

TRANSCRIPT WITH COMMENTARY

Phil J.: A neuroscience writer

Phil Interview 10

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the August 3 interview with Phil that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/QZC1e2DvNhY>. In green are comments about and explanations of the Descriptive Experience Sampling process. If you have corrections, suggestions, or questions, please post them as YouTube comments.

RTH = Russ Hurlburt

AG = Amber Goto

Phil = Phil J.

0:01 RTH: Good morning, Phil.

0:03 Phil: Good morning, Russ. Hello.

0:05 RTH: How are you this morning?

0:08 Phil: I'm fine. I'm fine. How's it going?

0:09 RTH: I guess, I guess it's afternoon, afternoon for you, isn't it.

0:15 Phil: Yeah, yeah.

0:17 RTH: It's still morning for us. There's no question about that.

0:22 Phil: [laughs] I hope...

0:23 RTH: Amber has been a real trooper making it. It's very early for her.

0:26 Phil: Yes. Yes. It's, it's like 5:30 or?

0:30 RTH: 5:30 in the morning for her.

0:32 Phil: Yeah. Yeah. So.

0:36 RTH: So anything we should be talking about before we look at beeps today?

0:42 Phil: Um, not that I can think of. Um.

0:42 Russ comments: They discuss an onboard-speaker issue with the beeper, which has no effect on this study.

- 2:13 Phil: Um, okay. Should I just, so this is Phil 10?
- 2:18 RTH: This is 10.
- 2:18 Phil: Yeah.
- 2:18 RTH: And I think I'm ready. If everybody else is ready.

SAMPLE 10.1 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 2:25 Phil: Yep. Okay. Yeah, some of these are a little bit more vague, but okay. Let's just get to them one by one. Um, beep number one, [apparently reads from notes] I was working on a Norwegian language exercise where you had to match the subject form of pronouns with their object form on, (I was doing it on) the computer. And on the screen, you had to move a box with the object form written in it and place it beside the correct subject form box. I had just matched the form "meg" which in Norwegian means 'me' with the subject form "Jeg" which is 'I'. Um, at the moment before the beep, I was looking at the empty spot beside the "jeg" box while holding the mouse button down to move the, the, "meg" box in, into that location, into that spot. The, the sensation of pressing the button was *not* in or holding the button down was *not* in my awareness. Visually, I was perceiving the blank blue space on the screen where I had the intention of moving the box to, and it was almost like I had the sensation of what it's like moving the box before actually moving it. [finishes reading] Um, and that's what I had for, for that one. [An aside about a computer issue:] There's something, something strange going on here. Okay. Yeah. So.
- 4:01 RTH: So this, when you say the sensation of *almost moving the box before you move it*, you mean a *visual* sensation? Of seeing the box move? Or a *physical* sensation?
- 4:10 Phil: Yeah. Um, uh, kin, kinesthe, I guess like a kinesthetic sensation of moving the mouse, or the upcoming, what, what to expect or the, the move I was going to make sort of, or, or, yeah, the movement I was planning. I think maybe that's a good way to put it, the, the movement I was planning to make.
- 4:33 RTH: And that's a kinesthetic, kinesthetic thing: I feel, I feel in my imagination my body moving in the direction in the way [Phil: Yeah.] manner that I'm moving...
- 4:43 Phil: I'm, I'm looking at the spot where I'm gonna move this box to. And, um, I have my hand on the left mouse button in about to move the box over to that location. And I can almost feel myself moving the box before I actually *do* move it.
- 5:02 RTH: Okay. And is that, is that kinesthetic anticipation, I guess we could call it, is that kinesthetic...?
- 5:08 Phil: I guess so. I guess so. [RTH: Is that the most...?] It's just like a basketball player maybe about to, to, to throw the ball in a, um, or, but or somebody about to make a pass or something sort of, yeah. Sort of akin to that, I would say.

5:29 RTH: And is that the *main portion* of your experience as...? So you also are seeing the blue region, the blue spot, I understand where you, which is gonna be the target of this motion?

5:46 Phil: Yeah. Um, I guess I would say 50-50. I'm looking at the spot where I'm about to move the box and I, I can just feel the, or I have this, this sort of motor plan of, of, of moving the mouse so that the box moves to that location.

6:08 RTH: So I *see* the target and I am physically, kinesthetically anticipating moving towards the target.

6:16 Phil: Yeah.

6:16 RTH: Is that, does that characterize that?

6:19 Phil: Yeah. I'm trying, I was just trying to think if, if, if I was visualizing the box moving, but I would say No. And I think I probably would've written that down if that was the case.

6:31 RTH: Okay. And the, the target was the blue region.

6:36 Phil: Yeah.

6:36 RTH: And is the blue a fact of the universe, I...?

6:42 Phil: The blue is just a fact of the universe. Yeah. Yeah.

6:48 RTH: So the, and, and how about the, the words *my*, *me* and *I*, *meg* and *jeg* or whatever they are?

6:56 Phil: Um, no. I think I had that sorted out and, uh, and it was just about completing the, like, moving this box over so I could move to the next word.

7:13 RTH: Okay. So at the moment of this beep my experience is entirely of an anticipation of moving this box to there, in a kinesthetic antici, visual, a visuo-kinesthetic anticipatory premonition or something?

7:34 Phil: Yeah. Yes.

7:36 RTH: Okay.

7:36 Phil: Yeah.

7:42 RTH: But that, that kinesthesia does *not* include actually the feeling of the mouse. Is that what that original denial statement was?

- 7:53 Phil: Well. [RTH: I feel my body moving in this direction?] um, that was more about, um, holding, like *pressing* the mouse button down and *holding* the mouse, which didn't.... I, I was unaware that I was holding the button down at, at that moment.
- 8:08 RTH: So even though that's my real physical ac, activity, I *don't* experience that. What I experience is this premonition or anticipation or whatever of the mov, movement that is about to ensue?
- 8:24 Phil: Yes. Yeah.
- 8:29 RTH: And I'm gathering that this is experientially, visual/kinesthetic, *not* cognitive? The cognitive is over or whatever?
- 8:42 Phil: Yeah. I'm not thinking about like, how am I going to move this box? Or this, this box goes here. It's just...
- 8:51 RTH: Or, or that *jeg* means *meg* or objective whatever?
- 8:55 Phil: Yeah. Yeah.
- 8:57 RTH: That's not part of your experience?
- 8:59 Phil: *Not* part of my experience at the moment.
- 9:05 RTH: And anything else in your experience at this, at this moment?
- 9:10 Phil: Uh, not, I don't believe so. No.
- 9:16 RTH: Okay. Amber, you have questions about that?
- 9:20 AG: Um, I believe I am good.
- 9:22 RTH: Alrighty. Number two.

SAMPLE 10.2 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 9:25 Phil: Okay. Um, this one's kind of short. Um, so [reads from notes] I was, I was on the phone and I was saying the word "something" at the moment right before the beep. And I, I may have been saying the phrase *something easy for dinner* [finishes reading] and, um, that's kind of all I remember there was, oh, I, I noted that [reads] there was nothing visual in my apprehension at the, at the time. [finishes reading] It was, it was diff, it was a bit difficult to recall because I had, I was on the phone and I was in a conversation and the beep went off and I was talking for a couple minutes afterwards. And then I, I tried to remember as best I could.
- 10:21 RTH: So it sounds like we're confident that I'm saying "something"?
- 10:26 Phil: Yep.

10:29 RTH: And that's part of a phrase, *something for, something easy for dinner*?

10:36 Phil: *Something easy for dinner*. Yeah. [RTH: Are you confident?] I think I'm as, as far as I can remember.

10:42 RTH: So is the, is the *as far as I remember* part is that I'm sure I was in the middle of some phrase, but I can't remember what the phrase was for sure. *Or* is it I'm, I think my experiences of the word "something" but maybe my experience was of something broader than that? So what I'm trying to get at is, is your experience of *one word*, namely, "something," which happens to be in the middle of the phrase? [Phil: Maybe.] *Or* is your experience of, or, or maybe there's no experience, maybe it's just I'm speaking and the beep happens to come at "something"?

11:23 Phil: Um, honestly I think that's, that's the most accurate description I'm speaking and the beep happens to come right after I say the word "something."

11:33 RTH: Okay.

11:33 Phil: And I can't, I can't remember much.

11:43 RTH: Okay. And then you made the comment that, that there was *nothing* visual in your experience?

11:49 Phil: Right. Right.

11:51 RTH: And is that to imply that my eyes are open and they're aimed at something, but I don't see it?

11:56 Phil: Correct. Yeah. I think when, when I speak on the phone or, or when I'm focusing on speaking [laughs], um, I, I tend, I sometimes perhaps tend not to, not to see. I'm focused, my attention is drawn to what I'm saying and I'm not focused on what I'm, what I'm looking at.

12:21 RTH: Okay. And, and I'm accepting that as a sort of a general self-characterization. And I also accept that as a description of what was probably happening at this moment. And I was speaking, but I was not seeing what I was, what I was, what my eyes were aimed at?

12:37 Phil: Right. Yeah.

12:41 RTH: And, and the content of the speaking was probably about dinner, but we're not sure about that.

12:50 Phil: I, I would say 60-70% certainty on that.

12:50 Russ comments: As a general DES rule, if we are not pretty close to 100% certain, then we mostly discard the sample. DES is *not* about averaging or accumulating a series of

60-70% certainties. Instead, DES is about trying to ferret out what contributes to the uncertainty in the hopes that that discussion will contribute to lessening the uncertainty *about future samples*. So the present sample will be filed mostly in the *I don't know* category; perhaps future sampling days will shed light on the phenomenon.

12:57 RTH: And is there anything about dinner other than... [Phil cranes his neck to look behind him.] That's the cat. The cat's been walking back and forth, and....

13:09 Phil: Okay! [laughs] Is there anything else about the dinner aspect? I was on the phone with Eva-stina and she was saying that she just wanted to make something, something simple for dinner. And I think I was just trying to come up with an idea for something easy for dinner.

13:34 RTH: But it's not like I have a visualization of something or a taste of something, or a...?

13:39 Phil: No.

13:45 RTH: Then I think I'm good. Amber?

13:51 AG: I'm good.

13:51 RTH: Number 3.

SAMPLE 10.3 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

13:55 Phil: Um yeah, and I was, [reads from notes] I was back at the Norwegian lessons. This time I was watching a video. Um, the instructor was saying the word "Hamar" as *Jeg bor på Hamar* which is, um, "I live in Hamar," (which is a small village, I guess you could say). Um, I was particularly focused on the word because she repeated it a few times and I could not clearly make out what she was saying. [finishes reading] So. So I guess what I was, what I'm sort of implying is that I wasn't focused on the sentence so much. I, I was, I was quite focused on the *word* because I had been hoping that it comes up again, cuz I, I didn't, it wasn't quite clear and I'm not familiar with this place. So I'm yeah, I, I'm, it was just a repeat of what she had said and, and each time she repeated it, I, I guess I was a little bit more clear on what she was, what she was saying, or how it was pronounced or how it might be spelled or....

15:10 RTH: So the word that you're aimed is the town name, Hamar or whatever?

15:16 Phil: Hamar. H-A-M-A-R. Yes.

15:21 RTH: And, and she's saying a sentence, [Phil: Yeah.] and you're hearing primarily the word "Hamar"?

15:32 Phil: Yeah.

15:33 RTH: And that's it as far as your experience is concerned?

- 15:36 Phil: Yeah.
- 15:38 RTH: And it, and is the part, well, *I'm trying to make this clear, I'm trying to, I'm not sure about what this, I'm not familiar with this place. I'm not sure what she said*, whatever. Is that all just sort of explanatory context? Or is that in your experience?
- 15:51 Phil: I think it's explanatory context because I, I was just, I was trying to listen carefully to, to this name. I think I, I wanted to write it down or, or, um. I don't know, I just, I felt like I would understand the sentence in the language that I'm not so familiar with a little better if I knew what this, it was kind of bothering me that I didn't know what this word was exactly.
- 16:20 RTH: And is that bothering you present to you? Or, or is that again, context in what's actually in my, in my experience is the, [Phil: Um.] is the word and the listening?
- 16:33 Phil: No, it was more, it was more like, uh, uh, clarification, like, *oh, good she said it again "Hamar"*. That's, I'm getting this, I'm start starting to get this name. I, I mean, I wasn't confusing it with any other word or anything. It's just was something unfamiliar. And I didn't know, I didn't know exactly what the word she was saying was.
- 17:03 RTH: And my question is: to what degree is that in your experience?
- 17:08 Phil: Um, [RTH: If anything.] I, I would say maybe 20% because I was, I was, I was trying to, I was mostly focused on, on listening, and I, I knew because of the words prior to *Hamar* that she was going to say it. So if I, if, if you hear *Jeg bor på*, then they're gonna say the name of the place that they live. So I knew that she was gonna say that word again, [pause] if that makes sense.
- 17:59 RTH: Well, it makes, it makes sense, but the question is how much of that is actually in your experience. The, [Phil: Um.] It was a fact that when somebody says *I live at* or whatever that is in Norwegian, then the name of the place is gonna come next. But whether I have an explicit thought, oh, somebody is saying "I live at" ...?
- 18:21 Phil: I, I don't think, I, I don't think I had time to think that or like, get that notion cuz it, she just speaks, she was speaking rather quickly. And, and um, I, I guess if I was trying to listen and she said that, and I must've been expecting the word, but I wasn't consciously thinking, *okay, I can expect this word next*. I can, I wasn't consciously thinking, *I can expect this word that I have had trouble hearing next*, but it was kind of *implicit*, I guess you could say.
- 18:57 RTH: And, and so is, are we talking about the same thing that was we, that we said was 20%, a little bit ago and now we're saying, well, probably wasn't really explicit. It was more the implicit portion of the task?
- 19:10 Phil: I thought wasn't I talking about something a bit different when I said it was 20%?
- 19:16 RTH: I'm not sure. That's why I'm asking.

- 19:19 Phil: I don't even remember now to be honest. No, I think that was a bit, um, being frustrated about, oh no, I can't, I can't remember. You have to, we're gonna have to watch the, the video of this.
- 19:19 Russ comments: The original mention of "20%" is at 17:08 and refers to the same concept we are discussing here.
- 19:46 RTH: Okay. What I would say (sort of in general) is that there's no clear dividing line, I think, between no, no bright line dividing line between what is experienced and what is implied in the way of experiencing. Y'know I'm, [Phil: Yeah.] I'm listening intently for this word. How much of that is, how much of that is the knowledge that that word is gonna be a place name? How much of that is explicitly oh, *this is* gonna be a place name? And how much of it is implicit in the way I'm listening, well, I'm listening in the way that you would listen when you listen for a place name?
- 20:31 Phil: Yeah.
- 20:31 RTH: I think, I think that's very hard if not impossible to tease apart.
- 20:35 Phil: Especially when, when somebody's speaking rather quickly. Yeah. Um.
- 20:44 RTH: There's a penumbra, there's a penumbra of meaning and intention and cognition or whatever that's around *everything*, probably.
- 20:58 Phil: Yeah. Um, should I go on to...?
- 21:02 RTH: I'm, I'm ready if Amber's ready.
- 21:03 AG: Go ahead. Yeah.
- 21:07 RTH: Number 4.

SAMPLE 10.4 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 21:07 Phil: Okay. So [reads from notes] I was, I was taking Max for a walk and I had just seen a man directly on my right. Um, as I was, I was crossing a street. And, um, he was on just on the sidewalk coming towards me. And at the moment before the beep, as, as I crossed the street, I recalled the image of the man I had just seen. And this is something I'm not quite sure about. I, I don't know if *recalled* is the right word, but, um, it could also be the case that the image of the man *lingered* as I turned my hand, my head and began to walk forward. So I, I, in my visualization or this lingering image, I could see the man, his gray shirt with something yellow on it, his, and his jeans, but his, his face was not clear. (And I think that was just more of the fact that he was a bit far away and with the lights and things like that, I couldn't make out his face very well.) And I could also see the street and the green trees that surrounded him. And, um, the way I recalled it was that the image or this visualization appeared, um, as though it was more humid or hazy than, um, than it actually was. [finishes reading]

22:47 Phil: So I, I hope that all kinda makes sense.

22:52 RTH: So lemme tell you what I understood from that, and that is that you're then you're crossing the street and you pass this guy...

23:00 Phil: Well, I didn't pass him. He was, he was on my, on my right. And he was like, I was just checking to see if there were cars and I saw a man walking towards me and then I looked back to, or then I looked ahead again to cross the street. And there was this lingering image of the man I had just seen, is a basic way to put it.

23:21 RTH: Oh okay. And, and so I, I am continuing in my imagination to see something, *someone* that I had seen earlier, half a second earlier?

23:35 Phil: Yeah.

23:36 RTH: And am I seeing just the man or the whole, would it make sense that would make sense that I've seen the man or is it I'm seeing the whole scene that I just seen? So the street, I guess I had to clarify, the street and the green trees: that's part of the man seeing?

23:53 Phil: Yeah, I guess it was, it was kind of the scene, but the man was the central focus or what drew most of my attention or what was drawing most of my attention in this visualization.

24:06 RTH: Okay. And so is it the case that all of my current, at the moment of the beep, visual experiences, this imaginary creation of recreation or holding on or whatever of.

24:18 Phil: Yeah, I would, I, I would say so. I would say so.

24:23 RTH: I don't really experience *where* I'm walking, I'm walking through cross the crosswalk, but I don't actually see?

24:27 Phil: Yeah. Ironically I'm crossing a street, which I had been just looking out for, for traffic. And [laughs], I guess I confirmed that there was no, there were no cars or anything. [RTH: Didn't have to worry about that.] So, go ahead. And I was, I think I was, just to give it some context. I was focused on the man because, um, Max is still, he still tends to want to run towards people and, um, and people are more of a factor—the presence of people is more of a factor when taking the dog for a walk than it would be otherwise. When I take Max for a walk, I'm more attentive to people around me.

25:09 RTH: Okay. And, and is that context, or is that part of your direct experience?

25:16 Phil: I would, I would say that it's context. I, I would say that I probably wouldn't have given this guy any, like hardly any attention if I was on my own.

25:29 RTH: So that, that's probably part of this penumbra thing that I was mentioning a little bit ago. You were looking at this guy from the standpoint of, of Phil taking Max for a walk,

but it wasn't like you were explicitly thinking, well, *I gotta see this guy because I'm taking Max walk.*

25:48 Phil: Yeah.

25:49 RTH: And I don't, I don't think, I, I think it's not possible to tease those kinds of details apart. So is this, is this seeing fairly vivid other than the guy's face? The guy's face isn't clear, but the rest of it?

26:09 Phil: I, I think so. Yeah, it was. Cuz I had just, I had just seen it. I had just seen this.

26:19 RTH: And so that the seeing lingers.

26:26 Phil: Yeah. And it was, um, it was, for some reason, I believe that the lingering seeing, uh, was, was more fo, not foggy, but it was more humid or, or hazy or, um, than, than it actually was. And I don't know why. I mean, there doesn't really have to be a reason, but...

27:10 RTH: So humid has the characteristic of being *of the scene*. I, I see this guy in a humid environment. And hazy could be a characteristic of the *seeing*, well, *my seeing isn't very clear, it's a little hazy*.

27:26 Phil: Okay. I understand. Um, I, I just, I think I have a lack of vocabulary. I, I, um, I can't think of the right word, but when it's really humid, you know, how it's, it's less clear. [RTH: Right.] Um, it was, it was like that. My, my image of the man and it like a, like a really, really hot, hot, humid day. Whereas it's, and it's, it's a relatively *warm* day here, but it wasn't, it's not.

27:59 RTH: Wasn't that warm.

28:00 Phil: Wasn't that warm.

28:06 RTH: So maybe this is not possible, but I haven't gotten an answer to my question. So does it, does it seem like I'm seeing this guy on a humid day, or does it seem like I have a sort of a fuzzy?

28:22 Phil: It's like I'm seeing this guy on a humid sort, sort of day.

28:22 Russ comments: The distinction RTH is trying to sort out is whether Phil clearly sees a hazy man, or whether Phil hazily sees a scene. That is, is the haziness a part of the content or an aspect of the process. Here RTH and Phil agree that the process is a clear seeing, and the content is of a hazy humidness.

28:50 RTH: [pause] Okay. So [Phil: Yes.] the real seeing of this guy, the real seeing took place a half a second or a quarter of a second or a second or something before the beep?

29:00 Phil: Right.

29:01 RTH: And does it seem like I have *continued to see* him so that this was like, like a continuous seeing that was still ongoing? Or does it seem like I had seen him over there and now I am recreating him *as if anew*. Or maybe that question doesn't make sense even?

29:22 Phil: Well, no, it makes sense. That's kind of what I was trying to get at earlier. I'm, I'm not sure if it, it's fair to say it was a recollection or a reimagining or, or revisu, like, or, or if it was just a lingering image. And I tend to think that it was more of a lingering image. I looked at, I looked over to the right, I saw the guy and I looked ahead and then as I started going, I was still seeing what I had just glanced at. So I just right there, I said *still* seeing. So I guess it was more of a, a lingering image based on my, based on my current memory, at least.

29:22 Russ comments: We will leave this distinction between lingering or reimagining unresolved. That is standard DES procedure: our aim is to get as high fidelity a view as we can, because we never know what will be interesting until days or weeks later. So we push to the limits, and sometimes (as here) we are not able to resolve a potential distinction.

30:31 RTH: [pause] Alright. I think I'm good. Amber?

30:34 AG: I'm good as well.

30:36 RTH: Number five.

SAMPLE 10.5 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

30:38 Phil: Um, so [reads from notes] I was sitting with my computer and I had, I had indigestion and I had just been thinking about how little I had eaten throughout the day so far. And the moment before the beep I was moving the cursor across the screen and thinking to myself with words, "I am, I am *not* hungry." The visual aspect of my experience was about 30%. And the feeling of discomfort was about 30%. And the rest was myself innerly saying "I am *not* hungry."

31:20 RTH: So the, "I am *not* hungry" is a little bit, the more prominent I'm gathering is that, uh?

31:26 Phil: Yeah.

31:27 RTH: And I am saying to myself?

31:34 Phil: Yeah, with those words, "I am *not* hungry."

31:39 RTH: And inflected in that way?

31:43 Phil: Correct.

31:43 Russ comments: Eva-stina appears on camera and takes a bag of dog food.

31:43 Phil: [to Eva-stina] Hello.

31:43 RTH: [to Eva-stina] Hello.

[inaudible conversation]

31:43 Phil: [to Eva-stina] [laughs] That's okay. It's okay.

32:04 RTH: So is this, I, I, I am saying to myself, "I am not hungry"? This is just *speaking* to myself innerly?

32:12 Phil: Yep.

32:17 RTH: And back in the day, month ago, when whenever, when we had more or less similar things, you might have said, "I...

32:28 Phil: ...heard...

32:29 RTH: ...heard myself speaking," something like that?

32:32 Phil: No, this was clearly, this was clearly speaking. Yeah. It was like, I was making the statement to someone.

32:47 RTH: [pause] Okay.

32:49 Phil: Yeah. I don't remember what I was looking.... I said that I was moving the cursor across the screen and that the visual aspect of my experience was about 30%, but I neglected to write down exactly what was on the screen. As far as I can remember, I was just paying attention to the movement of the cursor going across the screen.

33:19 RTH: Okay. But I'm not too sure about that, it sounds like. I was visually seeing something about what was on the screen. That we can be confident about. Is that right?

33:31 Phil: Yeah. I, I, I believe it was moving the, I, I, since I don't remember what was on the screen and I wrote down that I was moving the cursor across the screen, I'm tempted to conclude I was paying attention to the movement of the, of the cursor.

33:54 RTH: Okay. I'm always skeptical of that kind of conclusion, but...

33:54 Russ comments: (See the comment at 12:50.) DES tries to make a bright-line distinction between what is directly recalled as apprehended, on the one hand, and what is inferred as being likely, on the other hand. DES tries to cleave to what is directly recalled and to avoid crediting what is inferred or theorized about.

It is perhaps likely that Phil actually *was* attending to the motion. That is, RTH's skepticism is *not* disbelief.

As a meta-note about the DES process, RTH is quite transparent in his skepticism. There is nothing manipulative about DES—RTH tells Phil what he thinks about Phil's descriptive attempts.

34:00 Phil: Fair enough. [laughs]

34:03 RTH: And then I, I'm also 30% discomfort. Is that the indigestion discomfort?

34:09 Phil: Yeah.

34:10 RTH: And what, what, what is, what is your experience of that?

34:14 Phil: Well, okay. To be honest, I don't know if indigestion was the right word, but I just feel, I felt kind of bloated and like, um, uh, dis, some discomfort in my chest. And, um, and I guess that's about as good as I can describe it.

34:36 RTH: And is bloating, abdominal bloating?

34:39 Phil: Yeah.

34:39 RTH: So lower than my chest. So this is sort of two aspects of bodily discomfort. Is that right?

34:47 Phil: Yeah. Mm hmm.

34:50 RTH: And that I am experiencing at the moment of the beep at a 30% level or whatever?

34:58 Phil: Right. But it had been an ongoing thing. So it wasn't, it wasn't something particular to the moment right before the beep.

35:12 RTH: Okay. Alright then I think I'm good.

35:16 AG: I'm good too.

SAMPLE 10.6 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

35:16 RTH: Number six.

35:20 Phil: And this was the last one, um. Okay. [reads from notes] I was, um, it was on the patio and I was taking off my sweater and I glanced at the last remaining patch of snow on a small mountain on this, a small mountain close, closest to our, the mountain that is closest to our place. Um, when I saw it, I remembered seeing another spot earlier in the day, which looks like it could have also been snow, but I wasn't sure. And, and I was thinking that I could just glance at it with my binoculars if I *really* wanted to know. At the moment, right before the beep, I thought the, the neighbors who live in the house in the direction of the mountain might think I look nosey or even worse if they see me looking in the direction of their house through a pair of binoculars. So to be more specific at the moment, right before the beep, I was picturing myself with the binoculars from their perspective. And innerly saying with words, "think I'm weird" as in *they might think I'm weird*. [finishes reading]

36:37 RTH: So is the first part of that explanation context and the experiential part is I see myself looking through binoculars?

36:46 Phil: That's correct.

36:47 RTH: Okay. So what I, so I see myself from my neighbor's ex, house, basically, from my neighbor's perspective?

36:58 Phil: Yeah.

36:59 RTH: And what do I see?

37:02 Phil: I see [laughs] I see me standing there with like, ogling at something with a pair binoculars in a, in a very invasive kind of way. But I'm not actually looking at anything to do with *them*. But I don't know if that, that's not really part of the, I don't know if that, I guess that's just kind of context. [RTH: Okay.] But I, I pictured myself with what I'm wearing, which is a green shirt and a pair of black shorts. And I pictured myself on my, on the patio and, um, I'm holding a pair of binoculars [holds hands up to eyes] and I'm just standing there looking right in, right in the direction, right in their direction.

37:59 RTH: So I see the whole scene, not just my, not just my hands and face and binoculars, but I see the, the head to toe and the surrounding?

38:07 Phil: Yes I see. Kinda, kind of what I, how I would imagine it would look like if they saw me from, from their property straight, looking straight ahead at me.

38:22 RTH: So I see the deck in the house and the, and the Phil standing on it, [Phil: Yeah.] looking at me with, look, looking at, looking back at me with binoculars or something?

38:30 Phil: Yep.

38:32 RTH: Okay. And that, you were, you said you were taking, you were in the act or taking your sweater off. Are you, is your sweater off or you?

38:42 Phil: My sweater is off. Yup.

38:45 RTH: In reality my sweater is off?

38:47 Phil: My sweater is off, [RTH: And do I see my...] still have it in my, I still have it in my hands.

38:52 RTH: And do I see myself with the sweater on or off?

38:54 Phil: The sweater off.

38:54 RTH: Okay. But I don't see the sweater. Is that true?

39:06 Phil: That's true.

39:08 RTH: So I, the sweater in reality is in my hand, but in my *picture*, my hands are holding the binoculars?

39:17 Phil: Yep.

39:18 RTH: Okay. And at the same time, I am innerly saying, “think I’m weird”?

39:29 Phil: Yeah. Again, I have to use the word *vaguely* without being able to explain the vagueness, but those were, I know the word “weird” was definitely present and.... Yeah. It might have just been “weird” or (I don’t know), but the implication was like, they might think I’m weird or I just I’m. I have to apologize for being so vague, but....

40:17 RTH: Well there’s no apology necessary, the inner experience and outer experience are not necessarily the same thing. So, so let’s, let’s focus on the word “weird” and then worry about the rest of it. So is the “weird” present as if spoken or I’m just somehow thinking *weird*?

40:39 Phil: It was present as if spoken.

40:42 RTH: And innerly spoken?

40:45 Phil: Yeah.

40:47 RTH: And this is spoken as opposed to what we have said in the past as *hearing myself speak*?

40:53 Phil: That’s correct. Yeah. That’s right.

40:58 RTH: So this would be spoken in the same way as “I am not hungry.” Is that right?

41:09 Phil: Yeah. I think that I am not hungry was a bit more clear. Like I’m, like, I’m telling somebody like, I’m, I am like, I, I, I had just been thinking, I haven’t really eaten much today, but still “I am *not* hungry.” Whereas this was kind of like, [softly] “they might think I’m weird,” or like it’s...

41:31 RTH: Okay.

41:33 Phil: Just like, almost as if a whisper or, or, yeah.

41:39 RTH: And, and is that an experiential whisper or is that a, I am interpreting vagueness as being like a whisper?

41:48 Phil: I’m interpreting vagueness as being like a whisper.

41:51 RTH: Okay. So I experienced myself as *speaking*, but the speaking is *not* as clear as it was in the previous beep?

42:03 Phil: That's right.

42:05 RTH: And part of that unclarity is that I'm not actually sure how much of it I'm speaking? Maybe it's just "weird"? Maybe it's "think I'm weird"? Maybe it's "they think I'm weird"?

42:17 Phil: Right. And I mean, there seems to be some kind of relation to the sureness of the thought. Like when, when I, when I was saying to myself, "I am *not* hungry," it was very clear and I was very certain about that. But in this case, I don't know if they would actually see me. And I, I don't know if they, they would like there's mountains there and there's things that are going on. There's like paragliders and all sorts of, there's a cable car that goes to the top, there's all sorts of stuff to see. So, so I, I mean, it's not, it's not completely weird if you saw somebody looking in that direction with binoculars, but if your, if your home happens to be in the same direction, then, you know, somebody might wonder what you're up to.

43:06 RTH: Okay.

43:09 Phil: So that, just to give it a bit of context, so, and this is just an observation that I'm making. Like, I, I don't know if it, like, I don't know. I, and by the way, I did get the binoculars and look to see if there is, if that was, uh, uh, a tiny patch of snow, cuz the, the, they were right here, they were very convenient so.

43:31 RTH: And did you get caught by your neighbors?

43:33 Phil: Not that I know of. [they laugh] Not that I know. I don't think there was anyone home, so.

43:42 RTH: So I, sss, in my imagination, I see myself looking through binoculars, and I experienced myself as saying, "think I'm weird" or "weird" or something like that? [Phil: Yeah.] And does that all seem like part of the same, the same single experience? Or does it seem like I'm two different things going on, one is that I'm seeing, and the other is I'm saying?

44:12 Phil: I, I would say it seemed more like part of the same experience. Almost as if—I don't wanna open a can worms here, but what comes to mind is like, if you were watching a, something on television where it's an image of a guy looking through binoculars, but he is wondering if his neighbors will think he's weird, cuz he's looking in their direction and then you can hear him thinking to himself: *They might think I'm weird*. Something like that.

44:50 RTH: Okay.

44:50 Phil: So it's, it's part of the same scene there.

45:14 RTH: I think I'm good.

45:17 Phil: Okay.

45:18 RTH: So let's, let's, let's think about what we should be doing, going forwards here. And I'm, I'm open to a lot of different different deals here. So I don't have in mind the answer to the question that I'm raising, but we've, we've done this 10 times....

45:18 Russ comments: They decide that RTH will send Phil the transcripts of the first ten interviews and links to the video of those interviews. Then later they will decide how to proceed: debrief? Phil might have questions? More sampling days?