterized.

25:11 RTH: So I was a professional trumpet player for a right, for a long time. [Michael: Hmm.] And, and I, it, it, it would not occur to me to make valve fingerings with my left hand. That would seem very awkward to me. It, it would, it would be easy to do that with my right hand, now, I haven't been a trumpet player professionally for a long time, but the, but it would be easy to move my hand, my right-hand fingers that way, but not my left.

25:36 Michael: I, I don't find it to, I, I, I find it no more difficult on my right or my left.

25:42 RTH: Huh. That's interesting.

25:44 Michael: But I also don't really find it more difficult to write, like hand-write, writing right-handed or left-handed. I, I use whichever hand I picked a pencil up with. And when I get tired, I switch to the other hand.

25:57 AB: [laughs] That's convenient.

26:01 RTH: That's interesting, I don't know that I've ever talked to anybody that did that.

26:04 Michael: I used to, [Laughs] I used to take, when I was a grad student, I would take notes with both hands at the same time. And my, my fellow students.... Each hand had, its, had a, had a different job. So it was the job of my left hand to write down *my* thoughts, and it was the job of my right hand to write down things the professor said. [they laugh] And my fellow, my fellow students didn't like this.

26:25 AB:

26:26 RTH: [inaudible] That would seem to be a valuable skill!

26:29 AB: [Laughs] Yeah, big time, in our profession.

26:29 Russ comments: I find this description of handedness to be very unusual. It goes well beyond what might be called ambidextrous.

Michael Comments: Maybe it's important to add, for completeness and maybe clarification, that there are **some** activities that have a preferred hand. There might not be (or might be) a difference in ability (left versus right) in these activities, but there is definitely a preference. The most obvious (or at least frequently encountered) one is eating. I prefer to eat left-handed, and will switch to right only when the situation pushes in that direction (e.g., crammed on an airplane and eating lefty would mean elbowing the person to my left). Eating is thus different from writing, where there is no care about which hand grabs the pencil. (For example I think I am normally aware of eating right-handed when that happens, but not particularly aware of which hand is using the pencil unless something calls it to mind.)

Perhaps an interesting experiment would be to try playing guitar left handed. Since guitars by default come right-handed, I've never tried a left-handed guitar, but now I'm curious to try it and see whether it is easy or hard. 'Miming' it just now felt fine, but of course that's not the same as actually doing it. Not sure how that would go. My guess is it would be OK but not as good as right-handed playing, at least not without some practice.

Another activity where I don't care (recently experienced) is bowling, where I'm absolute garbage regardless of which hand is used!

26:33 Michael: Anyway, um. Whatever, that,

26:34 RTH: Okay, so I'm, I'm, I'm, I'm happy with the fingering portion. You're happy with that Agnes?

26:39 AB: Absolutely.

26:40 RTH: Then there's the singing and the walking.

26:44 Michael: Right.

26:45 RTH: And the singing, I'm gathering, is I *hear* this more than I *sing* it?

26:51 Michael: Yes.

26:52 RTH: And do I hear my voice singing it? [Michael: Yes.] So this is my voice, singing [sings] ba ba ba, ba ba badaba ba ba ba. [Michael: Yep, yep.] Okay. And I'm happy with that.

27:05 AB: I'm happy with that.

- 27:07 RTH: And, and then I am coordinating my walking with the cadence.
- 27:13 Michael: The cadence of my walking is, is matching the beat of what I'm singing. Yeah.
- 27:17 RTH: Okay. And purposefully?
- 27:19 Michael: Yes.
- 27:22 RTH: And does that, does that seem like I am a I'm, I'm adjusting my *gait* to match, as opposed to the other way around? Or doesn't that matter?
- 27:34 Michael: Um, in this particular case, what, I don't know how long they were coordinated, but when the beep went off, I was explicitly aware of the coordination. I don't think I had to adjust anything, because, the, the beat of the tune was, was very close to the, the, the... The tempo of the tune was very close to the, just natural tempo of walking.
- 27:57 RTH: So I was, I was noticing the coordination, but not ha, not having to enact it at the moment.
- 28:04 Michael: I mean I was doing it on purpose, but it was, it didn't require much effort because it, the, they fit naturally together.
- 28:09 RTH: And is the on-purposeness aimed at the *walking* or aimed at the,
- 28:14 Michael: At the walking. I'm a, yeah to whatever extent there's adjustment being made, I'm adjusting the walking to the singing, not vice versa. [RTH: Okay.] But as I said, not, not much adjustment's required, because, they would just naturally fit.
- 28:30 RTH: Okay. Then I think I'm good about that, unless there's something else that I'm missing. [Coughs]
- 28:38 Michael: Nope.
- 28:43 RTH: You happy with that Agnes? [AB: Yep.] Number 2.

[Sample 6.2 discussion starts here](#)

- 28:46 Michael: Okay. So I had actually, so, so number 2 happened very soon after. I had actually stopped under a bridge, to write down the stuff we just talked about. And I was, I, and so, that was the situation. And, uh, there were two, two aspects of experience that were present to me. I was, at the moment that the beep went off, I was saying to myself, "what is that from?" In other words, I was asking, I knew that the tune I was singing was not being made up by me, or at least I believed that it was not being made up by me, I believed it was from something, but I couldn't remember what it was. And so, and I was, I was explicitly asking myself in words, spoken, to myself, "what is that from?"

- 29:37 Michael: And, I probably th, this, this was not part of, this is not relevant to my experience, but since we always ask this question, I'll just answer it. There were a lot of people around, cuz all the students were getting out of class, and I was aware of them, So I probably didn't say it out loud, but I couldn't swear to that.
- 29:55 Then the other thing that happened is, um, because I was thinking about, you know, everything we just talked about, I let out a little laugh at the same time. So it was kind of almost simultaneous, "what is that from?" [laughs] Kinda like that. And the laugh was, not directed at that question, but was in fact directed at my realization, that I was fingering with the wrong hand, not my French-horn hand, I was not fingering the correct notes. Um, and, I was with my fingers, adding some extra notes that were, that I wasn't singing. And for some reason that all, the collection of those three things seemed mildly humorous to me at the time, and I let out a little chuckle. Which I was aware of. The, the, so I, I was amused. There was a feeling of amusement, but it manifested as a little chuckle.
- 30:54 AB: So, um, the chuckle, the way that you just described it, um, well first of all, you said that there were these two things going on, but then the way you described it, you said, um, "what is that from?" ha. Like, or the, the chuckle came afterwards. So,
- 31:12 Michael: I think the chuckle was in the middle, actually. I, it, I, in the middle. I think I, I think I was, I think while I was asking "what is that from?" I also kind of [laughs] did that. [AB: Okay.] It wasn't very much, it was just like that.
- 31:23 AB: Mm-hmm. And was, um, one or the other—of the saying, or the chuckle—more salient to you?
- 31:32 Michael: No, I, these were equally salient to me, at the time. And nothing else was really, although, I was holding the little book in my hand, with my pencil, but I wasn't really, I was thinking, I wasn't really paying attention to that.
- 31:49 AB: So, um, with the chuckle. Um, I mean, you mentioned what the chuckle was sort of a response to [Michael: Mm-hmm]. Um, was that somehow part of your experience of the chuckle, or were you saying that, to provide context for the chuckle?
- 32:15 Michael: Yeah, so the, the realization, of the kind of, slightly, slight disconnect between what my fingers were doing, and, these other things, like I wasn't fingering the correct notes, even though I was fingering consistently. So it was, it was like I was, it was like, I was actually, I wa, I, I, I, had just realized that actually whatever I, if I was actually playing a horn at that time, it would've sounded radically differently from what I was actually singing. And that was kind of amusing to me, uh, for a half a second. But the, the realization came before the beep. And the chuckle was pretty much *with* the beep and the saying, speaking, "what is that from?" was also kind of right with the beep. So those things hap, the, the beep and the, "what is that from?" and the, *huh?* that all happened, you know, effectively at the same time.
- 33:08 AB: So the, what the beep was the reaction to happened, like the moment before, the moment of the be, the beep, it's not part of the experience?

33:16 Michael: What the chuckle, what the chuckle was a reaction to was kind of, what happened right before. Yeah. [AB: Mm-hmm.] I mean this, maybe this is a little bit like the last one where the, the, “she gets it” was no longer part of experience, but there was that lingering sort of what, you know, what it was about was still part of the experience. And same here, I was no longer really, actively thinking about the fact that, the, these, these slight oddities of the situation. I kind of, I’ve, I had sussed that out. And the chuckle was just a kind of, to put a bow on that thought, I guess. [laughs]

33:51 AB: So, um, was the chuckle, like spoken or heard. Or none of the above

34:01 RTH: Or none of the above.

34:03 AB: [laughs]?Like, or was it produced or received?

34:07 Michael: Yeah, I, it was, it, it, I think it felt kind of, um, uh, um, involuntary. So it wasn’t, it wasn’t, so you, so speaking, usually whether it’s out loud or to myself, usually spe, feels voluntary, like *I am the one* making the words. This didn’t feel voluntary. It just felt like it happened. Um, and to the extent that I was experiencing it bodily, I would say it was in my stomach, cuz that’s where the chuckle happened. It was kind of a, *huh!* You know, you where your diaphragm kind of does a quick something or other.

34:48 AB: So it was like, um, an experience in your stomach, rather than an audit, like an auditory experience, or rather than your, a throat sound producing.

34:48 Russ comments: RE “So it was like, um, an experience in your stomach”

I think that characterization is much too definitive. Michael had said “to the extent that I was experiencing it bodily, I would say it was in my stomach, cuz that’s where the chuckle happened,” which to my ear is “<subjunctifier><subjunctifier>in my stomach<subjunctifier>”; furthermore, that whole expression could be said to primarily a qualification / explanation of “it just felt like it happened.” So to say simply that it was “an experience in your stomach” is a substantial oversimplification and emphasis on the bodily, coupled with a failure to honor the qualifiers. The qualifiers might be the most important feature of Michael’s turn, but this statement pushes him to focus on the stomach aspect.

35:02 Michael: Well, the, there, there may have, yeah. Yes. There was. I mean, um, it must have made a sound, but I didn’t, I, I, I did, I was not attending to whatever sounds. And maybe it didn’t make a sound, who knows. But, um, but I was not attending to the sound, I was attending to the chuckle, the, but it was a feeling, it was the feeling of a chuckle, [AB: Hmm.] not a hearing or a making.

35:02 Russ comments: Here is a list (separated by commas) of the subjunctifiers in that turn: Well, <restart>, <restart>, may have, <restart>, <restart>, I mean, um, must have, but I, <restart>, <restart>, <restart>, was not, maybe, who knows, but, um, not attending, <restart> but, <restart>, not. That is, Michael’s 35:02 turn is *heavily*

subjunctified. Applying the main rule (a question is good to the extent that it helps Michael describe his experience): ergo AB's 34:48 turn is likely problematic.

- 35:25 RTH: So I'm a little bit worried because when he did, when he said his, about something about his stomach, he, he pretty highly subjunctified it from my point of view. [see the comment at 34:48] I don't remember exactly what he said was something like, *to the extent that I know something bodily about it, it was in my stomach*. And you turned that into *this was about my stomach*. And that, that I think is, that leaves, leaves off the, the subjunctification of it. And I'm a little worried that, when the conversation that we had before about, well he's, he's sort of reenacting the, chuckle. and now when he reacts re, reenacts it, he might be more spending, more focused on the stomach aspect of it than the,
- 36:05 Michael: That that's possible. I'm not, I'm not gonna deny that. Um, what, what I will say for sure is it was not an auditory experience. It was not, an experience of like producing a chuckle. It was, just the experience of a chuckle. [laughs]
- 36:26 RTH: I think the technical word for that, probably is an *ejaculation*, and an old sense of *ejaculation*. [Michael: Right.] It's a,
- 36:34 Michael: That, that, that seems fine.
- 36:36 RTH: Sort of like *wow* or *oof*, or [Michael: Yes, mm-hmm.] Something like that.
- 36:41 Michael: Yep.
- 36:44 RTH: I don't think we have a modern, a modern word for it.
- 36:49 AB: Well, I'm satisfied with that portion of it, of the experience.
- 36:55 RTH: Me too. So I guess I would, I would underscore: what my understanding is that the chuckle is a quite separate experiential track from the "what's it from?"
- 37:07 Michael: Yeah. They're very separate. They happen the same time, but they're, they have nothing to do with each other.
- 37:12 RTH: Okay. That's the way I understood it.
- 37:16 AB: So then, um, the, what is that from was, um, spoken, experienced by you as spoken rather than heard? Um, and just like that, um, "where is that from?" Kind of the way, like the way that...
- 37:38 Michael: Yeah. Yeah. I, I said it pretty much like that. [AB: Mm-hmm]. I've been trying to, because of how our discussions have been going, I've been trying to pay better attention to whether things are *literally* said out loud or just *seemingly* said out loud. Um, *I'm trying*, so when the thing goes off, I think about that and try to see if I can figure out what just happened. A, and, um, but it's too much. I can't pay attention to it all the time. It's too much mental energy [laughs] involved, uh, to do

that. And I think I had relaxed a little bit because I do pay attention to that for obvious reasons, when I'm teaching. And then when I'm *done* teaching, I sort of let my mind relax a little bit. And so I'm not really sure whether it was out loud or not. I think I might have still been in the mode of like being careful not to say, talk out loud or not, not, sorry, not, not that, not that, but being careful about *whether* I'm talking out loud. Um, but maybe not, I'm not gonna swear to that.

38:47 RTH: So what I would say about that is I don't really care whether it's aloud or not. I, that would be part of the natural attitude stuff that I'm happy to bracket.

38:54 Michael: Right, right.

38:55 RTH: Uh, it *is* of interest to me as to the part, the, the part of it that doesn't know whether it's aloud or doesn't care, whether it's aloud or whatever, that if that's part of the experience, that this is a, this is the kind of a speaking that has the, the characteristics of aloud, but I don't know whether it's aloud or not, that's,...

39:14 Michael: Um, I wouldn't say it was being experienced with any reference to whether it was out loud or not.

39:21 RTH: That was, that's even an even better way than I was saying what I was, what I was trying to say. [Michael: Okay.] I was *saying* this and *it didn't matter* whether it was aloud, out loud, or not.

39:30 Michael: Correct. I think it probably wasn't, but that's again, a fact about the world. [RTH: Right.] I, yeah.

39:30 Russ comments: I wish to clarify what I think about experience and the natural world. I do think the natural world is important—I suspect it is indeed important whether Michael is or is not speaking aloud in the natural world. And it is probably important to know the connection between experience and the natural world—I suspect that at least in some circumstances it is important that Michael recognize how it feels to speak aloud or innerly. That is, I am not downplaying the importance of the natural world.

But what DES tries to do is to *bracket* the natural world so that *it is possible* to apprehend the experiential *as it is experienced*. That is, DES tries to focus only on the experiential rather than on some impure admixture of the experiential and the natural. *Then*, once experience has been apprehended as it is experienced, *and only then*, it might be valuable to speculate about the connection between the experiential and the natural world.

If one does *not* bracket the natural world (people hardly ever do that), then what is held to be a connection between experience and the natural world is actually a connection between one aspect of the natural world and another aspect of the natural world. That might be of some interest, but it does *not* explore a connection between experience and the natural world.

39:41 RTH: I'm satisfied with that. Me too. Number 3.

Sample 7.3 discussion starts here

- 39:44 Michael: Okay. I was in the grocery store, um, I was checking out and I had just heard the, the, the, the checkout (I was in one of those self checkout things) and um, and it, it had just said, "Please use PINpad to complete transaction." And I said, in both a speak-y and a hear-y way. And I, (and as it happens, although I didn't care about this at the time, relevant to the conversation we just had, but I know that) it was out loud because of what happened next. I said, "You need to learn the rest of the words!" I was speaking back to the device! [laughs] Because these things drive me crazy. I was like, why could... They *always* drive me crazy. Like, why couldn't you program it to say "Please use *the* pin pad to complete *your* transaction," but they just say, "lease use PINpad to complete transaction." [laughs]
- 40:38 And I don't know what kind of insight you get into my psychology here, but that drives me crazy. And so I, and, and I was struck by this and I said, "You need to learn the rest of the words!" And, um, it, as it happens, it was out loud, but not intentionally out loud. And I know that because the guy who's kind of standing there looking over all the self-checkout things, clearly heard me and laughed. [AB laughs]
- 41:06 Um, and then at the same time as I was saying that and the beep was going off, I was both seeing and reaching for my phone, which is also my wallet. (Um, so it's one of these things where your phone and a couple of credit cards all fit together.) I, I had set that on top of the PINpad and I was reaching for it. I was seeing it, but really just seeing it for the purpose of, you know, know, guiding my hands to it. And I was so, I was reaching for it and I had just about grabbed it when the beep went off.
- 41:43 And while that was happening (these, these are simultaneous) and I was the more to the point, sorry, I just described that as if it was just real world stuff. I was aware of my reaching for it and of my seeing the phone. Um, and I was saying those words while I was reaching for the phone.
- 42:05 RTH: So when you say "I was aware of that," do you mean in a, in a meta kind of way? Or do you mean I I'm seeing my wallet as
- 42:12 Michael: No, I was just having the experience of seeing and, and guiding my hands to the, I mean, guiding sounds like it was a difficult task. I mean, I was just grabbing my wallet, but I, but I was, I, I was, so the experience was an experience of seeing the wallet and the kinesthetic experience of arm moving or maybe proprioceptive experience of arm moving towards wallet.
- 42:46 RTH: So that, that makes it seem like a different kind of experience from *I'm reaching for my wallet*. I, it makes it seem like I'm more focused on the aspects of it that, as opposed to the overall act of it. Is that true? That I'm, I'm seeing it. That's a one separate deal. I feel my arm moving prep proprioceptively for it. That's another deal. Rather than just saying I'm coordinatedly moving towards my wallet?
- 43:12 Michael: So the seeing part was targeted. So the seeing what I was seeing was not a black shape or (the thing is black) was not a black phone shaped thing. I was seeing the ob, the, the target, my object, the thing I was trying to get to. So that's the nature of the seeing. But I *was* actually feeling my arm move. So *that one* was not really feeling it

as the arm doing the grabbing. It was really feeling the motion of the arm through space.

43:58 RTH: Okay. So experientially I am *see wallet—get wallet* thing; *and* at the same time feel proprioceptively arm stuff.

44:26 Michael: Yes.

44:26 RTH: And those are simultaneous and, and in real life coordinated with each other, but experientially sort of two separate tracks.

44:34 Michael: They are kind of two separate tracks. Yeah. I mean, of course my arm was actually reaching for the phone, but that I wasn't feeling it like that. I was just feeling the actual *muscular flexing motion through space* kind of thing.

44:51 RTH: Okay. Then I think I'm good about that aspect.

44:54 AB: Was that, um, the way you're describing *feeling your arm through space*, um, would you say that's similar to how you were experiencing the kinesthetic feeling of your fingers doing the trumpet motion?

45:13 Michael: Russ is the trumpet player. I,

45:14 RTH: French, French horn.

45:15 Michael: Sorry,

45:16 AB: My bad French horn. Sorry. [laughs] That's fine. [laughs]

45:19 Michael: I haven't actually played a French horn in over 10 years. Um, uh, yeah, there, there's some similarity there. Yes. Cuz in the fingers I'm feeling the, the muscles, the muscular activity and this, I'm feeling the muscular activity.

45:40 AB: Okay, then I'm good with that.

45:42 RTH: Okay. Well, I thought that was a fair question. Um, and then you need to hear, you need to learn the rest of the words. I'm saying that to the machine!?! [Michael: Yes.] And is my experience of saying that to the machine? Is it... [Michael: Yes.] And is that the more or less the same as when you say something to me, or to Agnes? That I'm, I'm talking to...

46:05 Michael: Yeah, it's pretty much the same [RTH: Mm-hmm]. Yeah.

46:08 RTH: And the, and the guy, and you *know* this out loud because the guy laughed. Is that after the beep? So the,...

46:13 Michael: Yeah, that's after the beep.

- 46:14 RTH: So the experience at the moment of the beep is: I am saying to the machine, “you need to learn the rest of the words.” [Michael: Yep.] And that’s in... The context of that, is it annoys me that the machines don’t use complete sentences or whatever. And is, am, am I, so am I saying that with annoyance or
- 46:39 Michael: I, I, I, I’ve been annoyed by this for so long. I think it’s more like res, I’m saying it with some kind of resignation.
- 46:45 RTH: Resignate...
- 46:46 Michael: Yeah. [laughs] I, I, I know as I’m saying it, that the machine’s not gonna learn all the rest of the words [they laugh] So yeah, I think, I think resignation is closer to the emotional aspect of this than annoyance.
- 47:01 RTH: Okay. I think I’m good about that.
- 47:08 AB: Me too.
- 47:09 RTH: And I do, I, I agree that it’s an interesting question as to why they do that. I was a com I’ve been a computer program for, and I, and I know that *back in the day* you would’ve shortened things because of space requirements. So they took more. But nowadays that isn’t a restriction. And so could be just
- 47:25 Michael: Left over these things. Yeah. These things have as much space as a supercomputer 25 years ago.
- 47:38 RTH: Right. Absolutely. Number 4?

[Sample 7.4 discussion starts here](#)

- 47:44 Michael: Number 4. Um, so now I’m home. Uh, I’m typing at the computer and I have a particular cloud service that I use. And when I was in my office earlier in the day, it wasn’t working and I had just filed away my mind, okay, well you’ll deal with that later, cuz I had to go teach class. And I had, um, so I turned to that task and um, it, it, it had, I had just pulled it up to test it to see, um, if it was gonna work, and it hadn’t worked. And, um, so then I was tinkering around to try to make it work. And at the moment that the beep went off the, again, did it go off? Well, I said some words, let me get, I guess lemme get to it. Um, and the beep I think went off maybe even in the middle of the words, even though there was a very short couple words.
- 48:43 So what I was see (so that’s all background), what I was *seeing* was the logo of this particular cloud service, which is a blue cloud. And the, i, I was seeing that on the screen, and I was very much attentive to that because the fact that it was blue and not gray was a sign that it was working, or at least it was a *suggestion* that it was working. So I was seeing that with some positive valence. Uh, there’s other, there’s other aspects to the thing, but all I was really noticing was the cloud shape and the blueness of it.
- 49:20 And more or less simultaneously with seeing that. So, so on the computer screen [gestures] (I’m looking right now at the same screen, so I’m, that’s why I’m

doing it this way.) But on the computer screen, uh, kind of on the right was the blue cloud that was, that had shown up. And then on the left, my left, um, the, the, the window where the files should show up, they had just the, the files had just shown up, or the fi the, the file names had just shown up in that window. So in other words, this thing was working again. While that, while I was seeing those two things, which were happening pretty much at the same time, there's the blue cloud and the files pop onto the screen, I said, "ta-da!"

50:04 And the, the, the beep went off somewhere right around there. And there was another aspect to this (which I thought a good bit about actually, um, la later, and, and if we get to the next beep, I'll, you'll see that). But at the time, the, the, the, the feeling was that the files had arrived, that the files had arrived from Charleston, South Carolina. So when I'm sitting at my desk at home, I'm facing Charleston, South Carolina, more or less. And the files popped onto the screen and there, there was some sense that they had arrived from Charleston. And I did think a little bit about how to unpack that. But when I, when I, but when I was writing the, the thing in the book, I just wrote, "it seems like they came from Charleston." But those were not thoughts or were, uh, or they were not worded thoughts of any kind, but that's how it felt. It felt like the, the, the files arrived from Charleston.

51:27 So I'm seeing them arrive. In other words, I'm seeing the, the names of the files pop up on the screen. I'm not really paying attention to the actual names. I'm just seeing, I'm just seeing the fact that there's something there rather than nothing because the window was empty before. And then I'm seeing the blue logo, I'm saying, "ta-da!" And there's some sense in which the file, not the logo, but the files, only the files, not the logo, there's some sense in which when they popped onto the screen, they had taken a, they, they, that was the end of their journey, which started in Charleston.

52:06 AB: So, um, are these, um, three separate experiential tracks? Or are they, do they have some kind of connection?

52:18 Michael: They're pretty closely connected. Um, they're all about the same thing. They're all about the files showing up.

52:26 AB: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm.

52:26 Michael: And they're all re they're all positively valence because [AB: Mm-hmm] I, y'know, I had been experiencing the slight panic that you feel when you think maybe I just lost a bunch of stuff. Um, and that and that, and so this was the release of that, like, oh! They're here! [laughs] And that was expressed with "ta-da!"

52:50 AB: And is any of those, um, aspects more salient than the other, like the "tada!" or the, the visual aspect of that feeling that they've come?

53:05 Michael: I think the, I think the file showing up maybe slightly, slightly more significant in my experience, the file names showing up in the window is probably the most significant part of the experience, because that's the most important thing. That's what I was really watching for. [laughs] Um, but the other things were pretty, they weren't, they weren't 10 percenters, they were 30 percenters.

53:33 AB: And was there like, um, an experience of any kind of relative timing between those other things? Between those three things?

53:44 Michael: They all happened at the same time.

53:47 AB: Okay. So with the visual experience, um, you described the cloud logo, um, being blue and like the, the salience of the blueness and the cloudness of the logo as being part of your experience. [Michael: Mm-hmm.] And then on the left side, this window, um, where the files should be and the, the files popping up. Um, did you, like, in your experience of those two things...

54:25 RTH: So can I back, can I, can I interrupt that a little bit? Sure. I, I think it's still possible that those are two separate experiences. So in the, [AB: Okay.], in the natural world, they would be one looking at two sides of the screen, but that is not necessarily *his* experience. So,

54:25 Russ comments: RTH here is reacting to AB's (53:47) "so with the visual experience," the "as being part of your experience," and the "in your experience of." Those all refer to *one* visual experience (the nouns are singular), which RTH fears misrepresents Michael, who has implied (as Russ hears it) that this sample involves (or at least may involve) multiple simultaneous experiences (plural), even multiple simultaneous *visual* experiences."

This is *not* an inference (based on previous sampling, his diagnosis, or anything else). This is based on Michael's description of this sample, which (to Russ's ear) has been since the opening salvo about simultaneous but separate experiences (see, for example, the 51:27 portion of Michael's opening salvo).

54:41 AB: Okay. Well, are those two s, separate experience or is, or, or is it one?

54:46 Michael: Well, so sorry, I wasn't clear before then. I, I was trying to say that they're separate in, in the sense that I'm separately aware of the two things, and they don't quite have the same salience for me in the moment. *One* of them is indicating that the program is working, that's the blue cloud. It was *gray* before, so its, blueness is quite important in this context. But the fact that the program's working doesn't imply that the files are present. So I'm getting two different bits of information here. They're both good, and they're closely related to each other, but they're not exactly the same. So I, they are different experiences, but as I said before, they're very tightly connected as well. I don't know if I answered the concern that Russ just expressed.

55:33 AB: Well, I think the concern that Russ expressed, if I understand correctly, was whether, um, whether there were two separate experiences: the experience of the cloud, um, the cloud logo, blue experience, and then the files showing up experience. Are those part of one visual experience? Or is, are they separate? Two separate?

55:33 Russ comments: That is a good and even-handed statement of the issue.

56:02 Michael: They're this, okay. I, under, I, I, I don't know why I wasn't seeing the question before, but I see it now. Those, those were two separate experiences.

56:02 Russ comments: Recalling the main rule (a question is good to the extent that it helps Michael describe his experience): To Russ's ear, Michael's 56:02 turn is what Michael sounds like when he knows what is being asked and he knows how to answer it. Ergo AB's 55:33 question is a good one.

56:10 RTH: So that's the way I had understood it in the, in the first place. And I was worried about Agnes's question because it made it seem like they were going one experience.

56:18 Michael: Oh, okay. I, I wasn't following it that way, but I, but that, that's fine. I, I get, I get, I get the whole discussion now. I wasn't getting it before.

56:28 RTH: And it's a, it is an epoché kind of a thing because in the, in the natural attitude, it seems like if there's one body looking at one screen, it's gonna be one experience. But that is in the real world, not in the,

56:39 Michael: Yeah, no, these are two, these, these are separate in the sense that I think we, I think I now understand.

56:48 RTH: Right. Is it, is the distinction clear to you, Agnes?

56:51 AB: Yep. It's clear to me. Okay. No, clear to me. I, I did think they were one experience in part because of, um...

56:59 Michael: I, I, I didn't do a very good job initially, but, but I think we're, I think we all understand now.

56:59 Russ comments: This is a good example of the wily power of the natural attitude. It affects AB and it affects Michael in different but overlapping ways, with the result that the experience is muddled. But if it can be bracketed, then the experience can emerge without difficulty.

57:13 AB: So yeah. [pause] Um, you go ahead, Russ, and ask questions about that visual or either of those,

57:24 RTH: Those, *those* visuals? [laughs]

57:26 AB: Those visuals. My bad! Sorry. [laughs]

57:29 RTH: So I, I, so I, I'm the, the, the logo is blue and the blue is important. And I haven't yet decided whether, I think that you're saying that I am attracted to the blueness *qua blue*—it's the, it's the *blue* gets to me—or whether I'm attracted to the blueness because it says that the thing is working.

- 57:49 Michael: The latter. [RTH: Okay.] I'm not really focused on the blueness *per se*. I'm aware that it's blue, but the importance of that is, it's not just, I'm not just interested in its blueness. [RTH: Okay.] Like you might look at the sky and say, what a beautiful blue sky. I'm interested in its blueness because blue means it's working.
- 58:07 RTH: Got it. And then, oh, I think that's the only choice. The only question I had left about the visual aspects.
- 58:17 AB: [laughs] Um, so, okay, now I'm losing track here.
- 58:23 Michael: Yeah, you have to ask about this crazy thing about they came from Charleston. Sorry!
- 58:27 AB: Yeah. Yeah. Well, I wanna [laughs]
- 58:28 Michael: That's just the way it is.
- 58:30 AB: [laughs] Um, so when you said this, you had this feeling that it came from Charleston. You said that it wasn't in words. Um, like it didn't, it didn't have like a, a word-y quality. Um,
- 58:54 Michael: So I, I, I did think about the, how, how did to describe this. And I, I, I thought about it as a result of having, having to think about, you know, writing down the, the, the, the beep, so to say. Um, and so I wrote it down and I, and what I wrote down was what I already said to you, what I, what I wrote down. But then I was *thinking* like, is there some way to unpack what that really means? And here's my best go at it. And I, Russ probably should turn off his speaker right now! [laughs] Cuz I'm gonna appeal to your experience for a second. Um, it's my experience too. But, but, so I'll just put it in terms of my own experience and then Russ can keep his speaker on! So when I'm at home, and let's say my wife arrives at home and I *know* that she's been at work, then what's coming into my house is something that's coming from her school (where she works). On the other hand, if I know that she's coming from Charleston, she still walks in the front door the same way. Well, actually that's a lie. She doesn't walk in the front door. She walks in the back door the same way.
- 1:00:08 Michael: But what I, but my experience is now of somebody arriving *from Charleston*, not somebody arriving from down the street. And that's, that's a, I, I, I feel that difference in my experience. Oh, *here she is from Charleston*. Oh, *here she is from down the street*. That's my best attempt to describe the feeling of knowing where this came from and that being a part of your experience without, I don't say *those words* to myself. I don't say, "Oh! Here's Misty from Charleston!" but still I'm experiencing her *as arriving from* Charleston or *as arriving from* down the street. And I was experiencing these files as arriving from Charleston. That's my best attempt.
- 1:00:08 Russ comments: Unfolding here is a hugely important (at least to me) discussion. There is a well-rehearsed philosophical discussion (I'm no philosopher, so I may misrepresent it) that holds that all communication is theory laden (Kühn, Popper,

Sellars, etc.); Michael here is giving an example of that—that *Misty arriving* has a theoretical underpinning, so *arriving from Charleston* is different from *arriving from her school down the street*. I (and DES) 100% accept that all words / concepts are theory laden.

The issue that is important (and which is, I think, is not adequately understood by the philosophers) is the *size* or the *importance* of theory-laden effect. Here, I call attention to the beginning of the discussion; later (at 1:04:54) I will refer back to here.

1:00:57 RTH: So I, I've got some questions about that. So along the line, fairly early on, you said your desk faces Charleston, that you are facing Charleston.

1:00:57 Russ comments: He actually said in his opening salvo at 50:04, "So when I'm sitting at my desk at home, I'm facing Charleston, South Carolina, more or less." At 50:04, RTH had filed that away in the *Huh!* category—where *Huh!* means *why did he tell us in which direction his desk faces?! That seems an unnecessary detail, and Michael does not usually provide irrelevancies*. Of course, RTH didn't think that explicitly, but he registered it.

1:01:07 Michael: Yeah. So they came through the back of the screen.

1:01:07 Russ comments: Now the *Huh!* becomes more like *Huh!!!* Through the back of the screen?!?!

1:01:12 RTH: So they, is it more that they came from Charleston or more that they came from over there, coming this, coming this way as opposed to coming that way?

1:01:23 Michael: It's, it's both. No, it's more like they're coming from *Charleston*. They came from over there, cuz that's where Charleston is. It's not, it's not that I experienced them as coming from behind the screen and I thought, *Oh, what's over that direction? Oh, it's Charleston*. Because actually, you know, there's lots of things in that direction. *London* is also in that direction. *These* things came from *Charleston*.

1:01:49 RTH: So I don't think I asked, I don't think I asked the question in a, in a, in the way that I wanted to ask the question. [Michael: Okay.] So I, maybe I can ask it, maybe I can ask it this way. *They came from Charleston*; or *They came from Charleston that's over there*. [points with his entire arm] That Charleston, Charleston with a physical location being over there. They came *this way from* Charleston. Or they just came from Charleston, which could've been over there.

1:02:24 Michael: Okay. I understand the distinction now. And it's the first.

1:02:28 RTH: Okay.

1:02:32 Michael: They, they weren't, they weren't mailed from Charleston. They weren't like, they didn't start in Charleston and it takes some circuitous route and end up here. It's a *much more* directional thing. [points with a clearly defined moving hand and arm] So yeah. So it that it's the first of the two options that you gave.

1:02:48 RTH: Okay. And is the, is the “back of my computer screen,” uh, an explanatory thing, or does it actually feel like *these come from Charleston through the back of my computer screen and now they’re here?*

1:03:05 Michael: Uh, I didn’t understand what it would mean for it to be an explanatory thing. So I’m, I’m gonna go with the second. Cuz the, the second thing you said is ac, is accurate, but I, but I’m, but I’m, I’m, I’m hesitant to be denying the first, cuz I’m not sure I understood it.

1:03:24 RTH: Uh, the, these are the challenges of language, which is what, which is what makes the, makes this work interesting. It’s a, for, for me, this work is, is a hundred percent as challenging every step of the way. The whole, the whole thing is a challenge.

1:03:38 So the, the first, the two options (I don’t remember actually, which was first or second) was that there’s a, a packet of something, there is *something* which is actually coming, coming and coming *through* my computer screen as a, as a sort of a real, my exper as an experiential sense of something coming through the back of my computer from, from over there, which is Charleston, through the back of my computer and appearing on the screen. That’s one thing. The other thing would be, I’m coming from Charleston and, and I have to, you know, I’m gesturing over there where Charleston is and Charleston’s there through the, through my com computer. I can’t see it, but it doesn’t have anything to do with the traverse-ity that traverse-ness this.

1:04:19 Michael: Okay. Alright. I understand that. It’s the first.

1:04:23 RTH: So you mean a packet of stuff that’s actually physically coming from Charleston-over-there *through* my computer screen, [Michael: That’s how I...] the *back* of my computer.

1:04:31 Michael: That’s how I experienced it. I obviously know that’s not true! [laughs] [RTH: Right.] But that’s how I experienced it.

1:04:37 RTH: And, and this, this is a great, from my point of view, this is a, a great example of the epoché in, in operation. The, the reality has nothing to do with the back of your computer screen the way the, the way it gets there. But *experientially*, if that’s the way it is, that’s the way it is.

1:04:54 Michael: That’s the way it is.

1:04:54 Russ comments: Recall that at 1:00:08 we discussed the theory-ladenness of words: We said that *Misty arriving* has a theoretical underpinning, so arriving from Charleston is different from arriving from her school down the street. I accepted that as being 100% true.

But the important thing is the *size* of that laden-ness; here, the theory-ladenness is infinitesimal by comparison to the actual experiential distinction that characterized Michael’s actual experience. Here, in Michael’s beeped experience, Michael intends *coming from Charleston* to be a specific, directly apprehended, not-

in-the-slightest minor feature of his at-the-moment-of-the-beep experience. That is not at all, I think, what the philosophers mean by theory-laden.

This example highlights a hugely important aspect of the epoché. Michael's discussion (1:00:08) of Misty arriving served to *hide* the important aspect of his at-the-moment-of-the-beep experience, and that, in my view, is the wily nature of presuppositions. Presuppositions mislead, lead away from, actual phenomena. Theory (including philosophers' theories) lead away from actual phenomena. The theory-ladenness theory is correct as far as it goes, but more importantly, it actively *hides* (or at least can hide) important aspects of non-theoretical (that is, directly apprehended) experience.

This is important because theory is, in my view, part of the natural attitude that needs to be bracketed. There are, doubtless, times when referring to a theory or its ramifications is useful. But there are also times (as here) where theoretical truths must be bracketed away (included in the epoché) if the experience is to be apprehended with fidelity.

1:04:55 RTH: And that's, and that *is* what's interesting to me. And I would say in Agnes's defense, it's, it's very difficult, it's, it's a matter of, of hearing things. So from my point of view, this particular one, he, he says he is sitting facing Charleston, so, well that doesn't make sense in the *real* world, in the, and so I, but he said it, and he is a smart guy and, and, and he doesn't say things very often (or ever) that, that don't have some experiential significance. And so I, I gotta figure what that, what that is. And it's sort of like, like a crossword puzzle or a mystery or some, something where, *for me*, or I'm trying to fit all those little pieces together to try to figure out what the experience is. Which is totally fascinating to me. And I, and I think, I think *genuinely* fascinating. But we've also passed the end of our hour here, so [Michael: Right.] So our, we're gonna be done with this one and, uh, skipping ...

1:06:00 AB: I'm good with this one. Yeah.

1:06:02 RTH: [Michael: Mm-hmm]. And shall we call this a day? And, and, uh,

Discussion after sampling

1:06:09 Michael: Sure. I, I have to, I have to tell you what I I won't, I won't tell you about the next one. We won't do it in detail, but I have a thought that you might find humorous, Russ. Uh, and it, and it was actually the part of the experience. I, I was, because the next beep happened like almost instant. It was very, very soon after. I had really, I had only just pulled the book outta my pocket to start writing. And the next beep happened. And I was saying to myself, I (Don't take this the wrong way!! [laughs]), but I was saying to myself, "I don't know what to write in this stupid little book!!" [they laugh]

1:06:47 And that brought to mind, there was a radio show that I used to love to listen to called *Car Talk*. And there was a, a particular episode in which some young woman was forced by her father to write down, she had to, like, he kept a book in the car and everything that happened in the car, she had to write it down. Like, I drove from here to here, and the mileage was this and that, and I put gas in, all this kind of stuff. And they were doing it, they were doing an episode in which they essentially

- brought these two into confrontation with each other. And she said something along the lines of, "I made an adult decision not to write in the stupid little book!" [they laugh]
- 1:07:25 And I thought of that as I was saying to myself, "I don't know what to write in this stupid little book"
- 1:07:32 RTH: So I'm a, I'm a *Car Talk* fan myself, and I miss Click and Clack. So the, the, I can, I can appreciate that. I don't remember that particular episode, but...
- 1:07:32 Russ comments: *Car Talk* was an NPR show from 1987 to 2012. "Click and Clack, the Tappet brothers" is how the *Car Talk* hosts (brothers Tom and Ray Magliozzi) referred to themselves.
- 1:07:44 And, and, and I do think, "I don't know what to write in this stupid little book" is a, is an important commentary on the method. I mean, it is, it is, it, it expresses the challenge of conveying, I think that we've talked about here. And I think that coming through the back of the computer was a good example of that. You, there's no possible way that the book can do that.
- 1:08:06 Michael: I, yeah, I didn't, I literally didn't know what to write in the book, so I just wrote, they, "they came from Charleston" and I mean, I think we did a good job actually there of trying to kind of sort out what that actually means. But, um, but at the time I didn't, I hadn't quite got, got the right words to say apart from "they came from Charleston."
- 1:08:26 RTH: Right. The, the good news, from my point of view, is it seems as it seems to me, *Michael knows what his experience is*. It's the, the difficulties are primarily on our end where it, it (not necessarily on *our* end), but in the, in the communication about it. It's, [Michael: I agree with that.] it would be hard for me to say, well, "Michael's just making this stuff up as, as we go," which is a criticism I hear a lot about my work. But, but I just don't think that's true. And I, I think these examples,
- 1:08:58 Michael: I wouldn't know what to make up! [laughs]
- 1:09:01 RTH: I think that,
- 1:09:02 AB: Would you say that some people are like, would you say that in general of all people who do it, or if in particular of Michael?
- 1:09:12 RTH: I think most people know, I think Michael is very articulate. Some people are more articulate, some people are less articulate. But most people and, and Michael's experience is somewhat more complicated than other, than some other people. I'm not sure that answered your question, but
- 1:09:32 AB: Yeah, I mean, my, my question was just about whether you think that *in general* people know their experience and the problem is communicating that experience or whether some people have a better ability to even *know* their experience. Like, is there a problem with that step ever in your view?

1:09:51 RTH: I think sometimes, but by, I would say most of the time by, by the time we get to the seventh day, people are pretty good at knowing what their experience is.

1:09:51 Russ comments: RTH didn't do a very good job of answering AB's question, so here's another shot. People have trouble knowing their experience to the extent that (a) their inner experience is itself rather inchoate; or (b) their ability to experience *anything* is not clear; or (c) their experience is in conflict with their presuppositions about their experience (or about experience in general). I think (a) and (c) can generally (or at least often) be overcome with enough iterative training.

Many psychologists / philosophers / consciousness scientists think that purported differences in inner experience are really merely differences in communication styles or skills, a view that is, in my view, based largely on inadequate (that is, not iterative) method. I think that if a person has adequate ability to communicate about external things, they can usually learn to communicate about inner experience, but that learning must be iterative in the sense that DES uses the term or somehow as good or better than DES in overcoming the lack of differentiation of language about inner experience that Skinner (among others) has identified. (See Hurlburt, R. T., & Heavey, C. L. (2001). Telling what we know: describing inner experience. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 5, 400-403.)

1:09:58 AB: Hmm.

1:10:04 RTH: So shall we do it again?

1:10:06 Michael: Sure. [AB: Sure.]

They compare calendars

1:10:17 RTH: Sounds like a plan. And, and Michael, shall I send you transcripts and...?

1:10:27 Michael: Uh, that's fine. I didn't mind looking at those. I mean, I didn't, I only partial, I only skimmed the transcript, but, um, I was mostly looking for your comments in the transcript. [RTH: Right.] Um, but I, I did read the other document that you sent. Okay.

1:10:40 RTH: So you should, you should feel free to treat those as, as, as you like, and to add to the comments, discussions, whatever, both of you.

1:10:51 Michael: Okay.

1:10:53 RTH: Alright. Thank you very much. All right. I'll see you all on, uh, next Monday.

1:11:00 Michael: Monday. Alright. Bye. [RTH: See you.][AB: Bye.]