

## TRANSCRIPT WITH COMMENTARY

### Olivia: A Podcast Journalist

#### Olivia Interview 2

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the February 15 interview with Olivia that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/FzkL0lbSSDU>. In green are comments about and explanations of the Descriptive Experience Sampling process. If you have corrections, suggestions, or questions, please post them as YouTube comments.

RTH = Russ Hurlburt

AK = Alek Krumm

Olivia = Olivia R., a podcast journalist

- 0:00 RTH: So, this is gonna be Olivia's day 2. And in the run up to this, Olivia sent a brief email to me, thanking me for the reminder and saying she didn't think she was any good at that, at this, even, even on the second day. And I didn't respond to that, but basically what I would say is, "well, let's see about that." And, uh, uh, many people say they're not very good at it and *are*, and other people say they're not very good at it and, and *aren't* very good at it. And some people get better at it and some people don't. And so I, I would like us to keep our options open as, as far as that's concerned. Unless, Olivia, you wanna elaborate in...
- 0:43 Olivia: Well, look, I think there's two things. There's definitely a feeling I have, um, where the beeper goes off and I go, *Oh!* And I kind of panic. And then I I'm like, my, my mind is empty, and I come, like, "what was I thinking?!? I don't know!" Um, so yes, there's that. Um, but also that, I think I've, I think I underst, I now understand that when I am in conversation with someone that is all there is. And then they keep going off when I'm talking to someone, and then I feel like it's kind of boring because I'm just mid speech or listening to, y'know, someone saying something to me. And so then there's no really interesting thought there; it's just external input.
- 1:34 RTH: Well, both of those things are reasonable. And I would say, we should look at the beeps that we've got. If, if,... I would say in the future, if you think that there's been a whole lot of beeps that are gonna be just, *I was talking and that's all there is to it*, you could get a few more beeps, but...
- 1:47 Olivia: Which is what I did. I ended up, well, there's only seven, but I, there was a couple that I didn't even write down cuz they were just the same where I was like, it was this sentence or, y'know. [RTH: Okay.] So I said, yeah, I did keep going.
- 1:58 RTH: There's there's no magic number. Six is not a magic number. We use six because it is very often the amount that we can talk about in 45 minutes or an hour or until we get tired or something. And uh, uh. But it's, y'know, the, if it's five or if it's seven, it doesn't really matter. So I'm ready to go on to 2.1 if, unless anybody else has anything they'd like to say before we do that. Oh, I guess I would say I, Uh, Alek and I are working on a

transcript. I don't know whether she's seen it yet, but I emailed it, emailed the draft of the transcript to her a couple hours ago. And uh, and when we have, when we have gotten that more or less in what we think is a draft form, then, then we'll send that to you, Olivia, and you can look at it or not. The, and then sooner later we have to decide whether we wanna put these things on YouTube. We, we are giving you a little bit of a lead time to do that. And maybe after, after this session, or after this session and its transcript, or after this session and you saw the old transcript, or something somewhere around in there, you should be able to say, "well, it's okay with me. Let's make this public and how we're gonna make it public, and what we're gonna say about you and who you are and how we're gonna use your name and whatever," all of those [coughs] excuse me, details we can work out sometime in the near future. [Olivia: Um hm.] That's what I was gonna say. Number 1. So I'm ready for number 1 if you're ready.

### SAMPLE 2.1 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 3:50 Olivia: Alright. Number 1. [RTH: If you're ready.] So number 1, I've written down "a handful, three or four." So I was talking. That was sort of, of what had just come out of my mouth, "a handful, three or four." (Funny, now I thought I would remember the context, but I don't.) Um, but I've written here, "Maybe I have a visual on the word 'four'." So... Yeah, it felt like I was seeing the word four as an image. The word, not the number. None of the other words, um, in that sort of those few words that immediately proceeded the beep.
- 4:37 RTH: And, and when you say you "think maybe you had an image," what, what exactly does that mean?
- 4:46 Olivia: Um, like a floating visual, but, but, but (funny, not externally visual, if that makes sense. I'm not seeing "four" on the wall over there, or on the floor over there), but just seeing a floating F O U R in my mind's eye.
- 5:06 RTH: Okay. And are you, are you confident that there is such a seeing going on?
- 5:11 Olivia: I don't feel confident about anything that I'm saying. [laughs]
- 5:14 RTH: Okay. Well, well let's, let me ask some questions, let us ask some questions about what you might be seeing, and then we can, somewhere down the road, decide whether you were actually seeing that. So I'm, what I understand you to be saying is: if, if there was this thing going on (which we're not taking a position yet about whether it was or not), but if it was, it was a, some kind of a visual phenomenon, a seeing of the letters F O U R. [Olivia nods affirmatively] And are these, how do these letters present themselves?
- 5:53 Olivia: Gosh, sorry. I, um, where the, the airport in Sydney is very close to the city and I'm under the flight path, um, and a plane's just gone over, which usually it's not too bad, but it's being really amplified in my microphone, in my ears, into the recorder. So, sorry. Um, so sorry.
- 6:10 RTH: I hate that when that happens. So my question is what, what does, what does, how does "four" appear? What do you see?

6:17 Olivia: Um, it appear, how does it appear?

6:22 RTH: And what I'm asking is this, like, in handwriting? Or printed words? Or capital letters?...

6:28 Olivia: Printed? Yeah. Okay. That's a good, okay. Yep. Printed, all capitals,...

6:33 RTH: All capitals! Capital F, capital O,...

6:34 Olivia: All capitals. Yep. Yep.

6:37 RTH: And in a, in a font? Does it ...

6:40 Olivia: Pretty straight, like a, like a no, y'know, a sans serif straight up kind of Arial kind of font.  
[RTH: Okay.] It's a very straightforward font.

6:51 RTH: All right. And black and white? Color?

6:55 Olivia: I know if they could attribute, I mean, I feel, uh, definitely not bright color, so maybe black and, and white is going on there, but not, yeah. I don't have a strong...

7:08 RTH: And, and

7:08 Olivia: I feel like there's a black background.

7:11 RTH: So white, white letters on a black background? Or black letters on a different kind of black background?

7:17 Olivia: I don't feel like, yeah. Maybe black on.... I, I don't feel confident at all. I can, I can feel confident, I can confidently say no bright colors. There's no colors going on. Colors are not a feature of the memory of the visual.

7:29 RTH: Okay. And so a sans serif font seems confident....

7:35 Olivia: Yes. All caps feels confident.

7:39 RTH: Okay. And yet the, the, it's hard to say whether this is white on black or black on white or gray on black or light black on dark black or that's... We're not confident about that. Is that right?

7:50 Olivia: Not confident about that. That's correct.

7:50 Russ comments: To clarify, we do not actually take Olivia's confidence as evidence of fidelity. A DES axiom is that many, perhaps even most, people are confident but mistaken about at least some of the details of their own inner experience. RTH narrows in on Olivia's confidence here either because it will help focus on describing the aspects she apprehends with fidelity, or because it may advance the process of undermining presuppositions (DES holds that presuppositions are mini or maxi delusions, which, like

all delusions, are confidently held beliefs that are false). In short, confidence is often worth pursuing for one of two very different reasons: either because the confidence is warranted or because the confidence is unwarranted. The interviewer does not need to know which reason is at play—the remainder of the interview and the iterative process may help sort that out.

- 7:52 RTH: Okay. And, and, in the real world that would be sort of difficult: to be, to see letters and be able to say exactly what the font was, but not to be able to say what the, what ...
- 8:06 Olivia: ... the colors are. Yes!
- 8:07 RTH: ...what the colors were. But that does not mean, and that's not, ...I'm, I'm not disbelieving you. I'm just, I'm just making sure that I understand what you're saying, that this is, the font-ness is present to me, but the color aspect is not present to me. Is that fair?
- 8:25 Olivia: Yep.
- 8:26 RTH: Okay. And, and you said these letters don't seem to be on the wall. Do they seem to be anywhere?
- 8:36 Olivia: Um, I mean, not anywhere outside of my body. So they feel like in, um, yeah, they're not out, they're not anywhere in the recognizable, in my surroundings. I mean, they seem to be just kind of,... It's funny. I feel like if I had to, um, um, attribute a location, it would be like here. [holds her left hand up slightly about and to the left of the left side of her head] [laughs ironically] Um, but, but that's kind of more as a representation of, it feels like kind of here, but in my head. Like, so sort of just floating around in an internal head-like space.
- 9:12 RTH: So by "here" [mirrors her gesture] do you mean (I, I understand this is a mental phenomenon and so it's not out there in the, in the *real* world), but does, do these letters appear as if they're outside of my head, a few inches outside of my head, even though it's not like I see them there, but yet they don't, for some reason don't seem to be inside my head.
- 9:33 Olivia: No. They feel like they're inside my head, but they're floating in a high... And I think, I mean, it's almost, I almost feel like I... Hmm. Once again, I'm not sure if "see"'s the right word, but have a sense of an internal, dark internal space that is the same shape as my head. Um, And they're kind of floating to the top sort of left hand of that space.
- 10:07 RTH: Okay. And, and does it seem like you're looking... Does, does there, is there a directionality in it? The seeing seems like it's going this way? Or going that way? I'm looking up at it? Or I'm looking forward at it, but from upward...?
- 10:19 Olivia: Oh... Yeah, I mean, it does feel like I'm sort of looking up slightly at it, because it's definitely feeling... Like the floaty feeling I feel confident about. So it's feeling like it's floating up high.

10:34 RTH: Okay. Okay. And Alek, do you want to ask anything about the visual aspect of this?

10:39 AK: I don't. No.

10:41 RTH: And, And so the sentence was something about a "handful, three or four." But the "handful three" was not seen. Is that correct?

10:53 Olivia: Nope. Yep.

10:53 RTH: And, and is it your sense that it *had been* seen and is now gone? like every word was there? Or does it seem like just the "four" was there the whole time?

11:01 Olivia: No, it just seems like the "four" was there and, and sort of persisted a little bit also after the, um, he, y'know, saying, uh, saying, and hearing and like... Similar to last time with the Xanthe that there was just kind of like an echo of a word. Although obviously this is a visual echo, but it kind of just hung around for a little bit.

11:24 RTH: Okay. And does it seem like it was there for the entire speaking? So it started at "a handful"? It started at the beginning of "a handful three or four"...?

11:31 Olivia: ...or did it start when I said "four"? I don't know.

11:31 Russ comments: Note that Olivia anticipates and naturally finishes RTH's question, a sign that she is taking on the role of the co-investigator (an essential part of the DES procedure).

11:39 RTH: Okay. Alright. Then... Then I'm all.... So we've, we've so far focused on just the visual aspect. And, but I'm also *saying* "A handful three or four," I'm saying that that aloud to somebody. Is that right?

11:55 Olivia: Yes. Yep.

11:56 RTH: And is, what's in your experience about that?

12:00 Olivia: Nothing beyond, I guess... (Sorry, I'm just closing this curtain. Bright sun.) Um, no, I'm not hearing it before I say it. It's just coming out of my mouth. And, and, and I'm not even, um,... Yeah, there's no, yeah, there's no premeditation. The word sort of flowed out. There's no kind of waiting in the way that I described last time where I'm sort of trying to find a word. It was, it was just, [gestures with her hand in an up and away motion]

12:34 RTH: And, and are these meaningful words you? Your [inaudible]

12:39 Olivia: Yeah, I was definitely, yes, I, I was... So I share an office here with my partner and we both work from home. Um, and I was, y'know, and so there's a lot of, y'know, mundane household conversations peppered into the workday. And I, it, it was one of those, gosh, what was it? [musingly] "A handful three or four." Yep. I can't remember.

13:00 RTH: And it doesn't really matter. We're not, we're not that interested in, in that kind of detail. [Olivia laughs]

13:09 AK: Do you experience yourself speaking? Or is, is this even less than that? Like, the words are just coming out of me, but I have no experience at all of speaking them.

13:21 Olivia: Uh, and, and you mean just kind of gen, generally how I feel about it?

13:25 AK: No, I, I mean specifically...

13:26 Olivia: ...at this moment.

13:26 AK: a handful three or four. Yeah.

13:29 Olivia: I mean (and, and I'm not sure if I can answer it, except for sort of more generally how I think about how I) I mean, I don't, I don't think I, um... There are times and sorry. I appreciate I'm actually not asking, cuz I can't, I don't know the answer to, to the question, exactly those words. [Alek: Okay.] Um, it feels like they just, they're just coming and, and, and going, y'know, and, and cuz there are times that I might think about what I'm gonna say before I say it, if I'm having an important conversation, there are times when I definitely sort of in my mind hear words and sort of practicing, but mundane conversations about three or four, whatever it was, it's just, well, it's just kind of spilling out.

14:15 AK: So it sounds like we're not sure really whether this reached the footlights of my conscious experience or whether it's just sort of coming out [inaudible]

14:29 Olivia: My feeling is that all the words are autopilot, y'know, my main conversation stuff, that are nowhere near the footlights of my consciousness. But for some reason, the "FOUR" in a visual way is hanging around in my consciousness.

14:49 RTH: So the distinction that Alek is, is trying to make it here, which is, is a difficult one. And so this is my version of what I think Alek is trying to get at. So sometimes words roll out, and more or less like a gesture. Like sometimes you go like this [waves hand as if gesturing while speaking] and your hand will move like this [continues to wave hand] when you're talking and, and the, the hand motion doesn't, doesn't *register at all*, it is connected to the speaking. And so it makes sense to have gestured like that. But the gesture itself is totally outside of awareness. And so you could say, well, *that gesture just sort of rolled out at me while I was talking*. The question is whether the, the whole words just rolled out like the gesture? Or whether I'm sort of engaged I'm, I'm, I'm saying something meaningful, I recognize myself to be saying something meaningful. It's not outside of my awareness, but I, but, but there's nothing more to it other than I recognize myself to be speaking at this moment.

15:50 Olivia: [points] That's what feels accurate.

15:52 RTH: The second one of those. Not the, not the words rolling out, but the: I'm saying something meaningful and I'm, I, I experienced myself, [clears throat] (excuse me) as saying something meaningful.

16:04 Olivia: Yeah. [RTH: Okay.] Because wouldn't it be? I mean, that feels right, and the reason being is that, um, I feel, I mean, obviously I wrote the words down so I can remember them, but I feel like a lot of the time, most of the time, if you ask me what I've just said, I can remember what I've just said. But if you ask me how I've just *gestured* [gestures] or something like that, that is, y'know, I can't necessarily remember the motion of the gestures. So there's more consciousness and awareness and of, of the speech. I mean, yeah. I'm I recognize myself saying those things.

16:45 RTH: So some people will say (not, not everybody by any means) but, but, but some people will, will say these words came outta me and they were, they caught me totally by surprise. They, it was as if *Russ* had said that. [Olivia: Yeah. ] And, and I'm gathering, that's *not* what you're saying here.

16:59 Olivia: That is definitely not my experience.

16:59 Russ comments: This difference between words being experientially created and words rolling out is a distinction that requires something like DES to explore--it could not be discovered by armchair introspection, for example. If you set yourself the task of observing your inner experience, it is by definition impossible (or at best exceedingly difficult) to notice something that is *not* part of inner experience. The possibility of this distinction was raised when Olivia said (at 12:06), "Um, no, I'm not hearing it before I say it. It's just coming out of my mouth. And, and, and I'm not even, um, Yeah, there's no, yeah, there's no premeditation. The word sort of flowed out." Was Olivia trying to describe what DES calls *words rolling out*? We have reached the conclusion that *No*, this is not *words rolling out* as DES describes it. But that "conclusion" should be regarded as tentative, or untrustworthy, or squishy: Olivia was not in a position to make that distinction when the experience occurred, so her retrospection about that experience should not be blindly trusted. But *going forward*, Olivia *will* no doubt be alert to the possibility of that distinction, so on subsequent sampling days she may be in a better position to notice immediately after the beep, while experience is still in short-term memory, whether the rolling-out phenomenon occurred. Which is to say: DES is fundamentally iterative.

17:04 RTH: Okay. So I would say I'm, I'm ready to move on to beep number 2. And, and what I would say about, about all beeps, but this one maybe in particular, is that, so we're leaving it relatively unconfidently reported about the visual aspect, whether that actually existed or not. And, and we talked about it as if it existed, I suppose, but, but I, I don't want us to say, well, y'know, there's gotta be a visual aspect or even that there *was* a visual aspect on this. It could be, well, maybe for whatever reason, Olivia was, thought she had to talk about visual stuff. And so now she's gonna talk about visual stuff.

17:04 Russ comments: This is another rung in the iterative, presupposition-bracketing ladder. We don't want to try to decide something now; we want to get in a better position to apprehend something later.

17:45 Olivia: It's funny because yeah, I think, well, if I, if I wrote it, if I felt this and wrote it, it must have been there. But I have written "maybe," *maybe* a visual on the word 'four'." Um,

17:59 RTH: And, and, and what I'm saying is I'm honoring the "maybe." I'm, I'm taking the "maybe" seriously. [Olivia: Um hmm.] And, and the "maybe" has two, two prongs to it. Yes, it was, or no, it wasn't (or maybe somewhere in between too, for that matter). And, and, and we, and we want to honor that. We want to take that seriously. When, we're trying to get your experience in high fidelity. And if whatever, and, and if, and if you're not *sure* about something, and you have "maybe" in order to convey the unsureness, well, then that's part of the deal. And we don't wanna slam the door one way or the other. [pause] Number 2?

## SAMPLE 2.2 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

18:43 AK: Number 2.

18:43 Olivia: Two. Okay. So number 2. Um, [sighs] So I was writing, I had three. I was right in the middle of writing. Um, I had three, uh, wait. Okay. So I had measured a shelf on, in my fridge that needs replacing. I had three numbers written down on a piece of paper, and I was writing above those three numbers, d h and w for depth, height, and width, width, um, cuz I'm looking to replace the shelf. Um, so once again, I feel, I mean, writing d h and w, y'know, I, um, I don't know how, (like a similar conversation to we've just had about sort of the awareness of speaking) I feel like applies to the awareness of writing. Was I thinking d or with my hand, just moving d. It doesn't feel like, was really thinking d d, or was I really thinking *little* round circle and a tall thing and a down, that doesn't feel right. Um, but strangely, even though I was writing d h w the word "width", I felt like I heard the word "width" in my head.

20:20 AK: So I guess I'm trying to gauge how much of this is kind of maybes. So it sounds like the d h w--I'm not really sure if or how I'm engaged in that. Y'know, I'm skillfully writing these things, but whether I'm thinking the letters or whatever, it seems like, *no*. But then the "width," are you, are you more confident about that? It seems like there is something about "width" going on here?

20:46 Olivia: That, and, and is it because, um, it's the last, it was the last of the three that I was writing? Um, I, I do feel more confident about it. Yes.

21:03 AK: Well, and the *reason* really doesn't matter. You could be thinking "squirrel" and I would be, y'know, just as interested. It doesn't have anything to do with what you're writing, but, y'know,

21:12 Olivia: But except we don't have squirrels in Australia, so unlikely that that would happen.

21:17 AK: Oh, you really don't?! Wow. You're missing out! So

21:21 RTH: Kangaroos. [Olivia nods affirmatively: We do.]

21:21 AK: But is it, is it fair to say that "width," this word "width" is, as best we can say, is in my experience at, at the moment of the beep?

21:30 Olivia: I think so. I think so. Yeah. I mean, I think I, yes. I mean, once again, I, I, I, I feel like none of this stuff is with a hundred percent confidence. [Alek nods: Okay.] But isn't that the nature of kind of... So I feel with as much confidence as I can. I mean, I've written it down, um, I remember thinking *weird! Why just that of the three?* Um, yeah.

21:58 AK: Okay. So as best we can say, it seems like "width" is there. And how exactly...

22:02 RTH: [interrupts] Can I, can I ask one more question about that for... [Alek: Yeah.] So are, are you more confident, less confident about "width" as you were about seeing the "FOUR"?

22:12 Olivia: I would say I am slightly more confident about "width" than I was about seeing the "FOUR". [RTH: Okay.]

22:02 Russ comments: Notice we have again returned to a discussion of Olivia's confidence. As before, our interest is not in her confidence *per se* but in understanding what she means by *I think so*. By asking her to compare or contrast two instances of her own *I think so*, RTH is seeking to calibrate, as it were, Olivia's use of that phrase. Does she use *I think so* and *maybe* to mean, simply, less than a hundred percent confidence (as she said about all her experiences at 21:40)? Or does she have a more nuanced, qualified meaning in mind that might vary from one occasion to the next? RTH does not simply blindly believe Olivia's width-is-more-confident claim. The aim of the question is iterative, rather than conclusory—in the future, perhaps Olivia will be able to be more specific in her use of *I think so* and *maybe*.

22:21 AK: So tell me about "width." How, how exactly do you experience that?

22:27 Olivia: Um, so I mean, it's, it's the hearing that I described last time that I feel like hearing is not the best word, but hearing's the word we we've got. It's a perceiving, it's a perception of the word in an audio-ish form.

22:46 AK: Mm hmm. So this is an *inner* word. I'm not hearing it aloud, or saying it, or something like that. [Olivia: Mm hmm. Mm hmm.] And is "width" in a voice?

22:58 Olivia: It's in, once again, the voice I think I described last time, which is my voice, but it's my internal voice that doesn't sound like the voice that I would hear when I listen back to this thing.

23:16 AK: Okay. [pause] And I think last time we, we sort of started down the path of the, um, distinction between, well, is this a *speaking* type phenomenon? I feel like I'm producing

the words? Or is this a *hearing* phenomenon? I, I seem to be hearing them even though, I mean, understand *innerly*. Can you say here?

23:40 Olivia: Well, it's funny because I'm, I mean, I'm, I'm definitely not speaking them. I'm not, and I didn't say any of, of this out loud.

23:40 Russ comments: In much of the philosophical literature, *inner speech* is the noun and the corresponding verb is *hearing*. That is a mistaken point of view on both counts (RTH thinks) and is perhaps based on the same kind of confusion that lies behind Olivia's answer here. It is apparently difficult for Olivia to imagine innerly speaking—she says her experience is not speaking because it is not out loud. We will have to help her (iteratively) understand that it is possible to *innerly* speak, so the fact that she is not *outerly* speaking does not at all imply that she is not *innerly* speaking. RTH will begin to work on that at 24:09. (To the philosophers: the phenomenon is a verb—*inner speaking*. There is no corresponding noun.)

23:48 Olivia: [continues] Um, I'm, I'm, I'm writing the letters that correspond to the words. Um, but for whatever reason, y'know, the word "depth" and the word "height" was not in my consciousness, but the word "width" was. Um,

24:09 RTH: So I don't, I don't think last time we made a distinction about speaking and hearing in the following way. So if you speak into a tape recorder and then you play the tape recording back, in some ways, that's exactly the same thing. It's your voice, they're your words, same words, same inflection, whatever. But for most people that's a very different experience. There, there's an experience of speaking (that's the first thing). And then there's the speaking of hearing, [RTH misspeaks here—he should have said "experience of hearing"] [Olivia: Hmm.] (that's the playing back). So I think we're accepting that, that the, the word "width" is *inner*. This is an *imaginary* thing. There's no question about that. But the question is whether this is more like the speaking *into* the tape recorder, or the hearing the word come *back out* of the tape recorder. Or maybe that doesn't make sense for you. So... [pause] And there's a third possibility too, before, before we answer that, and that is that this word is somehow present, with, with, without actually being spoken or heard, or maybe even voiced. That is, it *is* possible to imagine a word without having any vocal characteristics to it at all, even though it is somehow present and not seen and not whatever, but the word is, the word "width" is definitely present to me, even though I don't hear it, or I don't speak it innerly or any other way.

25:39 Olivia: So I think if you'd just given me the two options, um, was it more like the speaking into the tape recorder or hearing the tape recorder, the internal version of that? I would say it was the *speaking into* the tape recorder version. But you give me the third option that is like, allows me to not really [they laugh] not make a decision. And I wanna go with that one because, um,... Yeah, no, but I, y'know, I'm, I'm, I'm, I'm sort of actively producing this, y'know, and there's, there's the words and the meaning, right? Like there's, there's the, the meaning of the height and the depth and the width of this thing that I'm obviously also thinking about in some way, albeit not consciously. Like I wasn't visualizing the shelf. I had these three numbers that I'd written down and I was sort of ascribing a quality of depth, width and height to each one. Um, And, and, and sort of,

not in the realm of this beep, I sort of remember thinking, gosh, the depth and the height of this thing is like, which is which, actually? Because I mean, it's like depth and height are a little bit interchangeable sometimes. [RTH: Right.] So anyway, um, but the, the depth and the, so the, so I'm, I'm sort of producing these symbols that refer to these words that refer to these physical qualities, and I'm producing them on paper. Um, and so I, the width, the word "width" is, is, is, is produced. It's not received. It felt, it feels internally produced.

27:35 AK: Okay.

27:36 RTH: So what I, what I would say about this is, is it, it's probably not worth the effort to try to struggle through much more about that, about this particular beep, because last time I think we sort of came down on the side, well, this was like a *hearing* phenomenon. And then today we started out as being like, it's a *speaking* phenomenon and tomorrow it's probably be [Olivia laughs] like gonna be a, a non-speaking- but-somehow-I'm producing-the-words phenomenon. And, and that is totally okay. That's the way this procedure, that's the way this procedure works. And what that means, probably, is that Olivia, in her, I would say relatively naive way of thinking about inner her experience (like everybody's got a way of, a naive way of thinking about experiences) thought about these things as being hearing. And so it's naturally to say, "well, I was hearing that." And then you gotta work against that. And if it's not *hearing*, well, then it might be speaking. And now, so now we got another presupposition or whatever to deal with. And that's just the way this process goes. It is not a failure of Olivia's to not know how to do this. And, uh, and it's not a failure of Alek or me to not ask good questions. It's it is just that things need to mature, y'know, the, the, the yeast has to rise, I guess you could say. And, uh,

27:36 Russ comments: This extends the comment at 17:04. DES, unlike most other psychological investigations, does not try to interpret, or understand, or infer something about an ambiguous event or utterance that has already taken place. Instead, DES tries to get into a position so that future events or utterances are not ambiguous. So here, RTH is working with Olivia to sketch out some possibilities about the ways words might be apprehended, *not* to try to nail down how the words at beep 2.2 were apprehended. DES understands that if Olivia was not in a position to make unambiguous apprehensions of experience at the moment the original experience occurred, she will *never* be in a position to be a trustworthy reporter about that experience--her best shot at it is immediately at the beep, and any attempt after that will be worse. So RTH's effort here is aimed at beep 3.2, or beep 4.5--that is, at some future beep where it would be desirable for Olivia to be *ready* to make the necessary discriminations immediately as the beep occurs.

28:59 RTH: [continues after a pause] So I would say, Alek, you wanna go on to the rest of this sample? Unless you, unless you, unless you, unless you agree.

29:06 AK: No, I, I agree with all that. I do. I, y'know, one other thing I was gonna ask is, are there any qualities to this, um, to "width," y'know, is it, is there a inflection or a tone or volume that we can... [Olivia shakes her head in the negative] No.

29:23 Olivia: No. It feels, um, you the same way that I kind of said, I'm not sure I can really ascribe color to the visual of the word. Like it's, it's there and it's, it's not loud or quiet. It's just sort of a very vanilla, y'know, loud enough to hear, but not too loud, like just, it's just ...*there* and it's, um, there's no accent there's no.

29:53 RTH: So I guess I would like to ask one more question before we, before we abandon this. And that is: is it the case that the "width" is presented to you in a different way than "FOUR" was?

29:53 Russ comments: DES is a simple thing: AK and RTH should ask Olivia to talk about her experience without injecting their own theories or presuppositions into the mix. Here, RTH implements that by asking Olivia whether two of her own phenomena are similar or different. RTH has no theory that says that the two words should be similar or different; that is, he has *not* directed Olivia toward his own theories. Instead, he has engineered a situation where Olivia is asked to delve into only her own experiences. That is, this line of questioning encourages Olivia to make distinctions among her own phenomena.

As in the comment at 16:59, the aim of making distinctions is forward looking rather than backward looking. But this differs from the 16:59 comment in that there, RTH was suggesting distinctions that come from *his own* prior DES experience, whereas here he is asking Olivia to make distinction that come from her *own* experience.

30:05 Olivia: Yes, yes, yes. It's an, it's an audio...

30:07 RTH: So these are not the same

30:09 Olivia: ...experiences.

30:09 RTH: These are not the same thing that we've given different words to. These are two different kinds of experiences.

30:14 Olivia: Definitely.

30:15 RTH: We're still struggling with how to, what to say about 'em, [Olivia: Yes.] but they're, but they're, but they're not the same. [Olivia nods affirmatively.] Okay. And, and that's how this process works. I would much rather have us be in touch with the phenomenon and worry about the words later, rather than lead with the words, because I think that just screws things up all the time. [Olivia: Mm hm.] And, and it seems like we're doing a pretty good job of that. We're saying, well, this is one kind of phenomenon that, that, that one that we're calling the picture of "FOUR," and this is *another* kind of phenomenon, that we're calling the speaking, or the imagining, or whatever, we're calling it of "width."

30:15 Russ comments: RTH here highlights another way that DES differs from most of psychology. Psychology typically tries to define its terms carefully and then tries to determine whether a particular event fits the defined phenomenon. DES tries to describe phenomena repeatedly, allowing words to be elastic or change with each repetition, until the phenomenon is clearly apprehended. *Then* it might be desirable to nail down the best word choice. This interview with Olivia helps demonstrate the

inadequacies of the traditional psychological method: We saw that Olivia was not yet prepared to say definitively whether sample 2.1 included color or whether sample 2.2 was innerly spoken or heard; however, in a traditional psychological study, she would have likely been forced to come down (perhaps inaccurately) on one side or the other of each of those issues.

30:51 Olivia: And, and, but, and, but they are united with the similarity of them being one word plucked from a sort of sentence or entourage or of words surrounding them.

31:03 RTH: Yes. And I would say, yeah, I agree with that. But let's not think that that's the way the world is, or even that that's the way *your* experience is, because maybe that's just two accidents...

31:03 Russ comments: In our comments to sampling day 1, we, we urged the bracketing of Olivia's theories about her inner experience (see Olivia 1 30:36 and 35:00). This is another such instance. It is perhaps true that Olivia's inner experience often contains one word plucked from a larger verbal exchange, but it is also perhaps true that that is just a convenient extrapolation based on just two examples. The DES object is to wait and see. Olivia has noticed what may be the first two instances of a trend. Fine. But let's try not to let that noticing become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

31:16 Olivia: Or it was, yeah, just the one that was literally right before the beep. And yes, I agree. It, it feels like, I mean, that seems like a coincidence, but yes, it could not be.

31:16 Russ comments: To RTH's ear, it sounds like Olivia is still somewhat attached to the single-words-plucked-from-experience generalization about her experience, but he doesn't confront her about it. The bracketing of presuppositions is a gradually acquired skill, and the teaching of the bracketing-of-presuppositions (as RTH is trying to do along here) involves gentle but consistent (one might say relentless) pressure.

31:29 RTH: Carry on, then.

31:29 Olivia: On. Um,

31:32 AK: I, y'know, we haven't talked about the *writing* portion of this experience. So you are in fact writing, is that right at the moment the beep interrupts?

31:41 Olivia: Yep. [AK: Okay.] Yes. I've got a pencil in my hand [AK: ...and I'm writing...] and I'd just written and I'd just written, and I can't, y'know, like somewhere in, I, I was writing literally three letters. [AK: Um hm.] I'd written the, the, um, numbers a while ago. [AK: The numbers already.] And so it was those three letters. And at which precise, y'know, that obviously it's very quick to write three letters. I can't say exactly where the beep came.

32:08 AK: That's fine. And so, okay. I think I'm getting all of that. And then I guess my question is just, is that in my direct experience? So this is, this is sort of similar to our question about words just rolling out versus I have some recognition that I'm doing this, y'know,

and, [Olivia: Well...] in maybe the same way words are just coming out of my pen? Or I experience myself as writing them.

32:34 Olivia: Sort of, um. It feels less just roll out because I feel that I definitely had to be more, um, deliberate about writing the right letter over the right number. And so, but I don't remember that. So it just feels like more, y'know, I'm, I'm, it's a ma, it was a matching, um, rather than a... So, uh,

33:11 AK: And so the deliberateness, is that a characteristic of my experience at this moment? Or that's kind of a retrospection on, well, when I look back at this, I think, well, it wasn't just writing and being careful, so therefore I *must* be experiencing it?

33:26 Olivia: Well, [AK: ...be experiencing?] the deliberate, it feels, uh, um, y'know, the word deliberateness. I mean, I guess the other word I would say is like, I had to *think* about it before I did it in a way that is different to how I described general experience of speaking, where it's just coming out. And, um, so it may happen from time to time that I say something I'm like, no, that's not quite what I mean. Um, but it's just coming out with little sort of, like there's no pause between thinking and speaking. Whereas I feel like there *must have been* a microsecond of pause between writing d and making sure I was writing or writing... [as if as an aside] It's funny, actually, cuz width was the, I can't wanna, I can't find that piece of paper because now I'm even wondering if I wrote the right number on the wrong one, but

34:19 RTH: You're gonna order the wrong shelf here, then!

34:23 Olivia: [laughs] Well look, buying fridge shelves is a very interesting... You write to these companies and then they send you back an exploded version of your fridge, a diagram. It's, it's very interesting.... Anyway. Um, uh, yeah, it just feels like there must have been a microsecond of thought before writing, but I, yeah,

34:46 RTH: So it seems to me that the distinction here is whether it's a *gesture*, like you just put your hand to your mouth or whatever, and that gesture was something that you probably didn't think about, didn't plan: *I'm well, now I'm gonna put my hand next to my mouth*. [Olivia: Mmm. ] Instead, that was that, that, that gesture just sort of rolls out at you, which somehow accompanies the, the thought that you were trying to say back when you just did that gesture (which now I can't remember what it was). And so that's one thing, that's the sort of the gesture coming out without, coming out of your bag of bones in a skillful way. I, I I'm, we're not, I'm not trying to say this gesture has no meaning. I, it certainly does have a meaning, and it it's, it's attached to the, what it is that you were saying and in a fundamental way. But, but, but that (I'm guessing) feels different from the writing. The writing generally feels like you've got a *directed* goal, and...

35:41 Olivia: Yeah. And it definitely feels like a decision to do the writing before I do the writing, cuz I realized that I'd written down three numbers and I needed to have those, y'know, have the, the letters next to the numbers while I'm looking at these objects. So yes, I made decision. I picked up a pen, and um, yeah. [Reaches down] Oh, I found it! I found it. [looks at the sticky note] Okay. So I did, I did. Ah! But... [Laughs] Okay. So here it is.

[holds the sticky note up to the webcam] And then, so actually w is first not last! [RTH: Yeah.] um,

36:15 RTH: Unless you write right to left.

36:18 Olivia: No, no, I do not. I am lefthanded, but I do not write, right to left. Um, strange! In my memory it was last. But I did. It is right. The width is the longest one.

36:18 Russ comments: Olivia's memory is mistaken about a fairly important detail. We should not hold that against her, nor against DES: everyone's retrospection is imperfect. The difference here is that we are using a procedure that makes such discrepancies evident, whereas human interchanges usually fail to recognize them at all. Our aim is not perfection—that is unattainable in the human condition. Our aim is fidelity, which is attainable even though particular details may be wrong.

36:32 RTH: Okay.

36:35 AK: Well then I think I'm good for this. Beep

36:37 RTH: Me too.

### SAMPLE 2.3 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE (SKIPPED)

36:38 Olivia: Number 3. Okay. I wanna skip 3 cuz um, I feel like it was one of these ones with input. I was reading something on a website I'd sort of just opened this website and I was looking at the word at the top left of the website, which was... These happening quite quick succession where on, on, on a shop website that sells...

36:59 RTH: The refrigerator shelves!

37:02 Olivia: Um, y'know, and it just, it feels like it was just an input-y one that's not that interesting. So I would like to move on to number 4.

37:02 Russ comments: RTH thinks it likely (or at least possible) that there would have been something interesting / useful in a discussion of sample 2.3. Eventually, in the service of random sampling, we will prefer not to skip beeps—the sample is no longer random when one gets to choose to skip samples. However, DES is fundamentally a co-investigator effort, and here, on the second sampling day, we honor her request. This again is part of the iterative process: we will refine the procedure as sampling days proceed. Everything in DES is iterative!

This flexibility of procedure runs counter to nearly all psychology, which overwhelmingly favors standardization of procedure, requiring all participants to be treated the same. RTH believes that orthodox psychology is invested in a chimera: giving all participants exactly the same instructions *in no way* implies that all participants will have *received* anywhere close to the same instructions. Participants have idiosyncratic language understandings, pay attention in different ways and to different things, and so on. The *only possible* way to get participants the same

instructions is individualistically to shape instructions across time to meet the characteristics and proclivities of the individual participants.

That requires judgment and skill on the part of the investigator and runs the risk of the investigator's injecting their own bias into the process. Those are indeed risks, but avoiding those risks *guarantees* that participants will receive disparate instructions.

37:09 RTH: Okay.

#### SAMPLE 2.4 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

37:11 Olivia: Um, which is "tied up with strings" is what I've writ, written. Um, y'know, the song from *Sound of Music*, "brown paper packages tied up with strings. These are a few of my favorite things." Um, but just that, just the "tied up with strings" part of that line. Um, and I feel like this happens regularly, that a little bit of a song is in my head, and not necessarily on repeat round, round in loop, but it's there in my head. And, and then maybe a minute later it's there or, y'know, I read something and then I go and get a glass of water and uh, it comes in while, while I'm filling the glass. But anyway, probably you're not interested in the theorizing....

37:11 Russ comments: Here is another example of Olivia's drawing a generality from a very small number (perhaps only one) of particulars . It also illustrates the iterative nature of DES: Olivia herself is recognizing that we are not interested in the theorizing.

37:59 Olivia: ... [continues] but yeah, it's definitely that line of that song from *The Sound of Music* in an *hearing* kind of way. Um, no music, like no piano accompaniment, just the singing voice of "tied up with strings."

38:14 RTH: So, so I hear someone singing "tied up with strings." [Olivia: Um hmm.] And the "tied up with strings" is not a, is not going to be followed by "these are a few of my favorite things." It's just this phrase?

38:30 Olivia: Yep.

38:31 RTH: And there's nothing preceding it ei, either? I've just plucked this phrase out, out of the world for whatever reason. And, and I'm hearing "tied up with strings." Is that right?

38:42 Olivia: Yep.

38:42 RTH: Okay. And, and it's being *sung*, not *spoken*. And is the singer, uh, have a masculine voice? Or a feminine voice? Or...

38:53 Olivia: No, it's definitely a feminine voice. And I don't know if it's me or Julie Andrews, can't say.

39:01 RTH: And does that mean, *I don't remember*? Or that, that, that the Julie-Andrews-ness of it or the Olivia-ness of it, wasn't an important part of the experience.

39:11 Olivia: Wasn't an important part. I mean, I think if I had to decide, I would say it was not my voice.

39:17 RTH: And how about Julie Andrews? Was it Julie Andrew's voice?

39:19 Olivia: Well, it was more Julie Andrews-sy than, than me. It was quite, y'know, in tune and strong and...

39:26 RTH: Unlike you? [they laugh] And, but, but, but I'm gathering, this does not seem like I'm listening to a re a familiar recording that I know of Julie Andrews, except that I have removed the, the accompaniment.

39:42 Olivia: [shakes head in the negative] Nope.

39:43 RTH: But it might be in the, in the vein of Julie Andrews, whether it's Julie Andrews or not. Is that right?

39:49 Olivia: Yep.

39:49 RTH: And, and I'm understanding this to be a *hearing* phenomenon. I *hear* it. [Olivia nods affirmatively] I'm not *singing* in Julie Andrews's voice. I don't hear. I don't, I I'm not singing these words. I'm hearing these words. Is that right?

40:04 Olivia: Yes, [sighs] yes. Yeah. Yes *but*! Um, I mean, there's still a... No, maybe I can confidently say I'm hearing them, I'm, I'm receiving them. I'm not producing them. I'm listening to the recorded voice rather than recording the voice. Yes. Yes! And it sort of floats in all of its own accord.

40:04 Russ comments: Recall that we have struggled with the distinction between hearing and speaking previously (see 27:36). Now Olivia gets a chance to apprehend *from her own experience* the experiential difference between hearing and speaking. This of course is a substantial contribution of the iterative process as well as an advancement of the iterative process. It is likely that Olivia on future sampling days will be more confidently able to distinguish between a hearing and a speaking phenomenon. (We note in passing that such coincidental clarificatory experiences are very common in DES. Not sure why that is....)

40:31 RTH: Okay. So it, is the end of that soliloquy "Yes. I am hearing this"?

40:39 Olivia: Yes.

40:40 RTH: Okay. I'm not trying to talk you into it. I'm, I just want to give you...

40:43 Olivia: No, but I think I talked myself into it with the soliloquy. [they laugh]

40:43 Russ comments: Note again (see 11:31) that Olivia is taking on the role of the co-investigator.

40:48 RTH: And, and... So I hear... This, this we're more or less confidently saying is a *hearing* phenomenon. I *hear* some female kind of voice sing "tied up with strings."

41:11 Olivia: Yep.

41:13 RTH: And maybe this is repeated on a loop and maybe it's not, is that right? Or is it just confidently not [inaudible]

41:19 Olivia: It was, as I wrote it down, I was aware that I'd heard that several times over the proceeding minutes.

41:27 AK: And just that "tied up with strings"? [Olivia: (nods affirmatively) Um hmm.]

41:32 RTH: And, and does that mean "tied up with strings," [sings] "tied up with strings," "tied up with string," "tied up with strings," over and over?

41:37 Olivia: No, no, no. One, one, and then an indeterminant gap. And then just that again at some point.

41:47 RTH: Okay. So not a loop, but a repetition.

41:50 Olivia: A random repetition.

41:52 RTH: Okay. And, and presumably you're doing something else at this time, is that right?

42:02 Olivia: Um hmm. Yep. I'm probably sitting, y'know, I mean, I was probably sitting here working. Or maybe I'd was, y'know, was I preparing lunch? Y'know, I kind of moved back and forth between sitting at my desk and doing non-sitting-at-my-desk things, in the way that one does in a workday.

42:19 RTH: And, and, and does that mean that I don't remember what I was doing? Or at the moment of the beep what I was doing didn't matter because my experience was sort of entirely wrapped up with listening to, or hearing "tied up with strings."

42:33 Olivia: Ah, [sighs] I mean, I don't remember what I was doing. I didn't write down what I was doing. Um, but whether my experience was totally wrap, wrapped up in it... I mean, I feel confident I was doing *something*—I wasn't just sitting, y'know, quietly waiting for a beep and thinking. I was, I was definitely doing something. It was, y'know, these, this was sort of fourish hours in my workday. So, um, but, but how much that thing I was doing was part of my consciousness? I mean, it wasn't enough to make me write it down or remember it now. But in the same way that we talked the first time about maybe getting yoghurt out while I'm having a conversation, I'm getting yoghurt from a container into a bowl, but how much am I paying attention to that?

43:28 RTH: So the distinction that I remember us making was, was, uh, primarily about your partner and the coffee and whatever that was going on around you at the moment that your daughter was saying (whatever it was that she was saying) "I drink my coffee." [Olivia: Um hmm.] And, and, and, and we left it sort of, we weren't *sure* whether the partner

was actually present in your experience. He was clearly in your experience in one manner of speaking: you weren't bumping into him or spilling his coffee or whatever. But in the directly-in-front-of-the-footlights-of-my-conscious-experience way, well, maybe he was not there, or maybe he was there a little bit, it was sort of hard to tell. And so *now*, about... But that was the first sampling day. So now we have a little practice of, of that, and now we're trying to sort it through for *this* beep. And so at this beep is the fact that you, you didn't write it down, does that mean, *well, it just wasn't happening cuz y'know, we, we established last time that it could be just a little bit there, there, and if I was a little bit there, I should write it down, but it was a little bit there.*

44:37 Olivia: Yeah. Good point. No, I think that means that, I mean when the, when the beep goes off, I, I go to my head and, and try and find what was there and, and it doesn't, yeah, it doesn't feel the, the physical, um, what, what I'm actually doing doesn't feel like part of it. So in, in the same way, y'know, I was able to remember, um, more, y'know, I think the first time we did it, it was just a few hours earlier. So that morning, y'know, the kind of, um, session of events that morning was fresher in my mind, or even with the coffee. I mean, y'know, the morning starts the same way almost every day. So remembering when that thing happened, I can remember the setting. In this situation, it was some point in the day where I do lots of different things. And so, um, I don't remember it and I don't, I didn't write it down cuz it, yeah, the what-I'm-doing doesn't feel like part of my consciousness.

45:39 RTH: So what, what we're having now is round two of a conversation about the same thing. And, and I want to first emphasize that the fact that we have to have round two is not a failure of Olivia or a failure of us having not explained it well the first time around.

45:39 Russ comments: DES is fundamentally confrontational, explicitly acknowledging that what we have done is not adequate. Part of the art of confrontation is this kind of support.

45:53 RTH: [continues] It's that this is the way this process works, that, that we were raising the stakes, I guess a little bit of, we, we, we would like to know whether, whether what you were doing was present or whether your experience was sort of taken over entirely by the "strings" hearing and, and it's water over the dam for, for *this*. But for, for future references, we would like to know if there's some sort of minor small-time experience that's going on, we'd like to know about that. And if there's *not*, then we'd like to confidently say, *Well, there was nothing going on here. All that, all, all that was happening was "tied up with strings."*

46:37 Olivia: I mean, it doesn't feel like I can be doing stuff without being conscious of it. Yet it does feel like, I mean, there must, there must be *some* part of consciousness that is [gestures uncertainly]...

46:50 RTH: So that's why it's hard. That's why it's hard. Because you've got a self-theory says, *I must have been doing it*. And it's hard to give that... And I must have been aware of it at some level. And it's hard to give that up. And what I would, what this *lecture* and this that I'm giving right now is about, let's bracket, what I would call, what we would call "bracket" that. Which means, well, maybe it's true that there's some part of, of me that is

experiencing that. And if so, well, let's report that. But maybe it's not true. Maybe my self-theory is mistaken, and if that's the case and, and I discover in the future that it's not there, well, then that's, that's fine too. Either, either...

46:50 Russ comments: This is a good example of the bracketing skill—an even handed acceptance of either outcome. Putting one's preferences out of play.

47:28 Olivia: I don't know if it's, it's even a self theory. I mean, isn't it just like a general theory that how can you do something without paying some heed to what you're doing?

46:38 Russ comments: RTH would call this a *self-* theory because it applies to how Olivia herself understands how Olivia's experience works. Olivia would call it a general theory because she understands that how it works for Olivia is (obviously!) the same for everyone. RTH observes that presuppositions in general are understood to apply to everyone. Presuppositions are small delusions, and it likely will requires some substantial bracketing to keep them at bay.

47:40 RTH: It is a widely held theory. Yes. Whether it's true or not, I think....

47:47 Olivia: I mean, it makes me think of that thing that happens sometimes where you, you get on the bike or so... get in the car and start driving somewhere and realize that you've driven the, like, that you're driving, you're just driving the way you most commonly drive or you are, y'know, and then you've gotta double back. And, um, which I feel like, especially when you're in the car or, and on a bike, can feel unnerving because if you're paying that little attention to what you, what you're doing, um.... I mean, paying attention is another interesting.

48:23 RTH: So, so let's, let's, let's assume that you don't know anything about this. And maybe that I don't know anything about it either. Then that that's, that's, that's fine with me. But what I, what I would say is that we do *all kinds of skilled things* without paying attention to it. Life is really quite complicated, and we're engaged in skilled activities, and, and my right hand can be doing something and my left hand, doesn't know about it. And my body is adjusting itself at the same time. [he squirms exaggeratedly] And I'm not really thinking about that. And all those, all those things can happen, including driving from one state to another, one street to another, whatever. And, uh, and, and, and we can do that skillfully without necessarily... We, we can be totally engrossed, we could be driving together and I could be totally engrossed in a conversation with you, and driving skillfully at the same time I'm doing it, and yet any beep that came during that time might not have any aspect at all of the driving. I'm obviously doing it right. I'm not running into people or whatever. But, uh, so what I, what I would like us to recognize is that it's possible, might be, it *might be* possible. That's the lecture that I'm trying to give here. It *might be possible* for an experience *not to include* anything at all about what you're doing. I'm, I wanna raise that as a possibility so that we don't fight against that. [Olivia: Um hmm.] I'm not saying that's the way it *is* for you. I'm saying, I'm trying to neutralize the, what I call the self theory and what do you call the general, general theory, either one. Whatever, whatever you want to call that I'm trying to balance it out so that, so that it can go either way.

48:23 Russ comments: RTH has given a pretty long “lecture” on this topic, an effort DES calls *leveling the playing field*. He is doing more than merely asking a non-leading question; he is pushing somewhat energetically in a direction that opposes the direction that Olivia is naturally adopting. Olivia has tilted the field one way; RTH is trying to tilt it back to level.

There is, of course, a risk to this process, that by pushing in this way, RTH will talk Olivia out of a position that she not only naturally holds, but that actually characterizes her experience. RTH will try to reduce that risk in his next turn.

Also, note that RTH is being entirely transparent here. There is no manipulation of Olivia. There is no claim to knowing the Truth about Olivia. RTH conveys, straightforwardly, a genuine interest in getting it right.

50:06 Olivia: Okay.

50:07 RTH: Without, without saying the way it is, cuz I’m, I, I would be totally delighted for Olivia to come down and say, y’know, Russ, the, it *it’s there* all the time. Every, every time for me it’s there. I, I would be totally happy with that. But I would be most happy with that if we can get to a place where, where that makes, where we agree what we’re talking about, and it doesn’t come just from theory, it comes, comes from, *well at the moment of beep it was there. It was there at a low level, but it was there. Or* I would be just as happy--not more happy, not less happy--I would be just as happy if on some future beeps, Olivia would say, well, y’know, I was driving and I wasn’t paying any attention to it *at all* and yet... whatever.

50:46 Olivia: Okay.

50:51 RTH: And, and that is what makes, what makes the whole thing fun. I mean, the whole, the whole, it’s a challenge to try to tease out our self-theories or our general-theories or our expectations about the world, the world, or whatever you wanna call those, I don’t care. But to keep those separate from what’s actually in experience, that’s, that’s what makes this an interesting endeavor.

So we’re coming up on 50 minutes. Do we wanna do another one or we, or...

51:27 Olivia: I have one more [sample 2.6] that I feel quite confident about.

51:29 RTH: All right, let’s do that one.

51:29 Russ comments: The DES practice is *not* to choose to talk about beeped experiences where one is confident--the rule is to talk about experiences that are randomly selected, regardless of their characteristics. (See comment at 37:02.) However, recalling the way “confidence” guided which aspects we inquired about in beep 2.1, RTH breaks that rule here because he thinks that discussing a confidently apprehended experience may be good practice in the iterative attempt to apprehend less obvious experiences in the future.

51:30 AK: Let’s do it.

SAMPLE 2.5 IS NOT DISCUSSED

## SAMPLE 2. 6 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 51:31 Olivia: Um, so once again, I'm sitting here at my desk, I'm working, um, but a text message comes in and y'know, I'm on a Mac. I get a little, um, thing that comes up on my screen that says what's in the text message. And I, I had seen that, um, and then was, in my mind (um, so as, as just when the beep came in) I was formulating the words that I was going to respond to that text message. Um, and there was a reason. And so, because rather than quickly flipping to that text message and responding, I was eating a piece of watermelon and my hands were full, right. So I wasn't, y'know, and a bit wet and sticky. So I was waiting, y'know, I was, I saw it come in. I sort of thought very quickly about my response and the precise words. Um, but, and then, so it was kind of just, y'know, those words had, had gone through my head, um, just before the beep.
- 52:35 AK: Okay.
- 52:40 Olivia: And this [AK: And so...] feels like one of those, sorry, let me just instances that I've described where I'm sort of rehearsing something before I say it, or, y'know, like, it's, it's a deliberate thinking before I, so it was in this case, it was thinking before I wrote, rather than just, which sometimes happens when I'm just writing and it's just kind of flowing out. This was a, I thought about the words. [AK: Okay.] And then I, and then I wrote them.
- 53:05 AK: Okay. And there was sort of a bit of context there. I was I'm gathering. So it, what exactly did the beep catch? What, what exactly is present at the moment of the beep?
- 53:17 Olivia: I think, I mean, I think the beep caught, um, I mean, if, if I think the beep, I mean, I don't know, I it's like I've written down all the words of the text message. It was, it felt like they, y'know, and it was very quick. Like, I, I, I thought of the response very sort of, y'know, how do you measure the time between reading and thinking a response to something, which is what you do when you read a text message versus when you read a book or something, right? Like you read something that you're just consuming versus a, a read visual of a conversation. So I read it, I thought of the words that, that were the response. And I think the beep went off just as, or after I'd thought of these words that I responded. And, y'know, cuz I, I put down the piece of watermelon to note down the, on my little notepad.
- 54:17 AK: Okay. And so the, your response: are those words present as best we can say at the moment the beep interrupts you? It's not like they've come and gone, for example.
- 54:27 Olivia: No, I think they were, I mean, I mean, were they had, they just finished? Y'know, there was like, y'know, it's kind of like a 10-word text message. It, it, y'know, it travels through my head faster than it would saying them out loud.
- 54:47 AK: Okay. Well, what are the words? Let's go with that. What are the words?
- 54:50 Olivia: So the words are, [laughs] So the words are, so well, look, I'll just tell you the words. If you want the context, you can have it. "Lull"... So, and it's funny cuz "LOL" I'm I, I hear

the word “lull.” Um, I say “lull.” (I think it’s funny to say “lull.”) Um, “Lull, you’re not going to buy them if you decide they’re ugly.” Question mark. It’s a question.

55:12 AK: Okay. And how exactly are these words present to you? Is this a voice kind of thing? Is this, y’know, how does this compare to some of these others we’ve talked about?

55:32 Olivia: Yep. It’s a voice thing. It’s a heard thing. I’m not seeing them. I’m hearing them, um, in my voice, in my inside voice, [laughs] um. The producing voice, not the receiving voice.

55:53 RTH: So I, I got distracted by my computer making a pretty funny noise, which fortunately it stopped. So, but I missed a little bit about that. So did you say I am speaking these words in my head? Is, is that the gist of this?

56:07 Olivia: Yes. I am speaking the words in my head.

56:07 Russ comments: RTH, in his 55:53 turn, quite likely undermined the fidelity of the description of this sampling. In 55:32, Olivia spoke of *hearing* of her producing voice; in 55:53 RTH characterized that as *speaking*; in 56:07 Olivia assented to *speaking*; and the upcoming discussion accepts this as *speaking* without further clarification. It will turn out (see 59:30) that Olivia may have meant *hearing*; or may have meant *speaking* but called it *hearing*. RTH 55:53 deprived the interview of the possibility of sorting this out. DES is performance art, falling short of perfection.

56:10 RTH: Okay.

56:13 AK: Okay. So this is my voice or my inner voice speaking these words. And I can say, for example, that I’m saying “lull,” not “L O L.” Is there anything else about? Tone, inflection? Any,...

56:32 Olivia: I mean, there was, I, I can say that. I think yes, there was a sarcastic tone. Um, because I, it was a sarc, it was a sarcastic comment. Um, yeah.

56:52 RTH: And, and this... I’m still struggling with my computer noises I guess. But the, so this, this is clearly spoken. This is not just that I *know the meaning*? This is, I am speaking these exact words.

57:06 Olivia: Yeah, yeah, yeah. It’s definitely the words. And y’know, I think they’re the exact words that I went on to write in the text message. And it’s not a general thinking, not a general thought around wow! Will you buy them? If, when you see them, you decide that they’re ugly. Y’know, like it’s *the* words. Um, yeah.

57:31 AK: And so I am understanding that this *is* what I’m going to type back to my friend or whoever, but I’ve got watermelon on my hands and all that. Is the friend present to you? Is it, is it I, well, I am, innerly speaking to Joan or whatever? Or is it not quite that specific...?

57:52 Olivia: No. The friend’s not present. What is, um, and y’know, because, so this is it’s on WhatsApp; I have WhatsApp on my desktop, but that window is not open, right. I can’t

see the text. (Sorry. There's some weird noise now that I'm distracted by.) I can't see the, um, window with the text message. All I see is the notification, um, come and disappear. I think there is (cuz this was part, this was a sort of a rapid-fire text conversation, y'know, like a, I was in, y'know, my head was already was in the conversation). And so I'd been texting back and forth for a couple of minutes beforehand and (it really sounds like I don't do any work, doesn't it. I'm buying fridge parts...) [they laugh]Um,

58:42 AK: We won't tell your employer. [they laugh]

58:46 Olivia: Um, but I think there may be a,... (But once again, I'm putting the word "maybe" there). That maybe there's a visual of the text window. *She's* not there (the, the recipient, I'm not seeing her or feeling her presence), but more, uh, potentially there's something where I'm visualizing the chat window with the conversation that had come beforehand.

59:13 AK: Okay. And how, okay, so we're not totally confident about this. How, how would it compare to the first beep with the, the maybe visual of the FOUR of FOUR, F O U R?

59:30 Olivia: So I feel a high degree of confidence about the words, about hearing the words, the precise words.

59:30 Russ comments: Note that Olivia refers to the word phenomenon as "hearing." See the comment at 56:07.

59:36 Olivia: [continues] I don't feel a strong, I mean, and I think to be honest, I, I don't think had you not asked me the question was, was the person, were you seeing / feeling the person? I wouldn't have thought of that. But, um, I guess so, so, so yeah, I think I'm prompted to that by your question. But it does, there's an echo, like it doesn't feel totally conf like confected. It, it does feel that that, that I'm, y'know, yeah, that I, I can see the, the, the text chat window that I'm going to write this into.

1:00:20 AK: Okay.

1:00:22 RTH: And that's, innerly seen, not seeing on the screen.

1:00:25 Olivia: Innerly seen, yeah, because it wasn't on the screen.

1:00:27 RTH: Okay.

1:00:30 AK: Well, I'd say we can just leave that as kind of a big maybe then, y'know, unless you wanna get into the details of it. Seems like a, not, not so confident. But we are pretty confident that the friend is not present. So like, I'm thinking of them or sensing them or feeling, or seeing or whatever, though I am in fact going to send this to him or her. But the words we're very confident about, I know what they are and how they sound and it's my voice and I'm speaking them innerly. Okay. Is the stuff about the watermelon? Is that in my conscious experience? Or is that just sort of context? Y'know, if I had been there, I would see that, but it's not like I'm feeling my sticky hands or thinking, boy, I need to set this down so I can text, or

1:01:16 Olivia: Well, in the, I mean, in the same way that I obviously seem to be struggling with. I mean, there's obviously the thought that I can't write this because my hands are sticky and I don't wanna touch my computer. Um, I mean, but y'know, and I'm eating something. I mean, that's a sensory, that's a *experience*. Um, Well, I guess you can totally eat something and not really register it. Yeah. So,

1:01:59 AK: [pause] So would it be fair to say that if the watermelon-ness of this experience is present, it is certainly not as central as the words?

1:02:07 Olivia: Yes. That would be very...

1:02:08 AK: [inaudible] Okay. Yeah.

1:02:12 RTH: So this, this is a pretty good example of, of why skills are, are, are difficult. Because not only is... The, the candidates for your attention are the taste of the watermelon, and the stickiness on your fingers of the watermelon, and the connection between your fingers and the computer keyboard, and, and to say nothing of the rest of your body position, and, and the, and the, whatever it was that was gonna be ugly, whether this is a shirt or shoes or purse or whatever: All those things *could be* in your experience. But apparently weren't, I mean, I don't, or maybe they were! So, so what, what was it that was gonna be ugly?

1:02:57 Olivia: [laughs] So it was school photos. So, so I was texting with the mother of my step kids who was saying, it's annoying that you have to buy them before you see them. And I was like, well, what, you're just not gonna buy. Like, I was like, that's outrageous. [laughs]

1:03:13 RTH: Right. So at the moment of the beep, are you seeing photos, kid photos?

1:03:17 Olivia: No, no, no, no. Just words.

1:03:20 RTH: But you could be.

1:03:21 Olivia: I could be, but I, no, I wasn't.

1:03:25 RTH: So that, that's, that's really the only point I'm trying to make in this, in this lecture. There's a lot of stuff that would make sense for you to be experiencing that are part of this experience: the history of kid photos, and [inaudible]

1:03:38 Olivia: But... Sure, sure. Yeah. Except school photos are kind of notional at that point, right. I mean, there are these photos that exist that we're buying at that point. Um, but they're not existing in yet in the same way that the watermelon exists. But I mean, look, I, I get your point. I understand. But, um,

1:03:55 RTH: I'm, I'm just, I'm just trying to weaken that, that supposition, I'm still on the track of weakening supposition that if, if, if something is important, I must be thinking about it. And that's just not true. [Olivia: Yeah.] And, and y'know, I'm, I'm not, at any particular

moment, I'm not trying to talk you out of feeling the stickiness, or thinking that I can't type, or whatever, if that's, what's going on. I want to know about that. [Olivia: Um hmm.] We want to know that. But the, I, I do want to weaken the notion that it *has* to be there.[Olivia: Um hmm. Um hmm.]

1:03:55 Russ comments: Note again the straightforward candor of RTH's expression—he's telling Olivia exactly what he is doing and why. In short, he is treating her as a valued co-investigator.

1:04:31 RTH: [continues] So I'd say that's probably good enough for this, for, [Olivia: I agree.] I think we've, I think we've done a pretty good job of getting the down the second day. [Olivia: Right.] And, and so we started by saying, well, I'm not very good at this. And the answer is, it seems to me you're somewhat better at it today than you were yesterday [Alek: Um hmm.] [Olivia nods affirmatively] or whenever that was. And, and that's, y'know, that's, that's the way it is. That's the, it generally takes several days to get to do what you have to do to. And it seems like we're around the right track. [Olivia: Um hmm.]  
So should we do it again?

1:05:08 Olivia: Sure.

1:05:14 RTH: You want to suggest a time.

1:05:14 Russ comments: They compare calendars.

1:05:23 RTH: All right. Any last-minute things that anybody wants to say before we adjourn? [Olivia: Nope.] [AK: Not I.] Alright. Thank you very much. See you next Tuesday.

1:05:36 Olivia: All right. See you next week. Bye.

1:05:36 AK: Bye-bye everybody.