

Pete
Pete Interview 4
Sampling Day 4

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the April 8 interview with Peter Hoskin that is available on YouTube <https://youtu.be/HiYaWKdMh6c> . If you have corrections, suggestions, or questions, please post them as YouTube comments.

RTH = Russ Hurlburt
Pete = Peter Hoskin

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 Pete to disagree, or to amplify, or to say he doesn't understand, and so on. If he wishes to insert his own comments, he should pick a color other than this green and then do so. He should also feel free to correct the transcript.

0:02 Pete: Right. That works.

0:03 RTH: Got the recording going.

0:06 Pete: So should we get cooking?

0:08 RTH: I'm, I'm, I'm, I'm ready when you're ready.

0:10 Pete: You are ready. Uh,

0:12 RTH: And this is gonna be day, day 4, I think.

Sample 4.1 discussion starts here

0:15 Pete: Good. In which case, um, it is, it is. Yeah. Um, so, sorry, I'm just reading back my notes. Um,

0:30 RTH: These samples are from today or yesterday,

0:33 Pete: So I put it the top.... Today. Today, this morning. [RTH: Okay.] Um, so I put it at the top of my first beep divided attention of, there are two things going on. Um, and one was, um, an image of a particular cartoonist's work in my head. Um, and I'd been thinking about this cartoonist's work before. It's a non-specific image. I think it might have been of him, although, I don't know what he looks like, but it may have

been. In my head it was sort of a self-portrait of the cartoonist in his own style, obviously cuz self-portrait, um, but I don't know what he looks like. Um, uh,

0:33 Russ comments: There are audio glitches that make it hard to hear and easy to talk at the same time.

1:21 RTH: And let, let me, let me interrupt just for a minute because I haven't heard them,

1:24 Pete: I've said here...But it was more, it, it was an image, but it was also more just a *sense* of an image. Um, so I think last time we talked, we hit on this idea, um, or, or we talked about like an image without an image. Um, it was almost that I, I think if, if the beep had gone off a moment before, it would've been a clearer image, but it felt almost like it was dissipating. Um, so it was kind of like just half not there. Um, like, so just the *sense* of this guy, this type in, in his own style.

2:02 Um, and the reason I put divided attention is, is at that moment I was also sort of navigating the path ahead. I said, well, I'm just, um, minding my house today. Um, I was just moving around a bench, um, there some stuff on the floor, and I sort of moved my leg. Um, and I can remember I sort of, um, again, it was an unspoken spoken phrase, which is I kinda went, oohh! as I moved my leg, like, oops! Yeah. Not I, I didn't slip or anything, but I just mean like, woo! Like making a sort of movement around something that was there. Um, so, so they were the two things. Um, the, the second of those I put in my notes, it was more present in my, I was more present in my leg, um, than, than anything else. Um, when I say I was concentrating on the path I had, I, I just had this sense of my leg and moving it and yeah. I don't know what more to say at this stage.

3:09 RTH: And are those two paths, two tracks, whatever you wanna call them, equally intention, intense?

3:18 Pete: Uh, no. I think that the, the leg, the leg one is more intense at that moment. So, so again, you, you held up, you said you drew, um, not right now, but you, you drew this sort of a graph, um, the other week, [RTH: Right.] Where one thought's going and another one's coming in. Right. Um, we, some it feels, felt almost like we're somewhere around there. I don't quite know if I'm doing that on the right note, but we're more on the one that's coming in. But we've hit that moment of intersection.



3:48 RTH: Okay. And, and so the, I've, I've got some audio connections, connection difficulties here. So I've, you've broken up a little bit. So let me make sure that I got what I, what I think I got. You are walking through a cluttered floor [Pete: Yeah.] and you, and you're, and you have stepped around something that's on the floor. [Pete: Yes.] And your, your energy, your concentration, whatever you want to call that, is on your leg movement [Pete: Yeah.] as you step over or around this thing. [Pete: Yeah.] But the thing is not so important to you at the moment and you're at the, in the

experiential moment, what's important is the leg, [Pete nods head yes] my leg moving.

4:35 Pete: Yes. Yeah.

4:36 RTH: And there's some sort of unspoken, un-worded, but word, but spoke, spoken, but un-worded, I guess is what I, what I've understood. [Pete: Yes, yes] that said that something like, whoa or ugh.

4:49 Pete: Yeah. Like, whoa. Like, because I moved my leg, there was a, my leg, I know we don't want too much context, but my leg went in this kind of sweeping outwards motion just to dodge something. So I thought went whoa! in time with my leg. [RTH: Okay.] Uh, but it was unspoken or unvoiced.

5:07 RTH: But it seems, it seems spoken even though it's not spoken. [Pete: Yes.] So this is not, this is not just a cognitive reaction, this is a somehow voiced but unvoiced reaction. Is that right?

5:22 Pete: Yes. Yes. Um, in the, I didn't hear my voice in my head, I didn't speak in my head, but there was definite sense of that. I mean, it's quite specific actually. It was woo!, y'know, it was that, and it was in time with my leg movement. Um, but it was, it was definitely, I don't know which word to use, but yeah, there was no, I didn't say or hear anything in my head, I just know that that was present.

5:51 RTH: So what, what I guess I wanna be, I wanna be as clear as we can be about it, is this... I I would like to know whether this is a vocal phenomenon, even though it's not spoken or whatever, [Pete: Sorry,] rather than a merely cognitive,

6:05 Pete: Sorry, it's very hot in this room, I actually open the door a little bit. Um, yeah, it was a, it's a spoken phenomenon. [Inaudible]

6:11 RTH: It's in the, it's in the realm of speaking. [Pete: Yes, yes.] Even though there's no external *or internally* spoken [Pete: Yes.] speech, speech pattern. And yet it's, it is a, a spoken thing with some inflection, I guess the, the inflection is there. It's a, it's an up and over kind of whoa! [Pete: Yeah, um] Even, even though the whoa! part of it isn't present.

6:37 Pete: Yes.[Pete laughs] I know that sounds weird. Well, it probably doesn't sound weird to you, you'll tell me it's not weird. But, um, it's hard to explain at least. Um, but that, that's, you've described it very well.

6:48 RTH: [RTH inhales] So I do, I *do* think it is hard to, hard to describe, and I *don't* think it's weird. I think, I think we think of speech as being a really coherent, kind of a, kind of a deal, but it's not, it, I don't think. It is, um, a more or less coordinated (and in this particular case, sort of on the less end of coordinated) bringing together of expression and words and, and all, all the things that go along with that kinda stuff that your, that your gray matter is processing, not, not only your gray matter, but your whole bag of neurons is processing.

7:24 Pete: Yeah.

7:24 RTH: And sometimes it comes together as a coherent pattern, and sometimes less so.

7:30 Pete: Yeah.

7:33 RTH: So I'm good with that portion, I think. [Pete: Mm-hmm.] And then the other portion is, uh, seeing without a seeing [Pete: Mm-hmm.] of a guy and I, and, and, and so far I haven't figured out who this guy is, but the, because of the audio connection. Who, who are we talking about here?

7:48 Pete: So, he's a cartoonist. Um, so I was listening, if you want a bit of context. I was listening to a podcast at the time, and they mentioned a cartoonist called David Squires, who mostly does, um, uh, cartoons around football, um, as in British football (soccer). Um, and, um, they mentioned his name and I immediately got a, this image of him, his work in my head. But it's, it felt like it was a self-portrait, um, of him, but I dunno what he looks like, but it was in his distinctive style. Um,

8:22 RTH: And what's his name again?

8:24 Pete: David Squires. S-Q-U-I-R-E-S. Um, and, um, he, *but* at the moment the beep happened, like, like I say, if, if the beep had gone off two seconds earlier, we'd be talking about this quite clear front-cover-of-a-book image that I had in my head. However, it went off two seconds later. So it really felt like the only way I can describe is the thought dissipated. It was, um, it was at the front of my head and clear, and then it almost just receded. It didn't quite fade to black. It was, it was still there, which is why I mentioned it. Um, but it felt like it had been, um, turned down by like 80% or something as I was navigating this stuff on the floor. Um, but then it went all together.

9:18 RTH: And, and the thing is David, uh, sort of a self-portrait of David Squires in the David Squires style.

9:25 Pete: Yes. Yeah.

9:26 RTH: Okay. And, and you said it's in the front of your head. And, and is the dissipation, does that ex-, do you experience that as moving, as moving away from the front of my head? [Pete: Umm...] Or, or just, just turning down the clarity on it?

9:44 Pete: Yeah. It's, it hard to describe because, um, I don't think it moved from the front of my head. Um, turning down the clarity is a good description. Um, what, what, what it was *not* was anything as neat as like, I can't talk in film language here and say, y'know, there was no fade to black or anything like that, or a wipe away. It, it was nothing like that. It was nothing neat. It just dissipated. It just became less. Um, but it, but it was still definitely there. The same image was still definitely there when the people went off. Um,

- 10:23 RTH: So I, I, I think that's a quite natural phenomenon, actually. The, the, the fade to black kind of a thing that you're talking about, the, that's in, in the movie medium where there's only one sensation—you're looking at the screen or whatever—and so if, if the, if the editor or whoever wants to get you from one scene to the next, they're gonna change *your* attention. But there's, but there's only a single attention. [Pete: Yes.] What *you're* describing is that there are multiple attentions, [Pete: Yes.] and you are moving your, the collection of these at attentions is, is agglomerating itself more over to here than it was over, over to there. And so that's, [Pete: Yes, yeah,] it's not possible to do in a screen where you only got one attention going on, and, uh, [Pete: Yeah.] And therefore it's hard for us to talk about it, but, but that doesn't mean that it's not common or,
- 11:15 Pete: Yeah. Um, yeah, that, I mean, that, that, that segue between attentions is, is again, that's a good way of putting it, I think.
- 11:26 RTH: Yeah. And, and even, even that is to what I would call Cartesian-theater. Like one, like there's one center of attention, which I don't think there is. I don't think there, I don't think there is necessarily one center of attention. You've got, you've got an attention this way, which I, so the word *attention* is a bad word because it applies that there's *one seer*, which I don't think there is. I think there is a, and I think this is a good example of, of why (A) there's not an attention one attention, and (B) why it's hard to talk about it, and yet why it's important to talk about it if you really wanna understand what Pete's experience is about. It's, Pete's got a, Pete's got a multiplicity kind of a thing, and it's the multiplicity center of gravity, whatever that is, shifts from one place to another [Pete: Mm-hmm.] And it, and it's not like Pete has one view and it's going like this. That's not the case. [Pete: Yeah.] It's that Pete was going like this, and now Pete is going like that, and that's taking the attention out of the equation, I guess you could say.
- 12:28 Pete: Yeah. Yeah. Mm-hmm.
- 12:32 RTH: But it, it's a challenge to talk about,...
- 12:34 Pete: Yes. It is, it is,
- 12:36 RTH: ...but that doesn't make it any less, any less what happens, I think. [Pete: Mm-hmm.]
- 12:40 Pete: Mm-hmm
- 12:42 RTH: So I think I'm pretty good. What, and, and, but to summarize what we have is a, a shifting of the center of Pete's interests from a seeing which *had been* clear and now was almost not seen (it, it, it's still in the realm of seeing, but the thing that's being seen is not so clear anymore) to, uh, physical interest in my leg as it navigates its way around the stuff on my floor. [Pete: Yeah.] And, and that is in some way connected to a verbal aspect of me, which is not explicitized as a particular words that are spoken, but, but they're not absent either.
- 13:43 Pete: Yes. It's convoluted, but that's a very good description.

13:47 RTH: Okay. That's what we gotta do. I think I'm good then. Number 2.

Sample 4.2 discussion starts here

13:51 Pete: Let me find my notes. Um, sorry, just reading, reading them. [long pause] Um, so I put here "again I was doubly directed." Um, so there were two things going on. Um, the first thing was, um, a hand vibrating. Um, so it's a, a, a pretty clear image of a hand, um, and almost like actually, like it's on a movie screen and it was vibrate like shaking like this. [demonstrates his right hand vibrating very quickly (30-ish hz?)] Um, and, um, there was a sense, uh, sometimes there's, um, we've talked about images with black around them, or a black background or, or, or even bounded like a webpage or something like that. This was, it, it, it filled my head. [gestures hands moving widely apart] Um, and there was very much a sense of, um, there was a *real background* behind it. Like, I, I couldn't tell you what that background was that, y'know, it was a room or something like that.

15:30 Pete: But my attention in my head was on the hand in the image. I wasn't paying, I wasn't paying attention to what was behind it. But I do know that there was a world behind it. Not, not, y'know, it wasn't, it wasn't black, it wasn't, um, there would, there wasn't a frame around it. It was full, it was, y'know, Cinemascope sort of thing.

16:00 Um, and um, then at the same time, I looked out of the window and I can just remember registering the view. Um, and as it happens, it's the view, my front, front window. So there's a tree there. Um, there's a wall. And I took that view in. Um, I can remember registering it. I, I didn't think, *oh! a tree, a window, a wall*. I didn't like tick those things off. But I, I can, I did, I did register, register them. That's, that's the only way I can put it. Um, it was deliberate. Um, I saw the things, um, and that actually felt like a very, I got, I didn't feel present in my head at all with this, this part of it. So those things were very external. Um, but it wasn't just that they were in front of my eyes. There was an engagement by me with them. It just felt very external to my body.

17:07 Um, and, and these two things, unlike our previous beep, um, this was not a swapping over, either. So the, the beep came in and I had, I had the vibrating hand in my head [points with palms toward his temples or higher], and I had the view out the window in front of my eyes, and they were going on at the same time. And I'd say they, they had pretty much equal weight. Um, maybe, um, maybe the view had a little bit more cuz I just lifted my head and it was there, but, but not much.

17:40 RTH: Well, let's start there. I don't really care whether it's f50-50 or, 40-60, or 65-35 or whatever. That's, that's not a big deal for me.

17:49 So when you say *registering*, do you mean I'm registering the individual pieces of this, the wall of the tree, even though I'm not saying "wall" or "tree" or whatever, or are you just trying to say, I am feeling some kind of a visual connection to the scene, and then when I have to tell Hurlburt about it, I'm gonna say, well, y'know, "there's a tree and a wall, or whatever."

18:15 Pete: Um, it was actually more of a former. Um, so, so that's why I say there wasn't, it wasn't like I went down an itemized list, but I did, there was a deliberate clocking of

the elements. So tree, wall, um, leaves like what, whatever was in that scene, I did almost, I, I, I, again, I haven't read this from my notes, but I, in my notes I did write "a sense of scanning." So, um, [RTH inaudible] I'll describe it.

- 18:49 RTH: And the scanning there, I, the scanning there, I, I gather is from one part of the environment to the next one part of the scene.
- 18:57 Pete: Yeah, yes. But as, as we've discussed before, like it sounds like it would take a lot of time to go to "tree wall window." But no, it was all happening at the same time. Um, it did feel like I was checking them off, but there was no checklist and there was no order to it. Um, so it wa-, it wasn't simply that these things were in front of me. It, it was that I engaged with them in some ways, what I'm trying to convey.
- 19:25 RTH: And, and engaged with them in some sequential or quasi-sequential way I gather.
- 19:31 Pete: Yeah. Quasi-se, sequential at best, cuz, um, yeah, I, like I said, there was no order. Um, I, I couldn't even tell you which one I saw first, or, but, but at the same time, I did feel like I checked them off.
- 19:47 RTH: Particularizing this aspect, particularizing that aspect. [Pete: Yes.] But, but I'm also gathering that the, that this particularizing, checking, registering, whatever, is not a particularly cognitive thing. *Not* a cognitive/analytical deal. [Pete: No, no.] but a perceptual interest.
- 20:11 Pete: Yes. Um, I deliberately put *sense* of scanning because it was almost a, a feeling, not, I wouldn't quite call it an emotion, but it was, um, yeah. It, it was definitely not cognitive in the sense of, I, I wasn't thinking *what type of tree is that?* Or, y'know, *the window needs cleaning*. There was no, there was no, nothing to it beyond taking it in quite deliberately.
- 20:37 RTH: Okay. And I think I'm good about that aspect. And then the other as, unless you think there's other, something else I should...
- 20:47 Pete: No, no, no.
- 20:48 RTH: Okay. And then the other is, I'm, I'm, I'm apparently clearly seeing a vibrating hand. [Pete: Yeah.] And is, and is that absolutely clear, as clear as seeing it in real life, or more clear or less clear?
- 21:00 Pete: Um, not, not as clear as seeing it in real life. Um, but it, when that thought began, it definitely took my attention. Um, so that thought began before, before I looked out the window and before the beep had started. Um, and it remained in my head while the beep went on, obviously. Um, but it, it did suck me in. Um, so I was, I was up here, I was in my head, um, and it was, I, I don't want to, I don't wanna say it was 70% as clear as the real world, or, but it was, y'know, it was good. It was pretty darn clear. [RTH: Okay.] Um, and, and pretty life-like. Um, yeah.

21:51 RTH: And, and I, from your, from your miming of it, it looked like this hand had its fingers aimed to the left, to your left. Is that right?

22:01 Pete: Uh, yes. To my, yeah, to my left. So it came in from the right, and it was kind of this much forearm, and quiet see that much forearm and a hand,

22:10 RTH: And, and is it,

22:11 Pete: I'm not too far off that what I'm doing in there,

22:13 RTH: Okay. And does this look like a masculine hand? a feminine hand? Can't really tell?

22:18 Pete: Yeah. Uh, it's, it's a man's hand. Um, I mean, I, I even know in a way who the hand belonged to. Um, you're, you're going to get clues to the kind of day I've had, which is, um, chores around the house mostly. Uh, I'm off work today, um, and listening to podcasts as I do it, so a, a podcast I listened to, they, they said they were, it's a music podcast, and they, they were listening to an album, um, and they were, one of the hosts was physically trembling. Um, so, and, and they commented on this, "oh, God, y'know, you're shaking, it, so you like it so much." And, and that was my visualization of this. So it was the host's hand, as it were, um, in so far as I can picture him.

22:57 RTH: And, and had, had the podcast displayed this hand and now you're copying that? Or you, you, this is your, [Pete: No, no.] this is your creation of a, of the host's trembling hand.

23:07 Pete: Yes. Yeah. Yeah. Um,

23:11 RTH: And, and *trembling* and *vibrating*. Do we mean, is there a discrimination to be made there? Like, I would say vibrating is a really quick thing, and trembling is a, [RTH shows hand trembling]

23:24 Pete: Um, trembling. I, I guess it's trembling in the, it seemed very contained, like, um, almost more like a minor muscle spasm. I tried to do it now, but, um,

23:34 RTH: So that's a higher frequency, faster shake than Parkinson's shake [Pete: Yes.] or something like that.

23:39 Pete: Yeah, exactly. Exactly.

23:41 RTH: And, and that's, and you see that in motion. You, you see the vibration.

23:48 Pete: Yes.

23:49 RTH: So it's not just I see a hand and somehow *know* that it's vibrating. I see the vibration. [Pete shakes head yes] [Pete: Yeah.] In my imagination we're talking [Pete: Yeah.] imaginary, imaginary seeing here.

- 23:58 Pete: I, I mean this, it was very much like a film. Um, this i, I know is, don't want talk necessarily in filmic language, but this, this was a moving image, um, that I was watching in my head.
- 24:10 RTH: Okay. And, and you gestured as being somewhere in, in here. [RTH points to front of head] Is that,
- 24:16 Pete: Yeah.
- 24:16 RTH: Is that metaphoric, metaphorical, or does it actually seem like it's in here?
- 24:20 Pete: No, I, I think it seems like it's in there. Um, front, front middle, almost. Um, like I say, my attention got almost literally sucked. So I was, I can remember before the beep went off, I was looking at my sofa just doing some things, and then this image got put into my head by the podcast, and I can remember almost being just sucked up into here. [gestures moving from chest to front of head]
- 24:45 RTH: And the, the, is that a sensation of being like, [RTH shows head being pulled up]
- 24:50 Pete: Yeah. Um, not a physical sensation. Like, um, I always wanna say it was a imaginary sensation, which probably doesn't make sense. But, um, it was, it, it was not, we've, we've talked about physical sensations before, like, um, skipping a heartbeat or, y'know, you felt it in your gut, or,... It wasn't that, it was *not* that I felt something in my body, but I had a sensation nonetheless of sshh [gestures upward moving] into that. Um, but that was before the beep went off.
- 25:22 RTH: Okay. So what I got from that is that this image does see, or this seeing does seem to be taking place inside my head. I feel it in my head. And I'm, I'm not just saying in my head to distinguish that from an external seeing. [Pete: No.] This is, has a reality of his location or experiential reality of, of location, something like that.
- 25:47 Pete: Yeah, yeah.
- 25:54 RTH: Then I think I'm good about that. Anything else we should say about that?
- 25:59 Pete: Um, not that, not that I have in my notes at least. Um,
- 26:03 RTH: All right. [Pete: So yeah,] Number 3.

[Sample 4.3 discussion starts here](#)

- 26:09 Pete: Sorry, just reading it again, notes. This one, this one, I mean, they're all difficult to describe, but this one is perhaps the most difficult to describe. Um, so the, the only brief context I'll give is I was listening to a podcast still, different one at this time. Um, like I said, this is how my day's gone. Um, and I, I had him, I had a *sense* of, uh, one of the guests on the podcast, a *sense* of him in my head. Um, and I, I put here "more of sense of him than an image." Um, so, um, he, yeah, I, I, I think where the vibrating hand in the last bit was *very clear*, and I, it felt like I was looking at it. This

was not clear at all. Um, it, I just had a sense of brown hair, white man, roughly my age. Um, but I couldn't really tell you more than that.

27:27 Um, it didn't really appear in my head. It was, it was an, again, we've talked about this before, but like a, a sort of image without an image. Um, the experience felt like an image one, but there was nothing clear in, in my head or elsewhere.

27:45 Um, and at the same time, I, I struggled to even write this down at the time. I had a feeling of *timeline*. Um, and the, so, so I'll, I'll, I'll have to give a bit of context, otherwise I can't explain this at all. He, he just mentioned on the podcast that he was born in 1980. Um, and I, I was born in 1984, and the, the feeling I had was a, um, [pause, shakes head, throws up hands] I, I, I really finding it hard to, it was just the sense of almost *kinship* was if, if I had to put a word on it, but that's not quite right. Um, uh, golly, I, I think I had a, like, um, sense of similar things he and I might have experienced, um, and maybe one of them was, um, playing a particular video game system in the nineties. Um, *maybe*.

29:00 But it all, it just felt more like a rush of... Sorry, Russ, I'm, I'm really struggling to describe this one. Like a, like a rush of memory, but not with any discernible bits to it. It was just a sense of, um, he and I overlap; oh, yes, there's things that we've probably experienced, we've both experienced. Um, maybe if, if you just gone to my head and said, what were the things you were thinking of that you've both experienced? Maybe one of them was a video game Sega console in the nineties. But that was just part of a sort of rush of things that I can't really discern. Aagh! struggling with this one.

29:46 RTH: So there, so there seems like there's sort of two tracks here, two, two solar systems going on in your, in [Pete: Yeah.] In your inner experience, or something like that. One is the, the sense of how he looks. [Pete: Yeah.] And the other is the sense of kinship, broadly defined. [Pete: Yes. Yes.] And are those, are those equally present?

30:13 Pete: Yes.

30:15 RTH: All right. Well, let's start with the, with the first one. So you have a sense that he's a white guy with brown hair, whatever. And does this seem like a *seeing* sense or a *knowing* sense or something else?

30:31 Pete: Um, seeing, I think, um, although minus image.

30:39 RTH: So we've had a couple of examples of where you have, where we've had a seeing without a seeing, a seeing without a thing seen. [Pete: Yeah.] And does this seem just like that? Or does this seem even less, less see-y?

30:54 Pete: Even...? I'm trying to think of the other examples. Um, cuz this came up last week, I think.

31:00 RTH: Yeah, it did, I can't remember either.

31:02 Pete: Yeah. Um, yeah, I, I, I can't be def-definitively comparative.

- 31:08 RTH: Yeah, that, that was, that was probably not a good, not a good question for me, so let me, lemme withdraw the question. So what I wanna ask is, does this seem like a clearly *seeing* phenomenon even though there's no, there's no object being seen? Or does this seem like a sort of a diffuse kind of a seeing thing where the, even the *seer*, so if we're gonna make a distinction between the seer and the, and the thing seen, and in the hand vi- in the hand vibration, it was pretty clear that, that it was you that was seeing the hand, and there, there was no question on either end of that one (or at least very little question). [Pete: Yeah.] So the question I'm asking here is: does it seem like I'm *seeing* in the same way that I was seeing the hand, but the, but the *thing seen* is not clear? Or does it seem like even the *seeing itself* is not well differentiated? Or maybe that question is just doesn't make sense, or it doesn't apply to you, or whatever.
- 32:06 Pete: No, it does. I know, I know what you mean. Am I looking at an unclear image, or am I, is even the *looking* itself unclear?
- 32:14 RTH: Yep. That's what I'm trying to say.
- 32:16 Pete: Yeah, um,
- 32:18 RTH: That, *but* acknowledging that that question might not be a possible question to answer. I'm totally capable of answering ask, *asking* questions that don't have answers.
- 32:30 Pete: Hmm. Um, so I, the reason, the reason I'm thinking about it is it's not because I've have to make something up. It's, it's, I have quite a clear vision of, a clear memory of what happened. And it's just hard to vocalize. Um, I, I, I think if anything actually, it, it felt *quite clearly like looking*, and it was an unclear image. So I think it's more the first option. But what I don't want that to be confused for, with, is the idea that I was looking at something that was blurry. Um, y'know, it's not, it's not that I had a clear [laughs], sorry, we're, we're going down rabbit holes now, but like, it's not that I was, had a clear view of something blurry. Um, the, the sense of looking was pretty much as strong as it was in the case of the vibrating hand. It's just that the thing I don't even want to say in front of me, um, but the, the subject of what I, the subject of my viewing was unclear in a way that I can't really put into words and couldn't draw and couldn't describe it or, or try to describe it. But y'know what I mean?
- 32:30 Russ comments: Pete has done a careful job of describing a phenomenon that seems in the natural world to be impossible—unquestionably seeing but without seeing anything. The experiential world does not follow the rules of the natural world, as this example illustrates.
- 33:48 RTH: So what I hear from that is that I'm, I am seeing... Well, let me ask this. Does it seem like I'm seeing the guy, or does it seem like I'm seeing some characteristics of the guy, even though in neither case is this clear?
- 34:06 Pete: Seems more like I'm seeing the guy.

34:08 RTH: Okay. So the podcast is playing, and while the podcast is playing, I am seeing the pod... Is it the podcaster or the guest on the podcast?

34:19 Pete: It's a guest on the podcast, yeah.

34:20 RTH: Seeing the guest on the podcast. But that seeing is inchoate or, or implied or, or whatever. But the, the seeing seems clear, but the, the guest himself is not realized in that seeing.

34:37 Pete: Yes. Yeah.

34:41 RTH: Okay. I think, I think I'm good about that. And by the way, I, I see that as being sort of a skillful kind of a thing, in the sense that I don't know what this guy looks like. And so I am in some ways seeing an indeterminacy. I'm seeing him, but I'm seeing him, I'm seeing an indeterminate guy.

35:05 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

35:07 RTH: Y'know, if, and I knew what the guy looked like, I would, I would see him the way he looks. But, as it is, I'm just seeing into the realm of what I think he might look like.

35:18 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

35:21 RTH: Then I think I'm good about that aspect. And *then*, I have some historical sense of this guy. But the historical sense is no more differentiated than his visual sense. But it's in, it's in the realm of recognizing shared experiential history, history.

35:48 Pete: Yes.

35:52 RTH: So I'm recalling the kinds of things that we might have both experienced, but none of those things are really explicitized to me. [Pete: Yes.] And I can say *Sago* or whatever in the same way, more or less, that I would've said brown hair and white guy.

36:10 Pete: Ye, yes, actually, that's a very, that's a very good way of putting it. Um, the, the other thing I'd say, I guess is it, it almost felt like it was a rush of a hundred different possible shared experiences, but, I couldn't latch onto any one of them. And, and the best, the most, I can latch onto one is *Sago*. Um, but it took, they all came at once and, I, it wasn't like, um, uh, uh, y'know, it wasn't like a kind of, um, photo display or anything. It was, I couldn't pull one out or, but I had the sense of. Sorry, I'm not explaining it very well.

36:57 RTH: Well, you got several verbs there that I, and I would like to try to disentangle if we can. So one is I, I, I was somehow recalling, uh, shared experiences of which there might be a lot. And there, and the other was a *rush* of experiences where the rush seemed to imply a sequentiality that the first didn't seem to have, I guess, to it. Uh, rush has a,

37:27 Pete: Yeah, I don't,

37:27 RTH: One after another-ness.

37:30 Pete: Okay. No. That, that's one after the other-ness is not right. [RTH: Okay.] Um, all-at-once-ness might be right. Um, cuz like I say, the, the only thing that stood out and um, and e, even then I hesitate, is this kind of idea of a Sago console in the nineties kind of thing. Um, but that's definitely not all there was. Um, and... *But*, sorry, keep running back. But at the same time, if, if I'd been concentrating hard or if I had some way of pausing my mind and dipping into it, I don't think I'd have been able to identify any of the other things. It was just a, a *sense* that this was happening. Does, no, does that make sense?

38:22 RTH: So I'm recalling my, our possible shared experiences, without having any of those particular shared experiences present to me?

38:31 Pete: Yes.

38:32 RTH: So now in, in these samples, we've got seeing, without seeing, and now I can't remember what we've, what we've got. Seeing, seeing without seeing.

38:43 Pete: We've got talking Yeah. Speak, [Unintelligible.]

38:43 RTH: Talking, talking with talking, speaking without speaking and remembering without remembering.

38:43 Russ comments: RTH hasn't articulated this very well. The three kinds of experiences are: the experience of seeing without anything being seen; the experience of speaking without anything (words, etc.) being spoken; and the experience of recalling without any events being recalled. Such phenomena are often believed to be impossible. I think they are not uncommon, but they require a careful method to be noticeable. Most introspective-type observations are self-initiated—I wonder what I am thinking right now—and such procedures have as artifacts that the introspected processes appear well-formed and logical. DES introspections are beep-initiated, allowing experiences to be apprehended in the oven, so to speak, before they are fully baked.

38:49 Pete: Yes. Um, yeah.

38:54 RTH: And, and I, y'know, I, I think that's the way the world is often. Not every, I don't think everybody is like that, but I think a lot of people are like that. [Pete: Mm-hmm.] And, and I think it's underappreciated because of the difficulty... Y'know, if you think, if you think about the difficulty of the conversation that we're having here, that, that this conversation is made *possible only* because, you've had a beeper. And so we're now talking about a particular kind of a moment we've identified which moment we're gonna be talking about, and we've got three, three days already of practice in [Pete: Yeah.] talking about these kinds of things.

39:30 Pete: Yeah. Um, that, I mean, one thing, one thing I try to remind myself was I find this, I'm finding this one in particular, but often I find 'em very difficult to describe, but at the same time, I feel like I'm a hundred times better at describing [laughs.] these things than I was on day one. Um, y'know, so yeah. It's, it's strange in that respect. You're right. It's,

39:49 RTH: And, and would that, the difference there from day one, from my point of view, is that in, in day one, we, I think we didn't really understand what experience was. And so we were trying to figure out what that meant. [Pete: Yeah.] And *now, today*, it seems to me you're pretty confident about what you're trying to experience. [Pete: Mm-hmm.] But excuse me, you're pretty confident about, about the experience that you're trying to describe. [Pete: Yeah, yeah.] But the *trying to describe* it is not easy.

40:14 Pete: Yeah.

40:15 RTH: But those are total, that, that's two very different things.

40:18 Pete: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Um, yeah, I would say it's a [inaudible] [RTH: Which is,] transformation,

40:24 RTH: Which is not, not surprising to me, but, but I think, I think hugely under, underappreciated in the, in the everyday, in the everyday world and in the scientific world, and just about everybody's world, because the o the only, the only insight that you, the only way you could get the kind of insight that we're having is through *something like* a beeper method. I'm not saying the beeper is the best way to do it. cuz somebody else might come along with, with, with a way that would be better. And, [Pete: Yeah.] I'm, I'm, I'd be happy I'd be all over that if there were one. But, uh, what, I just wanna point out the, the why, why this stuff is invisible. Put it that way.

41:07 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

41:10 RTH: Number 4.

41:15 Pete: Um. [pause, reading notes] Uh, du du duh duh da. [pause] Okay. Sorry again, so now that it's another podcast related, this really has been my day, Russ, so I apologize. Um, so, it's the.... Um. So I guess there were three things going on.

42:06 One is very much, and, and I'll give the context of the words. So I'm listening to this podcast. It's, again, it's a music podcast. They're listening to a song. and, um, they, they commentate on the songs. Um, so they go through great albums and commentate on them. But there was one song that obviously one of the hosts particularly liked, and he just said, "We've got to keep playing. We've got to keep this playing" and, y'know, not talk over the top of it. And the other host said, "okay, okay." Gave it a few seconds and then paused it to talk. And the host who said, "We've got to keep playing," was just obviously annoyed. Um, and this is the first thing my thought. So that annoyance really stood out. Um, I could hear it in his voice, um, but it just really, really stood out to me, I, to, to the point that I almost

felt it. Um, and, um, I didn't feel it in that, in that I wasn't annoyed, but I, I guess I empathized with him. So that, so there was this kind of semi-shared sense of annoyance going on in, in my body. Um,

43:24 RTH: Empathic annoyance.

43:26 Pete: [laughs] Yes, exactly. Um, at the same time, um, I have a pretty clear picture of the two podcast hosts, uh, in my head. Um, I've put here, it's like I'm watching them on YouTube. Um, so it's a very much like a sort of camera set up. I, I do, as it happens, know what these podcast hosts look like. Um, and, um, when, when I say it's like I'm watching them on YouTube, that, that was very much the sense. Um, so it's almost like a rectangular, like I'm seeing you now in a way, a rectangular image. Professionally shot video. Um, it definitely framed, I felt YouTube, but I didn't see YouTube. Um, but I could see the rectangular frame clearly. Um, and yeah, if, if somehow I would've been able to zoom out and get clearer, it would've been a YouTube webpage. I knew that. I just didn't see it.

44:21 Um, and then, the third thing I've purchased is another sense. So I have this shared sense of annoyance or quasi-annoyance. Um, but I've also got this sense of "luxuriating" I've put, so, um, enjoying the music, um, luxuriating in the music. Um, and a feeling that, y'know, it felt very emotional actually, that I didn't feel emotional in. I was overwhelmed. I, I just more mean it, it was an emotion going on. Um, I, I, I felt that, y'know, there was something very worthwhile about listening to the music. Um, so yeah. All, all these three things were going on at once.

45:04 RTH: Equally?

45:06 Pete: Um. Yes. [quizzical pause] Um, the, the only reason I, I hesitate is it felt. Yes, but normally when you ask me that I can, it's, it's almost like there's a thing over here and there's a thing over here. And, y'know, I can almost say 70%--30%, something like that. This felt much more like a mix. Like it had all been put into a pot and stirred a little bit. [RTH: [RTH: Mm-hmm.] Um, so, so yes, equally, but it was also less, they were less distinct from each other, all these things. [RTH: Not un,] I'm describing them as distinct.

45:45 RTH: *Not unequally* as opposed to *equally*.

45:48 Pete: Yes. [laughs] Okay. Yes. *Not unequally*.

45:51 RTH: Mh-hmm. So let's start with the luxuriating, cuz that, that's the one that I understood the least. [Pete: Okay.] So is, is the sense of luxuriating *Pete's* luxuriating? The first sense, the, the, uh, annoyance, was *the host's* annoyance. [Pete: Yes.] Is this Pete's luxuriating, or is this the host's luxuriating in the same way that it was the hosts annoyance?

46:15 Pete: Well, the, the host [inaudible] luxuriating. Um, I mean that's, that's why the minor annoyance or one of the host's part, y'know, let's just listen to this was kind of his point. [RTH: Right.] Um, so they were luxuriating in this music. But I think, I think I was responding in kind, as it were. So, um. It is un, was utterly un-vocalized. There

was no vocal parts of this experience, but it was almost like I was going, yeah, yeah, yeah. It is good to really listen to this music. Um, and there was that kind of sense of warmth and sinking into it and acceptance, I guess.

46:54 RTH: And that's Pete's warmth and acceptance [Pete: Yes.] rather than the empathic, or,

47:02 Pete: Yeah, it's,

47:02 RTH: Secondary or whatever.

47:04 Pete: Yeah, it's my own, [RTH: Okay.] Like obviously they feel the same way, but I'm not. Yeah. This is not empathic. It's, it's my own.

47:11 RTH: Okay. And, and, and is this a bodily thing? Or a mental thing? Or neither one or both? or,

47:21 Pete: Um, both? I think, um, so again, it's not bodily in that very, very direct sense. Y'know, the, the hairs did not go up on the back of my neck. Um, but it felt in my body. Um, it didn't feel in my head. Except there was, I think, a sort of rational, there was a rational element that was almost distinct, which was, um, probably this acceptance point, which is like, um, again, not vocalized, but this sense of *yes, yes, yes, this is a good thing*. Um, a sense of agreement. Um. Um, but I, I, I don't want to make too much of that distinction. These, these are definitely the same thing, um,

48:15 RTH: Part, part of it.

48:16 Pete: Yeah. I, I think, I think some of it's corporeal, almost. And, and some of it is of course a sort of, um, rational feeling of, *Yeah, this is good*.

48:29 RTH: And, and, and this is *good*, this is a *good thing sense*, whatever we're gonna call that. Is, is the *this* in that something like, *my noticing this*, this or is it that the *music itself* is good music is,

48:50 Pete: Uh, it's more, um, the process of really listening deeply to music is good.

48:58 RTH: So not the music itself, but the act of attending to it.

49:03 Pete: Yes. Yeah.

49:04 RTH: Okay.

49:07 Pete: The music happened to be good, but that was not the thought.

49:15 RTH: Okay. So the, so the center of focus of this particular solar system, if we're trying to stay away from talking about *attention* or whatever, that is on the process of, on the process of attending to the music rather than on the music itself.

49:37 Pete: Mh-Hmm.

49:38 RTH: Okay. Then I think I'm good about that. And then the seeing of the podcast. So I, what I've got from that so far is I see clearly a YouTube frame, even though it's not a YouTube, I don't see anything YouTube-y about it, but I see a rectangular, wider than it is high rectangle.

50:02 Pete: Yeah.

50:05 RTH: And, and with two guys looking at each other?

50:08 Pete: Yeah.

50:10 RTH: And so two people in profile?

50:12 Pete: Uh, yeah, it's, um, they're at a low table, um, talking to each other. I know they do record their shows and put them out on YouTube. I haven't actually watched it like that so this is a sort of a mental guess. Um, but yeah, it's two guys in, um, almost full body shot. You should probably see down to roughly their knees. Um, and they're sort of leaning across the table, leaning towards each other, talking.

50:39 RTH: And do you, sss, is that a, a clearly seen thing?

50:44 Pete: Yeah. Um, I think it probably lacks some details because I dunno their exact setup. Y'know, I haven't seen their YouTube video, so some of it's guessed at. Um, but, like I said, I know what *they* look like. Um, and I think I've filled in some of the blanks quite clearly. Yeah.

51:04 RTH: Okay. And things like microphones and notepads and whatever, or do you see that kind of thing? Or is that just not of interest to you?

51:13 Pete: Um, there were definitely microphones. Um, I think there was stuff on the table, but I, it didn't really capture my attention.

51:21 RTH: Okay. So this is a pretty clear seeing. Much clearer than seeing the podcaster's brown hair. [Pete: Yup.] Much, much, much, *much* clearer than that. [Pete: Yes.] How about by comparison to the vibrating hand?

51:41 Pete: Not quite as clear as that.

51:44 RTH: Okay.

51:47 Pete: But, but not far off. Um.

51:51 RTH: Okay. Then I think I'm good about that portion. And then the last portion was, I didn't, I didn't quite get. So the, the music in the, in the real world, the music I've been playing, the guy said "We gotta keep playing this." The, the other guy lets it play for a while and it stops it. And then does the guy say again, we've gotta stop playing it, "we gotta keep playing this?"

52:13 Pete: Yeah. He said something to that effect. Um, so I, I didn't want to quote too much of the podcast cuz I didn't, I didn't want it to be about the context. [RTH: Right.] Um, but, but he's, he said, y'know, *keep playing*. And then the, what I put in quote marks was, we, "We gotta keep playing." And, but it was the *annoyance* that stood out to me, um, [RTH: Okay.] because he, he was just a bit annoyed that, um, his colleague hadn't let it go on a little bit more. Um,

52:48 RTH: And that, that annoyance was transmitted in the tone of voice or the,

52:52 Pete: Yeah, it was, it wasn't very strong. It wasn't like he was angry or anything like that. But, um, yeah, he just wanted it to run on a little bit more.

52:59 RTH: And, and *that* was the portion that you're attending to, more so than the words that he's saying. [Pete: Yeah.] As if the guy is somehow transmitting annoyance.

53:09 Pete: Yeah. Very, very, very light annoyance. But that was the, the, yeah, that was the thing that really caught my attention.

53:18 RTH: Okay. And, and I'm gathering you *felt* that annoyance somewhat,

53:28 Pete: Yes. I didn't.

53:30 RTH: There is a word for this, I think, but I can't remember what it is at this moment. Can't say it, but,

53:34 Pete: Um, it's like sympathy pains almost, isn't it? [RTH: Yes.] Um, but it's, um,

53:40 RTH: Vicarious annoyance or something?

53:41 Pete: Yeah. Um, yeah. It's that I, I wouldn't say that I was annoyed, but. I, yeah. But I *felt* his annoyance, [Laughs.] like, um, I *got it*. Y'know?

53:56 RTH: I wasn't thinking, I wasn't thinking about it. So this is not a cognitive recognition of annoyance. [Pete: Yeah.] This is a, *felt* annoyance, apprehension of his annoyance.

54:09 Pete: Yes.

54:10 RTH: And even though you, you, you know yourself not to be annoyed, this is not *my* annoyance. [Pete: Yeah.] This is, this is, I am in my annoyance way, feeling his annoyance.

54:23 Pete: Yes.

54:24 RTH: Something like that.

54:25 Pete: I'm in the realm of annoyance.

54:27 RTH: Got it. And all these things are happening. At what seemed like the same time?

54:36 Pete: Yes.

54:38 RTH: Okay. And I think I'm good about that.

54:42 Pete: Yeah. Um, Russ, I should turn, this is my fault. I just noticed the time and I have child pick up to do. Um, [RTH: Okay.] Uh, so would, would it be okay if we're on, this is beep five. Would it be okay if we just did this beep?

54:57 RTH: Sure. Or, or if you need to go, we should, we can, we can stop now. Whatever turns you in.

55:02 Pete: Is that enough? Is that enough material though, for you to work with? Or is that just the bad?

55:07 RTH: I think, I think this is fine.

55:09 Pete: Um. Okay. Is, is that okay in that case? cuz we are, we're pushing up on an hour, even with the late start. Um,

55:20 RTH: Totally, totally, totally fine with me.

55:23 Pete: Okay. Appreciate it.

55:25 RTH: Shall we, shall we do it again, [Pete: Please.] Shall we do it again?

55:26 Pete: Yes, please. Yes. Thank you.

55:28 RTH: And do we want to, do we want to figure out when now, or do you want to email about that?

55:32 Pete: Yeah, let's, let's figure that out.