

TRANSCRIPT WITH COMMENTARY

Phil J.: A neuroscience writer

Phil Interview 1

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the May 18 interview with Phil that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/-CZMYPFSmSE>. 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.

0:00 Phil: Okay, good.

0:02 RTH: Here, here he is.

0:04 Phil: Hello, Amber.

0:05 AG: Hi.

0:05 RTH: Let me introduce Phil to Amber. Amber is a very new student, so this will be her first crack at being the interviewer in one of these things, so.

0:14 Phil: Oh, exciting.

0:15 RTH: So, uh, I suspect she won't have too much to say, but maybe she will. We'll, we'll, we'll see about that. She's a free agent in that regard and, uh, Phil is a writer and...

0:25 Phil: ...Sure, yeah, freelancer...

0:26 RTH: ...neuroscience writer.

0:28 Phil: Yeah. I used to do research in psychology.

0:33 RTH: So, so what, it'll be interesting to see what, what, what we find out here. And, uh, Phil sent me, uh, some notes about the beeps that he has collected...

0:33 Russ comments: This is the email Phil sent Russ before the meeting:
Good morning Russ,
I've now logged six beeps. There's probably not enough time before we meet, but I thought I'd attach my notes on each beep if that's of any use for prepping. Maybe it's the case that you don't want to read them prior to our meeting, so I give the option of opening the file or not. :-)
See you soon.
p.

0:47 RTH: [continues] ...and these beeps came from today. Is that right, or yesterday?

0:49 Phil: Um, some of them, uh, four are from yesterday and three are, or two are from today.

0:55 RTH: Okay. And I didn't, I did *not* look at the, at those notes. And the, [Phil: Okay.] and the reason for that is the, the aim of DES is always to get at in this case Phil's experience. And I'm, and I'm worried about things like words *standing in the way* of that. So if, if, if you write the words in such a way, then I get, I could get captured by those words. And, uh, and so what I, I, I'm pretty sure that words have sort of an elastic meaning or sort of a variable meaning. And I would like that meaning, that meaning to *emerge*. And so in the conversation that we have, we're gonna go back and forth about what, what a particular word might mean. And the longer we spend in that conversation, the better I'm gonna like it, because I wanna make sure I got the words right. [Phil: Mm hmm.] and I don't wanna do anything that, to short circuit that.

0:55 Russ comments: Perhaps more fundamentally, I want Phil to apprehend his experience his as it presents itself to him, to get it as secure as possible within Phil, by Phil and for Phil, before he starts to transliterate that experience for me. So I *don't* want him to write notes between Phil and Russ; I want those notes to be between Phil and *Phil*.

1:52 Phil: Okay.

1:53 RTH: I'm I, there might very well be different ways to do it, but that's the, that's the way I have, for lack of a better word.

1:58 Phil: That makes sense to me.

2:00 RTH: And, uh, so I, so it's a, the, the whole notion of words is an interest to me because obviously DES is entirely about words. We're gonna, we're gonna communicate in words, we're not gonna communicate so much in gestures, although that's part of it, whatever, but, but mostly it's about words. And yet I'm, I am pretty convinced that that words themselves don't matter, that we're gonna, we're gonna use words as tools to point at Phil's experience. And, uh, and we're going to recognize that those words are ambiguous and, and we're gonna try to, we're gonna try to do the best we can given the tools we got, which are limited, but. [Phil: Mm hmm.]
So is there anything else that we should be talking about before we take a look at some beeps?

2:52 Phil: I don't think so. I just wanted to say thanks for, um, postponing the meeting until today.

2:57 RTH: No problem.

2:58 Phil: Yeah, it was, um, it's it was Constitution Day here in Norway, yesterday. And, um, it was the first time in a couple of years because of the pandemic. Um, now things are back to normal and it, there were some festivities going on downtown and, um, uh, my fiancé

and I really wanted to go. Um, and I thought it would be kind of interesting to be collecting, um, experiences in that context instead of coming home and, and doing this interview. So I thought, well, maybe if we can reschedule it for today, I can, I can, um, wear the beeper downtown in the middle of all the festivities that were happening. And, uh, and that's what I did.

3:47 RTH: Oh, cool. Well I'll look forward to that. And, and did the festivities get changed by the, by the impending NATO deal? [Phil: Oh , (inaudible).] What, what's is [inaudible]?

3:58 Phil: No, I didn't, I didn't haven't read anything connecting constitution day and, and NATO. So I don't think so.

4:06 RTH: Is, is NATO a big discussion in Norway among the, among the people?

4:11 Phil: Yeah, yeah, it is. Um, but I haven't, to be honest in the past week or so, I haven't been paying much attention, so, so I don't, I don't have too much more to say about that. [RTH: Okay.] But I do have to tell you that, um, I guess maybe it was a month and a half ago. Um, we took a, we took a ferry for a few hours to another town that's south of here (pretty much everything is south of here). [Phil lives in Norway, north of the Arctic Circle.] Um, and on the way we saw maybe five or six different military ships, just stationed at different points, different strategic points along the way, which was, uh, which was quite interesting. We had never seen, never seen anything like that before.

4:59 RTH: Ru, Russian military ships?

5:01 Phil: No, no. Um, NATO [RTH: NATO.] or Norwegian military ships. Yeah. So there's, yeah. And then there's some big, there's been, there's been some ongoing military exercise here, um.

5:16 RTH: Right, there's a big, there's a big NATO military exercise that maybe is in at least in part in Norway. I'm not exactly sure.

5:22 Phil: Yeah. Well, there it's been in the newspapers. Um, they let there, there are many Americans on the streets because they're, they're stationed here or they're maybe, I haven't seen a ship, but I imagine there's a ship around somewhere. And, um, the newspapers like to ask the Americans questions about what they think of Tromsø, and what they think of Norway, and, uh, and, um, and yeah, I, I hear them. Over the pandemic, I hardly heard any non, anybody speaking English without an accent. Um, or, well, to me, Americans, same, sound pretty much the same as Canadians, but, uh, now I hear, now I do hear all sorts of Americans around town, so it's, it's kind of interesting.

6:12 RTH: The world is a different place now than it was a year ago for sure. [Phil: Yeah.] In a variety of different perspectives.

6:18 Phil: Yeah. Well yeah, okay.

6:21 RTH: Well, I would say let's, let's take a look at beeps and, uh.

SAMPLE 1.1 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 6:25 Phil: Yeah. So beep number 1. Um, I'm just gonna read my, my note. Um, [reads] "I was sitting on my sofa using my computer. I was looking at a webpage for a booking, a cabin that we were interested in booking. And the moment prior to the beep, I was about to place my finger on the screen to (I have a, a haptic screen), um, to scroll the page, to get to a portion that contained a map. So I was looking at my finger, which appeared silhouetted, silhouetted against the bright white space on a mostly blank part of the webpage. And without words, I had a feeling of appreciation of how easy and fast I could get to the map at the top of the webpage, because there was so much open space that I could use to freely scroll upwards without having to worry about accidentally pressing on a link."
- 7:27 RTH: Okay. So there's a lot of things that there, there that were, or might have been, or whatever in your experience. So the, so starting from the, from the beginning, there was the finger, the dark finger against the white background? Is that?
- 7:40 Phil: Yup, yup.
- 7:41 RTH: And, and is that directly in your experience? Or is that a fact of the universe and the differen, the difference that I would, the distinction that I would make there is, if, if, um, if this is time, like this time, time is marching on like this [uses his notepaper as a visual aid], and the beep happens here and so the beep beeps and you push the button and the beep stops and time continues marching off, marching like that.
- 8:06 Phil: Yeah.
- 8:07 RTH: If the moment that we're interested in here is right, one microsecond before the beep. The question is, is the, is the silhouette-i-ness of the s, of your finger a, present in your direct experience? Or [Phil: Um.] is that just, well, it is a *fact* that my finger is silhouetted against it. And then, and then I respond to the beep, when I respond to the beep I can look back and say, oh, look, my finger's really bright against the dark against the back, right? Right?
- 8:38 Phil: Yeah. I think it was part of my experience. I was, I was looking at my finger and I was sort of taking in for a lack of a better word, how it was dark against the white background in how I could just like, phtt, phtt, phtt [makes scrolling motions with finger synchronized to the sound], just freely scroll the page.
- 8:58 RTH: So, so this aspect of your experience is about *Phil's finger*, *not* about the, the cabin or whatever?
- 9:09 Phil: Right, yeah.
- 9:10 RTH: So I'm, I'm noting my, I'm noting the visual characteristics of my finger at the moment of the beep?

9:19 Phil: That's, I would say that's correct. [RTH: Okay.] And I was also, um, cuz I was scrolling at the time. I was also appreciating how easy it was to scroll this page because it was, it had so much blank empty space.

9:35 RTH: And so that's sort of two separate (sounds like) themes of experience. Is that right? That, there's the...

9:42 Phil: ...I, I think so, yeah...

9:43 RTH: ...the visual and the satisfaction / appreciation?

9:46 Phil: Yeah. Yup.

9:46 RTH: Okay. And are those equal, equally powerful, present as far as your experience is concerned, or does, doesn't that question make sense?

10:00 Phil: I think so. I think so. I, uh. I was scrolling along, I noticed how my finger looked dark against the background and, and how easy it was to just maybe 1, 2, 3 times [scrolls finger in sync] to get to the top of the page to where that map was that I wanted to click on.

10:25 RTH: So let me see whether I've got, or let me tell you what I've got, you tell me whether this is, this is right. I'm, I'm looking for a cabin, but the cabin-ness is not in my experience, and the *vacation* is not in my experience, and the *plan* is not in my experience right now. That's obviously the task I'm engaged in. But when I...

10:42 Phil: ...Right, the, the webpage I was looking at, like I had already found the cabin and I was on an information page about that specific cabin. And I wanted to, um, I wanted to take another look at where it was exactly. So I had gone down to the bottom of the page and then at the top of the page, there was a map and I just wanted to get back to that, back to that map.

11:06 RTH: But I gathered that's the, the task that you've sort of set for yourself. But in your experience, right at the moment of the beep, that task is *not* present. It's not like, it's not like the *map* is present to me, What's present to me is the black against white of my finger, [Phil: Yeah.] and the convenience of the page or this satisfaction?

11:27 Phil: Yup. Yup.

11:29 RTH: Okay. And is there more to say about how the, the appreciation, what, what, what, I think that was appreciation?

11:39 Phil: Mmm hmm. I wasn't, um, I wasn't using any words at the moment. Um, I just, I just, I felt the ease with which I could scroll the, the page.

11:54 RTH: Okay.

11:54 Phil: Yeah. I, I think, yeah, this one is not, maybe not the most exciting. [Laughs]

- 12:06 RTH: Well, I would say it's the first one and they're all, they're all, all exciting. So I think we've, I think we've done pretty good job for number one. Amber, you have questions that you'd like to ask about them?
- 12:17 AG: Um, yeah. I wanted to ask, is there any sensory aspect of this? Like, do you feel the touching of the screen, do you feel?
- 12:27 Phil: Hmm.
- 12:28 AG: Part of your appreciation?
- 12:30 Phil: Well, I guess, um, there is maybe a, a bit of a timing issue here because at the moment, right before the beep, I don't know if I was actually contacting the screen if I, I don't know if I was touching the screen at that moment or not. Um, but I wasn't taking in any tactile aspect of the experience. It was more the, the visual aspect of my, that my looked really dark against this bright white background as I was easily scrolling the page.
- 13:09 RTH: So let make a little comment on that question. And, and, and that is it, it is *not* the case that we wanna do a catalog of all possible experiences. So it's quite possible that your finger was or was not touching the screen and you, and you may or may not have been feeling that tactile-ness. Like, for example, right now you're sitting on the chair, I presume, [Phil: Mm hmm.] and, and you've got tactile experiences of, of from your backside or whatever. [Phil: Mm hmm.] And I'm guessing you haven't been paying attention to that for the last few minutes, it's been there. [Phil: Correct.] It's, it's been there, but not part of your direct experience. And, and you've been responding to that in some, in some skillful way, you're not falling off your chair or whatever. And uh, but that does not mean it's in your experience. So, so we don't wanna imply that, that just because you're touching the screen, you should be feeling that, [AG: Right.] All right, let's go on to number 2.

SAMPLE 1.2 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 14:10 Phil: Okay, um. My fiancé Eva-stina and I were walking towards, um, the main street downtown, or just the downtown area where the Constitution Day festivities were taking place. And, uh, on the way we passed a lady with a young boy. And in Norwegian, um, just after we had passed them, he, uh, he got our attention and he, he asked us if we were going to see some specific part—I think he was asking about the, the military corps doing their, their rifle display. I don't really have the, the word for this, but they, they, um, they swing their guns around and they do this marching. And, um, and he was asking us if we were going downtown to see that. And, uh, and then he told us that, uh, it had already passed and we were too late. And, um, I didn't understand any of this because my Norwegian is not good enough, but Eva-stina can speak Norwegian, so. They had this little exchange and then I asked her, um, what the boy had said. And um, she was telling me as she was saying the word, "sorry," uh, sorry... [laughs] Right, the moment prior to the beep, she was saying the word "sorry" because she was describing the kid saying, "sorry, you missed it." And, um, and at the moment I was, I was really curious about, about their exchange, and even though we were walking, I wasn't, um, I

wasn't paying attention to, um.... I, I was *completely* listening to what she was saying. And I, I was *not* paying attention to anything visual. That kind of struck me, because usually when you're walking, you're looking at where you're going. Um, or you're trying to avoid obstacles or, or whatever. But I was, I was very into what she was saying at the moment, and she was saying the word "sorry."

HERE

16:30 RTH: And, and so does that mean that at this particular beep you were particularly interested in the word *sorry*, or does it mean like, I was interested in what she was saying and at the moment beep, the beep to get the word *sorry*?

16:46 Phil: That's a good question. That is a good question. Um, she was saying it in kind of a long drawn out way, like, *sorr-ry*. And, um, so I guess I was kind of focused on the word as well as the greater context. Um, yeah, so I was kind of focused on the, on the word, *sorry*.

17:18 RTH: And, and so now I've got sort of the same refining question as, as that, so were you attending to the vocal characteristics of the *sorr-ry*?

17:32 Phil: No.

17:33 RTH: Or, or was it just that, that word attracted you sort of out of the stream of the rest of the words?

17:41 Phil: The, the way she was saying it was, it sort of drew my, my , my attention. And, um, yeah, it was just, uh, oh, it's hard to describe. [laughs] Now that I think about it, I don't wanna think about, I feel like I don't wanna think about it too much. Cuz then I might bias myself in some way, but, um, she was saying the word *sorry*, and I, I was listening. See, it's unfortunate cuz I can't put it in the sentence that she was saying, cuz I don't remember what that sentence was. But um, but I had figured that the kid said something like that, cuz he, it seemed like he was describing something that we've, that, that we had missed and um, and he was telling us that he was trying to help us out and give us some information that this event had already passed, um.

18:38 RTH: And is that somehow present to you, or is that the context of the sentence that you're hearing?

18:45 Phil: That was, um, that was the context of the sentence that I was hearing, but I was sort of expecting that that's what the kid was saying. So when I was seen as said the word, *sorry*, I, I kind of wasn't surprised. And uh, and it was just sort of filling in my expectation of what the kid might have said.

19:11 RTH: Okay. So, so on a, on a sort of a meta note here, so you said a minute ago, I'm, I'm worried, I'm biased by what I'm thinking too hard about this. And, and you absolutely are, and that's the way this process is. And we understand that, so that, so that's, that's why every, every day is hopefully you'll become more efficient at it. And then, and then we, we won't have to spend too much as, as much time making the same kinds of distinctions as we're making. And so there's less opportunity for biasing. And that's just the way this process works. There's no, there's no shortcut for it, we have to learn how

to talk to each other. You've gotta learn what to say to us and we've gotta learn what to ask from you. And, and that takes some, some time, and what I [Phil: Some practice.] call an iterative process that we're gonna get better at. And, and so it is the case that as every, every question screws up the process, that's just the way it is. Amber, you got questions? [AG: No questions.] All right, let's go on to number 3.

19:11 Russ comments: The more we talk about a sample, the *less* warrant we have to credit the fidelity of the description. The harder we try, the worse we get. Some take that as an argument against attempting to describe inner experience, but I take it as an argument in favor of an iterative method.

SAMPLE 1.3 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 20:27 Phil: Okay. Um, I'll just read what I had. I was on the street side watching the Constitution Day parade go by, um, elementary school kids were in it, representing their schools and their classes, their grades. Um, and then at the moment. Okay, so there was a, there was a, um, a girl, she was maybe 11 or so, and she was approaching me and she looked, she looked at me, she looked at me in the eyes and I, and I looked at her looking at me. And after a moment I looked away and began thinking to myself, "aawkward." And, as the word went through my head, I began to think that I should have smiled or, or waved at her because it might have seemed like I was staring. And, um, the, at the moment prior to the beep the word "awkward," and it was, it was more, more like "aawkward." It was more, um, it was long and drawn out in the manner sometimes portrayed in, in movies or TV shows, I believe. And, um, I had come to this conclusion about, oh, maybe I should have smiled or, or waved while, while the word "awkward" was sort of playing in my head. I was, I was sort of hearing myself saying "aawkward" and that's, that's, that's what I have.
- 22:04 RTH: Okay. And so let's start with the word. So the word "awkward," "aawkward," is present to me. And, and is there more to say about how that word is present?
- 22:20 Phil: Um, I was, I was sort of half innerly speaking it and half innerly hearing it at this, it was just sort of automatic. And, um, and it was long and drawn out and I feel like simultaneously maybe—No, I think it was with, I don't know if it was with words or without words, but I remember at the same sort of instant, I was thinking, *oh, I should have smiled or waved or something* so that it wouldn't have been, cuz I, I felt like maybe it was a bit awkward.
- 23:01 RTH: Okay. And, and so the let's, let's stick with the word awkward for a minute. So you said you're sort of half speaking it and half hearing it, does that mean like two separate processes, *I speak it* and *I hear it*, or does it seem like one thing that I'm doing that has both a speak-y and a hear-y kind of a thing?
- 23:23 Phil: Yeah. Um, it happens to me in other occasions that are awkward and just the, the word "awkward" just sort of came to me. It's hard to describe, I wasn't, it wasn't like I was innerly speaking or trying to reason something out. It just sort of, it felt like it just sort of popped in my head, but it was *me* saying "aawkward."

- 23:53 RTH: In your voice?
- 23:54 Phil: In my voice, yes.
- 23:56 RTH: And in the manner of speaking. So it's, I, I feel myself to be speaking "awkward" as opposed to hearing it coming out of a tape recorder or something like that.
- 24:08 Phil: Yeah, I guess so. I, I think so. Yeah. Yeah. It was more me speaking the word "awkward."
- 24:15 RTH: Okay. And, and I'm gathering that this is one word it's not a word in a sentence. It's not like "that was an awkward situation" or something like that, and the beep happens?
- 24:25 Phil: Correct. Yup. Yup.
- 24:27 RTH: So this is a one word commentary that, that I speak to myself, [Phil: Yeah.] For, what, whatever.
- 24:35 Phil: Yeah, I, I, it was. It was almost like I started speaking the word "awkward," but then it just sort of became longer and more drawn out as, and as it, and then it almost turned into hearing it. And as I was hearing it, I was thinking, *oh, I should have smiled or waved*. And then it wouldn't have, and, and I was, I was thinking that because there were many more, um, kids and people in the parade that were coming by and I was like, you know, don't, don't stare at them, wave to them or smile to them.
- 25:13 RTH: And is the word, is the word "smile" or "wave" present at this moment, or, or is that just a, I un, understand that that's what I'm thinking, I'm not, not using any words to think it?
- 25:25 Phil: Yeah. I think the word "smile," I think it was sort of like a, a notion all at once. Like, I should have, *I should have smiled* or *I should wave*. And it was just sort of this, this notion it was maybe it felt like inner speaking, but it was just the, the whole thought sort of came to me without drawing it out into those individual words: "I should have waved or smiled."
- 25:25 Russ comments: The discussion from here to the end of the beep (31:10) is all iterative training—preparing us to be more adept at future sampling opportunities.
- 25:57 RTH: So let's, let's presume that it's possible, not saying that this is what happened with the, but it, that it's possible to have a thought such as *I should have smiled or waved* with words or without words, either one. I think it's possible to have that thought without words, not saying you *did* here, it's our first sampling day, we're not. But I wanna notice at least the possibility that it would be possible to think *I should have smiled or waved* and have that be carried with words or have that be without words.
- 26:29 Phil: Mm hmm. I don't know. I, now I'm, now I'm almost starting to doubt myself because I do remember, I do remember having the word "smile" or "smiled" come to mind or, yeah. [RTH: And, and.] I think, I think, I think I can put it this way. The word "smiled" sort of represented the whole notion of "I should have smiled or waved," I think.

27:02 RTH: So, I think...

27:03 Phil: That makes the most sense to me.

27:03 Russ comments: It does make sense, and there are theories of inner speech (following the Russian psychologist Vygotsky) that hold that most or all inner speech is the result of such “condensation”: why should Phil have to utter the whole sentence to himself, when he himself knows what the whole sentence should say?

That is indeed *plausible*, but whether it is *true* or not is another story. So I will encourage us to bracket that theory, to set aside the plausibility of that explanation. Then if such condensation emerges in Phil’s subsequent sampling, it can be reasonably seen as evidence in favor of Vygotsky. But if Phil’s inner speech is in complete sentences on subsequent sampling days, it can be reasonably seen as evidence against Vygotsky.

But for there to be evidence either way, we have to cultivate a genuine indifference to the direction (condensation vs. complete sentences) of the result: we have to practice preferring discovery over confirmation. We have to be genuinely more devoted to discovering Phil’s inner experience as it actually is than to contributing to or disconfirming some theory.

27:05 RTH: ...So I think that makes sense. And I think, but I also think that, that we may very well have muddled the waters substantially about this sample. [Phil: Hmm.] And so I, I think there’s reason to believe, reason to be skeptical about that. And there’s reason to believe it it’s plausible and whether it’s true or not, I don’t actually know. And, and, and that is not a criticism of Phil. That is the way, and not a criticism of me for asking the questions that I ask it. It’s the way this process works. [Phil: Mm hmm.] To the, to the, if, if we have to, let’s put it this way, if we have to sort of spell out the possibility that maybe there are words, and maybe there are not words, then I think it’s *not possible to know*, retrospectively, whether there are words or not words.

27:53 Phil: Mm, okay.

27:54 RTH: Going forwards, it’s a different deal because *now* we’ve had this discussion at least once about, well, maybe there’s words, or maybe there’s not. And, and Phil will be more alert to that, presumably, because we’ve had this conversation, or maybe not, maybe this, this conversation will flow in one ear and out the other or whatever. And that’s, that’s fine too, but that’s, but that’s the way this process works. [Phil: Okay.] And if, if we have to work at making a distinction, it’s too late for that distinction to, to be, uh, reliably reported.

28:28 Phil: Okay.

28:29 RTH: You, you have, you have got to have that distinction ready [Phil: Mm hmm.] the second right after the beep. [Phil: Mm hmm.] And if you didn’t, then the, I think there’s just no way of knowing what was going on at the moment of beep. [Phil: Yeah.] And that’s, and that is just the way this process works, that it’s.

- 28:48 Phil: Yeah. I, I'll try to be more attentive to that, instinctively.
- 28:51 RTH: Yeah. And, and what I, I would also say about that is I don't want you to be *particularly* attentive to *that* distinction because that is not necessarily the most important distinction that happens to be the one that we talked about on the third beep today. And maybe that was a figment of Russ's imagination or, or Phil and Russ got into some kind of a wild hair or whatever. And, and so what, what I, what I *expect* will happen is that we will get better at paying attention to what Phil's experience was. And we don't have to work at it any, any any more than we, if we're interested in it, which it seems to me, we are, then we'll get better at it. Just in the, in, in the course of a natural thing. And we don't have to specify *what* we're gonna get better at it. You know, it could very well be that there won't be any more words ever again, in your experience. And, and so this distinction will, will not make any sense to us. That will be fine with me.
- 29:54 Phil: Okay. You, so you pointed put the distinction, and now I'm, I'm aware of it and I'm, yeah. I'm not gonna try to focus on it in particular is, is what you're saying.
- 30:04 RTH: I think I, I think that's exactly right.
- 30:06 Phil: Yeah. Okay.
- 30:08 RTH: So, so for example, we, and we made a distinction in the previous week about that, about, uh, touch, the touch could be, there could not be there. [Phil: Mm hmm.] Well, that, that gets filed away into the distinctions that now, that now are part of our conversation. [Phil: Right.] And, and, but I don't want you to be going to say, oh, *was touch there? Was touch not there? or Words there? Words not there?* That's not the deal. The deal is, let's try to grasp Phil's experience, and, and we have some practice in talking about touch, talking about color ,and talking about brightness, and talking about words and talking about context, and all those things. And, uh, we're gonna get better at it, or we're not.
- 30:53 Phil: I think, I think we will.
- 30:55 RTH: I, I'm guessing that we will, but, but I don't, *even that* I don't wanna say, well, we are gonna get better at it because maybe we're not, the world's, the world's a complicated place.
- 31:05 Phil: Mm hmm. Okay.
- 31:08 RTH: Amber, you wanna ask anything there before we go on to number 4?
- 31:10 AG: Um, I think I'm good.
- 31:11 RTH: All right. Let's do number 4.

SAMPLE 1.4 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 31:15 Phil: Okay. I was on, um, there's a pedestrian section of the main street; I was on, I was on that part of the main street, surrounded by people celebrating, uh, Constitu, Constitution Day. And um, many people wear traditional outfits. They're very, they're very nice. And, um, it's actually a very formal occasion. Um, I wanted to send my family some pictures, and a few minutes prior, I had seen an, an older man wearing a, a very extravagant, um, so these traditional outfits are called Bunad. He was wearing a very extravagant Bunad and, um, and I regret, I regretted not asking him if I could take his picture. And at the moment prior to the beep, I was thinking to myself that I could have just said to him, "can I take a picture of your wonderful Bunad?" And, and it probably would've been fine. And the context there is that I have this vague memory of reading something, maybe a comment on Facebook or, or something, about locals not liking tourists taking their photo. I mean, I'm not really a tourist cuz I've lived here for over 4 years. But, um, they might think that I am. But I was, I was thinking to myself, it, it would've been just fine if, if I had approached the man and said, enthusiastically, "could I take a picture of your wonderful Bunad?" And that's, that's the, that's what was going through my head at the moment prior to the beep.
- 32:53 RTH: Okay. So that's a complicated phrase. "Can I take a picture of your wonderful Bunad?" Was that whole phrase there, or just the idea of that without any?
- 33:06 Phil: The whole phrase was there.
- 33:07 RTH: In what way?
- 33:09 Phil: I was, I was, as I remember it, I was innerly speaking to myself. Um, I should have just said, "can I take a picture of your wonderful Bunad?"
- 33:25 RTH: So I'm speaking that whole sentence quote, "I should have just said," quote, "can I take a picture of your wonderful Bunad?" unquote question mark, basically.
- 33:37 Phil: Um, the way that I have it here, I was, I just said, "can I take a, a picture of your wonderful Bunad?" Yeah.
- 33:49 RTH: So the, "I should have just said" is sort of the context of the, of the deal?
- 33:53 Phil: Yeah. That's the context.
- 33:54 Phil: Okay.
- 33:54 RTH: Yeah.
- 33:58 RTH: And so at the moment of the beep, my experience is of, innerly saying as if to this older fellow, "can I take a picture of your wonderful Bunad?"
- 34:09 Phil: Yeah.
- 34:10 RTH: And this is in my voice?

34:13 Phil: Yeah.

34:13 RTH: I, as if I'm speaking it?

34:17 Phil: It, like you're referring to me [RTH: Yeah.] and my, yeah.

34:22 RTH: Yeah. And, and, and, and, and as an aside, I sometimes switch back and forth with pronouns. Like, oh, I'll use, I, when I mean, you, and I think most of the time that's, but basically I'm trying to understand what you're like, and it's easier for me to do that if I...

34:36 Phil: Yeah. Sure. Yeah.

34:37 RTH: ...use first person, but the. [Phil: Yeah, but I.] So what I wanna know is, is, is this speaking, does this speaking feel to me as in *you*) [Phil: Mm hmm.] to Phil, like external speaking? Except that there's no words coming out?

34:58 Phil: Correct.

35:00 RTH: So this is a, this, this is me speaking to myself. Well, that's actually, well, let me ask that. So is this me speaking to myself or me speaking to the guy? Does it feel like I'm speaking to the guy.

35:12 Phil: I. [Exhales]

35:16 RTH: Or does it seem like?

35:17 Phil: Like I, like, I'm speaking to the guy, like I'm speaking to the guy. I was sort of just imagining myself, like, cuz I, I regretted not taking his picture, and I was sort of imagining myself back in time a few minutes ago when I had first seen him. And in saying to him, "can I take a picture of your wonderful Bunad?"

35:44 RTH: Okay. And is there anything else in your experience about this at the—I shouldn't say "about this." Is there anything else in your experience at the moment of the beep?

35:54 Phil: Oh, it was in, it was in the context of me saying that to him, but I wasn't, um, I, I wasn't really visualizing him. No, it was more, I was more focused on the, on the words that I regretted not saying to him.

36:15 RTH: And how about the regret? Is that part of your experience?

36:21 Phil: Um.

36:21 RTH: The whole thing is, the whole context is regret. I understand that. But do I feel regretful at this moment?

36:28 Phil: Yeah, I, I felt regretful, but I don't think it was an immediate part of the, uh, context of this experience. It was more in the background, and I was just focused on, on having not said these words.

36:47 RTH: Okay.

36:48 Phil: [to someone off camera] Hey!

36:53 RTH: So, because I might have to write something down here. How does one spell Bunad?

36:59 Phil: Oh yeah. Um, I had to look that up as well. It's B-U-N-A-D.

37:06 RTH: B-U-N-A-D?

37:08 Phil: Yeah, Bunad.

37:09 RTH: Bunad. Okay. And while I'm into spelling, your fiancé's name is Eva-stina, did you say?

37:17 Phil: Um, it's um E-V-A and then a hyphen and then S-T-I-N-A.

37:25 RTH: That's how I had it except the hyphen.

37:25 Phil: Good job.

37:25 RTH: Okay. I think I'm good. You're good, Amber?

37:44 AG: I'm good.

37:47 Phil: Okay.

37:49 RTH: Number 5.

SAMPLE 1.5 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

37:49 Phil: Okay. What happened at number 5? That was today. I had just finished reading the sentence, quote, unquote, "the term retroactive avoidance refers to a special class of effects of future stimulus presentations on past behavioral responses," quote. I didn't understand it; I didn't understand the sentence. And I was thinking, um, "I'm going to have to read that one again," as I was scanning with my eyes back to the beginning of the sentence to give it another try. Um, the sentence is the, the first sentence of an abstract in, um, in a, in an article of an article in, in PLOS ONE for a replication study about, um, strange phenomenon that some believers count as evidence towards the existence of the paranormal. And without saying it, I was also thinking something like, *oh God, here we go*. And while not really thinking it, but feeling that sort of attitude, um, it was kind of like, I was innerly rolling my eyes.

39:14 RTH: So I take it that there are something like three aspects of your experience going on at the moment?

39:23 Phil: Uh, I had just finished reading, okay. I had just finished reading the sentence and I didn't, I didn't, I didn't pick it up. I, I, I didn't give it enough attention, I guess. And, uh,

and I, I, yeah, so I didn't understand it. And I was thinking, yeah, "I'm gonna have to read that one again."

39:45 RTH: And is that a quote?

39:46 Phil: And I was scanning back to it and as I was scanning back to it, I had, I had an attitude of, oh, here's like, there's something about this paranormal, I like, I'm not a believer in the paranormal. And, uh, and any, this idea of retroactive avoidance as, as some sort of psychic phenomenon, um, I, I personally think is kind of silly, and it seems like this article got into that right away with the first sentence. And, um, I didn't understand the first sentence I was scrolling back to the beginning, but it was, and I was thinking, "I'm gonna have to read that one again." I think I used words, I believe as I remember it, I used words, "I'm gonna have to read that one again." And then as I was scrolling back with my eyes, back to the beginning of the sentence on the screen, it was kind of like, I was actually doing an eye roll of oh, geez.

40:47 RTH: So it seems like there's sort of *two* things going on. There's one is that I'm somehow conveying the *words*, "I'm gonna have to read that one again," unquote. And I'm scanning back with a attitude of, oh God, this paranormal crap again.

41:05 Phil: Yeah.

41:06 RTH: And, and that is accompanied by, or part of that, part of that is an eye, inner eye roll?

41:14 Phil: Yeah. It, it felt like that. It felt like that.

41:19 RTH: So does, and when, and when we talk about a eye roll, do you really, do you, does it feel like I'm rolling my eyes? Or, or are you saying I have the feeling that if I were to embody it, I would roll my eyes?

41:31 Phil: Yeah. Um, it felt like I, I wasn't actually rolling my eyes, but I was, as you sort of said, here we go with this crap. Um, I felt like I was doing an eye roll.

41:49 RTH: Okay. [Phil: Yeah.] And, and, and so how does that feeling present itself?

41:58 Phil: Not physically.

42:00 RTH: So not in my eyes?

42:02 Phil: In terms of, yeah, not physically. I didn't actually feel like I was rolling my eyes, but just in my, in my attitude.

42:10 RTH: So sort of a *mental* eye roll, a *mental*?

42:14 Phil: Yeah. A mental eye roll, yup.

42:16 RTH: A mental here, here we go again. Paranoid crap eye roll.

- 42:22 Phil: Yeah.
- 42:22 RTH: But no physical reaction to it. No eye roll. No, no sigh?
- 42:28 Phil: No. No. I was, um, I, what occupied a good, the, probably the greater part of my attention was me saying "I'm gonna have to read that one again."
- 42:45 RTH: And, and are you saying that? Is this an innerly spoken thing? I am speaking these words to myself, "I'm gonna have to read that one again," unquote?
- 42:54 Phil: Yeah. Very, very quickly, like, [speaks quickly] "I'm gonna have to read that one again."
- 42:59 RTH: So it's not just the idea, *I'm gonna have to read that one again*? It's the words, quote, "I'm gonna have to read that one again," unquote?
- 43:08 Phil: Yeah. But in, in kind of, um, in kind of a condensed manner, it's, it's hard to, y'know, it's hard to describe. It just, I feel like it happened so quickly. I, I read the sentence, I didn't understand it. And, and I thought to myself, "I'm gonna have to read that one again," but there's like, all those words might have sort of might have been joined together. And, um, and I remember looking back on the, on the screen to the beginning of the sentence and also having this attitude of, *oh boy, here we go*.
- 43:55 RTH: So let's have another little lecture about, about what, what, the way this, this could be. So it could be that you are experiencing those words one after another, just as if I was saying 'em out loud. Uh, "I'm gonna have to read that one again," unquote, that whole string of words. Or it could be that there is some condensation about that as you use the term, but the, the literature is, uh, is, as, as you no doubt know, talks about condensed inner speech and that, that inner, that condensation *could be*, you know, it could, could be all I, all I say was again, and I know that, that word, I, I know that what again means is, "I'm gonna have to read that one again," because it's me, that's doing the speaking, and so, so when I say "again," I know what that means. So, so that's possible. And it could be that there's one word and it could be there's, you know, "read again," those two words are present. And I don't, I, what, I, I want us to be open about that, so condensation could take place [Phil: Mm hmm.] or, or not. And it is possible for that idea to be present without any words *at all*, so you just sort of the maximal condensation, why [Phil: Mm hmm.] I can, I can think that thought with *no words at all*, because I'm doing this again, I don't have to, I don't have to use words if I don't want to, and I, I know what I'm thinking. *Or* it could be that I'm going back to do it again. My eyes are tracking back, and I don't have any really cog, cognition experience of anything cognitive, think-y, word-y, whatever. Don't have any experience in that. But I can say, well, the way my eyes are going back in, incorporates or embodies this idea that I have to read that one again. All those things are possible, and, and I'm, and on the first day, I don't ever expect anybody to get any of those things, right, I mean, it takes practice to tease those possibilities apart.
- 43:55 Russ comments: That was RTH's attempt at helping us bracket presuppositions about the nature of inner speech, or inner thinking in general. The question for the viewer is whether RTH's question contributed to leveling the playing field for *future* discussions

about *future* samples. It seems pretty fair to me, and I can forthrightly say I was *trying* to be fair, but the judgment about whether I was successful is not mine to make.

46:03 Phil: Mm hmm.

46:04 RTH: And I don't, I don't want to presuppose that I know which of those Phil engages in, and it could be that I have that I missed an important one for Phil. I don't want to imply that these are the four possibilities and that has to be *one of those* [Phil: Mm hmm.] – a multipl-choice-test kind of a deal. It's not that. What I....

46:26 Phil: It was, it was the way that I remember it. And I don't know if this makes sense, but, um, it was, it was almost like I innerly mumbled, "oh, I'm gonna have to read this one again," Just not really sounding out the words in my head, but not really being completely silent. Well, for lack of a better term, um, kind of like an inner, inner, [mumbles] "oh, I'm gonna have to read this one again."

46:56 RTH: Well, that there's, so there's option number 5. I listed four, or whatever, and that's option number 5. And, and, and, and what I, what I think is that the water is muddled. If now that we've had this conversation, the next time you have that beep you're, you're more likely to be able to pay, pay better attention to the way that experience actually took place.

47:19 Phil: Yeah. Yeah.

47:20 RTH: Maybe. So maybe there's some 6th option that, that won't have been improved or might have even been made worse by this conversation. [Phil: Hmm.] But I, the, the *best* we can do, from my point of view, is to, is to try to do the best we can do each time in, in the hopes that, that we get better at it as we go.

47:41 Phil: Mm hmm. Okay.

47:42 RTH: So I wouldn't, I, so I, what I'm saying is, I'm not really crediting your claim that what, that this was a mumble, Maybe it was, maybe it wasn't. [Phil: Okay.] I think, I think our questioning has screwed up your ability to answer that question adequately. And that's not a criticism of Phil. [Phil: Mm hmm.] It, it's just, um, a matter of fact: this is the way this, the way being careful about describing it.

47:42 Russ comments: DES is genuinely confrontational, as illustrated here: RTH says straightforwardly that he doesn't merely accept Phil's claim about mumbling. Etymologically, to "confront" means to come face-to-face with, and that is what motivates RTH's talk. RTH is being transparently genuine with Phil.

Confrontation has a bad reputation, because it is usually invoked in a power struggle: A confronts B because A wants to win something from B. That is not the case here. RTH confronts Phil because he wants RTH and Phil to be aligned with genuine respect for the obstacles that attend to any attempt at fidelity of description.

48:10 Phil: It really is becoming apparent how these biases and presuppositions can play a huge role in, in this. [RTH: Totally.] Yeah.

48:10 Russ comments: The enthusiasm of Phil's reply suggests that he grasps the intention of RTH's confrontation. That's good news. Confrontation of any kind is risky.

48:19 RTH: And so, and, and so I, I think, I think it's fair to say that probably every word that I have said is aimed at undermining the possibility of some presupposition or other. [Phil: Mm hmm.] And with the, with the hope that if we can set those presuppositions aside, then the experience on some future day will, will stand free of the prepositions.

48:42 Phil: Mm hmm. Yep.

48:45 RTH: And it's, and it's a skill, it's practice. We, we have to, you know, everybody's got their favorite presuppositions and, and we don't get rid of them on one day. We don't wake up one day and say, *well, I think I'll have no pre, presuppositions today* any more than I wake up today and say, *I think I'll be a virtuoso violinist today*. So, you gotta work at it. All right, that was number 5, should we go to number 6?

SAMPLE 1.6 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

49:13 Phil: Okay. This was the last one. I was about to search my emails for a message, a specific message, with a, like a draft, with a link to a Vietnamese recipe that's, that, uh, that we have planned for dinner tonight. Um, at the moment prior to the beep, I was about to type the name of the dish, which is it's called Goi Ga. And I was about to type the name of the dish in the search field, but I couldn't remember it. And often when I tried to recall the name of someone or something that I can't remember, I start by pretending to say it, but actually saying nonsense, like "blah, blah," over and over again. And I, I sort of gradually shape what I say into the, into the right number of syllables or a familiar letter or syllable, hoping that, um, if, if I'm right with maybe the first letter, the rest will come to me. And this time I did a, a mental "blah" without actually inner speaking the word "blah" or any nonsense word. It's more like the sentiment was there. Like I was expelling some random syllable to start the process. And simultaneously, or maybe, maybe an instant later, I automatically visualized, vaguely, the (this, this is a salad dish), I visualized the, the dish, which looks especially and uniquely colorful with, um, it has shredded chicken and purple cabbage. So when you look at the dish, you see kind of purple and, and white. And, um, so I, I was about to type the word. I, um, I couldn't remember the word and I just had this, this, um, inner blah. Hoping that I, it would come to mind. Meanwhile, I was, um, I was visualizing the, the colors of the dish, like little bits of purple and little bits of, of, of white to sort of help me remember the name of it.

51:29 RTH: And is all that happening right at the very leading edge of the, leading edge of the, caught in flight by the beep?

51:41 Phil: Yup.

51:41 RTH: So I'm some somehow saying blah and somehow visualizing color, the colors purple and white?

51:41 Russ comments: “*Saying blah*” does not do justice to Phil’s description, which had denied the saying portion: “And this time I did a, a mental ‘blah’ without actually inner speaking the word ‘blah’ or any nonsense word.” DES is a performance art, and investigators are occasionally off the mark.

It may be that infelicity that spurs Phil’s “that sounds right” qualification at 51:49. Had RTH 51:41 not misrepresented the saying, then Phil might have said “Yep” (at 51:48) and left it at that.

51:48 Phil: Yep.

51:49 RTH: Okay. [Phil: That, that sounds right.] And is one, one of those more, more salient to you than the other, the, the colors or the blah?

51:59 Phil: I think, I think they were equally salient.

52:02 RTH: 50-ish—50-ish? So let’s start with a, let’s start with the salad. So I’m, innerly seeing this salad, but I’m mostly attending to the purple and the white, is that right?

52:15 Phil: Yeah, I, it was only purple and white that I.... I didn’t really see the salad, I just saw bits of purple and bits of, bits of white.

52:24 RTH: Okay. So this is a, this is a purple, uh, the experience of seeing purple and white?

52:31 Phil: As a, as a representation of the salad.

52:41 RTH: So is my experience of seeing the salad or of seeing the purple and the white, [Phil: Mmm.] which I know to be the salad?

52:49 Phil: Uh, it was the experience of seeing purple and white as a representation of the salad.

53:01 RTH: So representation is a complicated word. So....

53:09 Phil: Um, I can, I can imagine the salad in a lot of detail if I want to. But in my memory of it, what stands out are the colors purple and white and little sort of little blotches, like, um, maybe if you took a picture of the salads and then put it out of focus and, or sort of distorted it and just reduced the colors to the main two colors. Um, maybe that’s kind of similar to what I was envisioning.

53:47 RTH: So in, in my experience, the color, the colors are the prominent portion of this thing? It’s not so much that I’m seeing a, that I’m *seeing* a salad, it’s that I’m seeing the colors purple and white?

53:59 Phil: Yeah. I’m not looking, [RTH: But.] I’m not seeing cabbage, and I’m not seeing chicken, I’m just seeing little bits of purple and little bits of white.

54:08 RTH: But I also rep, I also understand that the, the purple is somehow a cabbage-y purple, I guess, [Phil: Yeah.] and the white, [Phil: Yeah.] somehow a chicken-y white, but that’s?

54:21 Phil: Yeah. Exactly.

54:23 RTH: But my, but my interest is in the purpleless, purpleness and the whiteness?

54:28 Phil: Correct.

54:33 RTH: Okay. And at the same time I am somehow blah-ing?

54:37 Phil: Yeah. I just it's, it's almost as if I was, as if I said out loud, like I was thinking, "Oh, damn what is that, what is that salad called? What is the, the Vietnamese, what is the proper name for that salad? It's bluuh!" But I was doing that mentally.

54:59 RTH: And is, and so is that an innerly spoken "bluuh"? Or...?

55:03 Phil: No, no, it, it was just, I, it was just the sensation of having made some random sound to get me started on trying to remember the name. I don't know, maybe that doesn't make sense.

55:24 RTH: Well, everything makes sense, and nothing makes sense.

55:30 Phil: [laughs] Yeah.

55:30 RTH: We're trying to, we're trying to get at complicated things here. So is, is this *blah* thing or whatever it is, it is that present in the form of speaking? In the experience of speaking? Or present in the form of some kind of a cognitive space holder that doesn't have any speaking?

55:56 Phil: No, it was, it's present in the space of speaking.

56:00 RTH: So this is in the manner of innerly speaking, "blah"?

56:04 Phil: Yeah. But I wouldn't say it was the word, "blah." It was just [holds up hands as if in despair] [AG: Like a noise?] Making a noise, yeah.

56:04 Russ comments: Here's bit of commentary on DES procedure, as RTH sees it (in full recognition that RTH is not a perfect observer). Phil is in somewhat distress, and AG, nice person that she is, lets him off the hook by suggesting "noise" as the missing word. Phil responds with relief, repeating the word "noise."
RTH worries about that kind of interchange, worries that AG's suggestion, no matter how well intentioned, is an invitation to collude (let's call it noise, and then we can move on, avoiding the struggle), worries that Phil's response is an acceptance of that invitation.
If RTH is right about that, then the agreement to call it "noise" preempts the struggle to find a higher fidelity description.

56:14 RTH: And is there, is there actually a noise, or is there, is it even less re, even less explicit than that?

- 56:14 Russ comments: That is RTH's attempt to suspend any collusive acceptance of a less-than-adequate description and re-awaken the struggle.
- 56:23 Phil: Less explicit than that. [pause] [RTH: So...] I can't, see I, I can't, I can't describe the, I, I'm saying that I had, um, a feeling or a sort of like a sensation similar to making a noise, like, blah, but it wasn't the word "blah." And it wasn't an actual *noise* that I can describe.
- 56:50 RTH: So what, what I've got so far is that there's something about this, which seems spoken? [Phil: Yeah.] And what, what I understand that to mean is it's in somewhat of the same realm as "aawkward" was spoken?
- 57:10 Phil: No, awkward was a lot more clear. That was definitely the word "aawkward."
- 57:15 RTH: Right, so I understand, I understand that one was clearly, clearly articulated.
- 57:21 Phil: Yeah.
- 57:21 RTH: But what I was trying to get at was: that was *spoken*, clearly articulated. And this one, I understand that we're saying it was spoken, but at the other extreme of articulation?
- 57:33 Phil: Correct. Yup.
- 57:34 RTH: So it's not, it's not *just* that I'm waiting for a word to appear, it's that I am speaking a totally unarticulated token?
- 57:51 Phil: Yup. Yup. Um, I do this, I do this kind of regularly when I can't remember the, the word that I'm trying to think of. And, um, I usually start with just a, a guess of the first letter or how many syllables there are in the word. And I just, I had this experience like, like I had done that without actually doing it. And then at the same time, or perhaps an instant later, I was visualizing purple and white, sort of in a vague manner of the salad, looking at the salad.
- 58:43 RTH: So there, there's, we got another distinction to be making here. So I have the feeling that I had done that?
- 58:53 Phil: Yup.
- 58:53 RTH: That's sort of a, that would be a recollection of a speaking, rather than a speaking itself. So I can recall myself as having said something like blah, but at the moment of the beep, I'm not really *saying* anything.
- 59:11 Phil: Uh, I think I'm getting confused now.
- 59:13 RTH: So it comes down to the temporal specificity. So the, the moment that we're looking for is this, this moment, right, one microsecond just before the beep, beep begins.
- 59:25 Phil: Yup.

59:27 RTH: And the distinction that I'm chasing at the moment is something like, was I saying blah, without actually articulating blah, what it was, was I in the act of saying, that's one possibility. [Phil: Yeah.] And another possibility is I'm recalling that slightly before that, I had engaged in this inner, inner speaking of blah.

59:56 Phil: Now I think, I think the former is, is the correct [RTH: Okay.] experience, is, or a more accurate description of, of what my experience was.

1:00:08 RTH: So I'm, I am, s, innerly speaking something which wasn't gonna be a word in the, in the first place, but it's even less than not a word it's, I'm, I'm, innerly speaking...

1:00:24 Phil: Just a vocal of [RTH: ...a hint of a word or something.] a feeling similar to a vocal expulsion just to start the process of trying to remember this word.

1:00:24 Russ comments: The struggle that was referred to in the comments at 56:04 and 56:14 has continued for more than four minutes. DES is often a struggle: putting into words that which is not in words is indeed difficult. The aim of DES is to participate in that struggle, to recognize the potential virtue of that struggle, and to accept that the struggle is necessary is fidelity is the aim.

1:00:40 RTH: Okay. Then I think I'm....

1:00:40 Phil: A sound. Yeah.

1:00:41 RTH: I think I'm good.

1:00:42 Phil: Yeah.

1:00:43 RTH: And I think we've done a good job. This is a pretty typical, good high quality, I would say first day of, of sampling.

1:00:52 Phil: Good!

1:00:56 RTH: So we've, and so the goal, the goal, the goal of all day, all days of sampling is, as you said a minute ago, bracketing of presuppositions. I think we've, we've done that. We've tried to make some, some distinctions that seem like they might be important. Maybe they are, maybe they're not, we'll find out.

1:01:13 Phil: Mm hmm.

1:01:14 RTH: Um, we've taken each other seriously without, without believing each other. I mean, I think, I think that's, that's part of the, part of the, the goal. The goal here is to suspend belief until there's no reason to suspend belief anymore, so.

1:01:32 Phil: Yeah, sometimes I even had trouble believing myself. [laughs]

1:01:35 RTH: Yeah. So you say, you know, that I, I very frequently do this kind of thing. And I said, maybe he does, maybe he doesn't that's well, if it, if he does, then maybe we'll see some more beeps like this and we'll find out about that. And that's the, that is the, what I would take to be the, sort of the genuine effort that, that we're trying to make here. So we're, we're not interested really in Phil's experience in general, we're interested in Phil's experience at the randomly, moments that we get to, we get to see. And, and I think we've done a pretty good job of sort of corralling our interests into that.

1:02:16 Phil: Yeah. Yeah. I'm, I'm quite pleased. I think this, this, this is, this is turning, this is a great experience in, in, in and of itself.

1:02:24 RTH: Yeah, I agree with that. So shall we do it again?

1:02:28 Phil: Yes. Um, when is a good question, um.

1:02:28 Russ comments: They match calendars; the recording and this transcript fast-forwards over it.

1:06:54 RTH: I'll send you a calendar invite and, uh.

1:06:59 Phil: Okay. That's great.

1:07:02 RTH: Anything more that we should be saying today?

1:07:04 Phil: I don't think so. I, I'm, I'm a bit more attentive to these distinctions. Like was I actually using words or, or not? I think that's the main distinction um, I'm gonna be more aware of, but not overly focused on. Um, otherwise I think I'll just keep doing the same thing and, and just try to improve and be as specific as I can.

1:07:32 RTH: I think, I think that's the deal.

1:07:34 Phil: Yeah.

1:37:35 RTH: Alright, thank you very much.

1:07:37 AG: Thank you.

1:07:37 Phil: Okay. Thank you. Enjoy the rest of the day. It was nice meeting you, Amber, [AG: You too.] and, um, and I'll see you guys again soon.

1:07:42 RTH: See you Monday. All right. Take care.

1:07:45 RTH: Bye.

1:07:45 Phil: Buh-bye.