

TRANSCRIPT WITH COMMENTARY

Phil J.: A neuroscience writer

Phil Interview 2

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the May 23 interview with Phil that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/7SWhdTgMSnk>. 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.

0:03 Phil: Yup.

0:12 RTH: So it's still earlier, earlier for Amber, I guess she must, she must, must be very early for her.

0:18 AG: Yeah. It's 5AM here.

0:19 RTH: 5, 5AM.

0:20 AG: Yeah.

0:21 Phil: Oh my goodness. [laughs] Where, where are you?

0:25 AG: Uh, Hawaii.

0:26 Phil: In Hawaii! oh!

0:28 RTH: So you can't complai, can't complain too hard.

0:34 Phil: Yeah. [laughs] You can complain in the short term. Sure. But in the long term, Hawaii is a pretty nice place to be.

0:41 RTH: So you had some beeper issues, let's start with those. So that turns out to be a fairly frequent problem with the beeper. I thought I had sent you a beeper where that was not a problem, but the, the plastic apparently has out-gassed that holds the, that holds the earphone jack.

1:00 Phil: Okay.

1:00 RTH: And so, so let me ask your, let me answer your second question first about pushing the button, you can push the button whenever you wanna push the button. [Phil: Okay.] And that does n, that does not reset it. Pushing the button down stops the, stops the

process for a while that while you hold it down, so if you hold the button down for 30 seconds, you've just made the, but the interval 30 seconds longer.

1:21 Phil: Okay.

1:22 RTH: But, uh, so you can always press, you can *always* press the button. And that's what, that's what that this button is designed to do, so press the button. And, uh, you can tell whether the earphone is working, whether the jack is working.

1:35 Phil: Okay. That's perfect, good.

1:36 RTH: Then, as far as the jack itself, what I would recommend is if you could find a place where the, find a way that the jack operates and then use scotch tape or something and scotch tape, the, the, uh, plug in that position. [Phil: Yup. Yeah.] And by test, testing it out by holding the white button down, and if that does it, then let's limp along, limp along with that, I'm gonna have to, just [Phil: Sure.] be a more difficult problem than, than one point.

2:07 Phil: Yeah. I, I, I don't think the issue has prevented me from hearing any beeps, but I thought I'd mention it. And I'll, so I'll do that. I'll just sort of fix it in there with a bit of tape or something.

2:19 RTH: Right. And then there's the, the more broader issue of whether we should re, whether we should make these things public or not. And, and, and I think that's an important question and I don't wanna short circuit, short circuit that. One of the, one of the protections (I guess you could say) that's built into this process is that we don't have to make that decision today. I'm not asking for, uh, informed consent on the first day or whatever that for, for everything after that. So I would say we should go forwards and make a, and make a determination when we have all the information at hand. And at, at that time you should feel free to say, "well, we tried it I don't think it's a good idea." You should consult with whomever you wanna consult with about advantages and, and, and risks.

3:08 Phil: Yup.

3:09 RTH: And uh, I've tried to be forthcoming about what, what's in it for *me*. [Phil: Yup.] And, uh, what's in it, what, why, what I think is in it for *science* and, uh.

3:18 Phil: Yup. I, I really appreciate your openness and your informativeness. So, I'm gonna, I, I still do have to think about it quite carefully, cuz it is a, it is a big decision. And, um, and I don't want to say I'm leaning one way or the other way right now, but, um, um, I'll, I'll let you know, as soon as I, as soon as I have an answer,

3:38 RTH: Right. Well, I think that's fair. And I, and, and, and I don't wanna rush you into it one way or the other. I don't wanna pressure you into it, pressure you into it one way or another. [Phil: Mm hmm.] I, I would say it's the, the being public about it is, is a risk for all concerned, including me and the rest of us on the, on the screen, and I, it opens the process for everybody to look at. So people can say, "well, you know, Russ, you've been

saying this for however many *years*, and, but that isn't really what you, what you *do* now that I get a chance to see it." I can pick you apart as well. So, so I think that's part of the process and, uh, but that, but, but that's, uh, I think everybody should have the, the free, free-person right to decide whether they want to be a part of that or not.

4:30 Phil: Mm hmm. Sure.

4:34 RTH: So if it's alright with you, then what I would say is we should proceed in, in the way that we have, which is to say, we're we're proceeding, as on the *possibility* that maybe we'll make these things public. And if, and if that doesn't come to pass, you shouldn't feel bad about that. And that's the, that is the price of admission for *us*, I guess, that we're, we're, we're willing to take this step down the road and see where the road leads. And if the road doesn't lead to someplace that, that means making it publicq, then we'll, well, we won't make it public.

5:08 Phil: Yup. Yup. It's only the second, the second time. So let's, uh, yeah, let's see, let's see where this goes. I'm, I'm quite excited. [laughs]

5:21 RTH: So anything else that we should be talking about before we look at, at beeps?

5:26 Phil: Well, okay. I think as, um, as, as I practice a little more and, um, I may, I'm not such a, not such a beginner, I guess you could say, , I do have an initial thought. I'm, I'm sort of noticing a pattern. And that is when the beep goes off and I try to recall my inner experience at the moment, just prior to the beep. I'm, I'm starting to feel like on a few occasions, there's, there's sort of a multiplicity of events that I'm apprehending. And I don't know, I don't necessarily know I'm not entirely confident if I'm experiencing or apprehending these, these events simultaneously or if it's one or if there is some kind of sequence to them. But they're so close in time and everything seems to happen so quickly that I, I can't put them in a proper order. But, uh, we can, we can discuss this as I go through the individual beeps, or if you want to comment right now, um, we can, we can discuss it now if you want. But it's just this, this multiplicity and then the beep goes off and I'm like, okay I feel like there were a bunch of things going on at, at the moment, right before the beep. And I'm, I'm not quite sure if they were simultaneous or if, if there is an order to them, um, it's very difficult and it seemed like it was all happening very quickly.

7:08 RTH: Well, let me make one general com, comment and then, then I think, I guess maybe the overarching general comment is I think these questions are best answered by looking at individual beeps. [Phil: Okay.] So we should keep this, we should keep this question alive as we talk about the, talk about the beeps. And then the other general thing that I would say is there, there's no rule that says that inner experience should be of one thing, or it should be of multiple simultaneous things, or it should be of things that are, that, that are rapidly occurring and we can't sort out the order. The, I, I don't have a favorite kind of inner experience. The object is to be as, as faithful to the to, your experience as, as it is, and, and, and we'll see.

7:57 Phil: Okay.

- 7:58 RTH: So does, so does that answer enough in your question so that we can look at, look at individual...?
- 8:02 Phil: Sure. Yup.
- 8:02 RTH: So.
- 8:02 CK: Can I, can I add one thing as well, actually to that? I, I would say too, that I think that's why we do this over multiple rounds, right, in that it just takes, it sounds pretty trivial, easy, right, to apprehend whatever's ongoing, but. [Phil: It's not!] When you really start going through it, there's stuff that happens and, and, you know, and that's on the predicated on whether we do this or not, right, on future days, but that, that's not an uncommon sort of reaction as well to that. So it's not a failure of your part, Phil, or of our part or anything like that, it just, this is kind of how the process is.
- 8:34 Phil: Yeah. Yeah. It's um. Yeah, it's funny like, I feel like I'm, I'm getting more practice at it, I feel like I'm improving, but I also feel like I'm discovering how difficult it actually is.
- 8:47 RTH: Well, that, that's an important discovery, and that, and that is, that is part of the deal. And, and the question is whether it's just getting more difficult or whether it's impossible and that's a, and that's a big distinction. [Phil: Mm hmm, mm hmm.] And, uh, uh, and, but one that I don't think can be answered in the abstract. So I think we have, we have to go beep by beep by beep by beep and see, see what the deal is there.

SAMPLE 2.1 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 9:11 Phil: Okay. So I'm just gonna, uh, proceed as I did last time with, um, I'm just gonna read my, my note for each beep. Okay. So, um, beep number 1. I was, I was sort of innerly rehearsing what I was about to say. Um, Eva-stina my, my partner, my fiancé, um, she had been telling me that she was going to bring her passport on a trip, on a trip to Sweden, to a conference that she was, um, leaving for in, in, at the time, it was a few hours before she left. And, um, I recall the time her mom, who is normally a very, very organized, meticulous person, had called Eva-stina about misplacing her own passport. And I had been, innerly saying to myself with words, something like, "I remember when your mom thought *you* had her passport." And I, I wanted to share the memory with Eva-stina, but I was a bit hesitant because there was no reason to say anything that could seem a bit negative about her mom.
- 10:22 Phil: So I just said it in my head, with words, "I can't believe your mom misplaced her passport", instead of, instead of saying it out loud, to sort of help me decide if I wanted to actually say it out, out loud or not. It was, it was kind of like just putting it on the table as a thought to actually vocalize or not, just to see how it might feel if I did vocalize it, and to be better able to expect, to be better able to expect what Eva-stina might say. Or, alternatively, just forget about it and get back to what I was doing, which was just, I was walking through the entrance way of our place to get to our patio.
- 11:05 RTH: Okay. So I, I, there were a couple things about that that I didn't understand maybe cuz of glitches in the audio, or whatever. So there, that seemed like there were two things

that you were saying. One is, "I remember when you had, when your mom had your passport"?

11:18 Phil: Yeah. That was a little bit earlier that wasn't immediately before the beep, but that's just sort of setting up the context.

11:26 RTH: Okay, that's context. And then, and then at the *moment* of the beep is "I can't believe your mom," and then I lost the word there.

11:34 Phil: Okay. "I can't believe your mom misplaced her passport."

11:39 RTH: Okay. And that's a quote, a word for word quote, the entire sentence, what you, you said to yourself is that right?

11:46 Phil: Yup.

11:47 RTH: And, and it, and you said that that was an inner speech, we can, [Phil: Yeah.] and, and were there any characteristics of, of this? What, what what's the, this experience about?

12:01 Phil: [pause] Um, can, can you be more specific?

12:07 RTH: Well, like were there inflections? "I can't *believe* your mom lost her passport!" Or "misplaced her passport."

12:12 Phil: Yeah. Just as if I was, was saying it out loud, like "I can't believe..." What did I say, "I can't believe your mom misplaced her passport."

12:22 RTH: So that, that saying has a sort of a definitiveness to it, or a power to it, [Phil: Yeah.] more, more so than, [said with no expression] "well, I can't believe that your mom misplaced her passport." So, so is that correct that your inner speaking had that ...power...

12:37 Phil: Intonation.

12:38 RTH: power, intonation [Phil: Yup.] or puissance or whatever we wanna call it?

12:43 Phil: Yeah, [RTH: Okay.] it did. It did. [RTH: And....] Because her mom is normally very, very organized, so it was quite surprising that. So this was a while back and her mom had thought that Eva-stina might have, she might have accidentally packed her passport in, in something of Eva-stina's when we went to visit them. And that Eva-stina had brought it from Sweden back here to Norway and that she still had it.

13:09 RTH: Okay.

13:09 Phil: Yeah.

- 13:12 RTH: All right. And, and is there anything else to say about the, about the speaking itself? You seem, you seem very confident that, that this was part of the experience at the moment of the beep. Is that true?
- 13:23 Phil: Yeah, I'm, I'm quite confident. I was just kind of saying it in my head in, instead of saying it out loud, cuz I thought. I don't know, I just wanted to see how it would feel to just say it and then it was, it was gonna be either I do say that out loud or just forget about it.
- 13:42 RTH: Okay. And so I, I understand that context and, and, and the motivation and, and all, but I, I would like to know whether, whether that is part of your experience at the moment of the beep, like I'm evaluating this as to whether I should say it, is that in my direct experience? Or is that I, that's the context: I've set this up for myself and now I'm doing it?
- 14:04 Phil: I, I would say that was part of my experience.
- 14:08 RTH: And in, in any way that, in what, in what way is that part of your experience?
- 14:12 Phil: How did I apprehend that? I, I don't know. I was just, um, it's hard to describe it. It was more like a feeling of like, I'm just gonna put this on, I was gonna say it in my head to see, or, or I didn't think that, but I was just saying it in my head to see if I wanted to say it out loud or not.
- 14:37 RTH: So the question that I'm asking and it might very well be impossible to nail down is: are you directly apprehending yourself as evaluating this? *Or* have you set yourself an evaluation task and that's in motion, and now I'm just saying it out loud, sooner or later I...?
- 14:55 Phil: Yeah. The, the latter, the latter. I, I had set it in motion and I was just....
- 15:02 RTH: So the, so at the moment of the beep, this is more, uh, I'm just saying this. And then later on, I'm gonna come back and evaluate it. See what, see whether I should go with it or not.
- 15:12 Phil: Yeah.
- 15:13 RTH: Okay. And, and...
- 15:17 Phil: Well, I said it, I, I thought it with words in my head with the purpose of later deciding like with the intention of deciding whether or not I would say it out loud.
- 15:32 RTH: Right. I under, I understand that. But what I, so what I understand you to be saying is: I have set myself in motion so to speak, to say this out loud with the intention of deciding later. But now, at the moment, I'm just saying it. And then later on, I'm gonna, I'm gonna decide how that sounded. As opposed to keeping in mind directly I'm, I've got a piece of myself that's monitoring myself explicitly in my consciousness. But that might very well be a distinction that just is not possible to make.

16:06 Phil: Um. Can, can you repeat that once more?

16:13 RTH: So I could decide to get a cup of, get a cup of tea, and now I just pick up the cup of tea and while I, and when I'm getting the cup of tea, the decision to get it is gone, it's I have set myself a task of getting it and now I've got it. But when I, but when I've got it, I'm not the, there's no decision left to take a sip, I'm gonna, that's, I'm just in the action of doing that.

16:13 Comment: RTH is not doing a good job of explaining this distinction. It would have been better had he said something like: I could decide to get a cup of tea and then I walk over to the pot to get the tea. While I am walking, I *could be* thinking (before the footlights of consciousness) *I am on the way to get a cup of tea*. Alternatively, while I am walking, I could have *no* experience of the tea at all (my mind is a blank, or I am wondering about Fermat's last theorem, or...). In both cases, I have set myself the task of tea-getting and am in the act of accomplishing that task. But in the first possibility, the task is directly apprehended at the moment of the beep; in the second, it is not apprehended.

DES is a performance art, and sometimes questions just don't come out as clearly as I would like.

16:38 Phil: Right.

16:38 RTH: So the question is whether the evaluative component is present to you at the moment of this beep?

16:50 Phil: I, I would, I would say no, I would say no.

16:50 Comment: Because of the three subjunctifiers ("would say"), I don't give any weight to Phil's "No." I realized that I had given a bad example, which probably muddied the water and contributed to Phil's indecision.

16:53 RTH: Okay.

16:54 Phil: Yeah. I had thought to myself, oh, sorry. I'm just gonna let the, let the cat in. [leaves the screen] Yeah. I, um, I was just thinking about this time that her mom called and, um, and then I didn't know if I wanted to say anything out loud or not about it to Eva-stina or just keep my thoughts to myself. And then at the moment prior to the beep, I was saying to myself, "I can't believe your mom thought," uh, what was it again? [RTH: "Mom misplaced the passport."] "I can't believe," "I can't believe your mom misplaced her passport." And I knew as I was saying that, that afterwards I would evaluate it as something I was gonna say out loud or not. I think that's as best as I can put it.

18:04 RTH: Right, that's fair. And, and I think it is the case with, with inner experience in general, that, that there, there is often as here, probably not a perfectly clear dividing line between what is exactly in experience and what is not. We call that *in the weeds*, there's a [Phil: Okay.] part of experience that's in the weeds and, and you really can't say whether it's there, whether it, whether it's not there and, [Phil: Mm hmm.] and I think, I think this is probably one of those things, whether the intention might be there, might

color her the what you, the way you said it or whatever, but, but it's not possible to tease it apart.

18:44 Phil: Yeah. Yeah. I'm, I'm pretty sure the intention was there.

18:48 RTH: Right. The question is what, how, whether it was there experientially or whether it was there.

18:55 Phil: Oh, right, right. Yeah. I'm not, I'm not sure.

19:02 RTH: Sort of like the windup and a pitch, y'know. I'm not, I'm not planning on I'm, I'm not planning on doing the windup, I'm planning on making the pitch, but I'm winding up to do it. And that's. [Phil: Mm hmm, yup.] Anything else in your experience at this beep?

19:20 Phil: Um. Nope, nope. I think that's as best as I can describe that one.

19:29 RTH: Alright. Well, shall we let Cody ask some questions here and about this next beep?

19:35 CK: Sure. That sounds good to me. All right, Phil. Um, what was in your experience at the moment of beep 2?

SAMPLE 2.2 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

19:42 Phil: Okay. Um, uh, uh, I was spending the day with Eva-stina cuz she was, it was a weekend, she was going away and we were, um, we were outside and we were having lunch and um, we were talking about our new car. And um, with the previous cars, they had names so we're kinda guilty of anthropomorphizing that way. [laughs] But um, we were talking about what to name the new car. And I suggested the name *Billie* [pronounced bee-lee] pronounced that way because car is bil in Norwegian. And at the moment prior to the beep, I was saying that word out loud. Um, and while I was saying it, I was innerly visualizing the letters of the word B-I-L-L-I-E in tall italicized, black letters that look similar to maybe, um, a newspaper headline on a white background. And the letters were in what could be a font that exists, but I have no idea of the name of it or where I might have seen it, or it could just be a font that my brain conjured up it, but somehow it seemed appropriate for the car's new name, *Billie*.

21:08 CK: And, and just so I make it clear, you're saying *Billie*, B-I-L-L-I-E. That's the word for the.

21:16 Phil: Yeah, I guess it would be spelled B-I-L-L-I-E, but pronounced rbee-lee...

21:21 CK: *Billie*,.Okay.

21:22 Phil: ...like as if it had two B's, sorry, two E's after the B instead of an I.

21:28 CK: Gotcha. Okay. Um, and this italicized *Billie* the word. Is there a location to that where you're seeing it? Like, is this I'm, I'm seeing it in front of me? I'm s, is there a...?

21:43 Phil: Yup. It was just, just in front of me. Um, I wasn't paying any attention to the information that was actually coming into my eye, I wasn't paying attention to my immediate environment. I was just, I was purely visualizing the word *Billie* in these letters on a white background. And it was, I guess, just, well, now that you asked me if it had a loca, like do, like are you asking me if it had a location in my actual environment?

22:19 CK: That could be the case, or whether this is, whether the location has any sort of saliency to this? Like, so am I seeing again, is this sort of just, I'm seeing this and there really is no location, it's just something that's in my mind? Or I'm seeing it particularly projected on somewhere, y'know, something in my environment or that's somewhere, y'know, whether the location is relevant or not, I guess is my question is, does this have a location?

22:43 Phil: I, I, I don't think location is relevant. I mean, obviously it must have a location if I'm visualizing it. And relative to me that location would be as, just as if I'm like looking at a newspaper headline, I guess, I.

22:43 **Comment:** Here is a general DES principle: You can tell whether an interviewer asked a good question by the quality of the answer: if Phil talks unambiguously about experience and about a moment, then he was asked a good question. Here, Phil says "obviously it must have," to be a clear signal that Phil is *not* talking about experience at the moment of the beep. So RTH (in 23:00) will try to clarify the previous question.

23:00 RTH: So let me ask, let me, let me ask maybe a simpler version of the same question. Does it seem like, like this *Billie* that you see is out in front of you? Or does it seem like it's in your head? Obviously you're making it up, so the neurons are in your head, but does it, is the experience as if you're seeing it in front of you?

23:16 Phil: It, it was as if it was in front of me, yes.

23:20 RTH: So not in a particular location, like on that table or on that chair or whatever, but out in front of you somewhere?

23:26 Phil: Correct.

23:26 RTH: Okay.

23:26 Phil: Yeah.

23:28 CK: Okay. Okay. And is it big, I mean, again, I don't wanna be, but I'm not asking about the font here per the size specifically, but y'know, is this like small words, big words, big letters?

23:40 Phil: It was pretty big, [laughs] but I, I couldn't give you, um, I, I can't give you an actual estimate of how big it was, [CK: Okay.] but if you're, if you're, let's say a few feet away from a newspaper and it's a big headline, it would be kind of similar. Maybe less than a few feet.

24:10 CK: And is there, and you said there was a white, this is, these are black letters, black italicized letters on a white background.

24:18 Phil: Yes.

24:19 CK: Is that, is there, are you seeing a background here too? Or, you know, is this like, in other words again, is this as if, um. Yeah, I, are you seeing a white background or is this I'm seeing black letters and it's as if it was on, you know, printed on a newspaper and obviously in the real world, that newspaper would be on a white piece of paper or an offwhite piece of paper?

24:40 Phil: I would say there was a white background, yeah. It's not as if it was just kind of blank or just like nothingness, the ether. It was, it was a, it was quite similar as if, as if you were looking at a, an, an actual newspaper, or as something printed on a white sheet of paper. Yeah.

25:04 CK: Okay. It's more than just seeing the black letters and then there there's something about seeing like?

25:09 Phil: Or, or on a, or on a computer screen, for example. Yeah.

25:12 CK: And is there anything else in your experience here at the moment of the beep aside from the seeing *Billie*?

25:26 Phil: Um, I would say no. I would say no. I wonder though if I was, if I was picturing the word because of the difference between the pronunciation and my imaginary spelling of it.

25:41 RTH: Could very well be, but...

25:42 Phil: Cuz I was compar, I was comparing it to the name *Billy*, right, but it's not *Billy* it's *Billie* [pronounced bee-lee]. So maybe that's why I was visualizing the word, the written word at the time.

25:58 CK: And I think what we find often is that, y'know, inner experiences, defies explanation. I mean, we, you know, there's a lot of things we probably would assume we, would be in experience, but it's not. And that's kind of the beautiful thing about it, right. Is that [Phil: Yeah, yeah.] There's no logic to it or rules [Phil: Yeah!] that it has to follow.

26:14 Phil: Yeah.

26:15 CK: So [RTH: So.] what I understand this, oh, sorry, go ahead, Dr. Hurlburt.

26:18 RTH: So you said at the moment of the beep, you were saying *Billie* out loud, is that, [Phil: Yeah.] is that in your experience or is that just part of the background that...?

26:30 Phil: Well, if it was, I guess if it was part of my experience, I would've been paying attention to hearing myself saying it perhaps, or, or, uh, trying to pronounce it, um.

- 26:41 RTH: So I don't think *that's* necessarily true. But what I, what I heard you to say is I, I'm seeing *Billie* printed and I'm not, and I'm not experiencing the rest of the world that my eyes are looking at, my eyes are looking at, presumably Eva-stina, or the table, or the landscape or whatever. But I'm not experiencing that, I'm processing it clearly. My visual experience is doing whatever, from a visual *processing* apparatus, whatever that is, is doing its job, but I'm not experiencing that.
- 27:11 Phil: Correct.
- 27:11 RTH: So my question is about the same thing about the *saying* of *Billie*. You're *saying* that, you're a mental pro, your neurons are processing that, but that.
- 27:22 Phil: Yeah, I don't think I was experiencing anything to do with the fact that I was actually saying the word *Billie*.
- 27:29 RTH: So your experience, as far as you experience it, is entirely this inner visualization of the word.
- 27:36 Phil: I, yeah.
- 27:37 RTH: Okay.
- 27:37 Phil: Yes. Yes.
- 27:44 RTH: So, we done with this particular beep?
- 27:48 CK: That, yeah, that, that was gonna be my wrap up list to make sure I got it, but that was my understanding as well, Phil, what was going on, so.
- 27:53 RTH: So, so, so far returning to this discussion we had at the beginning, I haven't heard anything that sounds like this multiple simultaneous or sequential thing. Is tha...t?

SAMPLE 2.?? DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 27:53 Comment: Phil didn't entirely grasp what was in his experience, so he did not (and we will not) number this discussion.
- 28:03 Phil: Well. okay. Um, so that has to do with the next beep, which I didn't actually count cuz I don't know um. We were, we were talking about our duvets. We were, um, putting the duvets within, into the duvet covers. And right before the beep I was imagining (so I did write *this* down) I was imagining just having gotten into bed, focusing on it being a bit cold, but very comfortable. But I felt like there was something more specific that I had forgotten, like there was some, some other part of the experience or, or maybe imagining getting into bed and like what I had just described took place a little bit before the moment right before the beep. Um, so I, and I felt like maybe there was something to do with like the motion of getting under the covers or, or my, my personal configuration that I was imagining myself in or some, some other kind of realization, but I'll, I'll tell you exactly what I wrote: "I felt like I blanked on this in the same way as being

interrupted and forgetting what I was about to say. So I sort of felt like the beep kind of interrupted me.”

29:28 RTH: Okay.

29:32 Phil: Yeah like there was something right before the beep, but it had gone off, it had sort of startled me a little bit. And then, um, and then I, I couldn't, I couldn't remember what was right before the beep.

29:47 RTH: And that was, that feeling of interruption, or *I've lost it* is enough so that you didn't count that as a beep. Is that right?

29:53 Phil: Correct. Correct. Yeah.

29:55 RTH: And so.

29:56 Phil: I think like imagining getting into bed was sort of the moment before the moment before the beep somehow.

30:06 RTH: Okay.

30:07 Phil: Yeah. So I, I remember saying to Eva-stina I, I don't know, I feel like there was *something*, but I just, I, I can't remember it right now I just I'm just blanking on, on what it was exactly, and I said, I'm, I think I'm not gonna count this one. I don't know if that information is valuable to you, but.

30:30 RTH: Well, I, I don't think we know exactly what's valuable. What I, what I would, what I would say is part of the reason that we do this multiple times is that if we have this kind of experience *frequently*, (if this is a one off deal, then we could say, well, you know, there was something about this situation). But if we, if we were to go forward and sample a few more times and, and have two or three or four more beeps where there seemed to be something *just beyond*, then we would have to try to figure out what, what that's about, because that, that would seem to be an important, an important sort of constitutive feature of Phil's engagement in this task, whether it's his experience that way, or whether the task is that way, or the indecision about whether the beeps working or. [Phil: Mm hmm.] All that, all that stuff, or in Ukraine, y'know, who, who knows what, what might, y'know, what might enter, enter into this.

31:26 Phil: Mm hmm yeah. Um, so yeah, I thought it would be best just to move on to the next beep.

31:33 RTH: Okay. That, that would be fine. And let Amber, do you, would you *like* to ask the questions or shall we just... Amber's really new at this so it's putting her a little bit on the spot so my.

31:44 AG: Um, okay. If I have questions I'll like, I'll chime in. [RTH: Okay.] But like a lot of the questions I was thinking of someone had already asked them, so.

31:51 RTH: I think it's fair, fair, I just don't wanna, want you to feel slighted.

31:56 AG: Okay, thank you.

SAMPLE 2.3 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

31:58 RTH: Number 3.

32:00 Phil: Okay. Um, I was talking to myself out loud. Um, I wanted to clean a wooden bench on our patio and we don't have any, I don't, J if I say "J Cloth," do you know what I'm talking about?

32:18 RTH: I don't know what a J Cloth is.

32:20 Phil: [laughs] They're these little cloth sort of rags that you can buy to clean things with. [RTH: Okay.] Yeah. Um, we normally buy them and we didn't have any, so I was thinking of just using a rag and I was going to a closet to get one, and, and I was saying, "I'll use a rag, I suppose." At the same time, I was picturing one of the few rags I was pretty sure we have, which was a black sock. I was picturing it in the closet where I thought it was, on a, on a shelf unit on the left side, on the, on the upper shelf. And, um, what I thought was kind of strange is that I was saying this to myself although I had already decided what I was going to do. I, I had decided that I was gonna go see if this rag was there and go nab it, but for some reason, I still said, I was still saying out loud after making that decision, "I'll, I'll use a rag, I suppose."

33:30 RTH: Okay.

33:30 Phil: So it was sort of the same as the experience with the, with the car name. I was, um, I was saying something out loud and I was visualizing something at the same time, but in this case I was visualizing something that actually exists.

33:48 RTH: Okay. And, uh, and does is, in the present beep in the car rag beep is the visualization, the predominant portion of your experience?

34:00 Phil: Uh, did you say car rag?

34:04 RTH: The rag, bench rag, the J the, the sock. [Phil: The thing, yeah.] The sock?

34:11 Phil: Yeah, um, you're asking me if the visualizing was a, sorry, the audio was out a little bit. Um, you're asking me if visual aspect was the predominant aspect?

34:21 RTH: Yeah. Yes, that's what I'm asking.

34:28 Phil: [pause] I don't. I don't think so.

34:33 RTH: Okay. And.

34:34 Phil: And I think it was 50, I think it was both me saying that out loud or experiencing myself saying that out loud. *And*, um, and the, and the visualizing.

34:46 RTH: Sort of 50-50 ish.

34:47 Phil: Yeah, I think so.

34:49 RTH: So that makes this *different* from the Billie ex, example, which I understood to be almost entirely the inner visualization and the words were being set up.

35:00 Phil: Correct, correct. Yeah.

35:03 RTH: Okay. And, and so let's talk about the words. Uh.

35:09 Phil: Can I, can I just say something first? [RTH: Okay.] Um, so this was a bit of a different context because I was, I was alone. So that time I was, I was talking to Eva-stina and, um, I was, I, I was saying a lot, like I was, we were having a conversation, so talking was a thing that I was doing. Whereas at this point it was, uh, I don't know, I might have been playing some music, but it was, it was quiet and I, I had been alone for an hour or two and, uh, and I said this out loud, so it sort of stood out a bit more.

35:50 RTH: Okay. [pause] So does it, uh. So let, so lemme start at the beginning here. [Phil: Sure.] So you're saying out loud, "I'll use a rag, I suppose"?

36:08 Phil: Yup.

36:09 RTH: And, and does that have a particular inflection that you can?

36:15 Phil: Um, it was very similar to how I, would've just, just kind of thinking like you, you, I'm sure, you know, the phrase thinking out loud. Um, I said it, like, "I'll use a rag, I suppose." [RTH: Okay.] "I'll use a rag, I suppose."

36:34 RTH: Okay. And, and, and I experienced myself as *saying* that?

36:43 Phil: Yeah, I, I, I did, cuz I was, I was speaking it to myself, so.

36:51 RTH: And, and does it make sense to say whether this saying is a, the experience of *speaking* or the experience of *hearing* or both, or neither? [Phil: Oh.] And sometimes we use a distinction of like a tape recorder, if you can speak into the tape recorder and then you can play it back, those would be the same words, your voice, but quite different experience, speaking in is quite different for most people, quite different from the hearing it.

37:23 Phil: I would say the hearing aspect was, mmm. I would say the hearing aspect *might've* been--I'm not so confident in this--but the hearing aspect might've been a bit more prominent than the speaking aspect.

37:43 RTH: So it would be more fair to say, according to this draft *I hear myself saying*, rather than *I'm saying*?

37:55 Phil: Correct, yeah.

37:56 RTH: But you don't sound too sure about that. [Phil: Um.] That's a difficult thing, sometimes a difficult thing.

38:02 Phil: I, I would say I'm like 75% sure of that. I mean, I, it makes, it makes sense to me because, um, bec, again, because I was alone and it was, it was relatively quiet so, um.

38:16 RTH: So I would, I would like us to set aside what makes sense.

38:19 Phil: I, I, I, sorry, sorry, can I interrupt? I'm thinking of it in terms of. Okay, you can say something and, and not hear it like if the sound is somehow eliminated, as you say something, but you're still going, like you're still articulating your mouth and you're still making all the same motion that you would as if you're when you're, when you are saying something out loud, but you just hear absolutely nothing. Or, um, is it like, I'm, I'm, I'm completely silent and as you said, listening to a tape recorder. So between those two, I would say that, that the experience of *hearing* myself was, was more apparent than the experience of like vocalizing the word.

39:10 RTH: Okay.

39:10 Phil: Yeah.

39:14 RTH: And, and does it seem like that's like, like when you're talking to us right now, is that the same way that when you're talking to us, like you experience yourself as hearing it as much as, or more than saying it?

39:30 Phil: I think when I'm talking to you now, I'm doing a lot more planning of what I'm going to say. And, um, and I'm trying to be clear, uh, so that you can, cuz there is a bit of trouble with the audio sometimes. Um, so I'm putting more effort into articulating what I'm saying.

39:30 Comment: RTH is concerned that Phil seems to be invoking plausible explanations rather than describing experience. For example, at 35:09 he says "it was quiet and I, I had been alone for an hour or two and, uh, and I said this out loud, so it sort of stood out a bit more." At 38:02 "it makes sense to me because, um, bec, again, because I was alone and it was, it was relatively quiet." At 39:30 "I think when I'm talking to you now, I'm doing a lot more planning of what I'm going to say." RTH has tried to help {hil bracket this plausibility (for example, at 38:16 "So I would, I would like us to set aside what makes sense.>"). But we may have to be more assertive about it.

39:53 RTH: Okay. So the words are coming out while I'm, while I'm walking to get the rag.

39:59 Phil: Yup.

40:01 RTH: "I'll use a rag I suppose." And these words are meaningless in the sense that you already decided to get the rag, [Phil: Yes!] but uh, so they're like a commentary in some way, like just a commentary of.

40:15 Phil: Yeah, yeah, have, like doing my own play-by-play or something. [laughs]

40:23 RTH: Right, okay. Anything else to say about that experience? Anybody?

40:28 CK: I had one question [RTH: Go for it.] Or Amber, go ahead.

40:31 AG: Oh, I was gonna say, yeah, you mentioned also visualizing a black sock rag in the closet where [Phil: Yup.] you had, um, thought that it was. Do you have, uh, so in that visualization, what, do you have anything more to say about that?

40:48 Phil: Um, I guess I was, I was, um, recalling, remembering where it was and um, remembering the image of the last time that I saw it there. Um, it was, it was as though I was sort of looking at a, a picture of it. Um, cuz I wasn't entirely confident if it was there or if it even existed, but I was, I was pretty sure there was a black, black sock, uh, or two, uh, up at the top of the shelf on the left side. There's a bun, there's a lot of stuff up there, so.

40:48 **Comment:** "Cuz I wasn't entirely confident if it was there or if it even existed" is another of the potential explanations (see comment at 39:30).

41:39 RTH: And do you see this clearly, is this a?

41:42 Phil: Yep. I, I, I saw it. I saw it clearly. Yes.

41:48 RTH: And in the same sense of *seeing clearly* as seeing the letters *Billie*?

41:56 Phil: No. Now that you mention it, it is a bit more vague because I wasn't entirely sure of the other thing there's so as I was saying, there's a lot of stuff up there and um, to be honest, I wasn't so sure of what was next to it or on top of it or, um, yeah. So I, I was the surroundings of the black sock were kind of vague, but the, the black sock and the, the actual shelf and, um, and the rest was, was pretty clear, but, um, otherwise it was, it was kind of vague, I still, like, I don't know, I still don't know what was beside it or, um, below it or, or whatever. I just kind of went there and I, I, so that was my inner experience and then afterwards, uh, the beep went off and then I actually went there and I just kind of nabbed the sock and I, I was like, oh yeah, of course it's there.

43:01 RTH: So at the moment of this beep what I understand you be saying about the visual aspect is: I see the black sock and the shelf clearly, and then what's surrounding that is sort of, indeterminately seen, it's not *not seen* and it's not *seen*. It's somewhere in the middle of, of that. Is that, is that fair?

43:21 Phil: Yeah. Yep.

43:22 RTH: Okay. And so is the sock seen as clearly as the letters *Billie* or more clearly or different?

43:30 Phil: Um, I would say a little bit less clearly, cuz I didn't, I mean, I wasn't imagining the exact configuration of the sock that was sitting there, so.

43:47 RTH: Okay. All right.

43:49 Phil: Generic, black sock, generic sense of black sock experienced visually. [laughs].

43:55 RTH: Okay.

43:59 AG: And this seeing is would you, I mean, I know the sock is black, but would you consider it to be, the visualization, the entire, uh, image per se is, uh, black and white, in color?

44:11 Phil: In color, definitely.

44:13 AG: Okay.

44:17 Phil: Yeah. The shelf is brown. Um, I think there was a, like a box up there, even though I said I wasn't sure of what's next to it, but I know there's a box somewhere up there that's also sort of brown and, and yeah.

44:30 AG: Okay.

44:38 RTH: All right then I'm good. Number 4, you wanna do Cody, 4, Cody?

44:42 CK: Yeah. I have one question though, about the last beep here, the "I'll use a rag, I suppose." Phil, what did the beep interrupt that at any point? Like had you just said it? Was this, y'know, was this right after you had said that in the middle of rag or anywhere? Just the timing of the beep I was curious about.

44:58 Phil: I think as best I can remember, I was, I was in the middle of suppose.

45:06 CK: Okay.

45:13 Phil: "I'll use a rag I sup <beep>."

45:17 CK: Gotcha. Okay. Okay then I'm good on beep 3 and I think everyone else is, correct?

45:25 RTH: Yup.

45:25 CK: Okay. Alright on to the next beep.

SAMPLE 2.4 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

45:28 Phil: Okay. Um, I was still cleaning the patio. I noticed a plant, a weed, growing between some patio stones and I was irritated by its presence. While looking, while looking at it and bending down to remove it, I had, innerly said to myself with words, "this stupid plant!" and quickly grabbed, grabbed it and picked off some of its leaves. And as I did this with my hand, I apprehended a slight (so I don't want to complicate things with this)

so I apprehended a slight vague resemblance in the shape of the plant to some kind of large insect or creature, almost like something from a, from a horror film. Not that I mistook the plant for this thing and I didn't find it frightening. Um, and I, I wrote that perhaps this was the influence of having watched *Stranger Things* recently. I don't know if we're, I'm, I guess maybe we're familiar with *Stranger Things*.

45:28 **Comment:** "perhaps this was the influence of having watched *Stranger Things* recently" is another of the potential explanations (see comment at 39:30).

46:38 RTH: I can imagine, but I don't know.

46:43 CK: So I, I think I may have misheard the word first, so I wanted to make sure I understood this. When you said this resemblance to the, like an insect, is that a, what do you mean by that exactly? How is that directly in your experience?

47:03 Phil: It, it was just as I was. Okay. Yeah. I'll try to describe it a little more carefully. Um. So I noticed the plant and I was saying out loud, "this stupid plant!" and I, I reached out for it and I, I grabbed it to sort of pluck the leaves away. And as I was reaching it all of a sudden, um, it's sort of, I, it's hard to, it's really hard to describe. I noticed that it, it, um, resembled sort of an, an insect or some kind of creature that was kind of nasty. But it didn't, I didn't stop reaching towards, I, I knew that, of course it's just a, it's just a weed between the patio stones. But I had some, some instant fleeting apprehension of, of an insect or, or some kind of creature.

48:04 CK: And is that noticing a, is this like a, and I want to throw out a bunch of possibilities here. It could be neith, it could be one of these could be neither of these things. But was that like a, is this sort of like a cognitive-y sort of recognition of, again, there's some sort of evaluative component of knowing this, is this a visual sort of a thing of? Obviously in the real world, you're looking at a, at a, uh, a weed, but like, it's almost as if I'm, I'm seeing this insect thing, it was like, I'm feeling the texture or something?

48:04 **Comment:** The question CK is asking (" is this sort of like a cognitive-y sort of recognition") is difficult because *cognitive* implies some sort of processing, rather than description of a phenomenon (which is what CK is after). We will see whether his question hits the mark...

48:32 Phil: It was like there was some kind of cognitive.... It, it was like, there was some sort of cognitive process of that going on below the surface. But what I had access to was just all of a sudden, it, it looked sort of like, um, visually it appeared sort of like an insect for, for a brief moment in time before I plucked the greater part of it out.

48:32 **Comment:** ...It doesn't, at least at first: Phil replies about a "cognitive process of that going on below the surface." But he continues to describe experience ("But what I had access to"), so perhaps the question had a second wind.

49:00 CK: So I'm looking at this weed and I'm noticing, it looks like an, like an insect or again, some, some kind of a bug / insect thing, [Phil: Something nasty] like that, but.

49:11 Phil: Yup. I don't know. I you can try to ask me [CK: And I want...] toward something more specific, but I don't know if I can give it to you.

49:24 CK: And, and no, that, and that's fine. I don't, I, we wanna get you to the, sort of the edge of certainty to...

49:29 Phil: ...what, what the experience was. [CK: Right, yeah.] Yeah.

49:33 CK: And, and so is this like, is this as if I'm seeing an insect plant? Again, I know in reality it wasn't an insect plant, but is that, is that sort of what my experience feels like? Is I'm seeing, I'm seeing, I'm seeing an insect?

49:45 Phil: It wasn't necessarily, well, it's either an insect or a plant. So it was, uh, I knew it was a plant, but it, it appeared like it was some, some kind of insect or creature, or something that doesn't actually exist.

50:02 RTH: And it looks like that. This was a *seeing* experience?

50:04 Phil: Yeah. This was a *seeing* experience.

50:08 RTH: Not a, not a cognitive analytic experience?

50:09 Phil: Yeah. But it had a sort of, it did have a slight disturbing aspect to it. Like, like, um, if I, if I had given it more attention, I might have gone, eeuugh, like, "oh! Nasty!" for lack of a better way to put. I'm, I'm trying my best.

50:29 RTH: And, and so at the moment of this beep are you seeing an insect-y thing as far as your experience is concerned, I'm seeing this?

50:37 Phil: Well, this sort of, this is sort of what I'm talking about. I mean, there was, um, there was me thinking with inner innerly, speaking with words, um, um, "this stupid plant!" And me reaching out to it and plucking the greater part of it and, and apprehending this insect-like quality to it. And it's, it's quite difficult to put a sequence in those, those different aspects or, or, um, or, or decide whether or not it was all simultaneous.

51:23 RTH: So the beep comes somewhere in there. And maybe they're all at the same time and maybe they're one after another, but we were, can't remember?

51:30 Phil: I wouldn't, I wouldn't say the beep came somewhere in there, but well, maybe it did, maybe it did or just after, just after I, I, yeah, I think it was just after.

51:47 RTH: Maybe I should, I, I considered given this, this mini lecture in, in the context of the previous beep and maybe I should, I give it. So in, in, in answer to a question that Cody asked, you said that the beep came at the, at halfway through the word *support* or something like that?

52:02 Phil: *Suppose*, yeah.

- 52:03 RTH: *Suppose, suppose.* And, uh, and what I, what I would say is that o, over many years of sampling, what I have, what I have found is that *most* people, when they're reporting inner speaking, say that the beep comes right at the end of the sentence. And, and of course, that's not *true* in the *real* world. The real world, the beep the beep would be, you know, have a, sometimes at the beginning of a sentence sometimes in the middle of sentence. But in terms of *experience*, it's very often at the end. And so what I *think* that means is that it's not really the case, that the beep is a characteristic of the external world. You have to process the beep, and recognize that this is the beep, and that takes some cognitive processing or some mental processing or neuronal processing or whatever (I don't care how we, how we define that). But it takes a *while*. And, and, and, but you were already engaged in something else, and so you have to sort of finish off the first one and get to the second one and say, well, well, *that's the beep*. So the, so there, there is a *messiness* of the beep. The beep is not just a, [snaps] uh, instant in time.
- 53:11 Phil: Right, right. yeah.
- 53:11 RTH: The beep is an experiential piece of Phil's experiential world. And, and he's, he's gotta make that beep happen. That beep...
- 53:21 Phil: Yeah.
- 53:22 RTH: ...there are vibrations happening in the earphone or whatever, but to, to recognize it as a beep, takes some time. And that, so, so we do the best we can, but, but, but we recognize that there's a, a manufactured nature of the beep. [Phil: Yeah.] And so now in a more complicated situation, like with like maybe the one we've got, we've got going here, well, there's the beep we have to figure out that that's the beep and, as opposed to some other noise out there. And then we have to figure out what's going on about the plant and, and whatever. So we're, we're, we're pretty understanding that this is, there's some construction that happens. We're just, we're, we're just trying to do the best we can [Phil: Yeah, yup.] in, in that context.
- 54:09 Phil: Yeah. That's a good way to put it. The beep itself is an experience and then you, you, it forces you to recognize it, to, um, and, and to realize that, oh, I'm, I'm supposed to, supposed to describe for, for this, for DES, I'm supposed to describe what I was experiencing right before this beep. [RTH: Right.] And, and, um, that's maybe sort of what I was saying. It, it, um, with that, the beep that happened while we were putting the duvets in the duvet cover. Uh, I was kind of surprised by the beep and, and, um, and then I couldn't remember what was happening right before the beep, because it, it was an experience that, uh, the in, in and of itself. So yeah, I don't, I don't know.
- 55:01 RTH: So the, the beep launches the introspective task, I guess we could say (if we don't get too carried away with the word *introspection*). And, and the only, the only advantage of the beep is that, that you can learn, most people can learn to do that task pretty quickly and. And whereas if you, if you, in regular armchair introspection, you say, well, I wonder what I was thinking about right now, and then, y'know, that's sort of a long term kind of a thing, and you gotta be motivated to think about that right then, where the beep comes at at you from the outside and picks that picks that moment for you,

rather than you have to do it yourself,. But, but it, it, it does involve a, a reflection, and that reflection does change, whatever was happening. And the, the question and it's an important question is whether that's a minimal change or, or a maximal change.

55:59 Phil: Yeah. Yeah. It's difficult to answer that. It's difficult to answer that. But I feel like I'm getting better at this, so.

56:09 RTH: What I would, what I would say is that. Well I guess I still have a question about, so I, I, I, I wanna know about the bug and the, the insect and the, and the plant here. [Phil: Right.] So does it seem at the moment that I am reaching towards an insect? Or does it seem at the moment, like I'm reaching towards a plant and?

56:34 Phil: It seemed like I was reaching towards a plant.

56:36 RTH: Okay.

56:36 Phil: Yeah.

56:39 RTH: So I have not, I have not conjured up, I've not replaced the plant with an insect. I am, [Phil: Correct.] I am reaching towards a plant that has a clear enough insect-y looking presentation that I might say eeuww to.

57:01 Phil: Yeah.

57:02 RTH: I think I'm good. And, and I guess I also had a question about the, the, "the stupid plant": is that said innerly or out, out loud?

57:02 *Comment: Phil had said it was innerly at 45:28 and 50:37, but that it was out loud at 47:03.*

57:12 Phil: Um, innerly.

57:17 CK: Well, can I ask a question about that too? Is that, "that stupid plant!" was that *before* the moment of the beep or was that sort of, and I, I kind of, I know you said a conversation about the simultaneity of things.

57:27 Phil: It was, it was yup. It, it was, um, it was right, right before the beep. "This stupid plant!"

57:35 CK: So at the moment of the beep there's sort of two things going on, like "this stupid plant" and the seeing the plant that looks like an insect?

57:46 Phil: Well, there, there were those two things, and there was also the, um, me reaching towards it and, and plucking a good number of those of those insect-y looking leaves.

58:02 CK: And so those, those sort-of three things are in directly in my experience, right? This is, it's not just context that I'm reaching towards a plant, but that that's somehow present to, directly present?

58:12 Phil: Yeah. Yeah. [CK: Okay.] And now that I think of it, um, there, there is another aspect that I, I didn't write down, but I'm just going with my memory right now. And that was the sound of the leaves ripping off.

58:25 CK: [inaudible]

58:25 RTH: [they speak simultaneously] And it was part...

58:36 CK: Go ahead, Dr. Hurlburt.

58:38 RTH: And, and that was part of your direct experience at the moment?

58:41 Phil: Yes, I would say so. Yes.

58:43 RTH: And, and the distinction that I'm making there is that the physical world, as you said in beep 2, I guess it was the, when I was talking with Eva-stina the, the, the physical world wasn't there, wasn't present to me. Uh, it was obviously there and I was seeing, my eyes were aimed at it, and there was no doubt birds chirping or whatever I could hear, but I wasn't, or I wasn't attending to that. But in this particular case, it seems like the leaf-ripping was part of my direct experience.

59:15 Phil: Yes. Yep. Cuz it was, it was very quiet. So sounds, the context was very quiet, so sounds stood out.

59:26 RTH: Okay. So the, the, "it was very quiet" is what I would call an explanation and, [Phil: Okay.] and, and, and may very well be true. I'm not saying it's not true, but the, the question is not *why* the sounds stood out, the question is *whether* the sounds stood out in the, and the, the ex, the effort towards explanation screws up the effort towards careful description, it seems to me.

59:26 *Comment: RTH takes this opportunity to discuss the bracketing of causation (see the comments at 39:30, 40:48, and 45:28).*

59:53 Phil: Okay.

59:53 RTH: So I, I, I would like to train us, I guess you could say, I would like to *encourage* us not to spend too much time worrying about why something happened. That's too hard a question.q

1:00:05 Phil: Okay.

1:00:09 RTH: We good about beep 4?

1:00:12 CK: Yeah, I am good.

1:00:13 RTH: So we've been at this for the hour that we contracted. Should we keep on going or should we, uh?

1:00:20 Phil: I'm okay to keep on going.

1:00:23 RTH: Right.

1:00:24 Phil: I don't know.

1:00:25 CK: I have until, I have until the half hour, so until Pacific time, 9:30. So I got about 20 more minutes, so I'm good until then.

SAMPLE 2.5 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

1:00:34 RTH: Let's keep going. Number 5.

1:00:37 Phil: Okay. Um, okay. This one was difficult, but I'll get to that after. Um, I was walking on a trail around a small lake close to my place. Um, it's a particularly warm sunny day on the trail. I had just noticed a woman sitting on a bench ahead of me. And there were a couple of other women close to her walking or standing on the trail. At the moment prior to the beep, I was simply navigating the curve in the trail, looking ahead, I saw the woman the, as of yet leafless trees, and the ice on the lake behind them. Um, as I was striding by, at a decent pace. Um, I put physical action was just as prominent as anything else. And, um, then I also wrote it was difficult because I didn't really feel that I was apprehending anything at the moment prior to the beep. It went off and I thought to myself, something like, oh, geez, I have no idea. I felt like I was a sort of running on default mode, network brainwaves. I don't know if you know anything about default mode network, but, uh, I was very relaxed and I was in sort of a meditational state while going for a walk. And I wasn't focusing on anything in particular. I was just moving myself along at a good pace, making sure I didn't run into a tree or bump into a person while enjoying the walk. Um, yeah.

1:02:20 RTH: So I would, I, I would say that last sentence that you said I was moving along at a good pace, making sure I didn't bump that sounds to me like sort of a general description of this aspect of the, this portion of the walk. And the question is, is anything in, in your experience at the moment of the beep? And the answer to that could be well, no, we've decided that it's possible to have nothing about the environment be in experience, that's possible. Or it's possible that I am noticing my physicality I feel the walk you said that was as prominent as anything else that that's pretty ambiguous as to whether there.

1:03:01 Phil: I would, I would, I would, as best I can narrow it down. My experience consisted of, um, what I was seeing, those, the, the people in front of me, the trail, the, the trees, and then the, the lake is still, this is the Arctic, right, so the, the lake is still mostly frozen. Um, and, uh, and then the, the physicality, as, as you said, like I was, I was, I was walking at a, at a pretty good, a good pace.

1:03:39 RTH: And, and when you, so you've described it as the woman sitting on the bench, is it the, is it the womanness of that that's there, or is, could it just been easily to say a person sitting on a bench? In reality, she had to be a woman, but I just see a person.

- 1:04:00 Phil: No, I was, I, she wasn't, she was maybe, um, what, 15, 20 feet away. And there was clear that, that, like, I think she was wearing pink and, and, and I guess there was kind womanness, which is why I said a woman, rather than just saying a person sitting on the bench.
- 1:04:28 RTH: Okay. So there is some recognition of the womanness, of this and, and more, is there more detail about that or? I don't think there's any more detail about that. There was, there was that woman, and then there were the other two women and, um, the trail is only so wide. So I was, I didn't, I was sort of, hmm. Yeah. See, I feel like I'm creating too many things like I was sort of paying attention to where I was walking because I didn't, they, they were, one of them was coming my way and one of them was, I think, just standing there, maybe two of them were coming my way. And then there was this bench and I had to go a bit towards the right. Cuz you, you don't wanna move out of the, if somebody's coming towards you, you don't just move out of the way at the very last second, you kind of, you know, decide, okay, I'm taking the right side and they're taking the left side or whatever. And it's sort of the polite thing to do. And then there was also the aspect of, um, of just looking at the scene, like the, um, the trees and the, and the ice behind the trees. So it was these three women, the, the walking, the navigating and, um, and then the, the visual aspects.
- 1:06:00 RTH: And, and would you say that these things are all in your direct experience so that it, it's not like there was nothing in my experience?
- 1:06:10 Phil: Right.
- 1:06:10 RTH: Instead I'm seeing these things, I'm feeling my walking, I'm in the process of navigating the curve. All this stuff is somehow [Phil: Yeah.] in, in my direct apprehension.
- 1:06:23 Phil: Yeah. But see, I, I think of other experiences and I think of like something in particular, like innerly saying something or visualizing something, but for this one, I felt like none of these things was particularly dominant.
- 1:06:41 RTH: Mm hmm. Present, but not dominant?
- 1:06:44 Phil: Present, but not dominant, right.
- 1:06:45 RTH: As opposed to absent, like in the, in the beep, number 2, I guess it was where there, the visual aspect was not present. My eyes were seeing it no doubt, but I, what they were experientially, not present. Here, all this stuff is experientially present, but I haven't made any of them the figure to the figure of my.
- 1:07:06 Phil: Right. Yeah. I think that's as best as I can put it. Yeah.
- 1:07:11 RTH: Okay. And I would, I would say there's no, there's no law that says that, that a person has to have a figure out of every experience. I think that's.
- 1:07:25 Phil: Okay.

1:07:26 RTH: That's just the way it is.

1:07:27 Phil: Yeah.

1:07:28 RTH: And so out of, out of all of the possible candidates for the figure, there's the woman on the bench, the woman on the trail, the ice on the lake, the trees, the navigation.

1:07:41 Phil: Yup.

1:07:42 RTH: Those are all [Phil: Yeah.] in my experience?

1:07:47 Phil: And, and, um,

1:07:49 RTH: None of them dominant.

1:07:49 Phil: I was wondering if, um, like the, the physicality was a part of it as well. Like just the, the experience of walking, um, that, that was present as well.

1:08:06 RTH: More so, more so than the trees or the woman or the lake?

1:08:11 Phil: No, no. Hon, honestly, um, as best I can describe, there was nothing, nothing that stood out.

1:08:18 RTH: Okay. And the, the experience of walking, I guess I should have asked more questions about that. The experience of walking that's a physical, is that right?

1:08:28 Phil: Yeah.

1:08:29 RTH: In, in, in some particular part of my body or my feet or my legs or my arms?

1:08:33 Phil: That's hard to say just, uh.

1:08:36 RTH: Doesn't have to be.

1:08:40 Phil: Like, okay, so I've read some, some of your work and the different kinds of inexperience, uh, inner experiences that people have and the, the sort of categories. Um, and, and I haven't read anything about physical, like, like, um, like let's say you're playing sport or something and you have to, you have to do some kind of motion that requires a bit of skill and you're, you're executing that motion. I don't know if that comprises, like, if there's potential for that comprising another, another type of, of inner experience.

1:09:29 RTH: Well, it could be, but most of the time, those actions, I end up thinking of I'm engaged in a skilled activity, but the skill itself or the act of itself isn't present.

1:09:44 Phil: Yeah.

1:09:46 RTH: Obviously I'm skilled. I'm, I'm a skilled walker, I'm navigating. I know the rules.

1:09:51 Phil: No, I'm not like I know walking doesn't take much skill, but I was sort of navigating the trail and, and, and moving myself in a way that I wasn't going to bump into any oncoming traffic or a tree or something.

1:10:06 RTH: Right. I, I take, I, I use the word skill.

1:10:09 Phil: There was some awareness, there was some awareness of, of doing that.

1:10:18 RTH: I, u, I used the word skill pretty broadly, so I would say that this skill of walking on a trail involves them generally passing left shoulder to left shoulder or whatever, taking the right side of the trail and [Phil: Mm hmm.] then all that stuff is part of the trail walking skill.

1:10:34 Phil: Mm-hmm.

1:10:35 RTH: It's, it's not, it might not be a high level skill, but it's, I, I would call it a skill.

1:10:44 Phil: Sure.

1:10:45 RTH: But, but that is generally not done explicitly in awareness. That's like, well, I gotta pass, left, the, ru, rule number four, I gotta pass left shoulder to left shoulder or whatever. It's, it's, it just occurs as part of the application of the skill.

1:11:05 CK: Or I would say similarly sort of, sort of like skill in Phil, you were talking in the second or the, yeah, the second beep, right, where you were obviously skillfully communicating and talking about what to name the car. But that sort of was all done outside of your direct apprehension, right, that, that was happening, but that wasn't at all sort of part of your experience at the moment.

1:11:30 Phil: Sure, sure. Yeah.

1:11:34 CK: And so the walking in this beep is, but that, that's not like the second beep, right. The walking somehow is present. I, we haven't yet clarified maybe, and maybe we won't get to that today, but, but somehow the walking was, it wasn't that it was just something that I was doing, but that's, that's sort of context that somehow the walking is present to me.

1:11:52 Phil: Yup. Yes.

1:11:53 CK: Okay.

1:11:53 Phil: Yes.

1:11:59 RTH: Alright. Do we have time for number 6? Energy for?

SAMPLE 2.6 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 1:12:01 Phil: Okay. Um, sorry if I'm taking a while here. Um, okay. I was preparing a bowl of instant ramen noodles, literally adding contents to the bowl while the noodles were boiling. Um, I was trying to think of a way to use up some fresh cilantro and fresh mint so it wouldn't go bad. I had been thinking of making an Indian mint and cilantro sauce, the type that's, um, I've had at restaurants with, uh, qwerpapadams as an appetizer. I don't know if you're familiar with these foods, but, um, basically I remembered what the sauce was called and at the moment of the beep I had just thrown some cut up mint used into a bowl. Or, sorry, at the moment, prior to the beep, I had just thrown some cut up mint used into the bowl and was in nearly saying the word "haryali", which is the name of the sauce. As, as I remember it anyway, I'm not sure if that's actually correct. Um, I apprehended the subtle sound of the leaves as they landed in the bowl and was moving my hand back towards the cutting board in front of me. I was conscious of, of what was in front of me visually, but not focused on it. And it was the second, it was actually the second or third time I had consecutively, innerly said "haryali" as if to better ingrain it into my memory for the future.
- 1:13:49 RTH: This is yours if you want it, Cody.
- 1:13:53 CK: Oops, sorry. I forgot whose turn it was. One second, okay, and so.
- 1:13:59 RTH: So shall I ask if you're?
- 1:14:01 CK: Sure. Yeah, go ahead, go ahead.
- 1:14:03 RTH: So the, so first the, the, at least the primary part of this is the saying of "haryali"?
- 1:14:11 Phil: Yes.
- 1:14:12 RTH: And this is the, maybe the second or third time that you had said it?
- 1:14:15 Phil: Yep.
- 1:14:16 RTH: Okay. And is that more prominent or less prominent than the sound of the leaves or is the sound of the leaves equally, more, less?
- 1:14:26 Phil: Um, I think what was most prominent was me, innerly saying "haryali." Although I noticed, I noticed the sound of the leaves, but I wasn't, uh, yeah, it wasn't, it wasn't a main, it wasn't a central part of the experience, it was present, but not central. And what was central was saying, saying the word hary cuz I had just remembered it, so I was, I was "haryali" and I was just like "haryali" and then doing something else. And, and, and I said, "haryali" again. And then this time I had just thrown the, the mint leaves in the bowl, I had heard the sound and, and, and was moving my hand back towards myself. And, uh, and as I was doing this, I was innerly speaking the word "haryali."
- 1:15:19 RTH: And is the moving of my hand back towards myself, a fact of the universe or is that in my experience?

1:15:27 Phil: I guess it was a, it was a fact of the universe.

1:15:30 RTH: So experientially.

1:15:31 Phil: But part of my experience was, um, the, the visual aspect of cuz these things are in different places and, and the cutting board was in front of me and I was getting back to. I don't know, I think I was gonna either tear some more mint leaves or cut some cilantro or something. So, so, um, so the visual aspect was, uh, was part of the experience as well.

1:15:58 RTH: So there are three aspects of my experience if I'm counting correctly, saying "haryali," hearing the sound of the leaves, and seeing the visual display?

1:16:08 Phil: Yep.

1:16:08 RTH: And of those, the saying seems more prominent. Is that like 60-20-20 or 85-15, or? Not trying to hold you to the numbers, but just trying to get a sense of.

1:16:19 Phil: Yeah, I would say something like 60-20-20. Yup.

1:16:24 RTH: So quite a bit more of my attention is on the speaking innerly speaking?

1:16:31 Phil: Yeah.

1:16:31 RTH: But the, but the rest of the stuff is there, but not too prominent.

1:16:35 Phil: Correct.

1:16:37 RTH: Okay.

1:16:38 Phil: Yeah. Now whether it was, um, so I had, I had said this a few times. I had said the word innerly a few times, but by this point it was, it's actually questionable as to whether it was, it, I heard it if I sort of heard myself saying it or if I was, cuz I had already recalled it, right. That's, that's something I had been trying to do while preparing the food was remembering the name of the sauce and I had already recalled it, but I was just sort of repeating it, but I sort of feel like as you innerly repeat things, it, it almost gets to the point where you're you're, it's more like you're, you're, you're just hearing yourself saying it, it sort of comes to you.

1:17:30 RTH: And so.

1:17:33 Phil: Maybe that's just sort of how it was this time. I don't know if that's, if it's actually like that for anyone else, but

1:17:38 RTH: Yeah, I would say let's, let's set that aside, but, but does this seem like I'm hearing, I feel sort of confidently to say I'm hearing "haryali" for whatever reason, this is more a hearing than a speaking.

1:17:56 Phil: I'm not sure now, I'm not sure.

1:17:59 RTH: Mm hmm. So we we've made a distinction between hearing and seeing and, and in the real world, that's a, that is a really d, easy thing to describe. No one would confuse, I can't tell whether I'm talking into a tape recorder or hearing my voice come back that's y'know that no one, no one would make no one would find that problematic, but in the inner world, sometimes it takes some practice to try to figure out how to talk about that. And so I'm happy to leave that as being well, we've raised the question rather than answered it about the nature of inner speaking and inner hearing. We'll either figure that out or, or we won't.

1:18:36 Phil: Mm hmm.

1:18:36 RTH: So.

1:18:41 Phil: Can we just go back to what I said. I was, innerly saying the word "haryali." I don't know, maybe I've clouded my, my memory of the experience by the, by the, by realizing the possibility of, of, of hearing myself saying the word or actually processing the word.

1:19:02 RTH: So what I, what I would say about the method is that because we haven't had these conversations about the distinctions between hearing and, hearing and speaking. Then I think it's not possible for you to go back and reconstruct, I think, I think you can, you can say something that's plausible, but, but I wouldn't believe you because you didn't have those distinctions at your disposal at the time of the, at the time of the experience. Next time when you sample we'll have you, you will have, we will have had these conversations and you'll be more interested in that and maybe you'll be able to tell the difference and maybe you won't. I'm not trying to, [Phil: Yeah.] I'm not trying to force you into even a particular.

1:19:41 Phil: Right, just like last time. Um, I remember I, there were a few experiences where I wasn't sure if, um, if I had innerly said something with words or with, or it was just.

1:19:57 RTH: Right.

1:19:57 Phil: More like a, a thought like, um, and this time I paid more attention to that distinction and I wrote down if I, if I had innerly said something with words or, uh, or not.

1:20:13 RTH: qwerAnd, and I would.qwer

1:20:14 Phil: In each case it was with words, so.

1:20:17 RTH: And to double back to the conversation that we had at the beginning of today's conversation about the difficulty in determining simultaneity and, and sequentiality or, or, or whatever. To some degree, I think that's not possible because of the constructive nature of the beep. We do the best we can and, and try to be honest about it, so if, if we can't, if we can't determine whether something was sequential or

simultaneous, then we can't determine that and that's that's as, as, as good as we're gonna be able to get. [Phil: Yeah.] And, and that's good enough from my, from my point of view, I, when I qwergo about.qwer

1:20:54 Phil: I feel like I'm also getting, sorry to interrupt, but I, I feel like I'm getting a bit more comfortable with just saying, I don't know if there's something that I'm not, that I'm not sure of instead of trying to put it in, in one in, like a yes or no kind of thing or something definite, and I think I'm a bit more comfortable with just leaving something open if I'm, if I'm honestly not sure, instead of trying to reconstruct it. And then, and then by trying to reconstruct it, recreating it into something that maybe it wasn't.

1:21:28 RTH: Right. And, and I think, and, and that's great as far as I'm concerned, I don't know is a really good answer to, to a lot of questions. And I would, and I would say going forwards, maybe we're gonna figure this out, and maybe we're not, which is another layer of, I don't know. I don't know whether we're going to figure out the, I don't know, portion. [Phil: Right.] And, and that goes all the way down as far as I'm concerned, [Phil: Right.] either, either we're gonna figure it out, o, or we're not, and that's fine with me. And, and so there are some things about your experience about which didn't seem am, very ambiguous, ambiguous. Like I saw the letters and they were black and metallic and no font and maybe I can't name the font, but it was a particular font or whatever that. That seemed pretty central so, so Phil apparently knows centrality of experience when he sees it. And then other kinds of experiences didn't seem to have that sort of figural predominance. And, uh, and, and so that's, that's good. That's, that's the way it is as far as I'm concerned.

1:22:31 Phil: Mm hmm, yeah.

1:22:31 New Speaker: And that's the, I would say in a, in a way that's one of the things that distinguishes DES our, our intention is we, we're not trying to put something into categories, we're trying to get something described the way Phil experiences it. We're trying to help Phil, we're trying to help all of us actually, it's not just Phil. We're trying to help all of us speak to the limits that we can with the fidelity that we can about Phil's experience. [Phil: Yeah.] And without forcing him into our language or our, or, or we're, we're trying to support his indecision or because that's it. No, that's, that's the way it is, [Phil: Mm hmm, yeah.] so we need to. So shall we decide to do this again and see what?

1:25:28 Phil: Yeah.

1:25:29 RTH: Okay. Wednesday at the same time, unless something happens.

1:25:31 Phil: Yep.

1:25:31 RTH: And, and as far as the beeper is concerned, you know, use whatever, tape or, whatever, try to get that done and to test it out by holding on the white button and uh.

1:25:45 Phil: Yup. Will, will do, will do.

1:25:50 RTH: Alright sounds good to me. And, and.

1:25:54 Phil: Okay. I know we went over time, so thanks for your patience.

1:25:56 RTH: Yeah. And, and I would say you're doing great. The, the indecision or the, the i don't knowness is, I don't know, is, is a fundamentally important thing and.

1:26:10 Phil: Yeah.

1:26:10 RTH: And I, I'm happy to hear that we're worried about it cuz that really being worried about it is the, is the best that we can do.

1:26:19 Phil: Yes. Yes.

1:26:20 RTH: And then we'll get, we'll get as far as we can and as much understanding as we can without, without making anything up, that's the object.

1:26:28 Phil: Yeah. And let me know if you have more thoughts on this, this multiplicity aspect. So in, in a number of these experiences, um, there, there, there were multiple things that were simultaneous or slightly not like slightly sequential and if you, if you happen to have any more thought, I'm not asking you to tell me right now, but if you happen to have any more thoughts on that, I, I'm quite interested. But I also don't want it to bias my future, uh, um, recordings of my experiences so, so.

1:27:06 RTH: What I, what I would say about that is let's, let's keep the, the interest in multiple or simultaneous or whatever things alive, but not, let's not try to talk about it now because if we did, we would, we would be tempted to speculate on the basis of a couple of samples. And better, better we should gather some more data, which is either gonna change what we think about this or it's not and if it *does*, then it would've been really smart for us to wait and if it doesn't, then, then it doesn't didn't matter.

1:27:40 Phil: Okay. Okay, sounds good.

1:27:41 RTH: So I'm not trying to blow that question off. What I'm trying to say is that I think we can do a better job of answering it if we can be a little patient.

1:27:49 Phil: Okay. Yep. I, I agree. I agree.

1:27:53 RTH: And, and, and I would further, further say that there, I would, I would wish to be reassuring about it in the sense that, um, I was interested in the, y'know, some, some of your samples had a clear figure and everything else was in the ground and some didn't. [Phil: Yeah.] And, and, uh, that's interesting.

1:28:15 Phil: Yeah. Okay.

1:28:20 CK: And I would also say Phil, that it's possible through all this, that some, it's not like there's a rule that things have to be simultaneous or not, or any, you know, it doesn't have to follow any one sort of logic to it too so. I think the better that we can all get engaged and in touch with grasping whatever was going on just before that beep sounded that the better. Um, whatever that might look like, or that might lead us to. Um, [Phil: Okay.] but I wanted to echo to, I know this is a, this is a difficult process too, so I mean, you're [Phil: Challenging, yeah.] it's all good.

1:28:51 RTH: It is challenging. It's also interesting.

1:28:56 Phil: Very, yes.

1:28:57 RTH: Alright. Thank you all very much.

1:28:58 Phil: Okay. Have a great day.

1:29:00 RTH: See you on Wednesday morning.

1:29:02 CK: Thank you Phil, [AG: Thank you.] nice to meet you. Hopefully I can be there, the, maybe the next sampling day.

1:29:07 Phil: Okay.

1:29:07 New Speaker: See you later.

1:29:07 New Speaker: All right. Take care.

1:29:07 New Speaker: See you later. All right. Take care.