

Pete
Pete Interview 8
Green meeting (part 1 of 2)

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the May 6 green meeting (part 1) with Peter Hoskin that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/HUArOE4oTyA>. 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.
- 0:03 Pete: Lovely. We're recording.
- 0:04 RTH: Yep. We are recording And this is gonna be what, what I call the *green meeting*.
- 0:11 Pete: Yeah.
- 0:11 Russ comments: Russ begins his explanation of what is a *green meeting*.
- 0:11 RTH: And the green meeting is basically, uh, an opportunity to review, uh, all of the samples that we have collected. So you've, you've sampled for seven days, six of those days we consider actual samples. (The first day is a practice day or something like that.) [Pete: Yeah.] And, uh, so the task is to go through all of, all of them. So, so sooner or later (hopefully sooner, like sometime this week, maybe) I will write a description of what Pete's samples were like. [Pete: Yeah.] And I, and, and the object of that description is to be what I call a high-fidelity description, which is, which at least in part has to do with, it has to be connected to what Pete's actual experiences were.
- 0:54 Pete: Yeah.
- 0:54 RTH: And, uh, so the, the part of part of that is to go through all the samples, sort of to bring them back to mind, and to clarify them, because it could very well be that we learned something on day 7 that will allow us to figure out what Pete meant when he said whatever it was that he said on day 4 or something like that. That's, yeah.

0:54 Russ comments: That is, the green meeting is part of the iterative process.

1:12 Pete: Yeah.

1:12 RTH: That's, uh, that's part of the strategy.

1:15 Pete: Yeah.

1:16 RTH: And, and as part of that process, I write a *caption* for each sample. So each, each sample description is, is a hundred or a couple hundred words long. [Pete: Um-hmm.] And, and I write a caption that's may, maybe 10 words long or 5 words long, or something like that, so that I can see them all in one at one place.

1:16 Russ comments: The caption conveys things that we might wish to remember when we try to describe Pete's experience.

1:36 Pete: Correct.

1:36 RTH: And, and I generally write those captions in green, which is why I call this the *green meeting*. And, uh,

1:42 Pete: Uh, that makes sense.

1:45 RTH: And, and I guess I would emphasize that the, that the exercise is *not* about a review of what we have *written* or what I have written about each sample. The object is to review *Pete's experiences as they occurred at the moment of the beep*. [Pete: Yeah.] And we had a interview about that, and there's a transcript about that, and there's a video about that, and there's a description about that. And all of those are the, the aim is *to get back to Pete's experience* as best, as best they could. But so, so the point that I'm trying to make here is that this is *not* a matter of, of analyzing the words that I happened to use to write about sample 7.2 or whatever. [Pete: Yeah.] It's about sample 7.2.

1:45 Russ comments: The aim is to describe Pete's experiences, *not* to be constrained by what we have written about them.

In my view, that is a huge distinction between DES and much of what is often called qualitative psychology. Qualitative psychology often gathers descriptions and then carefully analyzes the words that are used in those descriptions. I don't think such analysis, no matter how careful, can ever improve on the quality of the original descriptions, which are not (in my view) usually adequate.

2:38 Pete: I see, I see.

2:40 RTH: Yeah. And we might have to go back to *look* at 7.2 because that's the video that we've got of 7.2 is better than what I wrote about 7.2 ,probably.

2:49 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

2:49 RTH: It was closer to it. And so it could be that we will get to a place where we'll say, well, I can't remember something that seems important. [Pete: Yeah.] We gotta go back and look at it again.

2:59 Pete: Yeah, Yeah.

3:00 RTH: Yeah. But, but the main point that I'm trying to make here is that it, it is *not* Psychology, psychology very often does textual, textual analysis kinds of kinds of deals. *This is not that!* This is about Pete's *experiences as they occurred*.

3:17 Pete: Yeah. Just getting back to source basically.

3:19 RTH: And the texts are pointers back, back, and they're nothing more than that. And the green, the green things that, that, that I write are just a shorter pointers. [Pete: Yeah.] So we've got a, a green thing, which is a shorter pointer, and then we got the description, which is a longer pointer, and then we've got the, the transcript, which is a longer-yet pointer, and then we got the video, which is a longer-yet pointer. But all of those are trying to point at Pete's experience.

3:43 Pete: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Yeah.

3:45 RTH: So that's my preamble there, what, what it is that we're trying to do.

3:49 Pete: That makes sense.

3:50 RTH: And if you got any questions about that or comments before we do it,

3:55 Pete: Uh, no, it, it sounds like a memory test more than anything else. Uh, I'm trying to remember, remember back experiences I had? Um,

4:02 RTH: Well, I, I, I should have, I should have included in the list [Pete: Yeah.] of when I, when I said there was a list of the green things and the descriptions and the transcripts and whatever. There's also Russ's memory, and there's Pete's memory.

4:16 Pete: Yeah.

4:16 RTH: All those things are aimed at the same thing, [Pete: Yeah.] which is to say Pete's experience at the moment of the beep. And all of them are aimed *imperfectly* at that Russ's memory has got his distortions, Pete's memory has got his distortions. [Pete: Yeah.] And, and I don't mean distortions isn't necessarily a bad thing—overlookings or whatever.

4:36 Pete: Yeah.

4:37 RTH: And that's why, that's why we might have to go back to look at, at a video if, if there, if it turns out, which it, which I wanna, I want to explicitly leave space to it, that there seems like *this is sort of an, an important thing—we should understand it*. We're not gonna rely on my memory, and we're not gonna rely on Pete's memory,

and we're not gonna rely on what I wrote at the time. Although all those things are important. [Pete: Yeah.] They're none of them. They're none of them impeccable. They're all

5:13 Pete: Okay. Yeah. Certainly not my memory. But, uh, yeah. We'll give it a whirl.

5:18 RTH: A lot of, a lot of, a lot of philosophers think that, that Pete has *incurable* access to his inner experience. And I don't think that's true. Pete, Pete's got his problems or sensitivities or whatever, and [Pete: Yeah.] as does Russ and everybody else. So we're all just doing the best we can to get in the ballpark of Pete's experience.

5:42 Pete: Yeah. Great.

5:43 RTH: Great. So shall I share my screen here? And, uh, yes,

5:46 Pete: Please do. Please do.

5:49 RTH: I can figure out how to do that on this machine. Certainly there must be a share button, uh, make this wider. I can see it and I'm going to share,

5:49 Russ comments: Russ shares his screen, on which is the document that shows his descriptions of each sample.

6:17 Pete: Uh, yeah, I'm seeing it.

6:19 RTH: So I'm sharing a piece of my screen. I've got a wide monitor, so you don't wanna see the whole thing. So [Pete: Yeah.] So can you see, this is basically day 7. And, and this, this is the same document that I have sent you previously. [Pete: Mm-hmm.] And [Pete: Yeah.] Except that I have doctored it in such a way as to make the captions come out easily in green. So, so when I write, start writing in right here, it's gonna come out green.

6:45 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

6:48 RTH: So our task is to look at point at, at 7.1, have a little conversation about it, then write a caption about it and, and see whether we agree about what happened here.

6:59 Pete: Yeah. Yeah. Okay. So I should be reading right now?

7:09 RTH: Yes. [Pete: Okay.] And, and it might be, and, and you can read on my screen, or if it's easier for you, you can read on your own document, which is the same document, whichever [Pete: Yeah.] If it matters to you,

7:20 Pete: Uh, yeah, I have the, on your screen, um,

Considering sample 7.1

8:04 RTH: [RTH begins typing] And I'm writing what, what I hope that you will take as a draft. I, I am *not* writing [Pete: Yeah.] a final version here. I'm putting down some keystrokes.

8:16 Pete: Well, what, what I would say is, is the, the main text, the black text,

8:20 RTH: Sorry,

8:21 Pete: Feels accurate. The, i, the black text feels accurate to me. [RTH: Okay.] So working from that is a good starting point. [RTH: That's good.] Um, um, I mean, the, the only thing that seems inaccurate in the, in the, uh, black text is the part that says the glass is surrounded by black. Um, it's more like the *scene including the glass* that is surrounded by black. Um, the, that might not be a huge deal, but it, it was a glass on a surface with some hint of hotel around it. Yeah.

9:07 RTH: So this word should be "scene" S-C-E-N-E, like that. [changes the description]

9:10 Pete: Yeah. The scene, the, that's better. That's that. Yeah. That improves it immediately.

9:14 RTH: Okay.

9:17 Pete: That's the only tweak I could make. Yeah.

9:25 RTH: Okay.

9:34 Pete: Yeah. [long pause] And in your caption, um, it seems to be like the most, um, (gosh, I'm struggling to find the word. I'm tired.) Um, so, but it, it seems to be the most refined version, the refined descrip, it's like, it's very short. It's not getting into the actual image, it's the kind of a description of just, of the experience. Is that right?

9:34 Russ comments: There, Pete wants to clarify the function of the caption.

10:09 RTH: Yeah. And it, it's a re, it's a reduced version, I would say. [Pete: Yeah.] It leaves out the content. So, so the fact that it was a glass that you were seeing doesn't seem like the kind of thing that that is gonna be of interest over the long haul. So what I'm trying to write here is things which I might wanna remember that we might wanna remember over the long haul. [Pete: Okay. Okay.] The fact that you happen to see, uh, a glass sitting on a bar is probably not particularly important, [Pete: Yeah.] because that, that, that's quite, (what's the word?) quite *contingent* on the accidental, the, the fact that it was a glass was, y'know, if you'd been listening to a different podcast, it would've been a different kind of a thing or something.

10:58 Pete: Yeah. Of course's. Okay.

11:00 RTH: But the fact that it was a, *seeing*, an *inner seeing* that seems like a characteristic of *Pete*, Pete innerly sees [Pete: Yeah] at this particular time. And I think frequently, so this is, so sooner or later, I'm guessing, I'm going to write something that will sound like "Pete had a lot of visual imagery, what I, what DES calls inner seeing," and then

I'm gonna go back, be able to go back and count, and this one will be one of them. And then I would be able to say something like, it happened on 40, 14 of his 70, 70 samples or whatever.

11:36 Pete: Okay. Okay. Um,

11:38 RTH: And the *imageless seeing* is my technical term for this kind of thing where [Pete: Yeah.] I, my understanding is that you took yourself to be seeing Stephen King, [Pete: Yeah.] *not* just remembering who Stephen King was, but [Pete: Yeah.] the experiences of *seeing*, even though you don't see any actual details. [Pete: Yeah.] I see without the thing seen.

12:06 Pete: Yeah.

12:07 RTH: And that, [Pete: Okay.] that I call *imageless seeing*.

12:11 Pete: That makes sense to me. The, the only thing in your caption that I've raised, um, is the word "unusual." Um, but this is not me taking issue with it. It's more asking a question because presumably, y'know, well, is that an unusual perspective? Can we say that? By unusual, do you mean it is not a sort of, uh, a point of view perspective? It's something different to that? Is

12:37 RTH: It's not, so what I meant by *unusual* there, and it's good that you're asking the question, what I meant by *unusual* is that it's not the perspective that Pete would usually have of that kind of a glass.

12:49 Pete: I see. Okay. Okay. Um, in, in which case, yeah, that, that caption all seems fine to me. Um, yeah.

12:58 RTH: Okay. And it, and, and so the, so a, a comment about the captions that I may very well (probably won't, actually) ever use this word *unusual*. It's in this caption. [Pete: Yeah.] But, but probably there aren't gonna be very many that, that I can remember from here, from here anyway, that have that kind of unusual perspective. [Pete: Yeah.] And so I'll have written it here, and then I'll, and, and then I'll, I'll ignore that later on. But if it turns out that when we go back, there's a lot of perspectives that he's seen of seeing this scene from a strange perspective and that one from a different perspective, then this is how we'll get, we'll get back to that.

13:32 Pete: I see, I see. And then unusual then will take on more importance. [RTH: Right.] Um, okay. Great. Great. Okay. So the,

13:38 RTH: The, so the caption is in that, in that respect *a living thing*, [Pete: Yeah.] in the sense that it is designed to keep our (yours and my) gray matter alive about what it is that we have seen here.

13:54 Pete: Yeah.

13:55 RTH: And, and there, there was something about this that I thought was adequately interesting that I should, we should say that this is an unusual, unusual perspective.

14:06 Pete: Yeah.

14:07 RTH: Got it. So, so is there anything else in here that you would say, this is, *there's something else about this that I would like to be able to remember after I have looked at the other 50 samples?*

14:19 Pete: No,

14:23 RTH: And, and the reason I ask about that is that I, I want to emphasize that, that *more is better than less* until we get too many, too many words in there. So if the, if there's something in there that, uuh, I'd *sort of* like to remember about this, y'know,

14:40 Pete: Well, I mean, one, one, one thing, again, (this is a question rather than a statement) um, is the, is the *clarity of the image*. Um, the two, two things that in our conversations that you've seem to ask questions about that aren't captured in the caption one is, um, where there were dual experiences or dual images, you'd say, was it 50—50 or something different, like the proportion? Um, and that's not caption captured here. And the other, the other thing was, um, um, yeah, the, the clarity itself, um, y'know, what was this, um, y'know, what, what, was it clear? Was it [inaudible]? Was it, um, should, should,

14:40 Russ comments: RTH asks about 50—50 or whatever for three reasons. First, he has found that to be a useful tool to help people focus on their directly apprehended experience rather than context, etc. Second, he has found it to be useful as a general rule (with many exceptions) to start a conversation about the more prominent aspect. Third, it may be that the relative prominence of some aspect of experience may be experientially important. Pete's question here focuses on the third reason.

15:30 RTH: Sure. Does this do it for you? [he modifies the green caption to say the image was clear]

15:33 Pete: Well, no, but it's, it is more a question like, do we need to capture those things? Or, or from your perspective, are they less important or,

15:42 RTH: So I, I think the answer to that is yes and speak. And so what, what is likely to have happened is that we're going to get into the next version where, where there was some not so clear thing, and then I'm gonna go back. Then I would've had to have go, gone back and say, oh, I should have marked this one as being *clear*.

15:59 Pete: Yeah. Okay. Okay. In which case, in which case, let's say that then, cuz this was clear. [RTH: Right. Um, yeah.

16:09 RTH: So I'm ha I'm, I'm delighted to include *clear*.

- 16:13 Pete: Okay. Okay.
- 16:14 RTH: *And*, and I would say that part of the procedure is that we're gonna adjust captions as we go, as we go. If, [Pete: Yeah.] if later on we, we think, oh, well we, that's interesting, but we didn't write, we didn't write that in the caption back in day 7, then we'll go back and fix it. Yeah.
- 16:31 Pete: Perfect. Yeah.
- 16:34 RTH: On to number 2.

Considering sample 7.2

- 16:35 Pete: Yeah. [pause while they read] Okay. So I think the, um, I think the second paragraph of black text is, is accurate. I think one thing that's missing from the first paragraph, um, is I, I think we had a mix of usual perspective, like point-of-view perspective. So in this, in this interview situation, I could see as if it were a memory, my point of view of my interview subject, this author, um, when I was asking the question. But his response came, um, from, from a perspective I could not possibly have had. So, so there was, there was a mix of *usual* perspective to use the lingo we've settled on an unusual, very unusual perspective.
- 18:02 RTH: And so where, where did his speaking come from?
- 18:05 Pete: So it, uh, I feel myself naturally speaking the entire question, um, the naturally speaking the entire question from my own point of view, um, or, or, or some words to that effect, whatever you want to use. Um, but then in the next sentence, simultaneously, although it seems to be a response, I hear his answer and see it delivered from various unusual angles. It's,
- 18:45 RTH: Did you say, "I see it delivered?"
- 18:48 Pete: Yeah. So it's, it was, it was very much, his answer was very much like a movie. It was cut, um, it was cuts, visual cuts. So a shot from here, a shot from here, a shot from here.
- 19:08 RTH: So I don't remember that as being visual at all.
- 19:12 Pete: Oh. It was, this was *very* visual. It was like a film. Um, so my, my question part of the film,
- 19:21 RTH: Um, so "I'm replaying" means I am innerly seeing this whole thing. This is a visual experience.
- 19:21 Russ comments: Part of the aim of the green meeting is to correct misunderstandings of any aspect of the sampling.
- 19:28 Pete: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

19:31 RTH: So that's the,

19:40 Pete: Yes.

19:41 RTH: Ah-hah!

19:43 Pete: Um, okay. So as an inner seeing, my, my part of it, my question was seen, um, like, I guess wasn't call or memory. So it was, it was exactly, it was how it happened on the evening from my point of view. But the author's answers to my call, answer to my question was seen from a cinematic point of view, an out-body-point of view, um, that I definitely didn't have on the evening.

20:17 RTH: So this should be as much I see here and hear his answer as just here. Yeah,

20:23 Pete: Yeah. But precisely. Yeah.

20:27 RTH: And, and what are, what are the points of view of this, of

20:33 Pete: The, the main one I can remember, I mean, we might need to go back to the video, but I can remember talking about a sort of camera shot that was, um, sorry, I'm holding my phone as there, it's a camera, um, all, almost like, imagine a camera, a cameraman, um, kneeling down. So, so my interview subject, this author, was on a chair, and, um, I can, if there were a cameraman kneeling down at his feet and pointing the camera up, so it's quite close, um, that was the main shot I can remember. But it felt like there was, there were a few shots, um, a few, yeah, maybe few more angles mixed in, um, got film, went to another shot. Then we, that's about the milk. Here we go. Uh, we did, we did concentrate on the hearing, but I, I can remember describing the camera angle. Ah, yeah. There. So 14:12.

20:33 Russ comments: While Pete was speaking, Russ produced the transcript from interview 7 and scrolled through sample 7.2. Eventually they found the 14:12 turn where things were explained.

This illustrates a feature of the green meeting: It is not the text, nor either Russ's or Pete's memory, or the transcript that is considered the primary source. All of the above can be invoked as potentially pointing at Pete's at-the-moment-of-the-beep experience to answer some questions of fact about that experience.

22:19 RTH: Okay. So this should not be called inner speaking. This should be called inner seeing with audio.

22:34 Pete: Yeah. (Sorry, I'm just very weirdly gonna, um, message my wife to instead to bring a tea out at the bottom of the, my garden. Um, sorry. Yeah. [pause] Thank you.) So seeing with audio, both my point of view. Yeah. Yeah.

24:16 RTH: [types in green] How does that grab you?

24:26 Pete: Yeah, yeah. That, that covers paragraph one. Obviously there's paragraph two as well.

24:37 RTH: Right Now we gotta go to p, paragraph two.

24:39 Pete: Yeah, yeah.

24:43 RTH: Which is gonna be a challenge just because it was always a challenge.

24:47 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

25:14 RTH: [types] So maybe we should call this a meta-attention, actually.

25:17 Pete: Yeah. I think meta-attention covers is a nice phrase. Um,

25:36 RTH: So this might be good enough to get us back. So the object, the object of the captions is, is so that when it comes time that I wanna write about this meta-attention-whoop thing, I can go back and find this, I can go find the samples. [Pete: Okay.] So I'm gonna, I'm gonna wanna use the same words the next time we get to

25:56 Pete: Yeah. Whoop seems a bit strange, but actually I think something like work definitely happened more than once, this

26:07 RTH: <crosstalk> Yeah. I think, I think quite a, I think quite a few times we're gonna find, yeah. So I'm gonna copy this to a doc to another document, just this piece of it. [Pete: Yeah. Yeah.] And the reason that I'm gonna do that is that I think we're gonna use that again.

26:23 Pete: Yeah.

26:24 RTH: And, and instead of getting the exact, going back here to find the exact words, I got this in my other document.

26:30 Pete: Yeah.

26:34 RTH: So we got about number two for both halves.

26:38 Pete: Yes, we are.

26:39 RTH: So this is actually two simultaneous experiences. [types]

26:42 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

26:53 RTH: And that was true of the first one as well.

26:56 Pete: Yes. The, the, the difference, sorry, the difference between the first one saying the first was truly simultaneous. The second was like a switching from one to the other.

So, so my, my attention was leaning away from the interview. That, that feels different to the first,

27:34 RTH: [types] So was this one of those where there was a waxing and a waning? Or is it like, just seemed like right after each other? So we called this “simultaneously.”

27:45 Pete: Yeah.

27:46 RTH: I, I should say I called this *simultaneously*, but that’s not necessarily what you thought.

27:51 Pete: Yeah. I, I think, um, well, simultaneously I do feel my attention leaning away from the interview and towards the pouring. Um, but, sorry, I’m struggling find the way to express this. Um,

28:08 RTH: So does, does that mean that the leaning is simultaneous, but the destination comes later?

28:14 Pete: Yes, exactly. That’s a good way of putting it. Um, [RTH types] yeah. Yeah. I think I like the waxing waning, um, that there, it is almost like two semi-simultaneous experiences in that they, they are simultaneous, *but* they’re not totally simultaneous. Uh, because one of them is, is entirely rooted in the idea that I’m moving on from the previous experience.

28:50 RTH: [scrolls] So we had a picture at one point.

28:54 Pete: Yeah. The, um, that yeah. *That*, that’s the, the waxing-waning thing.

29:02 RTH: Maybe that is it.

29:04 Pete: Yeah.

29:05 RTH: So it, it’s not simultaneous in the sense that *this one* happened first and *this one* happened second.

29:11 Pete: Yeah.

29:11 RTH: But it is simultaneous in the sense that they overlapped.

29:15 Pete: Yes, exactly. Exactly. So whereas it was in our, whereas in our Stephen King, where it was in our previous one, this, these are two inner seeings that are happening at the same time. There’s entirely just overlap. Um,

29:31 RTH: So maybe we should call this *overlapping*. [types]

29:31 Russ comments: We have distinguished between *simultaneous* (which means two things starting and happening at the same time) and *overlapping* (which means two things starting at different times but as one continues, its continuation is

simultaneous with the other experience that is starting). This is apparently an important distinction for Pete's experience.

29:34 Pete: Yes. That's, that's good. Yeah. Yeah. That is good.

29:41 RTH: You happy with that?

29:43 Pete: Yeah.

29:44 RTH: And, and the process. I would, I would say the process that we're going through here is exactly what the green meeting is supposed to be doing. That we're, we are refining our understanding, we're correcting the answers, we're we are communicating about what we thought, what we saw, how much, how much we can go back to the, the original transcripts were necessary. That's what [Pete: Yeah.] Which is, which is the emphasis that I was trying to make that, that we're, we're not, this is not a textual analysis. [Pete: Yeah.] We have started with the text, we've gone back to the transcript.

30:21 Pete: Yeah.

30:22 RTH: We've gone, we've gone to other samples.

30:27 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

30:29 RTH: This is not, it's *not about this text*.

30:32 Pete: Yeah.

30:33 RTH: This, this text is a *tool*.

30:35 Pete: Yeah.

30:38 RTH: And just,

30:38 Pete: I see what you mean about it. Um, you said it, it can take some time. I see what you mean.

30:44 RTH: Yep. I've been here before. But the, I think that they generally get somewhat faster because, [Pete: Yeah.] cuz the first few of 'em, we sort of have to work out the general rules, and then later on it'll become, *well, that was like that other thing that thing*.

Considering sample 7.3

30:59 Pete: Way. Yeah, exactly. It's a bit more copy and paste. Um, well, with, with the, the next one, I would say, um, the, so the black description is, I, I wouldn't correct anything. So maybe that helps. [RTH types] Yeah. I wouldn't change that either. Um, uh, the, the, the, the only thing, and again, this is more a question than anything else, is, um,

I think you, *you* were wondering, or maybe even speculating that this was a similar type of experience to my, to the meta-attention ones. Um, this doesn't feel the same as the meta-attention, but the kind of movement aspect. Um, so I don't know whether you want to signal that. [RTH types] Um, yeah, I mean, maybe that just with question marks, um, just so in terms of keywords, it pops up, but it, it, it might not be the same.

32:45 RTH: Okay. And that, and, and that's good as far as I'm concerned that this, that it is the keyword. So we can look at this. So what, [Pete: yeah.] sooner or later we're gonna have a collection of things which might qualify as meta-attention, and this will be one of those that we'll consider. [Pete: Yeah.] Or I'll consider, or, or however we'll do that. And, and, uh, then we'll fi have to figure out what to do with it. Yeah. So the, so the cap, the captions are *not answers*. They're, they're *additional pointers*. They're, yeah. So we happy to this?

Considering sample 7.4

33:21 Pete: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. [RTH scrolled to a different sample and copied what is green there] What you were doing there. And, uh, now I see. What, was this something else? I, I could be wrong. Was that the entirety of the experience?

34:29 RTH: Say that again?

34:30 Pete: Was that the entirety of the experience? Um, I feel like there was something else, but I could be wrong. [RTH opens the transcript and scrolls through sample 7.4] Okay. Doesn't seem that way. Uh, could, would you mind scrolling down a little bit, Russ. Yeah. Okay. That, yeah. I'm misremembering in, in which case, the, um, the black texts and what I've seen of the green text so far, um, both seem accurate. [RTH: Okay.] Yeah. I, yeah.

34:30 Russ comments: So now we have an example where Russ's understanding was mistaken (sample 7.2, where he didn't recall the seeing aspect) and an example where Pete's understanding was mistaken (here, recalling an aspect that didn't exist). The green meeting is designed to uncover and accept with humility the imperfection of memory of all participants, and to use the best evidence available to correct what can be corrected.

36:14 RTH: [types] You good with that? [Pete: Yeah.]

Consideration of sample 7.5

[pause while they read; RTH types]

36:41 Pete: Yeah. That's a, that's a lovely description. Yeah. Yes. Yeah. [RTH types] Yeah. I'm, I'm happy with that, Russ.

37:37 RTH: And would you call it two, two experiences? I think that's what we did at the time, but

37:40 Pete: Yeah, I think so. Um, yes. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

37:45 RTH: Okay. And I guess I would say as, as, as we're going here, that the object is not perfection. We're, [Pete: Mm-hmm.] we, we are not shooting to describe Pete's experience *absolutely perfectly*, cuz I don't think that's possible. [Pete: Yeah.] We're trying to say something which *we* can stand behind, *both of us* can stand behind and say, or, or, or *not*. You, you might say, *well, y'know, I didn't see it that way. And it's not that way. You write it your way, I'll write it my way.* That would be fine too. [Pete: Yeah.] But, but when, when, when we're done, I would like to be able to say, *I stand behind this* in the sense that I think this conveys what Pete's experience was, was like, as best as I could figure it out. Yeah. And I would like you to be able to do the same thing, perhaps about the same document, but, but, but leaving open the *possibility* that, that there, it, it is not necessarily an exercise in consensus. [Pete: Yeah.] It's the, the exercise is *not* about consensus. It's about, it is about, uh, *responsibility*. I have a responsibility to write what, uh, to, *to see written* what I think is the truth as best I can write it. And you have that responsibility as well, regardless of whether we happen to agree with each other.

39:03 Pete: Okay. Okay.

39:04 RTH: So, so far I, I'm thinking that we agree with each other, but Yeah. But the, but the *aim* is not consensus.

39:11 Pete: I see.

39:12 RTH: I see. The aim is, the aim is *personal fidelity* in a, in a, so if we disagree, if we disagree with each other, I would like that to be *explicit*, not just swept under the rug.

39:12 Russ comments: From my point of view, personal fidelity and responsibility (37:45) are the same thing, and are fundamental to DES. The aim is for Pete and Russ, each individually, to aver that what is written about Pete's experience is of high fidelity, *even if that means that they have to write two different versions*: Pete thinks *X* whereas Russ thinks *Y*. If they can agree (that is, if there is consensus), fine. But that is more a happy result than the aim of the procedure.

39:25 Pete: Of course. Yeah, of course.

Consideration of sample 7.6

[pause while they read; RTH types]

40:41 Pete: Ah, I was just about to say "cone of attention." Uh, probably something we'll come back to.

41:03 RTH: So you good with that? The green? [Pete: I am. Yeah.] The green? I'm pretty good with that too.

41:14 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

41:15 RTH: So on to day 6.

41:22 Pete: (Sorry, just texting about, um, tea, still with my wife. I've, I've, I've taken the key to our, um, so, um,)

41:30 RTH: Take your time,

41:32 Pete: [pause] Uh, just out the upshot is at some point the light in this office will flash and I'll need to go collect a cup of tea, if that's all right. Um, let's, it'll take 30 seconds.

42:00 RTH: Sure. No problem.

42:02 Pete: I need some form of caffeine. I'm also British, I just need tea. Um,

42:06 RTH: I've got a cup of tea going already.

42:08 Pete: Okay.

42:09 RTH: But I had to get it, I had to get it myself!

42:12 Pete: Hmm. Um, right. So, uh,

Consideration of sample 6.1

42:22 RTH: [pause while they read] I don't know what we're gonna call this, [types] but this happens in other sense, other sensory modalities as well as eyes. But, uh,

42:40 Pete: This, this feels, I mean, this is meta-attention again, isn't it? Um, I must admit, I'm struggling to entirely remember this one. I, I feel like I've moved into my eyes in the same way that in a similar way to I've moved into my ears and things like that. Um,

43:05 RTH: My recollection is that it, that you were *in* your eyes, but not *moving into* your eyes. So the ear thing was, I, I feel myself going into my ears.

43:16 Pete: Yeah.

43:17 RTH: This is, I am *in* my eyes, but it's not a movement thing.

43:23 Pete: Okay. I'm, I'm afraid I just can't entirely remember the, the beep in that case. Um,

43:30 RTH: Well, I could be misre misremembering it.

43:41 Pete: [RTH gets the transcript and scrolls] Oh, I do remember. Okay. I, I, I sort remember some of it now, but yeah. Okay. Um, yeah. Yeah. Keep scrolling. Here we go. Would you mind scrolling down a bit more, Russ?

44:31 RTH: So there is a, is a cone-of-attention deal?

44:34 Pete: No, because neck, neck sentences *didn't feel* like this. Uh, so this is different. Uh, I could almost feel my attention dropping down into my eyes, like I'm moving into my eyes. So I'm moving my attention into my eyes. 9:58.

45:09 RTH: Pretty clearly moving. Alright. So I misremembered that.

45:22 Pete: Yeah. If you, if you look at 11:02 at the bottom, I think that's where I compare it to ears. Uh, this is the, eye version 11:23. I felt like the I version where I went *whoop*, into my eyes.

45:46 RTH: Alright. That's pretty clear.

45:48 Pete: Yeah. So this, this seems like a, a, your, your copy, copy text of, um, "whoop meta attention. Whoop." [RTH types] That's it.

46:23 RTH: Okay. We good about that portion.

46:27 Pete: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Do, do we need to change the black text to, to capture that? Or...?

46:31 RTH: Yeah, we probably should. [he changes the black text]

46:49 Pete: Yeah. Right. So we, I haven't seen, (I have a tea to collect.)

46:58 RTH: Okay. Okay.

46:59 Pete: I'll be back in 30 seconds.

47:00 RTH: Take your time.

48:07 Speaker 3: <inaudible>

48:10 Pete: Ross. Thank you. I'm back.

48:12 RTH: No problem. I, I totally, you don't need to feel bad about it. I totally recognize the,

48:18 Pete: The need fatigue. [laughs]

48:20 RTH: Yeah. The need fatigue. But the, but, but the, the intensity, I guess, of this exercise. Yeah.

48:26 Pete: Yeah. It, it's, um, it's hard. It's hard. I also have nice chocolates as well, so I'm, uh, definitely well stocked there.

48:34 RTH: Yeah. That's good. Intensity isn't quite the word, but, but it's close to that. It's, it's an extended, an *extended intensity*, whatever that word is, there probably is one.

48:46 Pete: Yeah. Um,

48:50 RTH: But, but that's just the way it is. That's the, that is what makes... You have to do if, if you wanna be, if you want to do this thing, that's what you gotta do. And, uh, so about the, about the, at least one *whoop*, I, and this is a question, I understood that the whoop was actually a thought process. That there was something *almost said* about *whoop* in one of [Pete: Yes.] in one of the samples, or at least one of the samples.

49:25 Pete: At least one of the samples. I, well, I'd say at least two or three of the samples. Um, and, um,

49:32 RTH: And the question is, is, is it the case here? Is there a Whoop,

49:37 Pete: I think we just have to check the original transcript again, to be honest, I can't, I can't remember. Um,

49:45 RTH: [scrolls] Is this the right one? Yeah.

49:51 Pete: From what we just read, I definitely say whoop, but I'm not,

49:55 RTH: You used, you used the word "whoop," but it was, but it, but it was,

50:10 Pete: It was referring.... Okay. I, I, I don't think it would, sometimes... It's strange, cuz I'm using, I'm using whoop in two ways, and one is, or almost like to describe a sensation, like a, a, a *swoop*, I guess. The move, the movement. That's, yeah. Um,

50:35 RTH: Maybe we should call that a swoop. There's a swoop and a...

50:38 Pete: Yes, exactly. A swoop and a whoop. Yeah. Um, but I think sometimes there is a whoop, and it is a, it is a semi spoken,

50:47 RTH: Articulated, cognitively recognized.

50:47 Russ comments: They have distinguished between a *swoop* (a meta-experience of moving attention) and a *whoop* (a swoop *plus* a semi-articulated cognitive recognition of the swoop). The evidence is there in the transcript, but the recognition of the distinction comes from the green-meeting comparisons. (See a further distinction below at 1:09:10.)

50:51 Pete: Yeah. Something

50:53 RTH: Where,

50:53 Pete: Where there's this little leaning, we going *whooooo* into it. Um, but this, from reading back and, and semi from memory, I don't think there was the semi articulated whoop, I think it was a swoop. [laughs] This will drive us mad.

51:27 RTH: [types] So how does that grab you for the first portion?

51:31 Pete: Good.

51:39 RTH: And this is a pretty straightforward innerly seeing. [types]

51:47 Pete: Yeah, yeah.

51:56 RTH: Something like that.

51:58 Pete: Yeah.

Consideration of sample 6.2

52:05 RTH: Okay. Onward. [pause as they read 6.2][he goes back to 6.1 and types] I'm gonna write "two experiences here," but they're all two experiences, so that probably, I don't really need to write it. Two or more experiences.

52:37 Pete: Um, [pause] yeah. I, I, I think the black text is unimpeachable on this. [Russ types]

52:59 RTH: Okay. [pause; he types] So by "enjoying the sound," what I mean, there is some of your inner speaking is sort of content-oriented. I'm conveying something to myself. Yeah. I guess we've had one example of where you were instructing yourself, I forget what you were saying, the, the one word. [Pete: Right.] Right. You weren't, you weren't in, you weren't saying that for the so sonal [he probably means "aural"] qualities, is that a word for the sound qualities? You were saying that for the semantics. The

54:02 Pete: Motivational, yeah. Yeah.

54:05 RTH: But this is, this is *sensory*.

54:13 Pete: Yes. Yeah. I think you've put something like, for my own amusement. Then did you put that join the pleasant sound of [RTH types]

54:38 RTH: Happy with that portion?

54:41 Pete: Uh, yes. Yeah.

54:55 RTH: So what did we call this? "Clear and indistinct," something like that.

55:05 Pete: [RTH scrolls in the green document] Yeah. There. uh, well, what I did is it's not, it's not, the *not interested part* in this instance. Um, uh, because it, it was just the book cover, and I was, I wasn't sort of, there were no parts of it that my attention was not bothered about. Um,

55:46 RTH: So the word, the word *interested* probably should be *articulated*.

55:52 Pete: Yes.

55:54 RTH: *Not completely articulated.* That's really what I meant by *interested*, but *not articulated* is probably better.

56:03 Pete: Let, let me think what that would mean in the other case. [RTH scrolls to 7.4 and changes it there as well] I mean, that that is right.

56:10 RTH: Um, I think it's the case here too. The

56:12 Pete: Same experience. Uh, yeah. I, I think it just the case then too,

56:26 RTH: The point is that it's not blurry, but it's Yes. Not articulated either. It's not, it's not, it is not clearly seen. So your, [Pete: Yeah.] your seeings, when we get around to writing your seeings, your, your inner seeings can range from totally clear from your own perspective. Like, like you saw the podcast or the interviewee or whatever that guy was previous beep or two ranging to seeing nothing (Stephen King), [Pete: Yeah.] I, I experienced myself as seeing, but I don't see anything. [Pete: Yeah.] And, and everywhere along the way, I can, I can see the portions that I choose to articulate for whatever reason. I don't mean choose as an explicit decision, but

57:13 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

57:14 RTH: But the, the parts in which I, about which I'm interested, that's why *interested* works for me. The parts that I'm interested in seeing, I see clearly, and the parts that I'm not interested, I don't see clearly.

57:23 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

57:24 RTH: But it's not that those parts *aren't interesting*, that's the problem with the language, but the, it's just at this particular moment, I don't happen to articulate them for myself.

57:24 Russ comments: Here, Pete and Russ agree about the phenomenon but use the green-meeting interchange to refine the way of talking about that phenomenon.

57:33 Pete: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Um,

57:37 RTH: Which is a phenomenon that I think is not clearly understood and, but it, but interesting.

57:44 Pete: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Um, well, I, I'm happy with that second part as well.

57:50 RTH: Onward.

57:51 Pete: Yes.

Consideration of sample 6.3

[pause while they read]

58:29 RTH: So, first off, does this seem right to you?

58:32 Pete: Yes. Um, [pause] yeah, no, that's totally right. Um, I think, I think, uh, you, you said it was difficult to, for me to try. I think you understood this one better than I did, um, in a way.

58:56 RTH: I think I felt that at the time.

58:58 Pete: Yeah. But, but you, but you are totally right. But the, I was in parenting mode. I was not in specifically answering a specific question mode, even though that's what I was doing. Um, so yeah, so, so that, that first bit is, is good.

59:22 RTH: And, and that is, that is the kind of thing that I think is very interesting. I don't think it's fully understood by most of psychology or whatever [Pete: Mm-hmm.] that the words can come rolling out, which they are. [Pete: Yeah.] but, but you're not, you're not driving them. They're coming outta you.

59:22 Russ comments: "Word rolling out" is actually fairly common in DES samples. Sometimes I refer to such words as "gestural"—like a hand gesture while speaking: the speaker without question enacts the gesture, and the gesture is an informative and expressive act, but there is no direct apprehension of making or having made the gesture. The same kind of thing can happen with the words themselves.

59:43 Pete: Yeah. I think that's right. Um, yeah. It's, it's, it's actually quite strange having described that as a plain experience. It's actually quite, quite a weird experience. [laughs] Um,

1:00:17 RTH: So you're happy with this portion [highlights the green] for that paragraph?

1:00:19 Pete: Yes. Yeah. [pause while reading] So, so it seems to me that this was somewhere back in the kind of Stephen King territory there, um, seeing, without seeing,

1:00:42 RTH: Which is what I call *imageless seeing*.

1:00:45 Pete: Yeah. Um, but, but the, the only difference is there was a sense of agency and movement. I mean, I do wonder whether there's a touch of the, the, the *swoop* about it. Um, it, it actually, it, it feels like the, um, in terms of movement inside my head in which there's a sense of agency, it's a bit like the circle. Um, but the dancers on the screen creating a movement in my head, sense of agency and movement? Or...

1:01:32 RTH: So is your sense, [pause]

- 1:01:45 Pete: I suppose the difference with a, a swoop. A swoop feels like I am moving the, the circle and this scrolling. So, so the earlier circle with the dancers, [RTH: Right.] of this scrolling feel like I am, it's not me that's moving. I am creating movement. And that's where the agency comes in. I'm *doing* it.
- 1:02:18 RTH: So I guess, does this seem, does this movement seem like the same...? Let me, let me restate that question. The, the dancer movement: I took you to be saying on in the external world, I see the movement and, and *I am making* inner movement that superimposes or matches or reflects or whatever that out outside movement. [Pete: Yes.] There's an inner movement.
- 1:02:54 Pete: Yes.
- 1:02:56 RTH: Does 6.3, this present sample, have an inner movement that's something like that?
- 1:03:04 Pete: It has the scrolling. Um, it, it has the, the moving down a spectrum of shades of black, even though I'm not seeing, seeing that spectrum.
- 1:03:17 RTH: Um, so the movement *is* an important deal here. I guess I had, I had in my head for quite possibly in, in, in incorrectly, seen the movement as being sort of like scrolling. And in scrolling, people don't generally see the movement. They just see things going by.
- 1:03:39 Pete: It. It felt very clear to me that it was *downwards* movement, um, but not for me. Um, so it's not a swoop. Um, yeah, I, I guess what I was saying, that the movement was important. Um, I, I wouldn't change any of the black text. I think, um, it says, oh, I, this is an experience seeing without saying, of "my creating some sort of downward movement" that, that feels right to me. Um, and then I think it's important to capture that in, in the, in the green text, cuz yeah. The, the movement was at least 50% of this bit of the experience.
- 1:04:23 RTH: Okay. [types new green text] So how about, are we happy with this?
- 1:04:38 Pete: Yes. Yeah.
- 1:04:40 RTH: Onwards?
- 1:04:42 Pete: Yep. Yep.

Consideration of sample 6.4

- 1:05:13 RTH: [pause while reading] So is present in my fingers the same way as present my eyes and present in my ears?
- 1:05:18 Pete: This is no, because there is no *swoop*. Um, it's more, it's, it's what? Can, can I see that there was the one in, um, day 7 of, um, I, the iPad, [RTH scrolls] there was a little bit more like that, but, but maybe the iPad was more of a, uh, a closing of a window on... There! 7.5! [reads] "meta-attentional leaning, not shifting. Whoop."

Yeah. No, there was no leaning in the, um, headphones one. Um, yeah, I, I don't think this is, and, and just, um, I, I just felt very, so holding a, holding the, the headphone, uh, jack plug, is that right? Um,

1:06:26 RTH: Plug. Plug, I think.

1:06:27 Pete: Yeah. So I'm, I'm holding that, and that's where I just, I just feel like I am, really, in the, in the tips of my fingers.

1:06:37 RTH: So the, so I guess the question is: [pause] is there, it would be, if, if all you were doing was holding the click, holding the plug, if all you were doing was holding the plug, then I wouldn't have written it like this. [highlights the black] So I must not have thought that all you were doing was holding the plug.

1:07:13 Pete: No, it, it definitely wasn't. I wasn't just holding the plug. Um,

1:07:17 RTH: So this is like, there's some agency in your fingers. This is not a *Pete* agency, but a *finger* agency.

1:07:24 Pete: Yes. [pause] Yeah. I, I would not quibble with that description. Uh, but what, what, what it does not feel like, to me, it is not, it's not a matter of, there's no *swoop*. I don't *swoop* down to my fingers. This, this actually, so the misunderstanding we had over the *eye* one, when I'm looking at an email and you thought it was just me being present in my eyes, and actually I *swooped* into my eyes. This is the opposite. This is, this is, there is *no swoop*. I'm just present in my fingers.

1:08:10 RTH: So as, as abstracting out the swoop portion of it, is being present in your fingers, similar to being present in your eyes,

1:08:20 Pete: Um,

1:08:21 RTH: Which we would would've called meta-attention in your eyes,

1:08:29 Pete: Isn't, isn't the meta-attention, sorry, I don't wanna get stuck on lingo, but like, isn't, isn't the meta-attention the swoop as it were, that the fact that I'm consciously conscious of the movement, my attention **moving into** my eyes,

1:08:45 RTH: I don't think it's a, that

1:08:46 Pete: Being present for my eyes feels like the end destination. Um,

1:08:51 RTH: So from my point of view, the *meta* isn't about the *motion*. The meta is about the *attending to the attention* in this, in the one case, it happens to be moving. Yeah. And in another case, it doesn't happen to be moving. But those, those are both. [Pete: Okay.] The, the question is, are they, are they both meta-attentions?

1:09:10 Pete: In which case, sorry, to go round in circles on this. Yes. It probably is like the eyes, it just doesn't have a *swoop*. Okay.

- 1:09:10 Russ comments: We have now distinguished among three kinds of meta-attention: (1) Without-motion meta-attention (e.g. the present sample 6.4) where I am attending to my attention as it exists—here, I experience myself as being *in my fingers* as I hold the plug; (2) the *swoop*—meta-attention to the movement of attention; and (3) the *whoop*—the swoop plus a cognitive (and perhaps verbal) articulation (perhaps by saying “Whoop!”) along with the experience of the motion. We made the distinction between (2) and (3) at 50:47.
- 1:09:47 RTH: [write in green] Okay. And then the other portion is a *feeling*, I guess we would call this warm satisfaction.
- 1:10:06 Pete: Yeah.
- 1:10:12 RTH: Happy with that?
- 1:10:13 Pete: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.
- 1:11:34 RTH: [pause; RTH writes in green] And would this word here be better *realized* or *articulated*? What do you think?
- 1:11:34 Russ comments: The difficulty here is that there are two quite different meanings of *realized*. Webster’s definition **1a** (“to bring into concrete existence : **accomplish** [for example] finally *realized* her goal”) is a description of an action. Webster’s definition **3** (“to conceive vividly as real : be fully aware of [for example] did not *realize* the risk she was taking”) is a description of cognitive understanding.
- In the interchange here, RTH intended the 1a = action sense, but Pete heard the 3 = cognitive sense. That is not a failure of RTH nor a failure of Pete—it is a feature of the ambiguity of communication that they will have to disambiguate.
- Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Realize. In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary. Retrieved May 9, 2026, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/realize>
- 1:11:40 Pete: Um, I think, think *articulated*. It, it definitely matches the way we’re using *articulated* previously.
- 1:11:54 RTH: Those are pretty similar, but they have, they have of real.... I, I was using *realized* in the way that a painter would use *realize*, y’know?
- 1:12:05 Pete: Yeah. Yeah. Um,
- 1:12:10 RTH: Not, not *cognitively*, but *productively*.
- 1:12:17 Pete: Yeah. No, I think articulated is, is closer to the truth there. Um, the, the, the, the, the one thing I’d say this misses out actually, is that, is again, the, the slight sense of agency. I can remember that I was what best, um, dragging and dropping the names. Um, so I, I wasn’t just *seeing a list*. I was actually *playing with it*, as it were.
- 1:12:57 RTH: Maybe this way. [writes in green] You buying that?

1:13:10 Pete: Yes. And, and I'd actually say in the black text, so the last sentence of the black text, I think it's, it's not that they were ready to be moved to the pitch, it's more my experiences of seeing the players, um, *being moved* to the pitch. Not names in the bottom list being moved to the upper list.

1:13:30 RTH: So not *ready to be moved*.

1:13:32 Pete: They were *being moved*. So

1:13:34 RTH: Yeah. Being moved. [fixes green and black]

1:13:34 Pete: Moved, yeah. And then the, the matching change, uh, towards it. Yeah. That's it. Yeah. That's all

1:14:01 RTH: Good. So there, that's that portion of this is not in the green, which it probably should be. So the, the, the, you're what you *see* in terms of the visual characteristics of what you see are, uh, names. But what you *see experientially* are players

1:14:26 Pete: No, ma actually that now, so what I, what I *see* is names. What I *understand* is that by moving them, by dragging and dropping them, I'm introducing them to the pitch. Does that make sense? [RTH types] [pause] To the pitch? Not, not just dragging their names from, yeah, from the bottom list of the upper list. [approves what RTH has typed in green] Yeah. Yes. Yes.

1:15:57 RTH: Okay. Onward?

1:16:05 Pete: Yeah.

1:16:05 RTH: So it's now like 11:20 your time or something like that. Is that right?

1:16:08 Pete: It is, yes, it is.

1:16:10 RTH: We have energy to do another day.

1:16:12 Pete: Yeah. That, that would be good. And then we're sort of halfway through, aren't we.

1:16:16 RTH: Yeah, I think I need more caffeine, so I'm gonna get myself a Coke. Just a minute.

1:16:24 Pete: Okay, great.

1:16:45 RTH: [disappears to his refrigerator] The tea that I was drinking was too weak, so on to the real, real Coke!

1:16:56 Pete: [laughs] That's a spirit.

Considering sample 5.1

1:17:32 RTH: [pause as they read] So is this the same thing roughly as your fingers in the previous 6. whatever it is, my attention was in my fingers. [scrolls to 6.4] So the question is, is this like 6.4? Is 5.1 like 6.4?

1:18:04 Pete: I think it is, because I think it's like 7.5. Um, if that's the, iPad one. Yeah. So as we said, there's no swoop, but,

1:18:27 RTH: So if I copy that, we'll see what happens. So I'll copy that [copies the green from 6.4] and paste it at 5.1 and change it to pencil.

1:18:41 Pete: Yeah.

1:18:43 RTH: Does that seem right?

1:18:45 Pete: Yes.

1:18:50 RTH: That this is somehow

1:18:51 Pete: <crosstalk>. I remember the, the up and down my attention was going up and down with the, the rubbing of the, which, which seems a little bit like my attention leaning with my hand to close the window on my iPad. Is it is. They seem very,

1:19:09 RTH: So it's, so it's not that I have a stable attention that's watching my hand go up and down. It's that [Pete: No, no, no.] My attention is out there and the pencil going up and down.

1:19:17 Pete: Yes, yes.

1:19:18 RTH: Then this is, then this is Right meta attention in the pencil. Yeah. Maybe it's just attention in the pencil. [pause] So this is a feeling. [types green] You buying that?

1:19:56 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

1:20:03 RTH: And I, I guess I would comment just as sort of a meta comment along the way here, that, that this, this portion, this portion of the exercise is, is a fundamentally important deal as far as getting the experiences right, because [Pete: Yeah.] y'know, we did the best we could as we were doing it, but, but this allows us to have sort of a cross-perspective. It's sort of, it's sort of, i, I envision as being sort of like polishing rocks. The the rocks shine themselves up as they hit against each other in the tumbler. That, that [Pete: Yeah.] sort of the same thing is happening here. We're polishing our understanding one, what each, each rock, each sample, polishes the understanding of our understanding of the other samples.

1:20:57 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

Considering sample 5.2

1:21:04 RTH: Number 2. [pause to read] So this is an inner seeing of an external word.

1:21:35 Pete: Yeah. [RTH types in green] Yes. And then, and then it is a, yeah, meta-attention with swoop to ear.

1:22:40 RTH: You buying that?

1:22:42 Pete: And and then there's also this anticipation. We've, we've had anticipation before with the, again, with the iPad. Um, but I don't know whether we want to check on that.

1:23:08 RTH: So this is also a waxing and waning.

1:23:14 Pete: It is, yes. [RTH types in green] Yeah.

1:23:35 RTH: Are we good about that?

1:23:37 Pete: Yep.

1:23:48 RTH: So I'm, I'm gonna send you this document, by the way.

1:23:54 Pete: Thank you. So I'll, I'll go through this as well. Oh, by the way, Russ, I, I've had all sorts of, um, I haven't forgotten about the, the website. Um, I've looked at it very quickly and have some marks, but I'll, I'll look at it properly. Um, I just, I just had a dozen things on, um, last few days, but, um,

1:24:15 RTH: I think you'll find it interesting.

1:24:18 Pete: Um,

Considering sample 5.3

1:24:33 RTH: So this is inner speaking.

1:24:36 Pete: Yeah.

1:24:39 RTH: Repeated.

1:24:41 Pete: Yeah.

1:24:43 RTH: Fast, but experienced normal.

1:24:50 Pete: Yeah. [Russ types in green] This does make me think, so number 2, um, does make me think one, one thing that seemed important at the time was this, the placement of things in my head. So we talked about things being at the front of my head. This one I can really remember being top left, looked up, back. And I, I don't know whether it's just that we haven't being, um, we haven't had many of those experiences so far, or whether we haven't paid due attention to that.

1:25:59 RTH: Yeah, I think you're probably right. We just haven't paid attention. [types in green]

1:26:26 Pete: Yeah. That's, um,

1:26:42 RTH: So far the caption does *not convey* the redaction, which is sort of interesting.

1:26:54 Pete: Yeah. It's the first, it's, I think it's the only time... Black backgrounds come up a lot, or, or black edges come up quite a lot. The, this is the only one—*redaction* really was the word, because it felt like, I think we say superimposed it, right? So this, this does feel experientially different to a lot of my other seeings. Um,

1:27:24 RTH: So for whatever reason you wanted to see just a piece of this manifesto,

1:27:39 Pete: I don't know whether I, I, I, I, in truth, I can't answer that question. I don't know whether I just wanted to see a piece of it. Um, it's, it is all a little bit like, um, armchair, armchair psychiatrist, but I, I think if anything, I was, um, almost like leaning into the aesthetics of that world that a world of court documents that might be redacted. Um, does that make sense?

1:28:21 RTH: That makes sense, but it's not how I originally understood it. So you meant redaction in its literal sense. I understood you to be using redaction more or less metaphorically in the sense that it was covering up some stuff.

1:28:38 Pete: Oh, no, it it,

1:28:40 RTH: You meant redaction in the purposefully obliterating this aspect.

1:28:49 Pete: No, it, it wasn't, it wasn't purposefully. No, it wasn't. And there was, there was no sense of, sorry, I memory in hazy on this. I think, um, no, it just, it just felt more like a, um, is it a keyhole camera where... Anyway, it felt like a window. It felt in a way that, and it felt like a black border that was a window onto a thing. Um, and I don't think I was purposefully restricting the view I had of that thing. Um, it's just that in comparison to other images with black borders, black edges, this one felt, um, more like a thing that had been put on top of the image.

1:29:55 RTH: So is it the case that my experience is of seeing just a portion of what I want to see, as if I were looking through a keyhole and I can't see beyond the keyhole?

1:30:09 Pete: Yes. But without any, uh, there's no like attendant frustrat, it's not like I'm like, oh, I really wanted to see more of this. It's not that at all. It's like, it's like I'm seeing through a keyhole entirely neutrally. Like I'm just seeing what I'm seeing. But there's, there's the, but

1:30:25 RTH: It's not everything. *I'm seeing what I'm seeing, but it's not everything.*

1:30:29 Pete: Yes. Yes.

1:30:52 RTH: So as a, as a sort of an aside, this is an example of what I consider *skillful* inner seeing. [Pete: Okay.] And so re regular inner seeing, you've had an example or two, like I see Stephen King, or I see whatever. [Pete: Yeah.] That's sort of regular inner seeing, even though that's, let me, that's not the best example. Let's see whether there's a better example of inner seeing. [scrolls]

1:31:33 Pete: I maybe, maybe the

1:31:35 RTH: Yeah, the King, the King's twist. The King, King's twist [Pete: Yeah.] is, is sort of regular inner seeing. It's got a little, it's got a little bit of unusualness to it in the sense it is from an unusual perspective. Yeah. But, but this is sort of skillful. The, the current version 6, 5 point, whatever we're talking about is skillful in the sense that it plays around with the seeing to convey something beyond the thing seen.

1:32:04 Pete: Yes.

1:32:05 RTH: I'm, I am conveying to myself that I'm seeing just a portion of this stuff.

1:32:12 Pete: Yes.

1:32:13 RTH: And that's, that's what I call *skillful* inner seeing. It's, it's, uh, I don't, I don't have a better word than *skillful*. That's why, I guess why I'd call it *skillful*.

1:32:31 Pete: [laughs]

1:32:37 RTH: So this is what I would call, so this is not right word seman... [reads the green from 5.3] "words not semantically articulated" is not the right thing to say. What you're seeing is [types in the green] something like that.

1:33:16 Pete: Yeah, that's right, cuz the experience was not actually the words, the experience was of the window in a way, onto them. Yeah. Okay. [reads] Still included. Yeah. I'm, I'm down with that.

1:33:50 RTH: [types the green] How do you like that? [Pete: Yeah.] It's, it's as much about the occluding view, which makes it as much about the blackness [Pete: Yeah.] and the window as it is about the manifesto. So it's not, [Pete: Yeah.] not so much that I see the manifesto, it's that I see *the fact that I'm not actually seeing* the manifesto, or

1:34:16 Pete: Yes, I see the keyhole. Yeah.

1:34:26 RTH: Okay. So this is an example of the kind of thing that, that I, that I think (rightly or wrongly, and I'm not at all sure that I'm right about this), uh, but this kind of quibbling, I think is *somehow important*. That's the, it's the fundamental *Russ trying to get Pete's experience right* and *Pete trying to get Pete's experience right*.

1:34:47 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

- 1:34:48 RTH: And it, and it, that it, that *should be*, it seems to me, sort of the basis of science. [Pete: Mm-hmm.] This is, this is the fundamental of, of psychology or something like that.
- 1:35:03 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.
- 1:35:06 RTH: But nobody, nobody except me is doing it, basically.
- 1:35:11 Pete: Hmm. So, um, yeah. Okay. So it is a good example and a good lesson, this one I think because, um, yeah, it's easy to think, actually. Yes. I, it was, it was semantically not semantically articulated words, cuz in a way that was a portion of it, but no, no, that was not the experience, even though that was part of it. Um, yeah.
- 1:35:43 RTH: And I, and I truly don't, don't really know whether it's of value to try to get 'em right. But it *seems to me* that it's of value. [Pete: Yeah.] And, and, and that it's as much science as it is art. Uh, it is, it is poetry in its way. It is to, if you, if you buy poetry as somehow using words to convey the truth about [Pete: Yeah.] something, [Pete: Yeah.] that is sort of what we're trying to do here.
- 1:36:18 Pete: Yeah. Agreed.
- 1:36:18 Russ comments: It seems to me that the fundamental bit that is ascertainable with fidelity is Pete's experience at a particular moment. Everything else about Pete (his personality characteristics, his intellectual capability, his occupational achievement, his avocational interests, his blood pressure, his white blood cell count, etc.) is some sort of abstraction about Pete, some sort of normative comparison of Pete to a population, or the like, about which *fidelity* is not a concern. We can grasp Pete's at-a-moment experience with more or less (or not at all) fidelity, but his experience is *available* (to him, and to those that Pete allows) to be apprehended with fidelity. I think you cannot say that about his ego strength, or his IQ, or his writing ability, etc.
- 1:36:25 RTH: So have we, we haven't gotten to (3) yet. [referring to the third strand of sample 5.3]
- 1:36:30 Pete: No.
- 1:36:31 RTH: Number (3) is a bodily feeling, diffuse bodily feeling.
- 1:36:38 Pete: Yeah. Feeling. Yeah. I don't think we've had that before. Yeah.
- 1:36:54 RTH: Alright. Onwards?
- 1:36:56 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

Considering sample 5.4

- 1:37:11 RTH: So this is imageless seeing [Pete: Mm-hmm.] and inner seeing.

1:37:11 Russ comments: Seeing Steve move toward the microwave is an example of inner seeing that is *not* skillful in the sense that DES defines it. That is, Pete is *not* distorting his seeing, or overlooking aspects of his seeing, to convey something about his topic.

1:37:43 Pete: [pause as they review] Yeah. That, that all seems fine to me.

1:37:47 RTH: Good.

1:37:48 Pete: Relatively straightforward.

1:37:51 RTH: The it, for some reason, I'm reminded of the, what I call the, the sort of the quintessential, or the, there is a word that I can't remember what it is there for, for, uh, skillful seeing.

1:37:51 Russ comments: I think the word RTH wanted was "prototypical."

1:38:07 Pete: Yeah.

1:38:07 RTH: Came from a, a, a student, a female student who had an inner seeing of her roommate sitting on a, on the couch next to a boy. And the, and the girl is just wearing her bra and panties. And the bra and panties are clear and the, and the, and the roommate is clear, but the boy is *not clear*.

1:38:35 Pete: Ah.

1:38:36 RTH: And that's, that was a skillful way, *I thought*, of portraying this girl is promiscuous or, [Pete: Yeah.] or whatever with a lot of different boys. *So I'll make the boy not clear*.

1:38:50 Pete: The boy's generic. Yeah.

1:38:52 RTH: The, *the boy generic*. That's exactly right! I got a generic boy sitting next to a provocative roommate or something.

1:39:00 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

1:39:02 RTH: And that I take it to be a, a skillful way of communicating the [Pete: Yeah.] com, complexity of that, of that situation.

1:39:02 Russ comments: What makes that inner seeing skillful (in my view) is the nuanced degree of clarity of the seeing: the roommate in her bra and panties is clear—there is only one roommate with one kind of provocative attire. But the boy is generically unclear—there are lots of boys, and therefore the visual detail of the boy is not specified.

The boy is not presented as blurry—that would be a specific boy seen unclearly. The boy is presented as not articulated, not realized, not specified, not

particularized—any clarity of the boy would detract from this seeing. That is, to my mind, skillful.

1:39:14 Pete: Mm-hmm. Yeah. Yeah.

1:39:21 RTH: All right. Where are we? Are we at number 5?

1:39:23 Pete: 5.5. Yeah.

Considering sample 5.5

1:39:33 RTH: So this is I innerly see words.

1:39:55 Pete: Yep.

1:39:56 RTH: And this is gonna be a meta-attention, I think. Right?

1:40:03 Pete: Um,

1:40:04 RTH: In the sense that you sort of see the cone or sort of experienced the cone.

1:40:07 Pete: Yeah. We tagged, we tagged the previous cone as much attention, didn't we? And, and we definitely did the, um, trapezoid.

1:40:14 RTH: Yeah. But we didn't, we had another one that back down here that had a cone in it

1:40:20 Pete: [RTH scrolls] That was Elliot, I think it was seeing we type it on the screen. Uh, no, it's not, it's not that one. It's an Elliot one there. Can you go to control F for "Elliot" or Oh, "cone." Yeah. It's, it's, yeah. 5.2 was the cone.

1:40:59 RTH: 5.2 is what the one we're just doing. That's not just doing,

1:41:10 Pete: By the way, you've got the correct spelling of "Elliot," of, of all the like 17 variants. Um,

1:41:16 RTH: That's good!

1:41:17 Pete: That's our Elliot. So we looks,

1:41:28 RTH: It looks like I got 'em all.

1:41:30 Pete: Yeah. Yeah. We have. So yeah, so we, we, we, yeah. This is described as less retention, um,

1:41:45 RTH: And a straightforward seeing.

1:41:48 Pete: Yeah.

1:41:52 RTH: So this is a, this is a good example of a non-skillful what I, not that it's not skillful, but, but [Pete: I know what you mean.] an inner seeing that I would not call *skillful*.

1:42:02 Pete: Yeah. It, it's a straightforward image with nothing. Yeah. [RTH: Right.] Um,

1:42:12 RTH: Number 6?

1:42:13 Pete: Again, um, sorry, with this I we're not paying attention again to the, um, the fact that this was, I think, sort of fully occupied the full width of my front of my head. I don't know whether we need to, cuz I think most of the images are, I'm actually meaning the second paragraph, it's like a, rather than the first or, or full width. Yeah. Probably close to the....[Russ types] Yeah. We, we might need to go back and, um, if, if we are adding that in, we might need to add it into some of this. We've already done [pause]

1:43:33 RTH: [writes green] That good?

1:43:37 Pete: Yeah. Lovely. Yeah. Thi, this was the textbook example of meta-attention with, with *swoop*, but no *whoop*. I don't think there's more to add to that really.

1:44:17 RTH: Sorry?

1:44:19 Pete: I don't think there's more to add to that. Um,

1:44:26 RTH: Okay. Alright. That's day 5. So we've done three and we've got three to go.

1:44:30 Pete: Lovely.

1:44:31 RTH: Do we wanna call it, call it a day here? And

1:44:35 Pete: I might need to, it is, it is 10 to midnight here.

They compare calendars

1:46:45 Pete: Perfect.

1:46:46 RTH: And I, I do think there, there is some virtue in having the parts of the green meeting close together. [Pete: Yes.] Because we are trying to bank one sample against another. And the farther you get part the harder that is to do.

1:47:02 Pete: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Agreed.

1:47:04 RTH: And in the meantime, I'll send you what we've got, but I'll also send you the complete version when we're done. So you can either look at it or not look at it, whatever, but, uh, [Pete: Okay. Okay.] but I'll send it to you.

1:47:14 Pete: Yeah. Perfect.

1:47:19 RTH: So you, you, do you find this aspect of it interesting or is this just like work? Or, I,

1:47:23 Pete: I, I actually, I'm finding this, this session, I'm finding it very rewarding. Um, yeah. It's hard to describe. It's tying it all together. Um, and uh, I think seeing, seeing them all as well in conjunction with each other, um, you see the purpose more, um, everything's less isolated and I can, I can sort of see why this is....

1:47:46 RTH: You could see patterns. It's, it's, yeah,

1:47:48 Pete: Exactly. Exactly.

1:47:49 RTH: Easier to see patterns.

1:47:50 Pete: Yeah. Um, so I think this is possibly the most rewarding session so far. Um, and that's not a backhanded compliment to the other sessions. I just, I've just enjoyed this one. I've really enjoyed it.

1:48:03 RTH: Well, good. Alright. So Friday at, uh, is gonna be Pete Green 2. And I will send you a, well, I'll send you shortly the calendar invite.

1:48:18 Pete: Lovely. Thank you so much, Russ.

1:48:21 RTH: Have a good evening, what's left of it.

1:48:23 Pete: Enjoy the rest of your day. Bye.

1:48:24 RTH: See you.