

TRANSCRIPT WITH COMMENTARY

Phil J.: A neuroscience writer

Phil Interview 3

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the May 25 interview with Phil that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/SGZqeqFNYfM>. In green are comments about and explanations of the Descriptive Experience Sampling process. If you have corrections, suggestions, or questions, please post them as YouTube comments.

RTH = Russ Hurlburt

AG = Amber Goto

Phil = Phil J.

0:03 Phil: Good morning.

0:04 RTH: Good morning. Good afternoon.

0:05 AG: Good morning.

0:07 Phil: Are you still in Hawaii, Amber?

0:08 AG: Yes.

0:09 Phil: Yes. Okay. So it's very, very early.

0:12 AG: Yes!

0:14 RTH: We feel sad for her.

0:14 Phil: [laughs] Okay.

0:14 RTH: So anything that we should be talking about, the beeper, did the beeper work when, uh, with the tape on it or whatever?

0:28 Phil: Yeah. Beeper works fine beeper, no issues. Um. Yeah. I wore it out a little bit. Um, I had some, is there anyone else joining, Cody, no?

0:42 RTH: I think, I think Cody couldn't do today. He, he would like to join us next time if he can, but depending on what, what his schedule is.

0:50 Phil: Okay. Um, okay, so I can just get right into the first beep?

0:55 RTH: Alright, let's do it.

SAMPLE 3.1 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 0:57 Phil: Okay. So, uh, I haven't read over all of my notes yet, so I hope everything's okay. I think it will be, but might have to bear with me a little bit. [RTH: No problem.] Uh, okay. Beep number 1. [reads his notes] I was on the couch, sofa thinking about the beep. I had forgotten that I turned on the beeper when I suddenly remembered it was nearby and triggered. I was thinking about the potential of it beeping and what I would log or what I would remember if it went off and it did. Um, so I feel like I was in a very, like in a very dreamy, condensed kind of manner. I considered the present moment that I was lying on the couch after work, just being lazy, contemplating, um, making a, like a grocery list. And at the moment, right before the beep, I innerl, I innerly said to myself with words, "I was." Sort of as in a, "I was..." dot, dot, dot kind of manner as if imagining the first words in this very entry, which actually does begin with, "I was." [finishes reading]
- 2:12 RTH: And, and when you say just before the beep, do you mean caught in flight by the beep, as best you can tell? So I wanna make sure, [Phil: Um.] I wanna make sure that we're in agreement about what the phrase *just before* means.
- 2:29 Phil: Oh, just like immediately before the beep, like the instant before the sound began.
- 2:37 RTH: Okay. The last, *the last undisturbed moment*, sometimes we call that. Or sometimes we call it *interrupted by the leading edge of the beep*, or.
- 2:44 Phil: Correct. Yep.
- 2:45 RTH: Alright. That's what I figured, but I, every now and then you gotta make sure about that.
- 2:50 Phil: Sure, sure. Yeah.
- 2:51 RTH: So, [Phil: Uh huh.] so at what we would call *the moment of the beep*, what you would call *just before the beep*, what we might call *at the leading edge of the beep*, whatever you're saying to yourself, "I was..." as if you wanted to write down an entry into, about a, a beep.
- 3:09 Phil: Yup. Um, that's correct. Just imagine yourself staring at a blank page, and you know, you're gonna begin an entry about something and all the other entries have basically started with "I was" so the first words that automatically sort of come to mind are "I was." [RTH: Okay.] So I was thinking about the beep and I was like, oh, what if it goes off right now? What would I write? And then, and then the next thing that comes to mind is that "I was" blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.
- 3:41 RTH: And, and is the rest of that there? Or is it the, dot dot dot portion there or haven't gotten there yet?
- 3:48 Phil: No. No, but it's just the way in my head. I would characterize writing the words "I was."
- 3:57 RTH: Okay.
- 3:58 Phil: Yeah.

3:58 RTH: And so I'm gathering, I think, I think you said that you were *speaking* those words, is that right?

4:06 Phil: Correct.

4:06 RTH: As opposed to imagining yourself writing them or something?

4:10 Phil: Correct. Yup.

4:12 RTH: In your own naturally inflicted voice?

4:17 Phil: Yep. Yes. Yup. No, no sort of significant intonation or something. It's just, I, "I was."

4:28 RTH: Okay. [Phil: Yup.] And, and you've been using the word *speaking*, we've sometimes made the distinction between *speaking* and **hearing**. Is this, I'm speaking these words rather than hearing myself play these words back?

4:41 Phil: Yeah. More speaking than hearing, more speaking than hearing. [RTH: Okay.] Al, almost as if, oh, well, not really like writing, but I, I would definitely say speaking if I had to choose, but in the most passive manner possible, if that makes sense.

5:07 RTH: The most passive manner of speaking?

5:09 Phil: Yeah.

5:11 RTH: Okay. So it's not like, it's not like you're trying to direct somebody with something. It's just like I'm, "I was."

5:20 Phil: Inner mumbling, I guess you could sort of say.

5:26 RTH: And, and is there anything else in your experience? So, I understand the context is: I was wondering what I, what I would write if the beep went off. And is that context present to you? Or is that what has spawned this experience and the experience at the moment is just, "I was"?

5:46 Phil: Um...

5:48 RTH: Or doesn't that...

5:48 Phil: ...well...

5:49 RTH: ...doesn't that question make sense?

5:49 Phil: Well, I was giving you the context because that was, um, that was just prior, so right before the words "I was." Um, I was thinking, oh, what if the beep went off right now, then I would. Um, and what was I doing? I was just lying on the couch, staring into space. I had been contemplating, um, I was gonna go to the grocery store. So I was contemplating, um, a list of things that I needed to get. And, um, and then, and then

sort of automatically, I just went to like, as if I was about to write this, write an entry into this little, I have everything logged in the same file here. So I was just thinking of if I went to the file and I was about to log something right now, and then it was sort of just, it was kind of automatic. I, I, it just doing that came to mind and the first thing that sort of played out was "I was...."

6:52 RTH: Okay.

6:53 Phil: Yeah.

6:56 RTH: So I'm, I'm gathering that really at the moment, at the precise moment interrupted by the beep, the only thing that's really in your experience is the "I was" the, that's the?

7:08 Phil: Correct. Correct. Yup.

7:09 RTH: That's, that's set in motion by this desire to wonder what, what, what you might write or whatever, but....

7:15 Phil: Yeah, but I didn't get beyond, I didn't get beyond the, "I was" and then the beep went off and then I was like, well, I guess I'll find out now.

7:24 RTH: [laughs] Right. Alright. I'm good. You good Amber?

7:29 Phil: Okay.

7:31 AG: Um, I just wanted to ask, you had mentioned earlier, you described that "I was" as inner mumbling. Would you say that this was the, "I was" was clear? Like it was very clear "I was" or would you say it's kind of like, I think in the day 1 we had that kind of, uh, you were trying to pronounce a word, it kind of came out like bluuh?

7:51 Phil: Oh, no, it was, it was clear. [AG: Okay.] It was clear. Yeah. But more on, more on that later, I believe in, in one of the, one of the next, in one of the upcoming beeps.

8:04 AG: Okay.

8:05 RTH: Okay.

8:06 AG: I'm good.

8:07 RTH: Number 2.

SAMPLE 3.2 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

8:08 Phil: Okay. [reads his notes] I was reading a magazine article on my laptop and the portion of the present sentence was "we stop paying attention to what's happening around us." The, the moment of the beep was right after the word "attention." (So the beep happens in mid-sentence here, or close to the end of the sentence.) I, I was focused on taking in the information in the same manner one might be when listening to someone

tell you something interesting. The sentence was a quote from an interview. Although I was innerly hearing my own voice as I read the words, I had an awareness that it was someone else who had said them. So I automatically engaged in intonation in the manner in which I imagined *them* to have said the, the sentence. I felt remarkably similar to how I imagined myself to feel while listening to the words of someone else telling me something interesting. [finishes reading]

9:20 RTH: So I understand that the center of this experience is I'm *hearing* myself speak the words "we stopped paying attention to what happened around us"?

9:36 Phil: A, correct.

9:36 RTH: And that you have word, used the word *hearing*, I'm *hearing* myself say this, this is a *hearing* experience, not a *speaking* experience?

9:45 Phil: It's difficult to describe. Um, when I'm reading something, it, I don't know it, I guess it sort of feels somewhere, it feels somewhere between me *speaking* the words and me *hearing* the words.

10:02 RTH: Okay. So let's not talk about reading in general, let's, let's see that we can stick to just this one, this one instance [Phil: Okay.] that may or may not be typical of reading in general.

10:12 Phil: I, I believe, um, I believe *hearing* is more accurate.

10:17 RTH: So that would make this experience somewhat different from "I was," is that right?

10:24 Phil: Yeah. Yes.

10:25 RTH: And different in the sense that the, "I was," was mostly a speak-y kind of a thing. And, uh, *we stopped paying attention* is more a hear-y kind of a thing?

10:36 Phil: Uh, uh, it could be... [RTH: Not trying to, not trying to...] when I think of, when I think of hearing, I think of something that's sort of involuntary, but I could stop reading at any moment and then I wouldn't, I wouldn't apprehend the sound of the words in, in any way whatsoever, so...

10:57 RTH: So that is clearly, clearly true in the *external* world, but that doesn't necessarily have to apply in the *internal* world, so, [Phil: Okay.] so it's, there's no doubt about it that *your* neurons are producing these words, the words are on the page or on the screen, but you're, you are in some way creating them for yourself. And there's no doubt about that, it's your neurons doing that. [Phil: Yeah.] The question is are you doing that *experientially* in the manner of *speaking*—I'm speaking what I'm reading—or in the manner of hearing? I, I'm *hearing* my voice and I've, I've positive...

11:34 Phil: I've always thought of silent reading, um, more in the line of being related to *speaking* rather than *hearing*, but I don't know, I almost feel like this was more like, like *hearing* the words, especially because it was a quote, because when somebody says something

you *hear* them. You don't, you don't speak [laughs]. Um, so that that's more in line with actually hearing, cuz, yeah, as I said, it was a quote from an interview. So I sort of, I feel like I, I imagined myself *hearing* the person *saying* that, but because I wasn't *actually* hearing them saying that it, I had to use my *own*, it was in my own sort of voice as I read the words.

11:34

Comment: DES always seeks to describe just one experience, the one that happened to be ongoing at the moment of the beep. This interchange illustrates how difficult that task is. Let's observe the sequence:

(1) Phil originally says (in the 8:08 turn) he was hearing: "I felt remarkably similar to how I imagined myself to feel while listening to the words of someone else."

(2) RTH seeks to clarify that, and Phil's (very common) presupposition that reading experience is generally (or always) *speaking* seeps in (9:45): "When I'm reading something, it, I don't know it, I guess it sort of feels somewhere, it feels somewhere between me *speaking* the words and me *hearing* the words."

(3) RTH tries to help Phil keep his presuppositions out of play (DES calls that *bracketing* presuppositions), and Phil (10:12) returns to the *hearing* description: "I, I believe, um, I believe *hearing* is more accurate."

(4) But the battle against presuppositions is not over. At 10:36, the presupposition again is predominant: It can't be hearing because hearing is involuntary, "but I could stop reading at any moment."

(5) RTH counters that assumption by noting that that might be true in the real but not the experiential world.

(6) But rather than simply abandon the presupposition, at 11:34 Phil figures out a way to keep the presupposition intact: reading still involves speaking, but this one can be *hearing* the words "because it was a quote, because when somebody says something you *hear* them."

The battle between presuppositions and experience is messy. With support, Phil can say about this reading experience that it involved reading, but the reading-is-speaking presupposition will continue to be powerful, maybe more powerful than before this interchange, because now the presupposition is more refined (reading is speaking except when reading dialog, when it is hearing) and it seems that we have evidence for that refinement (when actually we have no evidence at all about reading as speaking).

The point here is that I think presuppositions are delusions (Hurlburt & Akhter, 2006; Hurlburt & Schwitzgebel, 2007; Hurlburt, 2011). Delusions are stubborn adversaries, as exemplified here.

This is not a weakness of Phil. We all (with the possible exception of those who have attained enlightenment) have presuppositions; our presuppositions are just as stubborn and self-protecting as is Phil's.

12:27 RTH:

So the notion, the notion of reading is a complicated thing. So lemme give a slight lecture here in, in the realm of bracketing our presuppositions about reading. So we, we've actually beeped quite a few people who have been reading. And, and what we have found is that *most* people actually *don't* hear or speak the words *at all* when they're reading. Much to their own surprise, they, they they're gleaning the meaning,

but more commonly, they're just seeing a picture of what was going on in their head, [Phil: Right.] as if someone was creating a video with no words whatsoever. And that comes as a surprise to people. People, people *think* (more or less like what you just said), that they speak the words when they're, when they're reading. And if it's dialogue, then they hear the other voice or whatever. And that is in fact sometimes true. So I'm not trying to say, this is not what ha, what happened for you. [Phil: Mm hmm.] But I'm, what I'm trying to say is, well, let's not let our self-theories or our theories about the way reading is color what happens in, in actual experience. So this is another bracketing of presuppositions [Phil: Mm hmm.] effort, effort, lecture, whatever you wanna call it. [Phil: Yeah.] That, uh, so there, so the, the que... the question is always: What is the characteristic, what are the characteristics of Phil's experience at the moment of *this beep*? Regardless of what might be usual *for Phil*, or might be usual *across people*, or might be *thought to be* usual across people *by Phil*, or might be thought to be used, by usual across people *by everybody*, or whatever. [Phil: Mm hmm.] We're trying to set all that stuff aside and go just at, at this experience. [Phil: Mm hmm.] and it's, and it's a, it's a trick to do that. I mean, you have to [Phil: Yeah.] work at, at what it is...

- 12:27 Comment: RTH's 12:27 "lecture" is his response to noticing what is described in the 11:34 comment. That lecture, like many things in DES, is aimed not primarily at the present sample, but in preparation for samples in the upcoming sampling days.
- 14:14 Phil: I, I honestly, I, I was honestly hearing my voice play out those words. It wasn't, it wasn't a purely visual experience. I'm very confident in that.
- 14:27 RTH: Okay. And I'm, and I'm, I definitely wanna make it clear that I'm not trying to talk you into or out of anything. [Phil: Right, yeah.] What I'm, what I'm trying to do is to, is to focus us in, focus in, on *one* experience at a time, one of Phil's experiences at a time, regardless of the rest of, as if the rest of the world didn't exist, basically. [Phil: Mm hmm yeah.] And that's obviously not possible, but, but we can approximate it [inaudible].
So: what I'm gathering is, as best we can say, at the moment of this beep I'm *reading* these words on the screen and my experiences of doing this and my voice inflected as the other guy might, might have said it. And that this seems more like a hearing experience than it seems like a speaking experience. It's more like I'm hearing my voice speaking than I am speaking it.
- 15:21 Phil: Cor, yeah. I, yes! I think, I think that's pretty much, that's pretty much as accurate as we can get it.
- 15:31 RTH: Okay. And, and, and the reason, I guess I've said this probably before, the, the reason that we do this proc, process on multiple occasions is that we have to have this kind of a conversation so that maybe sometime in a future beep you'll, you'll be reading again. And now, *then* at that moment, you'll be, you'll be *more interested* in what your own phenomenon is. That's really the hope is to get Phil interested in, well, what the hell do I actually really do in this, this kind of a situation?
- 15:58 Phil: Yeah, to revisit this reading situation. Yeah.

- 16:02 RTH: Maybe. And so I'm not saying we should go out and read again. Tthat, y'know, we can do that or not. But, but the, the ob, the object of the whole enterprise, really, is to get Phil interested in his experience as it happens at particular moments. But as it act, *actually* happens, setting aside what, what seems plausible or reasonable, or, [Phil: Mm hmm.] or likely, or whatever.
- 16:29 Phil: Mm hmm.
- 16:30 RTH: And that, you know, that's a skill that when, or maybe it's a *taste* that you have to acquire. So is there, is there anything else going on at this particular moment?
- 16:43 Phil: Um, no, that, that, I think, I think that's as much as I can, that's as best as I can describe it.
- 16:54 RTH: So I'm reading with comprehension. I know what it is that I'm, that I'm reading, and I'm hearing myself say these words inflected as, as if the other guy was saying it?
- 17:03 Phil: Yeah.
- 17:09 RTH: Then I think I'm good. Unless Am, Amber's got questions.
- 17:11 AG: I'm good.
- 17:13 Phil: Yeah.
- 17:14 RTH: Number 3.

SAMPLE 3.3 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 17:17 Phil: Okay. This one, it was, it was a bit late. Um, I had a bit of trouble with this one. So I was watching, I was watching the film *Get Back*, which is a documentary about the, The Beatles and their later years, they, they were trying to make a film about film, uh, about doing a, a sort of live album, but it, it never actually happened. Um, so it was showing the famous rooftop concert. Um, they did this concert on a rooftop of the recording studio in, in London, in 1969. Um, and the song *I've Got a Feeling* was just beginning. Leading up to the beep I recognized the song from the guitar intro and innerly, I, I, it's like, I could hear Paul McCartney saying the first line, "I've got a feeling." And then at the moment, just prior to the beep, the actual first line of the song began, and I watched McCartney and the rest of the band play the song. Um, there, there was visual and auditory focus on what I was seeing and hearing.
- 18:32 RTH: So I'm not a hundred percent sure I understood that. So, so do you *innerly* hear Paul McCartney's voice singing "I've got a feeling" [Phil: Okay.] before, before he actually sings it?
- 18:46 Phil: Yes, but I, so I would say that was at the moment *just prior* to the moment before the beep.

18:53 RTH: Okay.

18:54 Phil: And then, um, and then at the very instant, *right* before the beep, uh, he started the actual line. And I was just, I was watching it and I was listening to it.

19:09 RTH: And so at, at the moment of the beep, is it the case that you're sort of watching what's going on on the TV, carried along by the TV?

19:19 Phil: Yeah.

19:19 RTH: And that's basically it?

19:20 Phil: That's, that's basically it, yeah. I, I think this one, well, I don't know if any of them are boring, but this one is, I think this one is relatively simple. Um, I was, I was watching TV [laughs]. I was listening, I was listening and I was, I was watching.

19:42 RTH: And what's happening is that the, the, The Beatles are starting to play. I wanna, [Phil: I've got a...] *I've Got a Feeling* on the, on the roof, in their rooftop concert?

19:53 Phil: Mm hmm.

19:53 RTH: And are you, are you attending to any *particular* aspect of that, you said watching and hearing, or are you more into the hearing or more into the watching or is it just, these guys are playing, I'm watching it, I'm hearing it?

20:07 Phil: Yeah. That's pretty much it. Um, at the time on the screen, it showed the viewpoint of three separate cameras. And I was focused on the furthest, the view presented furthest to the right, my right on the screen. Which I believe was the one that was closest to Paul McCartney. [RTH: And...] So my, so it was kind of like this [leans forward and looks to the right] watching.

20:43 RTH: Okay. And, and so I, I'm understanding that as a fact of the universe, *my gaze* is at the right hand panel that's being presented?

20:55 Phil: Yeah.

20:56 RTH: And presumably the, the object of presenting three panels was so that the viewer could choose from among these panels and zoom in on each one?

21:05 Phil: Yeah.

21:05 RTH: And at the moment you happen to be behind door number three, so to speak?

21:09 Phil: Yeah. Yes. [laughs]

21:12 RTH: Ah, okay. And, and is there anything in *particular* in that panel that is drawing your attention? Or is it just, I had a choice of three and I'm?

- 21:22 Phil: I think it, because it was the start of the song and I knew that, um, I knew he was gonna start singing. Um, I was, I was looking at him. Whereas in the other, in the other panels, it showed the band from afar, from further away or another member of the band.
- 21:41 RTH: So it's fair to say that you were sort of zooming in on Paul McCartney?
- 21:46 Phil: Yeah.
- 21:47 RTH: But not on a particular aspect of Paul McCartney—the shirt that he's wearing, or the bass that he's playing, or whatever?
- 21:53 Phil: No, nope.
- 21:58 RTH: Okay. Then I'm happy with that. And I would, I would say that is a pretty typical watching TV kind of, kind of a beep. [Phil: Yeah.] But there are, there are alternatives to be had. I mean, some people will say, you know, the TV screen, but I was really interested in that Paul was wearing an orange shirt and it was the orange that I was interested in, and something like that, but.
- 22:17 Phil: I know people who get very distracted while watching television and they even have trouble watching movies and, and yeah. I, sometimes I focus on things that are not relevant to the plot or what you're suppo, what they're trying to focus your attention on so, yeah. Okay.
- 22:41 RTH: Alright. Number 4. Unless Amber you have questions about that?
- 22:44 AG: Uh, yeah. I had a question about the hearing portion. [Phil: Yeah.] So, uh, you said you were hearing the TV, you're hearing the actual line of *I've Got a Feeling*. Are you hearing that in Paul McCartney's voice because he's singing it? Are you hearing it and is there anything more to say about that?
- 23:00 Phil: Wait, uh, sorry. Um, are you talking about the instant in the film where he started singing the song? Or...?
- 23:07 AG: Yes. Yeah. You've mentioned that you saw, you were watching TV and you were hearing the TV as well. Is there anything else to say about your hearing...
- 23:16 Phil: Uh, no.
- 23:16 AG: ...of what was coming from the TV?
- 23:19 Phil: N, no. [AG: Okay.] Nothing else to say.
- 23:26 RTH: All right. Number 4.

SAMPLE 3.4 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 23:27 Phil: Okay. Um, oh, now yeah, now we're moving on to today. Uh, [reads from notes] I had just locked my bike and was crossing. (So I, I went downtown and I had just locked my bike and I was crossing) a pedestrian street, which is the main street, to go into my bank. Before the beep, I was innerly repeating the combination of Eva-stina's lock. Which I had just used to secure the bike. I hadn't used it in some time and I was, and, and was trying to better consolidate the combination in memory. As I began to cross the street, I innerly said it with, with words "1-4-7," and then almost automatically, I began to repeat it a second time. I was a bit apprehensive about having to explain, um, the device [the beeper] to a representative inside the bank. And during the second repeat of "1-4-7" at the, at the moment, right before the beep, I was also saying to myself clearly, with words, "should I wear the beeper?" (So have a little more on this cuz I think it's kind of interesting.) It was like, it was like the innerly saying of the "1-4-7" repeat had a ballistic nature, sort of like I started it and that was good enough to set the whole sequence in motion so midway through, I could just let the rest play out and move on to something more important, which was doing something or not with the beeper as I approached the front door of the bank. It was like, it turned from inner speaking to inner hearing. And the speaking transferred to the, "should I wear the beeper?" [finishes reading] It's a bit, it's a bit complicated. So ask me to clarify anything.
- 25:29 RTH: Okay. So I, I think I got the picture more or less. We'll see. The, so at the moment of the beep there are two streams of words going on "1-4-7" [Phil: Yup.] and "should I wear the beeper?"
- 25:42 Phil: Yup. Yeah.
- 25:45 RTH: Now let's so let me give the bracketing lecture first. The, because you said that the, the, the, the "1-4-7" was changing from being inner speaking to being inner hearing. And that may very well be a good characteristic of your experience, I'm not trying to talk you outta that, but what I want us to do is *not* fall into the trap of saying, well, I couldn't possibly, be innerly speaking two different things at the same time.
- 26:07 Phil: Mm, mm hmm, yup.
- 26:08 RTH: Cuz that's not true. It is possible to innerly speak multiple things, whether, whether that's possible for *you* or likely for *you* is another story, but, but I'm confident that people can innerly speak two, [Phil: Mm hmm.] sort of, innerly speak two different things at, at the same time
- 26:23 Phil: In, in this instance. Um, I *do*, I *do* feel like it sort of went from inner s. Well, maybe it was always inner hearing, but, um, because it was a repeat, so I saw the combination when I actually locked the lock. And I probably said it to myself. And then as I was leaving the bike, walking across the street to the bank, I just kind of repeated it, repeated it to myself, "1-4-7." And then I was sort of in a mode of just repeating it to myself, to memorize it a bit better. And, um, and then, yeah, I started with the, the "1-4" and then I was getting close to the bank and then I was like, "should I wear the beeper?" But I could still sort of hear the "4-7" play out.

- 27:22 RTH: Okay. And, and I, I, I guess I still haven't figured out the hearing and speaking. And, and we're, and it's, it's possible that we're making more of a distinction between hearing and seeing than is, than is possible.
- 27:40 Phil: Um hmm.
- 27:43 RTH: But I guess what, so what, what I guess I wanna know is as best you can say, is your experience of the "4-7" at the moment of the beep the same or different as your experience of, "should I wear the beeper?"
- 27:57 Phil: Different. Because "should I wear the beeper?" was, um, clearly I remember it as clearly inner speaking.
- 28:10 RTH: Okay.
- 28:10 Phil: I, I, I saw the door of the bank and then, or, well, I wasn't focused visually, but as I got closer to the bank, it just kind of struck me like, oh, "should I wear the beeper?" And I, I said it to myself, I spoke it innely.
- 28:27 RTH: Okay.
- 28:27 Phil: Yeah. I'm, I'm quite confident in that. But as I did the "4," like the "1-4-7" was still sort of in the background. [RTH: Okay. And...] It, it was like, there was kind of an overlap. [gestures an overlap with his hands]
- 28:47 RTH: And in the background, in the nature of Phil's voice, whether spoken or heard? So it's not like I've just abstracted out the voice and gone to somehow presenting the numbers to myself, "4-7" with no voice involved? There's still a voice involved in this?
- 29:05 Phil: That's how I remember it. It's very difficult for me to reimagine it, but that's how I remember it.
- 29:12 RTH: Okay. Well, it's, it is the kind of a thing that it might not be possible for you to imagine it in this setting. Something that actually took place while, while it was happening, which is, which is why, which is why we do these things the way we do, asking you to capture it as best you can right at the moment.
- 29:29 Phil: I, I startled myself a bit because it was like, I was speaking two things at the same time. And I wasn't aware that I, I can do that or... Or yeah, I, I wasn't sure how these two things could be happening simultaneously. And it really struck me at the moment, but it's very difficult to remember it or re-imagine it.
- 29:29 Comment: This is a good example of why I think armchair introspection (which is what I call the attempt to observe your own experience on demand, *not* in its natural setting) is problematic. When you sit there and try to imagine something, there is in reality only one thing ongoing: you're sitting there trying to imagine. But in the natural world, there are often two or more things ongoing (here, remembering the combination and thinking about the beeper in the bank). In the armchair, it's very difficult or impossible to

imagine two asynchronous events, each with its own independent rhythm and independent environmental cues.

Also: This example gives some further insight into the operation of presuppositions. Here, the presupposition is that only one worded experience can be ongoing at a time. That is a common presupposition, but the point I wish to make here is about "I startled myself a bit." Presuppositions are deeply organically rooted. It is not merely a cognitive recognition of a disparity; it is a startle. It is not merely a dispassionate comparison; it is a *what!?! A that can't be!* So bracketing a presupposition is *not* merely a selection of one alternative over another, but a battle that pits one observation against a deeply-held-without-question position.

- 29:55 RTH: Well, that that's the kinda report that leads me to, to believe that the reports are true. I mean that, that when, [Phil: Oh, good!] when people are *surprised* at something and say, *well, this is what happened, doesn't seem like it's possible, but that's what happened*, [Phil: Mm hmm.] that leads me to think, well, they're telling me what happened, because [Phil: (laughs)] why would, why would they tell me *that!*
- 30:15 Phil: Yeah. Yeah. I I'm trying, I'm trying my best. [laughs]
- 30:22 RTH: Right. The inner, the inner life does not follow the same rules as the external world. That's ju, [Phil: No, it really, it doesn't.] that's just the way it is. And the, and quite a bit of psychological theory and inner-speaking theory and whatever presumes that the inner life is the same as external life and the, it's a faulty assumption.
- 30:44 Phil: I, I completely agree. Yeah.
- 30:48 RTH: Okay. So there's, so there's some concern about wearing the beeper, which led you to say to yourself, "should I wear the beeper?" And is, is that *concern* present to you in any way or is that, is that carried by the sentence and that's it?
- 31:03 Phil: I would say that it's, I would say that it's carried by the sentence and that's it. I, I didn't have a, like, I, I wasn't really nervous about wearing the beer, the beeper into the bank. Um, that was, um, it was just a realization [RTH: Okay.] that I had the beeper on, and that may, I might wanna take this off if I'm gonna walk up to the representative and, and then I'm, you know, then I might feel like I have to tell them what this, what this is. Even though, yeah, I don't know if that's what would really happen, now that I give it more thought I don't think they would care very much, but...
- 31:46 RTH: I don't think they would, but, but that doesn't stop you, the inner experience from wondering, I guess.
- 31:51 Phil: Right.
- 31:55 RTH: Alright. I think I'm good. Amber, you...?
- 31:58 AG: Oh, yeah. Could, um, so you're saying, you were saying two things at once. Was one stronger than the other about the same?

- 32:04 Phil: The, the, um, “should I wear the beeper?” was stronger than the “1-4-7.”
- 32:12 AG: Okay. [Phil: Yeah.] And are we, our numbers? 80-20, 60-40, 90-10?
- 32:17 Phil: What’s oh, um, I would say, uh, 80-20, 80, 70-30. [AG: Okay.] From 70-30 to 80-20 [laughs].
- 32:34 AG: Yeah. Just so we can get an idea of where it’s at. Numbers don’t really matter, but okay. I’m good.
- 32:43 RTH: Okay. Number 5.

SAMPLE 3.5 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 32:45 Phil: Okay. Um, I was, I was cycling home from downtown. Um, which is a ride that consists pretty much entirely of a climb of about 375 feet in about a mile. And it was the first time this year I had cycled that climb, and I was nearly there. Right before the beep, I had innerly said to myself with words, “I should do this every day.” And after that, I innerly responded to my own statement, saying, again with words, “but then only my legs would be strong.” And there seemed to be, um, uh, a dialogic kind of aspect to this sequence and the intonation of the first sentence exemplified an exclamation. Like, um, “I should do this every day!” The second was intoned as though it was a response from, from maybe a skeptic. Both sentences seemed to be complete, but somehow much faster than if I had actually said them out loud, somehow complete, but almost instantaneous. [his cat walks back and forth on his keyboard, and he laughs]
- 34:03 RTH: I saw the cat paying attention from the background there, wanting in on the action.
- 34:06 Phil: [laughs]
- 34:10 RTH: So, so by instantaneous, does that mean that your, that your words *sound fast* to you? Or are you saying, *well, they must have been fast because the experience...?*
- 34:19 Phil: The memory of my inner speaking was that it was somehow very fast, not necessarily instantaneous, but, but fast, faster than I could possibly say it out loud.
- 34:33 RTH: So I guess I gotta give another lecture here. So, so it’s possible... The, the, so the word *fast*, the word *fast* has several different meanings to it. So, so it’s possible that, that what you could have experienced was yourself: [said quickly] “I should do this every day.” Like the words come out, rapid fire. Or it’s possible that *fast* means [normally] “I should do this every day,” but somehow, even though the words seem like they’re coming out at the normal speed, if there was a clock involved that would’ve happened at a, in a, in a shorter amount of time.
- 35:07 Phil: Um.

35:09 RTH: So the question is, do the, do, do the words seem *rapidly* spoken, or does it seem like the whole speaking just somehow happened, happened fast, even though it didn't seem rapid at the time?

35:22 Phil: Uh, I would say the latter. [RTH: Okay.] Yeah. It wasn't that I was just innerly saying it.... I don't know, it's, it's difficult. I don't know, see when you, I know that when you speak, you join all the words together and it, it sort of comes out like one, I-should-do-this-all-the-time. And if you were to look at an audio, the like, um, the wave form of that, you would not see where *I* begins and *I* ends, and *should* begins and where *should* ends, et cetera, et cetera. So it is kind of melded together anyway, I-should.... Ugh!

36:12 RTH: So let, let me try, let me see whether I can do a better job of asking the question or stating the alternative. One is I experienced *the words as rapidly coming out*, and the other is I experienced myself *as accomplishing this speaking in a short amount of time*, even though the words themselves didn't seem like they were rapid.

36:12 *Comment: Here's an exercise where you can perhaps see for yourself the distinction RTH is trying to make here. In the YouTube player there is a Settings gear icon; clicking that will reveal a Playback Speed option. Set that to 1.5 (or play around with the setting). At first, you are likely to hear the words as occurring rapidly. But eventually, it is likely that the words will seem to come at a normal rate, even though you know that you are accomplishing the hearing at a faster speed.*

36:36 Phil: Yeah! I would again say the latter. I experienced myself accomplishing this speaking in, in a significantly short amount of time.

36:50 RTH: Okay. And, and so in, so there's *two* sentences as said in two different ways, one exclamatory and the other skeptically or something, I guess you said. Is that right?

37:03 Phil: Yes. Yup.

37:05 RTH: And, and, and is it possible to say where the beep occurs in, in that, or does it seem like they're fast enough that the beep just gets 'em both?

37:16 Phil: Um, did I write where the, did I mention where the beep went off? Right before the beep I had innerly said to mys. Um, yeah, so I guess the, the instant right before the beep, I was saying to myself, "but then only my legs would be strong." But the moment right before *that* I had said to myself, um, "I should do this every day." So it just depends on how much time, like, if the beep is here, then I go back this much, this, if this is going back in time, but I go back this much. It was, "but then only my legs would be strong." And if I go back this much more, that would in, that would include, um, "I should do this every day!"

38:06 RTH: So that's plausible and quite possibly true, I'm not trying to talk you out of anything here as, as is usual. But it's all, so, so the, what, what we call a moment, what is the *experiential* moment. And sometimes the experiment, experiential moment is somewhat longer and sometimes it's shorter. And, and so does it seem like these are all of *one moment* the, the speaking and the, the exclamation and the re, and the skeptical

reply, or does it seem like, well, there's one and then there's another the beep gotta catch me in the second one?

38:45 Phil: Um, hmm, yeah, I guess it sort of comes down to like, what is a, what is a moment? Um, yeah, that's sort of as best as I can put it, um.

39:00 RTH: Okay. And, and I'm, I'm happy with that there. I'm not there, there's no clear demarcation between.

39:08 Phil: Yeah. Um, like, are you asking me like for the instantaneous moment right before the beep?

39:16 RTH: So let, let me, let me see, try to be totally explicit about what I'm asking about. So, what, we have acknowledged that, uh, that inner speaking, uh, doesn't follow the rules of the external world. And so what we're, what, what, what I *think* we have understood ourselves to be saying is *these words, I experienced them as happening at sort of a normal pace, but they happened, but somehow they, they were, they started and ended faster than they would've in the real world.* And so now I'm won, now I'm wondering whether that should be extended to, *well, I said this sentence, I said this sentence. And in the real world, there would have to be this sentence and then this sentence, but in the experiential world, it could be that there was the sentence and the reply, and that was all sort of one experiential piece.* But I'm also recognizing that that question might make more sense in the abstract world than in does in Phil's experience. So you should, you should feel...

40:15 Phil: Yeah. I don't know if it would, I don't know if I could describe it as one single piece, but, but sort of, sort of two, two portions of, um, of an, of an ongoing stream of thought, [RTH: Okay.] sort of. Um, and it, it felt very, it did feel very conversational. Like, like I, I put the statement, "I should do this every day" on the table. And then, um, and then immediately what comes to mind is, "but then only my legs would be strong."

40:15 *Comment: The length of or duration of the moment is always going to be to some degree arbitrary. What one would call a moment may well differ from one person to the next. So the duration of a moment is not of particular interest to DES. Of more interest (and less ambiguity) is (a) whether an experience is ongoing at the onset of the beep (regardless of how long the duration of the moment is said to be) and (b) whether things are understood to be of one piece or separate. Here, "I should do this every day" seems like it has begun and ended before "but then only my legs would be strong" — those are not simultaneous, those are not of one piece, and only "but then only my legs would be strong" is the part that is caught in flight by the beep.*

40:54 RTH: Okay. And I took you to be saying that those were both complete sentences?

41:01 Phil: Yes. Yes.

41:03 RTH: So we're not condensing these and saying *every day* and *every day* stands for, *I should do this every day* and then responding *legs*, it's not that it's, these are entire...?

- 41:14 Phil: These are entire sentences. [RTH: Mm hmm.] Yup. But, um, they, but there, there seem to be some sort of *fast aspect* to them. And it's really, it's quite difficult for me to decide if it was that I was just, innerly saying it fast, or it just, the exper, I, I experienced the whole sentences rapidly. And I, I tend to go more with the latter. [RTH: Okay. So.] There, there was, yeah, it wasn't like, uh, [speaks quickly] "but then only my legs would be strong." It, it wasn't like that, but it seemed to, I, I, I apprehended the entire sentence, but in a time that I feel like wouldn't, would be considerably faster than, than if I had said it out loud.
- 42:05 RTH: Right. [inaudible]
- 42:07 Phil: It's Difficult. It's, I didn't feel like I was saying it super, super quickly, but there was something about it that it, it happened over a period of time, the period of time during which I experienced that thought that, that, that I said that seemed to be somehow shorter than, than it would've been in real life if I had said that loud.
- 42:33 RTH: Got it. And that, that turns out not, not to be terribly uncommon.
- 42:39 Phil: Okay.
- 42:39 RTH: And, and it's, and, and it's also very difficult to discern that because you almost need to have like an external clock and, but the external clock is not part of your experience.
- 42:50 Phil: It was somehow like time, time was, was, was warped. And, um, and I could, I can do these things like, um... Like there's an episode of *Star Trek* where they're speeded up and they do all sorts of things and, and the rest of the, the, the rest of the world is happening at normal speed, but the way that they're portrayed the, the rest of the world is extre, like is happening in slow motion. So I felt like I was the, it feels like I was the, the speeded up, the speeded up version.
- 43:29 RTH: Well, in, in this particular case, there actually is an experiential clock involved because you were bicycling it, so you got the pedals and the action and whatever and so you may have some sense of I'm, I experienced myself as saying this at normal speed, and yet my pedals only went that far, and, and if I had said it out loud, the pedals would've made a complete rotation or something like that.
- 43:50 Phil: Yeah. I had a, a little, I had one more sentence that's on the next page here that I didn't see. And I said, there wasn't much awareness of my visual surroundings, if any, nor of my exhaustion, although I would say my exhaustion provided an, an underlying foggy sort of feeling. It was, I was quite out of breath and, um. And it was, it was difficult to, it was difficult to concentrate, I guess, although I wasn't really concentrating on anything.
- 44:26 RTH: Okay. Then I think I'm good. Amber?
- 44:30 AG: I'm good.
- 44:32 RTH: Number 6.

SAMPLE 3.6 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 44:35 Phil: Yeah, okay. Um, [reads notes] I was watching an otherwise completely sunbathed mountain being entirely overtaken by the shade of a huge, very fast moving cloud. (It was, it was quite interesting actually.) Um, I was visually following the leading edge of an extension of the jagged shape of the cloud's shadow face as it moved across the mountain from a snowy region to a rocky region, um, (on the face of the mountain). At the moment before the beep the extension shadow had just crossed into the rocky region and I noticed how it was impossible to continue to follow it because there was not enough contrast to be able to see the shadow on the dark rocks. I felt as if I was saying to myself, "can't see it anymore," but without words. [finishes reading]
- 45:43 RTH: So I'm watching a shadow? And I'm noticing that it's going from the snowy into the rocks? [Phil: Mm hmm.] And that it's difficult to see the shadow in the, in the rocks?
- 45:58 Phil: Yup. So the, the shadow had just crossed on to the rocky region and then *beep*. That's when the beep happened.
- 46:09 RTH: Okay. And, and then there's the *can't see it anymore* portion?
- 46:12 Phil: Yup.
- 46:16 RTH: And you said something about it, it's as if I said it without words?
- 46:22 Phil: Yeah. Um, just right after, I turned the beep off and it was like, I'm, it was like, I, I said, I feel like I had just said, "can't see it anymore," but I didn't, I didn't, I didn't say that. I didn't, I didn't innerly speak those words.
- 46:43 RTH: Okay. So, so let's see how far we can tease this apart. So it's possible to have the idea of *can't see it anymore* present without any words or speaking at all.
- 46:54 Phil: Yup.
- 46:55 RTH: And it's also possible to have a sense of having spoken, a sense of speaking, but without any words. So I feel myself to be speaking and I actually know what I'm speaking, I'm speaking "I can't see it anymore," even though I don't experience the words. So those are two fairly experientially different things. One is, one is I understand the *meaning* sort of purely the, the meaning is present to me: *Can't see it anymore*. And the other is: I understand myself to be *speaking*, even though the words aren't present. [Phil: Yeah.] The question is, is there the experience of *speaking*? Or is this a, a meaning present without speaking?
- 46:55 RTH has left out another possibility: that the words "I can't see it anymore" are present without the experience of being spoken or hear. That is, it is not merely the *meaning* that is present—the *words themselves* are present. They are simply not experienced as being spoken or heard. Leaving that option unstated may contribute to Phil's upcoming difficulty.

- 47:46 Phil: Oh, that's very, very difficult. That is very difficult. Uh, I understand the distinction that you're trying to make. It had just crossed into that rocky region. And then. I don't know, I don't know.
- 48:13 RTH: So that's totally fair. And what, what I would say as a, as a general procedure about the, what, way these things work. If we have to talk about a distinction, sort of a new, a new distinction, or a distinction that might be unusual to you or whatever, then I don't think it's actually,... many times it's not possible for you to make that distinction. If we have, if we have to tease apart this distinction, then it's too late for you to have made it, because you would've had to have known that distinction at the moment of the beep to have been able to apply it adequately.
- 48:46 Phil: That's, that's right. yeah. [RTH: Just the w...] I can't, um, I, in all fairness, I can't go back now and, and remember.
- 48:53 RTH: And I'm, I'm totally happy with that. And that's the... But now we've made that distinction, [Phil: Yup.] on, on later beeps then if there's a distinction to be made about, well, I, I have this meaning I'm, I know exactly what I'm thinking, I'm thinking "can't see it anymore." And there either was the experience of producing words, even though those words weren't there, or there wasn't. [Phil: Yeah.] then, then Phil will be in a different, in a different position to be able to make that, to make those distinctions.
- 49:24 Phil: Yes. Yeah. Okay. I'm going to, I'm going to, um, I might make a note of that. Well, I don't wanna, y'know. I remember what we were saying about having presuppositions, but, um, it's a very, very, I think it's a quite *subtle* distinction. So, so it's...
- 49:44 RTH: It is and it isn't. It is and it isn't. So I'm, I have gathered from our conversation today that Phil pretty much knows what it means to innerly speak. He.... Whether his inner speaking is the same as somebody else's inner, inner speaking, that's an entirely different story, but, but Phil, Phil is confident when he said I'm inner speaking, but, but only my likes would be strong and he can make, he can make subtle distinctions about, about that and going into the bank, "should I wear the beeper," whatever that, that was, he, he, he knows what the words were and he can talk about sentences and condensation or whatever. He's got a, these are phenomenon that present themselves to Phil, [Phil: Mm hmm.] it seems to me. And now we're making one more distinction about, about that, which may or may not be a distinction that is possible for Phil to make about his inner experience. Maybe it is, maybe it's not. We'll, we'll see about that.
- 50:44 Phil: If I, if I had to, if I had to go with one way or the other, in terms of this distinction, I would say that I, I apprehended "can't see it anymore" with, *without* the feeling of having spoken it with. There was just something "can't see it anymore" about this experience that didn't involve the, the feeling. It, it, it included those words, but it didn't include the, the feeling of, or the, the experience of having spoken them in any way whatsoever. If, if, if I would, had to choose, I would choose that there was no, no actual *speaking* involved, involved, but I'm not, I'm not so confident on that.
- 50:44 Comment: Phil here is describe the option that RTH omitted (see the comment at 46:55). Good for him!

- 51:44 RTH: So that rai, that raises one more distinction because the way these things are gonna happen. So it's possible for the words to be there, but not spoken. And it's possible for the words to be there spoken. And it's possible for the meaning to be there without being spoken. And it's possible for the meaning to be there without being in words, all those things are possible.
- 52:08 Phil: Mm.
- 52:09 RTH: So I can, I can have the meaning. I can't see it anymore that can, that can be present to me. I'm *thinking* if I put it into words, it would be quote, "I can't see it anymore" unquote. But I'm not speaking those words I'm not experiencing those words at all, but the meaning is present to me. That's a common thing, that we call that *unsymbolized thinking*, that is, [Phil: Mm, mm.] I'm, I'm engaged in this, in this directly conscious thinking, but there aren't any, but there are any words. I can tell you what it is. *I can't, I can't see it anymore*. [Phil: Yes.] But there's, but there's no words. But it's also possible for the, for words to be present with or without meaning. I mean, all these things are really separate from each other when you, when you get careful about, about looking at it.
- 52:56 Phil: Yes. Yeah, okay. It's, it's complicated. [RTH: Yes.] It's complicated. Yeah. And I really appreciate your skill in making these distinctions because I wouldn't, I wouldn't realize them otherwise.
- 53:17 RTH: And, and so what I would, what I would say about this, and this, I guess, would be a, um, a, you could take it as a twisting your arm or whatever, putting these things on the web or something. But, but I, I don't mean it as that, but what I, but it, but it *is* the case that, that for people to grasp... So I, I can write in a book, look, I could, I could write a paragraph about look there's (and I have many times actually), but there's a distinction to be made about words that are there, and words that aren't there, and meaning that's there, meaning it's, it's not there. And with, but without watching the struggle between Phil and Russ and Amber to get these things out there, that, [Phil: Mm hmm.] that's a sort of a lifeless kind of a thing. There there's something about the Phil and Russ and Amber struggling to get it right. And the limits of that, that only, that you, that you can only, you can only witness by watching Phil and Russ and Amber do it. The transcript doesn't do it. A [Phil: Mm hmm.] characterization doesn't do it, doesn't do it very well. [Phil: Right.] And so I'm, I'm I want be, I'm not trying to twist your arm in the slightest. I'm telling you, you asked me what's, what's at stake here. And I'm trying to tell you, this is, this is the kind of a thing that [Phil: mm hmm.] is at stake.
- 54:44 Phil: Yeah. [cat meows off screen] [laughs] I don't know if you heard that, but.
- 54:49 RTH: Cat, cat thought I was right.
- 54:50 Phil: [laughs] Yeah. [to cat] Okay. Soon, soon.
- 55:00 RTH: All right. So that's 6. We gonna do this again?

55:05 Phil: Yeah. Um.

56:19 RTH: Sounds like a plan.

56:21 Phil: Yes.

56:21 Comment: They compare calendars.

56:22 RTH: So I, what I, I would say, I would say you're doing, you're doing great. That this is the, it is a struggle.

56:30 Phil: Yeah.

56:30 RTH: The struggle's important. It seems to me that you're engaged in the struggle, that you're not trying to go, you're not trying to make things up. And so I've got, I've got antennae out there that are trying to determine whether somebody's shining me on or, or just going along with me or whatever. And I, those, those antennae are happy.

56:48 Phil: [laughs] Okay, good.

56:51 RTH: So I'm, I'm happy.

56:53 Phil: Yeah. No, I, I'm, I'm trying, I'm trying my best.

56:58 RTH: That's all we can do.

57:00 Phil: [laughs]

57:01 RTH: Alright. So maybe we'll see each other on Friday and maybe we won't, and you're gonna let us know tomorrow and, uh.

57:06 Phil: Yup. As soon as I can. Well, both of you will probably wake up to a message from me, so yeah.

57:13 RTH: Fair enough.

57:15 Phil: Tomorrow. Yeah.

57:15 RTH: Alright. Thank you very much.

57:17 AG: Thank you.

57:17 Phil: Okay. Have a great day. Take care, Amber.

57:19 AG: You too.

57:20 Phil: Alright.

57:21 RTH: See you later.

57:22 Phil: Take care, Russ.