

TRANSCRIPT WITH COMMENTARY

Phil J.: A neuroscience writer

Phil Interview 5

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the June 9 interview with Phil that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/GdjlMOj0inA>. 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

CK = Cody Kaneshiro

AG = Amber Goto

Phil = Phil J.

- 0:00 RTH: So, I think we are, we are now more or less on schedule here, and this is going to be Phil 5. [Phil: Mm hmm.] And sorry about the delay and the, and the failure to notify people and whatever, [Phil: Oh, no problem.] but it seems like we got that under control. Anything else we should be talking about before we launch into beeps?
- 0:23 Phil: Um, I, I wanted to mention that I have to admit for some of the beeps that have been happening over the couple of days (and I think it did happen a couple of times last time), um, the beep goes off and I'm, I'm honestly at a loss for what my inner experience was at the moment right before the beep. Especially if I'm, if I'm engaged in something or I'm a bit busy. Um, yeah, so I, I have admittedly skipped a few beeps.
- 0:56 RTH: Well, well, I would, I would say going forwards, if that happens, let's not skip the beep. Let's do the, let's do the best we can and talk about, talk about that situation or whatever [Phil: Okay.] and maybe there's so, so there's a bunch of possibilities, one is that the beeper system, the beeping, the beeping logic doesn't work for you. That's quite possible in that situation. Or that there's nothing going on and the reason that you can't find anything is that there's *nothing*. And nothing is a totally okay answer to the question *what's in your experience at the moment of the beep?*
- 0:56 Russ comments: Another possibility is that Phil was using the beeper's onboard speaker instead of the earphone (we discovered that that was an issue on sampling day 7). The DES procedure requires a clear, unambiguous signal "injected" directly into the ear, and the onboard speaker is not adequate in that regard.
- 1:25 Phil: Okay.
- 1:27 RTH: So, so what I'm saying is let's not, let's not chalk this up as a personal Phil failure that... [Phil: Okay.] Let's, let's think of it as a characteristic of this adventure that we're on here, where we've given Phil a beeper, he's wearing it, he's doing the best he can, but maybe that's not good enough and, but that's not necessarily Phil's problem, it could be the, the method. So I, [Phil: Okay.] I think our task, our task is to try to be sort

of straightforwardly honest with each other about what's happening at the moment of these beeps. And if, and if that's problematic, then we should talk about it.

2:07 Phil: Okay.

2:11 RTH: Anything else we should be talking about?

2:13 Phil: Um, my first beep, uh, was a minimal involvement. Um, not that I can think of.

2:22 RTH: Okay.

2:23 Phil: Little, some signal difficulties. Um, I think I'm ready to move on to the first beep if everyone else is.

2:28 RTH: I am.

2:29 CK: Yup that works for me.

SAMPLE 5.1 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

2:30 Phil: Okay. So yeah, I was saying that the first beep involved a minimum of experience, so it's pretty, there's not so much to say here. Um, [appears to read from his notes:] I was sitting on a chair with my feet, warming, warming up on top of the portable heater. I happened to be looking at the floor through a hole formed by my bent arm on one side and my leg on the other. At the moment immediately before the beep I was about to shift my gaze, and my mind was blank. I just, I just wrote my mind was blank. The only content I can vaguely recall was that I was appreciating the, the deep green color of the pants I was wearing that I particularly like. [Finishes reading from notes.]

3:16 RTH: So I, I heard sort of two, two possibilities for what was in your experience. One was the, the hole that was made by your, by your arm and pants, I guess. Is that what the hole was made by? [Phil nods affirmatively.] And the other is the color of the, of the pants.

3:32 Phil: Yeah.

3:33 RTH: Are, are those both in your experience?

3:37 Phil: I would say that yes.

3:39 RTH: Equally?

3:42 Phil: I would say, I would say yes. [RTH: Okay.] Yeah.

3:49 RTH: And so this would, and then, and then, is there anything else in your experience other than, other than that?

- 3:57 Phil: You just have a little. Okay. Hold on. [inaudible; camera moves. Perhaps the puppy is interfering?]. Okay. Let me reposition the camera here. Um.
- 4:21 RTH: Zoom presents some challenges. Can't blame, can't say Zoom.
- 4:24 Phil: Sorry. No, that's [laughs] I, I lost track of where we were. I was just, I was say you were asking one experience was dominant over the other. And I, I think I was saying that it was about even.
- 4:38 RTH: Right. And so it seems like what, what what's in your experience is *two* separable but parallel sensory kinds of kinds of things. One is I'm seeing this hole, which is not really a hole, but it appears to be a hole made by two different geometries. [Phil: Mm hmm.] And I'm seeing the green of my, of the cordur, corduroy pants? did you say that you were wearing...?
- 5:02 Phil: No, they, well, they're not corduroy, but they're, they're green, green pants. Yeah.
- 5:02 Russ comments: The exchange starting at about 5:02 illustrates the difficulty of communication about inner experience. Phil had said in his 2:30 initial description that "The only content I can vaguely recall was that I was appreciating the, the deep green color of the pants." That sound like Phil describing what DES calls *sensory awareness*, an interest in some sensory aspect (here, the color green) for its own sake, not connected to any instrumental intention.
- 5:06 RTH: Green. And, and so the, so you said about the green, I think, that you were appreciating the greenness?
- 5:19 Phil: The deep green. Yeah. Yeah.
- 5:19 Russ comments: RTH wants to be sure it is a sensory-awareness experience, so he followed up at 5:06, and Phil at 5:19 still sounds like he's describing a straightforward sensory awareness.
- 5:22 RTH: So for whatever reason, it seems like you're drawn to the greenness, is that the?
- 5:28 Phil: I don't feel like I was particularly *drawn to* it. I just happened to be looking in that direction and it was in my view and I, the pants are relatively new and I like them.
- 5:28 Russ comments: RTH at 5:22 wanted to be triply sure, but now Phil can be understood as saying that his experience was *not* sensory awareness. But maybe the problem is with the word *drawn to*.
- 5:42 RTH: So the distinction that I'm trying to make is, is it the case that my eyeballs are aimed in this direction, and at the moment of the beep, I have to say something and so I'm gonna say, well, my eyeballs are aimed in my green pants? Or is it that, that the beep catches me in, in somehow involved with the greenness of the pants, that the greenness has attracted my attention for whatever reason and that gets caught?

- 5:43 Russ comments: The determination of sensory awareness can be understood as: Phil is seeing the pants, which happen to be green (*not* sensory awareness); or Phil is seeing the greenness, which happens to be of pants (sensory awareness).
- 6:08 Phil: I would say more in the former, they just happen to occur at that moment. That, that in part of my field of view were these pants and, um.
- 6:08 Russ comments: That sounds like *not* sensory awareness.
- 6:20 Phil: [continues] And I wasn't consciously appreciating the greenness of them, but somehow I feel that in my experience, there was, there was some kind of appreciation floating around the level of consciousness.
- 6:20 Russ comments: If we accept (as I do) that Phil is trying faithfully to describe his experience, then we must wrestle (along with him) as he tries to articulate a distinction between *not consciously appreciating the greenness* and yet *there was some kind of appreciation floating around the level of consciousness*.
- 6:36 RTH: Okay. So I, I, I don't wanna be making too much of the, of the *appreciation*, as if that has to be some kind of a separable deal, cuz that's not the point that I'm trying to make. What it, what I'm trying to tease apart here is whether the greenness somehow stands out for you, different from say the fabric or the shape or whatever, that, that I've, that my...
- 7:00 Phil: Yes. Yes, Different, separate from the fabric or the shape or any other aspect of the pants, the greenness stands out. Yes.
- 7:00 Russ comments: Phil sounds confident about this: The greenness stands out. RTH accepts that as being as-good-as-we're-going-to-get: His experience *is* sensory awareness.
- 7:09 RTH: Okay. And, and is that true of the hole that is formed as well? That is, it's the *hole* is standing out (actually the hole doesn't exist in the physical world, the hole exists in the Phil's perception of this thing and that thing) and...?
- 7:31 Phil: Yeah it was just like if I, if I go like this there's a hole right here it was, [RTH: Right.] I just happened to be looking through that hole, at the floor, noticing that at the moment prior to the beep, that's where my gaze happened to be directed. So it wasn't there, there was no, there was minimal active, a minimal active aspect to that moment.
- 8:03 RTH: These, these are the hard distinctions to pull apart. But so the, so the, so the question that I'm trying to understand for myself here is: is it the case that my eyes are looking in this direction? And when I have to describe to these guys, I'm saying, well, there was sort of a hole made of my arm and my leg or whatever it was. Or...
- 8:24 Phil: Yeah. I think it's fair to say that I was conscious of, uh, of a gap that I was looking through.

- 8:36 RTH: So you sort of broke up in that. You were conscious?
- 8:38 Phil: Uh oh there was a signal. I was consciously noticing this gap that I was looking through.
- 8:46 RTH: Okay. And that to my ear makes it seem sort of like the green of the pants. [Phil: Yeah!] That I could have... [Phil: Okay, yeah.] It's more than, it's more than I was just looking in this direction and there was a leg in an arm and that made a hole, but I am somehow seeing the hole rather than seeing the arm or the leg or, or whatever. Like I am seeing the green of the pants.
- 9:12 Phil: Meanwhile, I'm, I'm seeing the green of the pants, yeah. [RTH: Right.] If anything, it was the green of the pants that stood out a little bit more than, than this hole.
- 9:12 Russ comments: DES is a performance art, and the situation matters: we have been at this sample for seven minutes (and the longer one talks about a sample, the *less* reliable the conversation); the audio/video transmission difficulties interfere; and so on, so RTH thinks we have gotten as far as is reasonable about this sample. He tentatively concludes that at least the green was sensory awareness, but on subsequent sampling days he will recall the difficulty of this discussion, and perhaps then we will develop a clearer understanding about whether sensory awareness is an aspect of Phil's experience.
- 9:23 RTH: Okay. So, so those are those, those are common kinds of things, but that we call sensory awareness. And sometimes it seems like, like sensory awareness is... Some people say, well, that, that, that doesn't count. People seem to say, well, uh that's why, why would these guys be interested in the fact that I was seeing the greenness of the pants? But if that's, if that's what is in experience, then that we call that sensory awareness, we're interested in some sensory aspect. [Phil: Mm hmm.] It's more than my eyes are aimed at it, it's that I am in some way involved with the green. [Phil: Um hmm.] My neuro apparatus has decided to be interested in the green for whatever reason.
- 10:19 Phil: Yeah. Yeah. Oh, can, am I coming through okay?
- 10:22 RTH: Yep, now. [Phil: Okay.] We still have some challenges there. So I'm good about number 1, I think.
- 10:32 Phil: Okay. Um, yeah. Okay. Okay.
- 10:37 RTH: Anybody else have any questions about beep 1?
- 10:38 Phil: Uh, no, I'm good.
- 10:44 RTH: Okay. Beep number 2.

SAMPLE 5.2 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 10:48 Phil: Okay. Beep number 2. [Appears to read from notes.] I was riding my bike past a car that was backed into a driveway. I looked at the front of the car and was struck by the lack of any sign of its make. With words (and this is difficult to describe), I innerly said to myself, “it isn’t *anything*” such that all three words seem to overlap as if to be simultaneous. And by “it isn’t anything” [audio cuts out for 10-15 seconds] that there is no it’s no simultaneous. It also had a quality that felt equal parts passive, as if I was just realizing it had no make, and hearing myself say “it isn’t anything.” And actually *saying* it as if I was making ...[audio glitches] At the same time, I was perceiving two large auxiliary, auxiliary lights mounted on the front of the car, not something I see often in Canada or North America, but something common here in Scandinavia. The experience were, the experience were about 60-40, between the “it isn’t anything” and the seeing the lights. [apparently finishes reading notes] And that’s what I have.
- 10:48 Russ comments: (a) As a general DES principle, hearing as fully as possible what Phil says *at first* about a sample is very important. This is Phil’s first chance at describing the phenomenon without interference from the interviewer. That doesn’t mean that what Phil says is faithful or informative, but it is an important data point. (b) As a general DES principle, live interviews are much better than remote interviews—there is simply much information that fomes from intonation and body language that is impossible to receive in a video box. (c) Phil is in the process of describing a difficult-to-describe, impossible-in-the-real-world phenomenon, which under the best of circumstances will be a challenge. (d) This sample puts the worst of all of those things together, to create a minor tragedy for this situation: it will be very difficult if not impossible to get this right.
- 12:26 CK: Okay, Phil, if you don’t mind, actually, you broke up in the middle of talking about, um, you had mentioned like the three words, “it isn’t anything” was, were overlapping and then we kind of lost the big chunk there. And it picked back up after [Phil: Okay.] talking about, um, it had a quality of equal parts, passive and hearing. So if you could go back a little bit and tell us more about the, the, after the overlap, anything more to say about the wor, words.
- 12:57 Phil: Yup. Um, I innerly said to mys, okay. Um, I said it also had quality that equal parts passive as if I was just realizing the car had no make, and *hearing* myself say “it isn’t anything.” Wait. Okay. I, I have to read this with the right intonation so that it makes sense. Um, [apparently reads notes] it also had a quality that felt equal parts passive, as if I was just realizing it had no make, and hearing myself say “it isn’t anything,” and actually saying it as if I was making the exclamation to an imaginary person. [apparently finishes reading again] So, I hope it’s a little more clear.
- 13:41 CK: Yeah, I got that. And so let’s start with the 60% here that, the “it isn’t anything.” So those exact words present, right, quote “it isn’t anything” unquote?
- 13:54 Phil: Yeah. Yup.

- 13:57 CK: And I took you to be saying, this is both a hearing sort of a thing, like hearing your voice played back to you, as well as a producing of the word, I'm both hearing and speaking these words?
- 14:10 Phil: Yeah! It's *really* difficult to describe. I, it was, it was somewhere in between being active and passive. It's kind of like those words just came to me, but then it was also, like *I said them* with the, even with the intonation that I was making the exclamation to someone that might have been there.
- 14:36 CK: And is that *quality* of passive and active in the, y'know, the intonation of the words or the, y'know, intention to speak it or?
- 14:50 Phil: The active, the active aspect is there in the intonation of the words because I, it was, it was like somebody, I was with someone and I had said, *hey, look at this car*. It, well, I wouldn't have, I wouldn't have chosen those words because the person wouldn't have known what I was talking about, but it was like, I was saying, "it isn't *anything*!" Like it has no it's, it's, it has no make like no, no regular make, it's not a Ford, it's not a Mercedes, it's not, it's. Like kinda like as if to say, *what the hell is this*?
- 15:28 CK: Mm hmm. So it is sort of like, there's like an exclamation point into that, right, like "it isn't anything"? And I'm sorry you said and, and that was in?
- 15:35 Phil: A question mark *and* an exclamation mark.
- 15:38 CK: Gotcha. And I had lost this in the static, but you had said that, like, "it isn't, anything" is in the hearing of it or the speaking of it or both, or?
- 15:53 Phil: Um, um, in the hearing, it, it, it was like, I heard it and it was like, I spoke it.
- 16:00 CK: Okay. So I'm taking to be saying the, sort of like the, this is a qual, this is the sort of incredulous saying and hearing of sort of like again, of context of surprise, like "it isn't anything!?" [Phil: Yeah!] And, but again, and also one quality of this is that these words are somehow all simultaneously present, right? In reality, I'm saying this one after another, but at the moment of the beep sort of all three of those words were directly apprehended?
- 16:33 Phil: Yup.
- 16:34 CK: Okay. And is that to say, and this is maybe a hard question, but were those words [pause]. Would you say when those words were heard, was it that the words were sort of just like that? Like, it "isn't anything" kind, some, but it was just like that heard where I'm hearing these three words separated? Or is it sort of like, "it isn't anything" as if I were to combine those words in a recording and play it all back so they're all present at a single second?
- 17:11 Phil: It's a very, very valid question, but I, I can't explain it other than to say, um, the words overlapped each other so greatly to the point that they seemed simultaneous. And it was, it was like, I heard myself, maybe that's the new aspect that I hadn't described

before. It was like, I heard *myself* saying them, but it was like, I was also actively making the exclamation.

- 17:41 CK: Okay. So there actually something overlap-y about the words that you heard?
- 17:49 Phil: Yeah. To the point where, when I wrote this, I thought they were simultaneous.
- 17:57 RTH: So there's, there's been a challenge of the, of the audio. And so I wanna make sure that I understand. So is, does it *seem* that these three words are coming out at the same time as if we had taken a recording of *it* and a recording of *isn't* and a recording of *anything* and overlap them and play them back simultaneously with these?
- 18:20 Phil: Yeah! More, more or less I sort of get this visual where each of the words is, is on, um, a transparency and they're all, they're, they're all in uh, aligned.
- 18:37 RTH: And I take it that that's an explanatory metaphor that you're applying now, you didn't see that transparency at the moment of the beep, but now you're as a way to try to explain what's happening with the?
- 18:48 Phil: That's right, yeah.
- 18:52 RTH: So this is a, and, and you seem confident about this, that even though this is sort of a strang, er word or whatever kinda thing that you wouldn't experience in the real world, it seemed like this was the case that these, these words were somehow how simultaneously appearing in your...?
- 19:09 Phil: Yeah. I can almost, replay it in my mind right now.
- 19:13 RTH: You can, or you cannot?
- 19:15 Phil: I, I *can*, almost.
- 19:18 RTH: Okay.
- 19:20 CK: And feel like I, I, like, I think the question Dr. Hurlburt was asking, and I tried to ask at first. It's not that these words are just quickly spoken for, for example, right. Again, the real world. I couldn't say all, I couldn't say three words simultaneously, but it would sound something like [spoken quickly] "it isn't anything" right, or something really quick. It's not that I take you to be saying, it's *not* that, that, there's something that's actually, it's more than that?
- 19:41 Phil: It's more than that. Yes.
- 19:42 CK: Okay.
- 19:42 Phil: Yeah.

- 19:47 CK: Any other questions about the words that anyone wants to ask or? Okay. So I also wanted to go on to, Phil, about the, the other part of this experience. I took you saying there was something about auxiliary lights present? [Phil: Yeah.] Correct? And how is that present to you?
- 20:04 Phil: Um. Yeah, it's, it's, I find it difficult to think of any other way to describe it, as beyond saying it was a visual, simultaneous, visual experience. Um, I wasn't dr, well, I guess I was drawn to the lights because they're not something I'm so used to seeing. And, um, they, I guess for lack of a better way to put it, they just attracted the direction of my gaze.
- 20:49 CK: So this is I'm, so maybe try this on, it's, um, I'm looking at the car, the car has auxiliary lights. And at the moment in the beep, I'm drawn to seeing a...?
- 21:02 Phil: Yeah. [CK: ... auxiliary lights.] I mean, in the moment that came immediately prior, I had been looking at the front of the car just because, um, I, I guess I just noticed that there was no sign of any make, and I had been looking a little bit more closely at the front of the car. And then I had this, "it isn't anything." And while the, and it, while the isn't, "it isn't anything" happened I was looking at these, uh, at these auxiliary lights.
- 21:35 CK: And not necessarily drawn to like the color or the material or anything like that it, right, just looking at the lights?
- 21:41 Phil: I was just looking at the lights, yeah.
- 21:45 CK: Okay. Then I think I'm good on that. Anyone else have any questions?
- 21:50 RTH: I'm good.
- 21:52 Phil: Okay.
- 21:53 RTH: Number 3.

SAMPLE 5.3 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 21:55 Phil: Yep. [apparently reads notes] I was using my computer and had just typed a message in, um, Messenger on Facebook. Before sending it, I wanted to include a laughing emoji and hovered the cursor over the emoji icon for a moment before clicking on it. At the moment right before the beep the words "choose an emoji" appeared, and I read them, they, they appeared on the, on the screen. I viewed the words all at once, and I innerly heard myself say slowly, "choose an emoji." [apparently stops reading]
- 22:37 RTH: And by "slowly," do you mean slowly by contrast to the previous beep or slowly by, by Phil's usual speed of speaking?
- 22:50 Phil: Slowly by Phil's usual mode of speaking. [laughs] It was, was early, well not...
- 22:57 RTH: No, no, no excuses necessary [laughs]

- 23:00 Phil: ...possibly really early in the morning and uh. [laughs] And um, I, yeah, I didn't have [audio cuts out] so much coffee and I, those words appeared. And just as a sort of automatic reaction, no, I don't know. Am I, am I coming in clear enough?
- 23:25 RTH: You broke up, but now you are.
- 23:28 Phil: Okay. Yeah. I moved the cursor over the icon and those words came up and sort of more or less as a reaction. I, I automatically started to read them, "choose..." the words came up, I saw [speaks slowly] "choose... an...emoji" and I was, and next thing would've been like, *well, okay!*
- 23:51 RTH: [laughs] And, and did you, did you, you, I believe you said that you *heard* your voice say this? So that was this a, I *heard* my voice say this, or is this a, *I said it?*
- 24:04 Phil: I heard my voice say it.
- 24:08 RTH: And is that distinction as clear as, as if you had heard a recording of your voice say it? or is, or heard me say it in your...?
- 24:19 Phil: That's a, that's a good way to put it. I, I would say it was quite like hearing a recording of my voice saying it.
- 24:25 RTH: More, like saying more, more, like hearing a recording of my voice than like saying it?
- 24:31 Phil: More like hearing a recording of my voice than like actually saying it, yeah.
- 24:43 RTH: Okay. So I think I'm good with, as far as this, so the experience. What I've got, basically, is I'm looking at the, um, I'm in the process of sending a message or whatever, and I'm look hovering over a, an emoji (and, and that's sort of the context). And the experience is I'm seeing the emoji and hearing my voice say, I'm, I'm seeing the emoji, I'm seeing the sign say, "choose an emoji," and I'm hearing my voice say slowly, [speaks slowly] "choose...an...emoji."
- 25:12 Phil: Yeah.
- 25:17 RTH: Okay. Then I think I'm good.
- 25:19 CK: Me as well.
- 25:19 Phil: Okay. Beep 4.

SAMPLE 5.4 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 25:19 CK: Beep 4.
- 25:26 Phil: [Appears to read from his notes.] I was, was walking with Max, the new puppy, and I was quite pleased because we made it as far as the small lake near our place. And I

was walking... (Okay, this one's kind of, this one's interesting I think.) Um, I was walking, looking down at the ground just ahead of me. I could see, I was, innerly hearing an instrumental part of a song I like very much called "Come In Alone." The enjoyable, relatively high pitched swelling sounds in the melody re, repeated. I have a very visual association with the songs from this album. And I began to passively imagine flashing shards of glowing shades of pink appearing. They didn't appear in the external world, and somehow they were just there similar to what you see when you shut your eyes after looking at something bright, like a fire or the sun. [Appears to stop reading.] (Not that I spend much time looking at the sun, but you know what I mean.)

- 26:38 CK: So just to make sure, cuz there's some audio issues, Phil, when you were saying earlier, but you're walking, the context is [Phil: Oh darn.] you're walking with Max and you were also hearing, um, you were like, were you listening to "Come In Alone" like on earphones or is this something that's playing in your head?
- 26:53 Phil: It was something playing in my head.
- 26:55 CK: Okay. But so you hear the instrumental part of "Come In Alone" in your head. And right at the moment of the beep it's seeing these flashing glowing pink? Is that, is that correct? Okay. [Phil: (nods) Yes.] And so at the moment of the beep, are your eyes open?
- 27:16 Phil: Yep.
- 27:16 CK: Okay. But this, but these flashing glowing pink and, and what, and what are, is it, is there something more to be said about that? Like, is there a shape to this, or a?
- 27:32 Phil: Um, not a shape that I can describe, but just sort of patches that are, that maybe fill up, I would say [squirms] between 5 and 10% of my visual field.
- 27:55 CK: And I take you to be saying, this is a visual thing, right? Like somehow this I'm apprehending this as visual. As opposed to I, this pink is something I associate with the song and I kinda *know* this song is pink, but?
- 28:11 Phil: Yeah.
- 28:12 CK: Okay. And at the moment of the beep, is there a location to those, like, patches or the pink, like around the borders or kind of in the center, or does that question not make sense?
- 28:28 Phil: Um, it was the only way I can describe them is somehow more peripheral than central. [pauses] On the, [smiles] on the left side for some reason. [CK: Okay.] On my left side.
- 28:54 CK: Okay. And you said that it's sort of like floaters, right? Like when you close your eyes, is that, y'know, or I'm sorry, not floaters, but y'know, like the afterglow, I guess, right, of looking at a bright light?

- 29:06 Phil: Yep.
- 29:09 CK: Does that mean that these are s, or I'm trying to figure out, I guess, is for this particular glowing pink, is that something that you see? And I'm seeing it in my imagination sort of, and I'm sort of super imposing this, or how is that present?
- 29:31 Phil: Yeah, I, I would say that there is an aspect to it that involved a super imposition on, on the real world.
- 29:43 CK: I'm not seeing it out onto the right, like whatever I look at the ground or the trees or whatever, but I know this pink is sort of?
- 29:50 Phil: There was like a, a minimal, almost non-existent what did I write about the spatial aspect of this? [looks at notes] Yeah, in, in terms of geometry associated with the real world, there was a, like a minimally spatial aspect... There was no depth, there was no depth to these shards of pink.
- 30:16 CK: Sort of these flat patches or blobs or...?
- 30:19 Phil: Yeah.
- 30:19 CK: Okay.
- 30:24 RTH: So I, I understand you to be saying that your system, your neurological system is making up these shards of pink, but the question that Cody was asking a little bit ago that I didn't hear the answer to, I think, was, does it, as far as your experiences concerned, does it seem like these pink patches are out there in the real world, that I'm, I'm seeing exterior pink?
- 30:44 Phil: No. No. Nope. None.
- 30:46 RTH: So I, I, I recognize myself to, to be creating these things. This is more or less like a visual image, and I'm seeing a visual image at the same time as I'm seeing the external world?
- 30:55 Phil: Yeah. The cover of the album that this song comes from [shown here] is just filled with like shades of pink and purple and red, and, and I, and I've, I've seen videos for some of the songs from this album and they also involve like, um, swirling pink, like, so it just kind, it's, it's a natural association, maybe not even just for me, but for, for other people as well I'm, I'm, I might think.
- 31:23 RTH: And for *you* at the moment of this beep, is it just the pink color, rather than the pink and the purple and the other colors?



Figure 1. The album cover

31:37 Phil: [pause] That's hard to answer. It's like my, my memory of it now is just the pink color. But what I wrote down was, I wrote "glowing shades of pink." So *maybe*, [RTH: Okay.] *maybe* it was, yeah.

32:04 RTH: So it's possible that we've muddied the water beyond recognition in that regard.

32:11 Phil: Maybe. And just, just for, for, um, just out of curiosity, I went and, when I came home, I, I listened to the song and my, the way that I had it in my head was a little bit different from, from what it actually sounds like. And, uh, what was playing in my head was, was a part of it. It was as if you could put up that certain part of it to accentuate it over the, over the other instrumentation in the song. So it was a, it was kind of biased towards these swirling, these swirling noises that, yeah, I'm at kind of a loss to describe.

33:01 RTH: And does, does that mean that at the moment of the beep it seems like I'm hearing this song the way it actually is? But when I got home and checked it out, I found, well, that wasn't really the case, it was, I've, I've distorted or biased or?

33:17 Phil: Yep. Yeah.

33:17 RTH: Okay.

33:20 CK: Just to clarify, Phil, that hearing was present at the moment of the beep with the shades of pink?

33:27 Phil: Yep. [CK: Okay.] The moment prior to the beep, yep. Or, yeah, sure, the moment of the beep.

33:33 CK: The, the moment just before the beep went off, right, I'm, I'm, innerly hearing that instrumental part of "Come In Alone" and the seeing the shades of pink?

33:42 Phil: Yup.

33:48 CK: And just the, in terms of *what* you're hearing, you said at the beginning, it's like a brief part of the chorus, is that correct?

33:58 Phil: Um, no, not a part of the chorus. Just, just sort of the, this, this, this melody that plays more or less throughout the song.

34:12 CK: Okay, got it.

34:13 RTH: And is it an instrument in the original real song, is it an instrumental portion? Or have *you* extracted out the voices?

34:24 Phil: No, it's an instrumental, yeah.

34:26 RTH: Okay. Then I think I'm good.

34:30 CK: I'm good too.

34:32 Phil: Okay.

34:36 RTH: 5. Number 5.

SAMPLE 5.5 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

34:38 Phil: Here is okay, Number 5. I was. Yeah, I think I, I find this one interesting as well. [Appears to read from notes.] I was, I was inside on my sofa (I would normally say couch), um, with my computer. And it was virtually silent during a gap between typing. Coming from the airport, about two and a half miles away, I had heard faintly what sounded like two instances of jet engines starting up. They make a ghostly howling noise that travels for kilometers between the surrounding mountains. Each sound lasts a few seconds. The beep occurred at around the end of a *third* instance of the sound while listening to the sound. I innerly heard myself say "inside...third...three." "Inside" alluded to the fact that I could hear the sounds from inside, which is rare. "Third" referred appropriately, appropriately to it being the third instance of the sound. "Three" referenced my surprise at actually hearing the sound three times consecutively, as most often, it's heard once or twice. At the same time, my gaze was directed at our portable heater, the surrounding floor, and part of the bookshelves we have that are filled with books, I was not simultaneously directing attention visually beyond, I'd say, 5%. [finishes reading]

36:16 RTH: So that last part is that 5, 5% of me I'm, I'm seeing my, I'm seeing what my eyes are aimed at, which is the bookshelf? [Phil: Yeah.] Is that right?

36:23 Phil: Yeah. Yeah. Well the portable heater, the bookshelf and, I believe, part of the floor.

36:29 RTH: Okay. So the, so is, is my experience at the moment of the beep, the other 95%, I guess, is that all about this speaking to myself: "inside... third... 3"? Or am I still hearing the third...?

36:52 Phil: There's some, some aspect. I have to remember it now cuz I didn't write it down. Um, as I remember it now, I was still hearing the sound.

37:04 RTH: Okay. And...

37:11 Phil: Oh yes, I did. I wrote "while listening to the sound, I innerly heard myself say" those words.

37:20 RTH: And, and we've been making this distinction between hearing and speaking it. So is, is this clearly experientially a *hearing* of my voice rather than a *speaking* of those words? Or maybe we can't make that...

37:35 Phil: Yeah. Yep. Yeah. I would say more on the side of hearing my voice say those words. Yeah.

37:43 RTH: And by more on the side, that being?

37:46 Phil: More, more on the passive side, more instead of me, like instead of me actually speaking those words. Yeah.

37:58 RTH: Okay. And by, by *more on* that side, you mean maybe there's still some of me speaking them? So clearly, we understand that clearly your, your bag of bones is making up these words. There's no question about that. The, the question is what, what you *experience*. And the, the experience could be, well, I was saying to myself "inside ...third.... 3", or it could be, I heard Phil's voice say "inside... third...3," or somewhere in between, or?

38:32 Phil: I *have to go* with somewhere in between.

38:34 RTH: Okay.

38:36 Phil: I, it's my best recollection. I've.

38:40 RTH: So it's not, it's not precisely a hearing and not precisely a speaking or we, or that's a distinction that doesn't work for you, for whatever reason?

38:49 Phil: I don't know if it's a distinction that doesn't work for me, but it's somewhere somehow in between, [RTH: Okay.] like in the other, in the other instance.

39:02 RTH: So that there are three words and, uh, are these sequential one after another "inside, third, 3"?

39:08 Phil: Yeah, the way I remember it and the like, I didn't, I didn't write anything about simultaneity or overlapping, they were sequential.

39:16 RTH: Okay. And these are, are *condensation*. So in, *inside* has a specific meaning: that I'm hearing these from inside my house rather than only usually hearing them from outside? [Phil: Yeah.] And they *mean* that, the word "inside" *conveys* that to you?

39:35 Phil: Yeah.

39:37 RTH: Okay. And *third*, is it, the conveys that it's the third instance of this jet sound. [Phil: Yeah.] And then is, is it the number three or the, does it make any difference whether this is the numeral 3 or T-H-R-E-E, as far as what you're saying, hearing?

39:56 Phil: Oh, that's a good question. So can, can you, um, can you rephrase that?

40:08 RTH: Well, sometimes people will, when they use numbers, they say, well, this is clearly a *numeral* that I am somehow articulating. And sometimes people will say, well, it's clearly a, the word "three" that I'm articulating. And some people say, well, y'know, it doesn't really matter. I'm hearing this, I'm hearing the word, the word... I'm hearing

“three” and it could be, the *number* could be the word, could be the *numeral* could be the *lettered words*.

40:39 Phil: I would say that it was more the numeral because I was surprised that I heard three of them so it was kind of like 3 with an exclamation mark 3!

40:54 RTH: Okay. Then I think I’m good. Anybody else?

41:13 CK: I think I am good as well.

41:18 Phil: Okay.

41:18 RTH: Number 6.

SAMPLE 5.6 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

41:20 Phil: Number 6. Alright. [reads] I was at my desk and the image on my monitor had gone out for a moment. I had just noticed the HDMI cable connecting my laptop and the monitor was positioned badly. Uh, a couple of inches from the commute, the computer connection port, I saw the cable was propped up on one of the feet of the monitor support stand. Um, at the very moment before the beep, I realized the stress on the connection and the need to move the cable immediately. I felt like the noticing of the cable on the monitor foot came first, but overlapped with the realization of the need to move it. And there were, but there were, there were *no* words involved.

42:14 CK: So this is almost like a transition between seeing the, seeing the computer stand and the cable, and then needing to move the cable.

42:25 Phil: Yeah.

42:27 CK: And both of those simultaneous, simultaneously present at the moment of the beep?

42:34 Phil: Well, this is a current theme today. I feel like there was some overlap with seeing [CK: Right.] that it was positioned badly and realizing that I need to move it, or wanting to move it.

42:49 CK: Right. And that’s what I’m saying, the beep kinda caught you right in that overlap is [Phil: Yeah.] what I take you to be saying, right? Okay.

42:54 Phil: Yeah.

42:56 CK: Both of those sort of *equally* present or is there one sort of more?

43:02 Phil: No, I would say both of them equally present.

43:05 CK: Both? Okay. Um, so let’s start with the seeing. So is there, is there anything more to say about this other than just, y’know, I’m, I’m seeing this, I’m seeing the cables positioned badly?

- 43:20 Phil: I don't, I don't, I can't think of anything.
- 43:24 CK: Unlike the, let's see in the first two beeps of today, right, like there's some aspect where I'm, I'm looking kind of at like, I'm, the greenness is attracting me or I'm noticing that, or I'm noticing the, the, uh, auxiliary lights, right. There's nothing necessarily like that here in this beep, is what I take you saying?
- 43:44 Phil: [shakes head negatively]. No..
- 43:46 CK: Okay. And then the moving the cable: how is that present to you?
- 43:58 Phil: [pause] Um, as a, as an urge to just push the laptop a bit [pushes the laptop] so that it, it moves away from, from having the cable go up on the foot of the monitor.
- 44:21 CK: Okay. And *urge* is a good word for that, right, like, it's, uh, this is just like a, again, like sort of a, a realized like a, I'm seeing this and I have to, I have to fix this?
- 44:21 Russ comments: To RTH's ear, (a) CK is out ahead of Phil here; Phil did use the word *urge*, but only after a pause, so *urge* would be better understood as a first draft, with easy space left to revise or reconsider; and (b) CK's question makes it too much about the *word*, rather than about the *experience*. So RTH will have to find a way to retreat from this position. It may be that the word *urge* is absolutely the right word to describe the experience; the problem is that that the CK 44:21 question deprives us of the opportunity to discover that.
- 44:33 Phil: Yeah.
- 44:33 CK: Kind of a thing, right?
- 44:33 Phil: Yeah.
- 44:35 RTH: Yeah. So, so I've, I've heard, or I could imagine two different interpretations of this and, and, and maybe what I'd like to do is double back. The first time that you described this aspect, I think you used the word immediately: I should move this *immediately*. [Phil: mm hmm, yeah.] Is that part of the, is the immediately-ness part of this experience?
- 44:55 Phil: Yes. Yep.
- 44:58 RTH: Okay. And then, *then* I heard the word you say, I, I, I *realized* that I had to do it, and I *had the urge* to do it. And *realized* makes it seem like sort of a *mental* thing, and *urge* makes it seem like a physical move-the-laptop thing. Does this seem like a mental or physical or doesn't that, land the wrong direction?
- 44:58 Russ comments: *Urge* is actually a pretty ambiguous word. RTH has articulated one connotation of *urge*, but there is another connotation: that of a force that impels an action (that is, the urge could be *felt* as happening either causally or temporally *before*

the action). This difficulty (RTH thinks) is the result of CK 44:21's focus on the *word*. If the 44:21 focus had been on the *experience*, then it is likely that Phil would have easily led us to the experience, in which case the proper meaning or *urge* would likely have emerged naturally without our having to clarify which of the three meanings he had in mind.

45:25 Phil: I don't know. [appears distressed.] Hmm.

45:28 RTH: So the question is, is, is there a distinction to make between the analytical / cognitive [Phil: Oh, uh.] I can see this and something, something needs to be happened as, as a mental realization? Or, is this I'm I should physically embody the...?

45:48 Phil: Yeah. I, I would say it's the, the early beginnings of, um, a motor, a motor sequence to get that, get that laptop moved so that this, uh, this thing isn't badly positioned anymore, like to reach out with my arm.

46:06 RTH: So this is the beginning of a motor move, movement, basically?

46:11 Phil: Yeah.

46:12 RTH: And so urge is the better word than realize, I guess?

46:12 Russ comments: RTH thinks that to call it an *urge* is risky because he thinks the most common connotation of *urge* is of something that is felt to happen *before* the motor action: I feel an urge to go bike riding is something that happens *before* I go bike riding. We haven't clarified that usage here.

46:16 Phil: Yeah. I, I think so. I think so. [RTH: Okay.] Yeah. Mm hmm.

46:25 CK: Anything else present Phil?

46:31 Phil: No. Nope.

46:35 CK: Alright. Then I think I'm good on this beep.

46:37 RTH: And I think so too, but let me, lemme make sure that I understand it. So what, what I've got from this is that I, I've s, I'm seeing the position of the cable and I am in the be, very beginning of adjusting my body so that I can adjust the cable, something like that, I'm moving towards the?

47:01 Phil: Yeah, I, I would say, um, potentially more accurate than *seeing* the cable position badly is, is *realizing* that this ca, this, this isn't right. And I need to fix it like, but.

47:19 RTH: So there is, there is some analysis that's going on. How much of that is directly in your experience is maybe sorta hard to tell, but it's not just seeing a cable, it is seeing a cable and recog, and recognizing that it's in a bad place.

47:36 Phil: Yeah. Yup.

47:46 RTH: Okay. I think I'm good.

47:49 CK: Yeah, me too.

47:50 RTH: So that's six.

CONVERSATION AFTER The DISCUSSION OF THE SAMPLES

47:52 Phil: Okay. So how many, um, how many times are there usually where we talk about six beeps? How many, [RTH: How many sampling days?] how many...?

48:04 RTH: ...How many sampling days?...

48:06 Phil: How many sampling?...

48:08 CK: ...Rounds of sampling and interviewing?

48:11 Phil: I, I would say how many, I, I think I wanna ask how many, how many interviewing days there are, because sampling can occur on two days before each interview.

48:21 RTH: Okay. Fair enough. So I, I would say it depends, that depends greatly on what we're trying to do. [Phil: Okay.] I would say, I would say as a general rule, maybe ,at least four. And then, and then after that, it depends on, on, on our aim. So I, I, what I would say is that when, whenever we are ready in this particular saying, we could say that's enough. So we could say, we've just had our fifth, fifth day. We could say, five is enough. Or we could say, we should do this again, or we should do this several more times or whatever. So I'm, I'm open, I'm open to that. So if you, if you think this is enough, I'm happy to say this is enough. These beeps are interesting. We're, we're trying to sort out as best we can.

49:11 Phil: Um my, well, my question was purely out of curiosity. And I wasn't thinking that, oh, maybe this is enough or anything like that. Uh, [inaudible] but that, I don't *think* this is enough.

49:33 RTH: Alright then good. Let's, let's keep on going.

49:35 Phil: Yeah, you're good.

49:36 CK: Maybe to fill in more, Phil to your context, we've done, It's, we've done sampling with folks, you know, 10, 12, 15 times. [RTH: Or more.] I wouldn't say that's necessarily, or yeah, or more, I wouldn't say that's necessarily typical. But to what Dr. Hurlburt was saying, we very rarely sort of set out in a prescriptive way. Like, y'know, we are ending this at four and there's no, y'know, and that is it. But I mean, again, sometimes that happens, but that's not necessarily the normal operation.

50:06 Phil: Okay. Alright. Um, so let's talk about the next, the next meeting then. <<<They compare calendars>>>

52:06 RTH: And, and we we've had, we've had quite a bit of [audiovisual] breakup issues here is like, I think you're frozen. You're frozen on my screen right now, [CK: Mm hmm.] Phil out of sight, is that [Phil: Yeah.] Is that an internet issue on your end?

52:18 Phil: It, it, it probably is. It probably is. Um, I will try to, I, yeah, I'll, I'll try to come up with a solution.

52:34 RTH: Okay. That'd be, that'd be great. It's, it's scary because you don't know what you don't know. Some, when in this kind of a situation, if somebody says something and you don't hear it, then you don't know what you didn't hear. And uh.

52:46 Phil: Yeah. Yeah.