

Pete
Pete Interview 9
Green meeting (part 2 of 2)

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the May 8 green meeting (part 2) with Peter Hoskin that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/4HKFH-pf8EY>. 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: Okay, we're recording

0:04 RTH: And we are going to share my screen, and we're on day 4.

0:10 Pete: Yeah.

0:15 RTH: Which I think I want to share a portion of my screen.

0:30 Pete: Uh, I'm seeing a, I'm seeing a folder at the moment. Um, yeah, now I'm seeing the doc. There we go. Lovely.

0:38 RTH: Okay, so we're on day 4. We're finished day 7, 6, and 5. We're gonna do 4.

0:44 Pete: Yeah. Okay. Right.

Considering sample 4.1

[pause as they read]

1:01 RTH: So this first portion is an imageless seeing.

1:05 Pete: Yeah. That's straightforward. [pause] And it,

1:26 RTH: Go ahead.

1:28 Pete: I, I just about to, I, I, I wonder then if the, the, the second portion is of, is the meta-attention.

1:33 RTH: That's what I would say.

1:35 Pete: Yeah. With, with *whoop*. Yeah. I, I don't think, I think it was "Woood," but, but uh, but it's the same, it's the same, same, same deal.

1:51 RTH: Same [inaudible] deal.

1:52 Pete: Yeah.

1:52 RTH: I agree with that. And this is a waxing and waning.

1:59 Pete: Yes. It was the, uh, archetypal one.

2:08 RTH: That seems pretty straightforward.

2:10 Pete: Yeah.

2:11 RTH: We good about number 1?

2:13 Pete: We are, yeah. You're, right now we've built up the lexicon and it's, um a lot more straightforward.

Considering sample 4.2

2:36 RTH: Right. [pause] So this, I took to be a clear innerly seeing

2:39 Pete: Yes, it was,

2:48 RTH: Which I thought was sort of remarkable in the speed of its vibration.

2:54 Pete: Yeah. And it was like a, yeah shaking hand. I, I can weirdly, I can remember the inner seeing, um, very well actually, but I can't remember what, what, what caused it. I feel there was something, I mean, if we went back to the notes, I'm sure it would, it'd be there. Um, but I guess the context doesn't matter. But I can't remember at all while I, why I was thinking that.

3:14 RTH: I don't remember that either.

3:17 Pete: Um,

3:20 RTH: And then this portion is, well, first off, this shouldn't have been there. [corrects the black] That should have been here. And this portion was a seeing that was registering, but not explicit. Something that was explicit. Explicit but *not* cognitive.

3:53 Pete: Yes. Um, [pause] yeah, I think I, I think I may have described this at the time as almost like checking items off. [RTH: Right.] Um,

4:18 RTH: But not sequential.

4:21 Pete: No. Yeah. That's the bit you put the this and this and this, this of the seeing. I, I remember that. Um, what, what, what do you mean by, so you say this is not a cognitive or analytical noting, but rather specifying perceptual interest. What, what does that mean? That last bit?

4:52 RTH: What I was intending to convey by that was that I'm, I'm seeing this one and then I'm seeing that one, (but with no then involved). I'm seeing this one and this one and this one. Okay. But there was no analytical portion. It's not like I'm seeing this one because it's red and that one because it has a front porch on. Oh, yes,

5:09 Pete: Yes, yes. Yeah. No, it *very much* wasn't that. It was not, yeah.

5:13 RTH: So this is a perceptual, what I call it, a perceptual interest rather than a *conceptual*.

5:19 Pete: Okay, okay. Yeah. Yeah, yeah. That makes sense.

5:26 RTH: So are we in agreement with both the blackness and the greenness?

5:29 Pete: Yes. Yes, we are. Right. I can, uh, Russ, I can just hear my wife coming in the door. [RTH: Okay.] Um, so what I might do is if I hang up, it doesn't cancel the meeting, does it? I can still hop on.

5:29 Russ comments: Pete leaves the meeting and re-enters from a different computer. We do not display that time period.

Considering sample 4.3

5:44 RTH: Well, and can you see 4.3?

5:49 Pete: Uh, yes. Two strands. Right?

6:03 RTH: So this is gonna be imageless seeing again.

6:06 Pete: Yep.

6:30 RTH: And then I don't know that we've got anything better to say than there's some sense of kinship.

6:36 Pete: Yeah. Um, so [inaudible] minor that, um, popular. So Sega, SEGA games, S-E-G-A.

6:49 RTH: I should have known that.

6:50 Pete: And then, and then the *post hoc* explanation, I'm not sure. That was quite how, it's not how I remember it, at least. Like, I remember it more as like a rush of, um, some form of images. Um, or some, some form of feelings like, um, the, the, that did feel a bit more sort of at the moment of the beep.

RTH launches the transcript of interview 4 and scrolls through sample 4.3, and highlights some phrases.

7:45 Pete: Yeah. This was such a timeline. Um, a rush of memory, rush of things that I can't really discern.[pause] I suppose, suppose, I suppose though, in your clarifying remark, which I agree with, you said there's two tracks. And maybe one, maybe I'm overthinking the kind of Sega consoles and stuff. But here you've boiled it on, on the day you boiled it down to *kinship*, *broadly defined*, and I say yes. Um,

8:34 RTH: So the question.. Kin, kinship seems...

8:36 Pete: How did I experience it? Yeah,

8:38 RTH: Yeah. Kinship. A sense of kinship, which is what I said here, and then I wrote, [Pete: Yeah.] seems sort of like a *static* thing, [Pete: Yeah.] whereas *rush* seems like it has a kineticness to it.

8:52 Pete: Yeah. So I say "rush of memory," um,

9:01 RTH: And *rush* was the word that you used again 10 minutes ago or five minutes ago or whatever, when you said, [Pete: Yeah] I remember it. So rush. There's probably something *rushy* about this experience, which is *not* conveyed here and *not* conveyed here.

9:22 Pete: Yeah, I think so. I think it was a sense of kinship, um, that was, that *came from* a rush of almost like memories that I can't really pin, I couldn't really pin down. Um, so, so, you know, when, um, there was one the other day where I, I had a warm fuzzy feeling about, um, old tech, repairing old tech. [He refers to sample 6.4] [RTH: Right.] Um, and, and I had, there were like a few colleagues, it was like collage-y, and I can remember saying, um, that there were like three images that I could really pick out.

10:09 RTH: Oh. But maybe there were 20.

10:10 Pete: It felt like there were, yeah, maybe, but yeah, exactly. Not even *maybe*! I'm like pretty certain there were 20. I just couldn't, I wasn't paying attention to them all. Um, I, I think this one felt like a similar, not a collage, but a *rush* of what felt like memories, like moving image things. But it was so quick. I, it felt like there were a hundred, and if I, I could, I could really only pick out one, which was a sense of a Sega console. Um, I mean, this is why I found it hard to describe at the time, but, but what I felt from it was the experience of it was more this sense of kinship. Um, but it was sort of built, it was rooted in this rush of memories that, y'know, I guess in my

head there were sort of shared memories, the sort of memories that he and I might have had together. Um, yeah.

11:26 RTH: [he corrects the black text] So does this, the black, seem right now?

11:31 Pete: [reads] "Rush of a hundred [inaudible]" Yeah! That's, that's spot on.

11:35 RTH: Okay. And so this, [types in the green] then the green should be something like a rush.

11:55 Pete: Yes.

11:56 RTH: Maybe it's, maybe it's more shared than kinship. A rush of shared memories, which is what I *wrote* here.

12:06 Pete: No, I think it was *kinship* or something [inaudible] like it. Um, I remember struggling on the, I, I think I used the word *timeline*, um, on the day, which wasn't quite right. But I think I was trying to convey, um, that he and I might have had similar timelines. [RTH: Right.] Um, I, I think that's exactly what's inside, but it, I think he could have been that he eventually was born in the same year or something like that, or, um,

12:31 RTH: And it did the same and did the same things that that was not limited just to Sega games, but, but whatever the [Pete: Yeah.] politic political situation or the gasoline price situation or whatever the...

12:45 Pete: Yeah. Or just like nuclear family, you know, that kind of stuff is what it all, um, similar toys, that kind of thing. [RTH: Right.] Um, but yeah, but the, the, the feeling I felt was a kind of like, *oh, it is like me* was the overriding thing. So I don't think kinship is the worst word. In fact, it might be the best.

13:19 RTH: [types in the green]How do you like that? That

13:20 Pete: Might be even better.

13:26 RTH: Okay. Then are we good about that?

13:35 Pete: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

13:35 RTH: And apparently we only had three, three samples on day 4. So

13:41 Pete: Oh!

13:42 RTH: On to day 2, er 3? On to day 3? [Pete: Yeah.] [they read]

Considering sample 3.1

14:20 Pete: Inner speaking. And I wonder if, again, this is a meta-attention, fingertip sensation, sense of speed rush.

14:50 RTH: [pause] So more important than the inner speaking is the sensation of scrolling.
[Pete: Yes.]

15:40 Pete: [pause while RTH writes green] Yeah. I think that's a good way of looking at it.

15:47 RTH: So it is, it, it is related, it seems to the meta stuff [Pete: Yeah.] where you're paying attention to how you're paying attention to things. But here you're actually speaking it.

15:58 Pete: Yeah. Um, yeah. I, I think that's, that's right.

16:13 RTH: Okay. We, we good about number 1? [Pete: Yeah. Good. We're good.]

Considering sample 3.2

16:15 Pete: [pause, reads, RTH writes green] Okay. I think that's the first time we've had that. Um, and then *inner wordless speaking*, I'm sorry, I forget. Image *imageless seeing* seems to be

16:59 RTH: So wordless speaking and an imageless seeing is sort of the same thing with different modalities.

17:04 Pete: Yeah. I don't know if it makes a difference, but this imageless seeing did seems to be more complicated than my usual, um, or, or complex even in that, um,... So normally the image I'm seeing would be image I'm seeing or a picture of Stephen King. Um, whereas this was a weirdly holistic sense of an entire shop. I don't know whether that's... So where, where, where there to be pictures, it would be an overlap of the outside, the inside, different angles. Um, just the sense of it as a whole. [RTH writes in green] Yes.

18:12 RTH: So what that does is that makes the point that imageless is not just a *reduced* kind of seeing, it's not just a *hint of a* seeing. [Pete: Yes.] It's a, it's a full-on complexly articulated experience of seeing, except that I don't see what a, what I'm seeing.

18:30 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

18:33 RTH: Okay.

18:34 Pete: This, this one, the shop felt to me like one of my richest experiences, if that makes sense, uh, in this whole process.

18:43 RTH: Um, so maybe instead of *complexly* detailed, I should say *richly* detailed. Yeah.

18:47 Pete: May, maybe actually *richly*. Yeah.

19:01 RTH: Fair enough. Onward?

Considering sample 3.4

- 19:19 Pete: [pause to read; RTH starts to write] Yeah. So you've got inner speaking quite straightforward. Um,
- 19:31 RTH: But it, I what I, we could say about the inner speaking that it's a complete sentence...
- 19:37 Pete: Yeah.
- 19:44 RTH: ...and it's fully articulated.
- 19:46 Pete: Yeah.
- 19:52 RTH: So when we want to tell the story of inner speaking, we're gonna wanna say *Pete is capable of having a full-on inner innerly spoken sentence*. Yeah. Un unlike the one word kind of thing. Like "Right" and "Scroll. Scroll" and [Pete: Yeah.] and wordless speaking, and....
- 20:14 Pete: I would also say, I think, um, I think this one as well, I, I can't remember entirely, but where some might seem like it's two minutes worth of speaking compressed into a hundredth of a second. This one felt almost like, like I was just saying, "he does in paragraphs what others have struggled to do in books." I mean, obviously it was quicker than that, but it didn't, it didn't feel too far off. Absolutely normal.
- 20:50 RTH: [writes in green] Something like that?
- 20:52 Pete: Yeah.
- 21:02 RTH: All right. That's that paragraph then. This paragraph.
- 21:06 Pete: Yeah. I mean, I, I don't know specifically the lingo you want to use, but *cognitive examination* seems like quite spot on. It felt like, uh, very deliberate thing, which I, I didn't get around to it cuz I think the beep actually intervened in a way, but, um, I was gearing up to list book titles in my head and have a think about they're any good.
- 22:01 RTH: So *cognitive examination* seems pretty good to me. I think I generally call it... I don't remember what I generally call it, *cognitive recognition*, maybe something like that. But the, the, the distinction is: this is less than what I would call unsymbolized thinking. It's not like I have a fully, uh, articulated thought, even though there's no words involved.
- 22:28 Pete: Yeah.
- 22:29 RTH: It's the beginning of that. So *cognitive examination* is close enough for me. [they read] So this is a waxing and waning.

22:46 Pete: Yeah.

22:57 RTH: Okay. Good for number 3?

22:59 Pete: Yep.

Considering sample 3.4

23:15 RTH: So this was an inner seeing.

23:18 Pete: Yeah.

23:25 RTH: But I don't, I don't remember what, what this means. [highlights part of black] Does it mean we, you saw yourself from the side?

23:34 Pete: I, I, I don't remember that. Um,

23:37 RTH: So let's see whether we

23:38 Pete: Can one small point of order while we, his 2-year-old *son*, um, not *daughter*, uh, on the,

23:58 RTH: So let's see whether we can figure out. [RTH launches the transcript for interview 3 and scrolls to sample 3.4]

24:03 Pete: That's 3.4. Oh, I see.

24:22 RTH: So it's more hitting the roll, it's more the rolling pin action.

24:28 Pete: Yeah.

24:28 RTH: From your, *from your perspective*.

24:31 Pete: Yes. Yeah. I can kind of remember it now. It is almost, *collage* isn't quite right, but it was a, a, a non-sequential sequence of images, if that makes sense, um, to do with smashing this chicken and to make it interesting it all.

24:56 RTH: So this was like, this was a first-person perspective is what it was.

25:00 Pete: Yes. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. And then I guess the, and experiencing color and motion, is it seeing myself actually, it's just the sense that it was a, a moving image, wasn't it, rather than stills. [RTH writes in green] Yeah.

25:43 RTH: So do we fix the black?

25:47 Pete: Uh,

25:50 RTH: My hand holding the rolling pin pounding a chicken breast? So I guess we don't need this again. [edits the black]

25:58 Pete: Yeah. I, I think the rest is quite good now, now I've reminded myself what it meant. Um,

26:13 RTH: This is really "myself." [edits the black] So first-person perspective, innerly see myself mostly my hand holding the rolling pin, pounding a chicken breast...

26:38 Pete: Yeah.

26:40 RTH: ...as if I see myself actually doing that, [Pete: Yeah.] Seems pretty accurate.

26:45 Pete: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

26:52 RTH: And this is an innerly saying, *you're* innerly saying "Cat" in your son's voice.

26:58 Pete: Yeah. Yeah. But I think, I remember we had the discussion, I dunno if it's relevant of, um, whether it was I was hearing my son's voice or I was speaking my son's voice. I, whether it was an impression or a, and I think, I think it's that stuff, i in between those in a way. Um, I, I think I was doing an impression sort of for my own amusement, cuz the way he says "cat" is, um, is sweet and funny. Um, but I, I also think it was, yeah, it was, it was not my voice, so it was something slightly more than an impression in a way. (Um, I, I spot the confusion. Aubrey is also a girl's name, but it is also a boy's name, so [inaudible])

28:01 RTH: That's, that's, that's where I went wrong. But, uh, so I take this description as being *I am speaking, but I'm also hearing*.

28:39 Pete: I think in a way I just couldn't distinguish between whether it was my, I couldn't distinguish between whether it was my son's voice or whether it was my impression of my son, but it sounded so close to my son's voice that it would've had to have been a very, very good impression. Um, maybe it doesn't matter, but also maybe it does. Um,

29:17 RTH: So what I've, what I've got out of this is basically the experience is *of my son's voice*. Yeah. Whether it's exactly the same or whether I've, I've exaggerated or whatever to jokingly, ironically. But I don't, I don't think that's a distinction that we can probably make.

29:41 Pete: Yeah.

29:41 RTH: And whether it's more heard or spoken, I think we probably weren't in a good position to be able to make that distinction yet. *Somewhere between heard and spoken*,

29:57 Pete: I think. I think, yeah. I mean, I'd love to say it was 50—50, but I, I can't remember. I can't remember. It was, it was definitely both, um, that I can remember.

30:11 RTH: Okay. So this [types in green] is going to be *speaking in* my son's voice and *hearing of* my son's voice.

30:31 Pete: Yeah.

31:01 RTH: So how does that grab you? Um, yeah. Can't, that's, need that, so you're creating this, this spoken "cat"? I don't think there's much doubt about that. [Pete: Yeah.] It's *not* like, [Pete: Yeah.] I'm just remembering; it's not, I'm just remembering that my son calls him "Cat." It's that I am reproducing in my son's voice somehow. [Pete: Yeah.] "Cat."

31:31 Pete: Yeah. Um, yeah, exactly that.

31:36 RTH: In a friendly manner.

31:41 Pete: Yeah. I, I think, I think that sense of it, like the best way I can describe it was like *for my own amusement*, um,

31:51 RTH: That's what meant *appre appreciated*. [Pete: Yeah.]

31:53 Pete: Yeah.

31:56 RTH: But *for my own amusement* is a little bit more

32:10 Pete: Yeah. If, if I'm putting for my own amusement, I get rid of joking because, um, they're similar, but the second one is actually more accurate, I think. [RTH writes green]Yeah.

32:26 RTH: Okay. And this is something like waxing and waning, but faster,...

32:34 Pete: Yeah.

32:34 RTH: ...is how I understood it.

32:37 Pete: Yeah. I literally physically turned and saw nickel as the beep went off. That was the, yeah.

32:58 RTH: Joe, we good about number 4?

Considering sample 3.5

33:00 Pete: Yep. Lots of AI books in this. You can tell what I was reading at that time.

33:10 RTH: That's a lot of people reading AI books at the time, [Pete: Yeah, that's true.] moment in the history of the world.

33:28 Pete: So this, this is in a, seeing you had a good phrase for sort of *semantically*, um, *unrealized* or something like that the other day that might apply there, I guess. [RTH writes in green] Yeah. Yeah.

34:41 RTH: So my impression is that you're making color blocks.

34:45 Pete: Yeah.

34:45 RTH: And you understand in some way that those color blocks represent something about the reinforcement learning,...

34:53 Pete: Yeah.

34:56 RTH: ...but not a direct semantic representation of that.

35:02 Pete: Yeah. Yeah. That's right.

35:17 RTH: And including blackness that goes to the end of the visual field.

35:28 Pete: Yeah. [RTH edits the green]Yeah.

36:33 RTH: You're actually seeing a flow shot, flow, flow *chart*.

36:37 Pete: Yeah.

36:44 RTH: That seems pretty good to me.

36:46 Pete: Yeah, I agree. I agree.

Considering sample 3.6

37:00 Pete: I mean, this seems just like, it's fairly straightforward inner seeing,

37:17 RTH: So there's nothing around Kurtzweil, unlike here where the blackness goes to the edge?

37:27 Pete: No, this was definitely not cinemascope, so to speak. It was, um, quite contained.

37:56 RTH: [pause] So this is an inner seeing that illustrates what you've read. [Pete: Yeah.] The reading... I'm gathering that the reading itself is not particularly present to you. What is present to you is your illustration.

38:38 Pete: Yeah, I think, I think I've retreated into my head a little bit, um, I mean, I may even have slightly paused the reading, but yeah, this was not an experience of the words on the page in front of me.

39:06 RTH: We good?

39:08 Pete: Yep.

39:09 RTH: On to day 2? [Pete: Yep.]

Considering sample 2.1

39:12 Pete: [pause to read] Yeah. Okay. So it's an inner seeing. We're talking before about visual field, this is [inaudible] vision off to the, the top left. [RTH types in green] I, I think there's also that sense of, um, *semantically unrealized* or or whatever phrase we're using. I knew the article, but I couldn't see any words. [RTH types in green] Yeah. That all seems fair to me.

42:07 RTH: Which in its way is something like meta-experience. You have produced a picture, and now you're trying to decide is that the right picture? Did I, did I make that right?

42:18 Pete: Yeah?! I think that true!

42:20 RTH: Sort of in the self-analytic

42:24 Pete: Yeah. It's attending to the attention. Yeah.

42:47 RTH: Like I think, I think I think it's more usual that if somebody has made an image which is not right, they just fix it.

42:56 Pete: Okay.

42:57 RTH: That would, and that's actually a pretty common when people are reading. When people are reading in reading a story or reading something, and they make a picture that illustrates the story. And then the story provides a detail that was, y'know, I, my picture had myself walking on a beach, but it turns out I wasn't really walking on a beach, I was walking in a desert. And so then I adjust the picture to make a desert rather than a beach. And

42:57 Russ comments: That kind of correction is very common while reading, and there is usually no recognition that it occurs. The experience is of seeing an illustration of what I'm reading; and then seeing an illustration of what I'm reading; and then continuing to see an illustration of what I'm reading. As I read, I update the picture as new details are revealed, but I generally have to recognition that that update has taken place (unless a beep happens to catch it in flight).

43:22 Pete: That, that seems really weird to me. I don't think I really do that. Um, I do, I do wonder then if, if we're saying that this is in the ballpark of meta, but I wonder if the two previous, whether they were on 2.1, so it must have been 3.5 or 3.6. [RTH scrolls to 3.5] I wonder if that's similar because both of them, I sort of had knew that, *oh, this is wrong*. So, so my, my mind's giving me an image to illustrate reinforcement learning, but at the same time as per the penultimate bracketed sentence, um, I knew it was like a bad, bad image for reinforcement learning. And then in the, the next one as well, I somehow understand that this is not a correct or

recent photo. So my mind serves me up, Ray Kurzweil, and I'm like, *nah, that's not him*. And neither of them do I correct it. I just sort of *notice it*, really. [RTH updates the green of 3.5 and 3.6]

43:22 Russ comments: This is an example of how the green meeting conversations, and the green captions themselves, and alive, interwoven attempts to characterize each sample, iteratively profiting from the prior *and subsequent* discussions of other samples.

45:21 RTH: Like that

45:27 Pete: 2.2.

45:34 RTH: So we happy with the adjustments of 3.5 and 3.6.

45:37 Pete: Yes. Yeah. Yeah. Very much so.

45:51 RTH: And then I think we're done with 2.1. [Pete: Yeah.]

Considering sample 2.2

45:56 Pete: [pause to read] And I felt, I feel that's a fairly straightforward one. Again, it's in the top left of, or [inaudible] in the left of the visual field, but otherwise it seems like you're sort of straightforward inner seeing. [RTH types green] Alright. Yep.

Considering sample 2.3

47:08 RTH: [they read] So this is a feeling.

47:10 Pete: Yeah.

47:14 RTH: Diffusely bodily.

47:17 Pete: Yeah.

47:28 RTH: And we've also had one other that was in the sort of the parenting model.

47:34 Pete: Yeah. We did. I think this is similar, like sort of like attending to my son, right. Um, with a large part of the experience. It was experience

48:05 RTH: [Writes green] Like that?

48:06 Pete: Yeah. Yeah. I think that's right.

Considering sample 2.4

48:47 Pete: [pause to read] [RTH write in green]Okay. Yes. That just about to say message experience, cone. I mean, no, no, no *swoop* or *whoop* like we were looking at the other day.

49:21 RTH: So what, what are you, what are you cone-shaped into in this? What?

49:26 Pete: Um, so I'm watching a replay from a game. I, I mean, I forget the exact thing I was focusing on, but there was something I was focusing on, um, maybe the ball or something. Um,

49:49 RTH: Right. And is the experience more of the cone-shaped region or more of the game? I guess we gotta go and look at that.

49:58 Pete: Um, more of the cone shape. [RTH launches the transcript from interview 2]

50:47 RTH: [they read] So you're apparently playing some kind of a game, game with other players elsewhere.

50:52 Pete: Yeah. So, so yeah, it's an online game. Um, so I'm playing against the real person.

51:00 RTH: But we've exaggerated how much you're into the cone.

51:08 Pete: Sorry. Do, do, wait! Do you mean we've *wrongly* exaggerated or you mean we've

51:08 Russ comments: This is a good example of the collaborative nature of the green meeting. RTH's "exaggerated" is a bad choice of word, which offends Pete's understanding of the phenomenon, and together they repair the offending "exaggerated" to become "emphasized."

51:13 RTH: No, I didn't mean *wrongly*. I mean, we just *emphasized* it.

51:17 Pete: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

51:19 RTH: That it was about the cone. I was answering my own question. Was this more about the cone game and it's

51:24 Pete: More about the I would definitely more about that. Yeah.

51:25 RTH: More about the cone.

51:25 Pete: I mean, I think I'd probably say more about the cone further down, cuz we don't actually say cone there, but I have a feeling this might be the first time the cone came up.

51:35 RTH: Right. I think you're right. Alright.

51:35 Russ comments: This gives a glimpse into the iterative procedure. In the original sampling day 2 (34:50), Pete describes the *cone* aspect of his experience, but we

don't really know what to make of it. It is only later that we can develop the meta-experience significance of the cone.

- 51:56 Pete: No whoop or swoop, because I think we were distinguishing between those— *whoop* is the sort of inner speaking and the *swoop* is the, um, [RTH: Motion.] moving around. Yeah. Um,
- 52:15 RTH: And I just *see* the screen.
- 52:18 Pete: Yeah. Yeah. [pause] So it's feeling, but not diffusely bo it's very similar to 2.3, but not diffusely bodily. It's just,
- 52:53 RTH: So this to me [highlights black] is ambiguous in the sense of it's not, this does *not* say I am annoying the other player, in which case this would be feeling mental.
- 53:10 Pete: Yeah.
- 53:11 RTH: This says I'm *analyzing* this situation to determine whether I'm feeling, whether, whether he was feeling
- 53:23 Pete: The way I, the way I would say it is I was *wondering* whether I was annoying the other player. Yeah. It definitely wasn't me thinking *I am annoying* the other player.
- 53:31 RTH: And it's *not*, you are feeling annoyed and it's not, and it, and it is not your feeling even vicariously annoyed.
- 53:40 Pete: No.
- 53:40 RTH: So this word feeling is really not true. This is *not* a feeling in my lingo. This is not a feeling. This is a *wondering*.
- 53:49 Pete: Okay. Okay. A wondering. Yeah. Yeah. That, that, that seems more accurate to me anyway.
- 54:02 RTH: And that, this without, if, if it weren't for the 10%, this is what sounds like an unsymbolized thinking. This kinda wondering, am I, yeah. *Am I annoying that other guy?* That's, that is an uns symbolized thinking if it takes place without any words. So Unsymbolized thinking question mark question mark?
- 54:27 Pete: Okay. Yeah. Why the question marks? Sorry, Russ.
- 54:48 RTH: I think primarily because it's only 10%.
- 54:51 Pete: Okay. Okay.
- 54:53 RTH: The,
- 54:56 Pete: So you don't wanna put too much weight on it. [RTH: Right.] Okay.

55:01 RTH: If, if, if the whole experience were, was just this, [Pete: Yeah.] then I would, there wouldn't be any question marks.

55:12 Pete: Yeah. Okay.

55:13 RTH: But when it's the third, third thing down, then I, I would not, I would not want to have to go to bat and say, *Pete had an unsymbolized thinking in sample number 2.4.* [Pete: Yeah.] I'd wanna say, well, *maybe* he did. *Could be.* [Pete: Yeah.] Probably did, maybe did whatever. But I don't, I don't think there's any hard-and-fast rule about that. It's, it's just that [Pete: Yeah.] I'm, it would, it would be hard for me to, to, to go to bat for un symbolized thinking about this sample. That's all those simple.

55:58 Pete: Okay. Okay. Well, I won't, I won't make you go to bat for it!

56:02 RTH: Okay, good! And, and the going to bat for is actually quite a bit of, a bit of the, of the work that I do. It's that how mu how mu how much can I go to, *how much am I willing to go to bat that this is what Pete's experience was like.*

56:22 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

56:23 RTH: And you'll have

56:24 Pete: <inaudible> and weight things as well. So.

56:26 RTH: Yeah. And the answer is, I'm, I'm, I'm willing to go to bat that that meta-experience is an important thing for Pete.

56:34 Pete: Yeah.

56:34 RTH: And I, and, and that seems to arise in a, in a variety of different ways. Sometimes it's explicitly this cone thing and sometimes it seems like an analytic kind of thing. And, and, and the farther we get away from the center of the target, the less I'm gonna be sure about whether we should call this meta-awareness. Like the, when we went, just went back and put meta-awareness of those last two and sample 4.5 and 6 or whatever they were.

56:59 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

57:00 RTH: Maybe they were, maybe they weren't. They, they weren't. I would think I put a question mark on them in experience there.

57:07 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

57:16 RTH: And, and I would say a lot of the green meeting is basically, uh, a honing of how much we're willing to go to bat about. [Pete: Yeah.] About, about what are we willing to go to bat, that this is the characteristic of Pete's experience? [Pete: Yeah.] That's what we're trying to decide here.

57:16 Russ comments: DES descriptions are worth reading (or otherwise considering) only to the extent that the reader trusts us, and that trust is earned by being honest about what we would and would not go to bat about.

57:35 Pete: Yeah. I mean, we're literally drawing out what to emphasize, aren't we? So,

Considering sample 2.5

57:39 RTH: Right. Yep. So this is an inner seeing of what my eyes are actually seeing.

58:08 Pete: Yes.

58:15 RTH: Which is interesting. [types in green] And also, this is another inner seeing. [Pete: Uh uh. (ambiguous)] [pause] I take that back. That might not be, be right. [pause] So maybe it *was* right. Maybe it wasn't. So you're seeing two players bumping into each other.

59:44 Pete: Yeah.

59:45 RTH: And you understand those as being Sam and Bill, or whatever.

59:51 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

59:57 RTH: But, but the Sam-ness and the Bill-ness is not important.

1:00:03 Pete: Yes. Um,

1:00:11 RTH: And so the question is,

1:00:12 Pete: I think, I think, I think it's Sam,... Yeah. The Sam-ness and the Bill-ness does not present itself to me. Um, it's, it "looks like" if I conjured up an image of you, Russ, but if I were then to actually look at that, I, I know it to be you, it "looks like" you in inverted commas. But if I were to actually really attend to it, it doesn't look like you, it just, you know, it's sort of not you. It's like generically you or something. Um,

1:00:50 RTH: So, so it's the generic about this, about the, about sample 2.5. So is the, is the point of your seeing that this game that's being played is an aggressive game, [Pete: Ahh] and the two players who are bumping into each other are two specific players and they're bumping into each other aggressively, but, but the point of my seeing is to illustrate the game-wide aggressiveness, not just Sam and Bill.

1:01:19 Pete: Um, yeah. I, I don't think if I, I don't know if I was, I, I think it was a sort of aggressive image in that they were, you know, shoulder to shoulder tackling for the ball. I don't think I was trying to illustrate game-wide aggressiveness, but I think I was trying to illustrate the game as a wider thing. Um, it was like my, it was two specific players that were somehow not specifically drawn. Um, they were Sam and Bill, but the Sam

and Bill-ness was blurry, for want of a better word. Um, but it was to illustrate generically the game itself.

1:02:06 RTH: So that is, that is what in the ballpark of what I call skillful.

1:02:11 Pete: Yeah.

1:02:12 RTH: I'm illustrating the game. I'm not particularly interested in Sam and Bill. I'm interested in the game of which Sam and Bill are, are, are apart, but

1:02:24 Pete: Yeah,

1:02:50 RTH: [Types in green] Something like that?

1:02:52 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

1:03:18 RTH: And should I check it? Does that mean, *should I check the score?*

1:03:22 Pete: Yeah, yeah. Yeah.

1:03:24 RTH: And should this word *feeling* be, I was *thinking* a very faint *thinking about* should I check the score?

1:03:29 Pete: Yeah. I mean, it might be more the wondering in a way, but yeah. Think, thinking's fine. A big feeling is kind of wrong. Um, I have loose language on my part.

1:03:49 RTH: So that makes it in the ballpark of unsymbolized thinking?? Question mark. Question mark. For the same reason.

1:03:57 Pete: Yes. Yes.

1:03:57 RTH: If I were, if this whole thing were about, if this whole experience was about should I check to get the score of that game, I'm wondering what the score of that game was. That would be un symbolized thinking, but the very greatness.

1:04:08 Pete: Yeah. But this is very, yeah. It's very similar. Like 10% of the experience is that

1:04:28 RTH: We good with that?

1:04:31 Pete: Yeah.

Considering sample 2.6

1:05:07 RTH: [They read] [RTH types in green] So that's not really true at all. [erases what he has written.] It's, that's, so this seems like a feeling.

1:05:27 Pete: Yeah.

1:05:30 RTH: Diffuse bodily.

1:05:32 Pete: Yeah. And there's definitely an inner speaking.

1:05:54 RTH: So this is more a word. This should have been in quotation marks. [corrects the black]

1:06:00 Pete: Yeah.

1:06:06 RTH: That's something that you *said*.

1:06:16 Pete: Yeah.

1:06:37 RTH: So we're happy with that.

1:06:39 Pete: We are.

Conversation after the sample consideration

1:06:46 RTH: Okay. So that's the last one, cuz we don't usually do the go back and do the first one the first day. Yeah.

1:06:52 Pete: I look back at, um, they're wrong, aren't they? [laughs] Um,

1:07:03 RTH: The first, the first day we generally take to be far enough away from confident

1:07:10 Pete: Yeah.

1:07:11 RTH: That it's, that it is better, generally better just to skip 'em.

1:07:16 Pete: Yeah. Yeah. Agreed.

1:07:23 RTH: So we are done with the green meeting. And then [Pete: Wonderful.] And the next, so the next step is, well, I guess there are two next steps. One is, I'm gonna write a description.

1:07:36 Pete: Yep.

Describing the independent informal characterization

1:07:38 RTH: And I, and that's gonna, that is gonna take into consideration, well actually the, there's, there's, there's two, there's two next steps, which we probably ought to do. So the, the, the orthodox DES next step would be: you and I are obligated individually to write, uh, an inde, what we call an *independent characterization, independent informal characterization*. So not detailed, but this, but, uh, you're, *you*, you are to be on the record of saying this is these are the kinds of things that I think any description of Pete's experience ought to include.

1:08:17 Pete: Yeah.

1:08:18 RTH: And I, and I need to do the same thing in independently and then, and that that can, that takes a lot of different kinds of formats. Sometimes they're bullet points, sometimes they're paragraph descriptions. I don't have, I don't have any rules about that. [Pete: Yeah.] But what it, what the object is, is to commit yourself to, this is what Pete got out of the green meeting recollections and the [Pete: I see, yeah.] and the whole process basically. And for Russ, for Russ to do the same thing *independent* of well, how Pete might do it.

1:08:53 Pete: Yeah, yeah, yeah. That makes sense.

1:08:54 RTH: And then we'll bring those together and see whether those are, those agree with each other.

1:08:58 Pete: No, I, I'd like to, I'd like to do that.

1:09:00 RTH: And, and that's, and the, the task is to do that generally before you sleep on it, or before you sleep on it *twice* in your, in your case, since it's already 11 o'clock or whatever your time,

1:09:13 Pete: [laughs]. Yeah. I, I'm gonna go to bed soon. Um, okay. Well, I I, I can do that tomorrow in that case.

1:09:20 RTH: Okay. And then, and then I will send it to you and you'll send it to me. But you're, the, the rule is if I happen to send it to you before you send it to me, then you can't open it...

1:09:30 Pete: Of course. Of course. Yeah.

1:09:32 RTH: ...until you've, until you've written your own.

1:09:34 Pete: Yeah. And, uh, and, and, and this is not like a, a large text, it's a

1:09:38 RTH: No, this, it is not, this is a, it can be just bullet points, you know,

1:09:42 Pete: Like, okay, okay.

1:09:44 RTH: There are five things. These are, these are five things and a sentence about each one, or whatever.

1:09:47 Pete: Okay. Okay. Um, yeah. Okay. Well, I'll, I'll get that stat tomorrow.

How the independent informal characterization interfaces with the written description

1:09:55 RTH: It's what, it's, what it's designed is to forge the resp, the individual responsibility. That you have. You're eventually, there's gonna be a written description of Pete's experience, *and it better, it better confront these things*. That's what, that's, that's

what this is, is about. And, and so it could be that you, you'll write one thing and I'll write another thing, and we will disagree with each other. I don't think that's gonna be true. [Pete: Yeah.] But it *could* be. And which case, the written thing has to take both of those into consideration. And it *could be*. The extreme of that would be, Pete saw it this way and Russ didn't see it that way *at all*. Russ saw it this way. [Pete: Yeah.] And Pete didn't see it that way at all. But both of those things have to be in the document for us. [Pete: Yeah.] For us to be personally willing to go to bat for, as in the lingo that I've used today, but

1:10:48 Pete: Yeah. Yeah, yeah.

1:10:49 RTH: Yeah. But, uh, responsible for, for the process. And *then* we're, we want to have a, uh, debrief meeting. [Pete: Yeah.] And we can, we can, we could either schedule that now, or we could wait until, until I have written. So sometime it's gonna take, take me a few days to do it, but I'll, sometime in the next few days, I hopefully will have written a description of Pete's experience.

1:11:22 Pete: Um,

1:11:25 RTH: And so we could schedule it...

1:11:27 Pete: Should, should we, should we wait? Cuz I, I quite like the kind of one thing at a time approach be taken. Um, [RTH: That's fine with me.] You mean I, I, I, I feel a bit behind, like, I need to, I need to send you my notes on the website, um, that aren't many, but I still need to send them; do this writer up. We'll send them to each other. Um, you'll do your description and then, *then* it feels like the next thing is the debrief to cap, to cap it all off.

1:11:55 RTH: Okay. All right. That's fine with me. Then, *and* I would say

1:11:59 Pete: Homework first.

1:12:00 RTH: I would say that I have fixed some of the black descriptions as we've gone, as we've gone through these things. So I will have, I will have to eventually bring that, bring the, the descriptions that are on the website up to date. [Pete: Yeah.] I don't, I don't think any of those things are very major, but there are a few, there are a few samples that are wrong. Most of them are typos that I've fixed as we've gone. But, but I will, I will do all those again. Yeah. And, and I have fixed a few typos in the transcripts, just as we've been look, as we've looked at 'em, I've seen, you know, I saw the word *beat*, which should have been *beep* and uh, [Pete: Yeah.] Fix that. That kind of thing. So I will, I will fix those, but I don't feel a particular rush to do that. I think you can comment on the website.

1:12:50 Pete: Yeah, yeah. Um,

1:12:52 RTH: There might be some overlap. You might, you might say, well, this, this

1:12:57 Pete: I mean, to be honest, the only big one is, um, there's a lot of s on the end of my name, which doesn't exist. Um, there's a lot of ho skins. I'm, I'm singular Hoskin. Um, it's, it is not a big deal. But that, that was like the main thing I noticed, really. And then there were a few other tiny tweaks, but nothing

1:13:13 RTH: Major. And you, you, you, you would, you should look at your bio and see whether you think, whether you'd like to

1:13:18 Pete: Do, yeah. Oh, that was another, that was another thing that I I,

1:13:20 RTH: Whether you'd like it to say something else, wanted to

1:13:22 Pete: Be subtly different. Yeah, yeah.

1:13:23 RTH: Yeah. And I've, and I altered the picture. I changed the picture on the website, so,

1:13:29 Pete: So the unflattering one!

1:13:30 RTH: Yeah. And, uh, and you might like that better or, or not. And if it looks, and, *and* if it looks like the same picture, then you might have to refresh your browser some.

1:13:39 Pete: Of course, yeah.

1:13:40 RTH: Some browsers are pretty aggressive about keeping the, the, the image.

1:13:45 Pete: Yeah. Yeah.

1:13:46 RTH: Even, even you can refresh and it'll refresh the text, but it'll keep, it'll keep old images. But it's probably been long enough that, that that won't be the case. But, but if you, if, if you *do* open it and it does look like the same image, then you might try looking at it with a different browser and see whether that

1:14:03 Pete: Of course. Yeah, of course.

1:14:04 RTH: But the, what I would, what I would say is that the, the image that I replaced it with is an image of you holding up a beeper, holding up the beeper. There was a time [Pete: Mm-hmm.] When you said you'd, you'd fixed your earphone or something like that. And you held up the beep like that. And I thought that was good. Yeah. So I grabbed that one, but [Pete: Nice.] But, uh, but if you've got a better, if you've got a better one, I can fix that. I can fix that. Yeah.

1:14:27 Pete: No, that, that sounds perfect. But I'll, I'll take a look. Thanks, Russ.

1:14:32 RTH: So our marching orders are: we're going to each rate our independent informal characterization and send it to each other. [Pete: Yep.] And assuming that we agree about things, which I'm, I'm guessing that we will, then I will, I will set about writing a description [Pete: Mm-hmm.] And when I do that, I'll send it to you, and then you can fix that, or we can debate about what, whatever. And then yeah, you're gonna

critique the website and [Pete: Yeah.] Then we're gonna schedule a debrief. Yeah.
And I should, I should be pretty easy [about scheduling].