

TRANSCRIPT WITH COMMENTARY

Phil J.: A neuroscience writer

Phil Interview 7

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the June 29 interview with Phil that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/Z7u5ZH0xxLw>. In green are comments about and explanations of the Descriptive Experience Sampling process. If you have corrections, suggestions, or questions, please post them as YouTube comments.

RTH = Russ Hurlburt

CK = Cody Kaneshiro

AG = Amber Goto

Phil = Phil J.

0:00 Phil: Hi.

0:02 RTH: Good morning, Phil.

0:04 Phil: Good morning. [laughs] Good morning Amber, early morning.

0:09 AG: Good morning. It's so early here. [laughs].

0:15 RTH: [laughs] It's what five o'clock in the afternoon for you, for you Phil?

0:19 Phil: It's, uh, 5:30, yep.

0:23 RTH: Well, we haven't done this for a while.

0:25 Phil: No. Back on track. Yeah. We had a, a visit from Eva-stina's parents and then I had some things I wanted to get finished, so, so I did that. And now, now I'm back on track [RTH: Alright.] with DES.

0:39 RTH: Well, good. I'm, I'm interested to see where we're going. I can't remember exactly where we've been. I remember there was being sort of interesting, but I don't remember, [inaudible].

0:47 Phil: Okay. Um, now as for, um, be, beeper's working very well, I had no issues. Um, I can get to beep number one.

0:56 RTH: Alright. Let's do it.

SAMPLE 7.1 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

0:58 Phil: Okay. So, um, [reads from notes] the weather was quite hot. (It was, um, I figured it out in Fahrenheit. It was 84 [laughs] which might not sound so hot for you. [RTH: Not, not, hot for me.] It's ver, it's, it's very rare for the temperature to go up that high

here.) Um, so I was in our entrance way, respooling doggy bags that had unraveled. At the moment before the beep, as I was doing this, I innerly heard what was like an echo of myself saying "I don't really want to." I was referring to not wanting to go out to get some groceries. It was like, I was re, reiterating that to myself because I already *knew* that I didn't want to go. At the same time, I was thinking to myself that like the, the premise that *you don't really want to do anything when it's so hot out*. Though this didn't contain words or at least not clearly. [finishes reading] So this one, I think this one's a bit tough.

- 2:01 RTH: And, and is, are those things simultaneous? I, I don't really want to, and I don't wanna do anything when it's hot out. Does that seem like it's happening at the same time?
- 2:10 Phil: Yeah, I'm, more or less simultaneous, um, maybe overlapping. Um, yeah, I, I th, I would say that they're simultaneous or nearly entirely overlapping. [RTH: Okay. And by simultaneous..] Um, I just, I had this sentiment of, of, um, or this sort of realization that, well, I've had it before. Just, it just hasn't been, I haven't experienced heat in a long time. And, and this, this, this, um, realize, re-realization that it kind of makes you not want to do anything because it's uncomfortable outside and it's hot. Um, so saying to myself, "I don't really want to," I might have said it. I feel like I might have thought it innerly with words, and I just kind of, it was just repeating. Maybe it was more like I was hearing myself saying that. Um, but it, it, while that was happening, there was this, this realization of a, a more general sentiment that, *hey, you don't really wanna go out and do things, you don't really wanna go out and do anything when it's hot*.
- 3:26 RTH: Okay. So, so lemme back up a, a second and say what I mean by simultaneous. When, when I'm, when I say simultaneous, I don't mean that they start at one time and sort of in parallel, they started one time and then they end at one time. That's, that's a *more strict* version of simultaneous than I had in mind. [Phil: Okay.] What I had in, what I have in mind when I say simultaneous, is that at the precise moment that the beep *begins*, that they're both ongoing. [Phil: Okay.] One of them might have started a second ago and is gonna go on for another couple of seconds, and another one might have started a half a second ago, but as long as they're both going on at the moment of the beep, then I call that simultaneous.
- 4:05 Phil: Then I would say they were simultaneous.
- 4:07 RTH: Okay. So there's a, there are a lot of overlapping experiences where, where they're not exactly time locked, that they're, they're asynchronous [Phil: Mm hmm.] going on, but the, but that's, that's a different, that's a different, different deal. So I'm gathering that, that these experiences are simultaneous in the sense of caught, *both* caught in flight by the beep at the same time? [Phil: Yeah.] But, but not time locked in that, I'm not saying that they started at the same time and would end at the same time?
- 4:36 Phil: Yep.
- 4:36 RTH: Okay.

4:38 Phil: That, that sounds right.

4:38 RTH: And, and is one of these more, more salient than the other, or do they seem sort of evenly or what?

4:49 Phil: I would say the realization that nobody really wants to do anything when it's so hot, it was, it was perhaps a little bit more salient.

5:01 RTH: And by a little bit more: 60-40, 70-30, 80-20?

5:04 Phil: I would say 75-25.

5:09 RTH: Okay. And *that*, I'm gathering is, [pause] uh, well, I've heard several different versions. I don't wanna do anything when nobody wants to do anything when it's hot out.

5:26 Phil: Yeah. Yeah. I, I wouldn't say it was strictly those, those words, but just this I, well, I don't know maybe I just can't recall. If it was, if, if, what the exact words were, if there were words, but it was, it was kind of vague. It was just more like a sentiment.

5:46 RTH: People don't, people don't wanna do things when it's hot.

5:51 Phil: Yeah. I, I don't know. I, what I wrote down was I was thinking to myself that quote, "you don't really want to do anything when it's so hot out." So maybe I stick with my original.

6:07 RTH: Okay.

6:08 Phil: You as in any, anyone.

6:14 RTH: Okay. And, and, and I understood the first time when you said that, that this one was *not* in words that the, "I don't really want to" is in words, but that you don't really wanna do anything when it's hot out is not in words, is that right?

6:29 Phil: Yeah. That's what I, that's what I wrote, or I said, at least not clearly, it's like, um, I think I have another sort of experience like this in a, in a different beep, where I couldn't really tell if it, if there are words or like, it was kind of like, there were hints of words, but I wasn't sure if there were actual words.

6:51 RTH: So one of, one of the challenges is that when we talk about things, we have to put 'em into words, but that doesn't necessarily mean that they have to be in words when we, when we were experiencing them in the first place. And so I think it's possible to think a thought like this: *you don't really wanna do anything when it's hot out*, to think that *in words*, or in *no words at all* but just the thought, or in some hints of words, or partial words or one word that means the whole thing or all, all those things are possible.

- 6:51 Comment: It is perhaps impossible to tell from the questions themselves, but RTH is no longer trying to ascertain what Phil's experience was at the moment of this beep; instead, he is trying to clarify possibilities for future sampling days.
- 7:18 Phil: Yeah. I would say it was more like in, in partial hints of words as, as best I could put it.
- 7:30 RTH: Okay. And, and, and I would say as what, that, one of the reasons that we do this multiple times (and maybe we've taken enough of a time off that we're back to we're, we're having a step backwards or whatever about that) is that, uh, one of the things that's interesting is the extent to which words are present in speaking.
- 7:52 Phil: Yeah.
- 7:53 RTH: And, and I guess it's probably particularly interested in you, for you, who started out with an interest in inner speech. [Phil: Yeah.] Now you got a, now you've got a, a contrary possibility. One, should I call this speech? Is this speech? It certainly isn't speech like the other one was speech! But there's nothing we can do about that.
- 8:09 Phil: Right, right. I, I think perhaps in some previous beeps, I've, I've been sort of at a loss to describe... I, I, I might have been a bit inaccurate thinking that it either has to be words or not words, and there's no possibility of anything in between. But after a couple of experiences this time, I'm perhaps starting to convince myself that it is *possible* to have something that's in between words and no words.
- 8:39 RTH: Well, let's, let's accept that as possible and, and see whether we can get past the, trying to convince ourselves of the possibility. And see whether we can go for the actuality of what it was for Phil at, at the times of particular beeps. And not, and not worry the possibility, the, the general possibility, [Phil: Mm hmm okay.] because one, one of the things that I need to fight about are that we need to fight about in DES all the time is, is, is people who want to have this experience, whatever the experience is, fit into some category that they've got in mind.
- 9:12 Phil: Mm hmm, mm hmm.
- 9:13 RTH: And it's much better if we, if we suspend the categories and, and let the categories emerge at the end. [Phil: Yeah.] So when we're, we're *done* after, y'know, when we can look back and we can say, well, y'know, there, there were words here, some of the time, and not other times, that's a better, a better generalization made *looking backwards* than looking forwards.
- 9:34 Phil: Mm hmm. Yes. And that, I, I just wanted to mention that, uh, that "I don't really want to," that that *was* with words, but it was like an echo of, it was, it was more like I was hearing myself repeat it than actually say it, because I think I had come to that realization a minute prior or so, like, I, I already knew that I didn't really want to go, didn't need to say it to myself. It was, it was kind of like I was complaining to myself or something.

10:10 RTH: And, and when you say like an echo... An echo in the real world is an *auditory* thing. I *hear that* coming back to me for the second time or whatever. But that doesn't necessarily mean that you mean that as an auditory thing *at this beep*. I could've been... By echo, I mean I'm just saying it over again. I'm saying "I don't really want to, I don't really want to, I don't really want to."

10:33 Phil: Right. I don't. Yeah. I'm just, just saying it over again.

10:37 RTH: So this is a saying, this *is* a saying over again? You think?

10:42 Phil: I th, yeah, I think so.

10:44 RTH: So this would be an inner s...

10:46 Phil: Oh, no, I, I have to be careful here cuz I don't know if I want to use the word *saying*, but it's kind of... I say "echo" because it was kind of, yeah. And I think we're, we've been here before. It was perhaps a bit more like I was *hearing myself saying it* than actually *saying it*.

11:08 RTH: So that would be like a *true* echo. If I'm in a canyon somewhere and I say "hello," and then a second later, I hear "hello" coming back.

11:15 Phil: Okay. When you describe, when, when you were talking about an auditory experience before I, I sort of thought of that as like, actually hearing like, like how, like hearing something, um, like an au, more like an auditory hallucination or something. But this was just something I like a thought coming to me again. Yeah [laughs] I'm getting, I'm, I think I might be muddying the waters here.

11:47 RTH: Well, our, our task is to muddy these waters so that the next time around with something similar happens, we can, we can get to it more, more clearly. So, or more...

11:56 Phil: I, I could just try to do it one, I can try to put it in one final way. [RTH: Okay.] It was, it was, it was just like, I, I could hear myself saying, "I don't really want to," for the *n*th time.

12:19 RTH: [pause] So the locution *hear myself saying* is an ambiguous one for me to receive.

12:28 Phil: Okay.

12:29 RTH: So I do, I does that mean, I am *saying* for the *n*th time, "I don't really want to," or does that mean that I have, I am now *just hearing it* as if I had somehow said it and now it is being played back to me?

12:52 Phil: I think it must have been somewhere in between.

12:56 RTH: Okay.

12:59 Phil: Yeah.

- 13:00 RTH: Let's which is, which is fine with me. I'm not, I don't I'm, I don't have a preference for one or the other. And I don't have a need for it to *be* one or the other. I'm just trying to get at as best we can to the experience. So, so I guess we're, given that we've been at this beep for 15 minutes already, we're, we're probably gonna end up with, this is somewhere in between *saying* this to myself and *hearing myself* say it.
- 13:29 Phil: Yep.
- 13:29 RTH: And it's only 25% of my experience anyway, because the *most*, the more of my experience is well *you don't really wanna do anything when it's hot*. And *that* is sort of in the never, never land between words and not words.
- 13:45 Phil: Yes. Yes.
- 13:50 RTH: So from the standpoint of, of somebody interested in inner speech, you could say that neither one of these is inner speech, or you could say that both of them are inner speech, or you could say, well, the concept of inner speech doesn't really apply very well to this concept.
- 13:50 Comment: The background of this statement is that Phil came to Russ initially because of an interest in inner speech.
Note that the issue here is *not* a failure of Phil's apprehending his inner experience: he has been very consistent throughout all the interviews to say that "hearing myself say it" is a better description than "innerly hearing my voice," which suggests that Phil has a clear apprehension of the phenomenon. The question is why it is difficult to put the phenomenon into words. I see two possibilities. First, there may well not be an adequate word to describe the phenomenon. In the external world, there is no word that is halfway between speaking and hearing, the because the vocabulary about inner phenomena is modeled after the vocabulary about external phenomena, there is no adequate inner word. Second, Phil may have some presupposition that interferes with his willingness to describe phenomena straightforwardly. For example, if he is firmly committed (knowingly or not) to the notion that if his own voice is involved, he *must be* innerly speaking, that will make it difficult to describe a pure hearing phenomenon is such a phenomenon occurs.
- 14:04 Phil: Yeah. [laughs] Yeah.
- 14:07 RTH: And, and, y'know, we're not gonna, we don't have to decide that about this particular beep. It's what the... What, what makes this task interesting is the attempt for us to try to be honest with each other about what we're trying to say. That's the, that's the...
- 14:26 Phil: Yes. Yeah. I'm, I'm *trying*, but it's, it's difficult, it's difficult. And it is, I do think it's easy to, um, post dictate something afterward. Like the more I *talk* about it, the more I might *change* it in some ways.

14:45 RTH: I totally agree with that. So the longer we talk about something, the less, I believe what we say about it and, [Phil: Yeah.] and so what that means is that the longer we talk about it, the *more* that this is preparation for next time. So that tomorrow or next week, or whenever we do this again, the, the,... Phil is ready at the moment of the beep or just after the beep to, to, to be able to try to enter into this conversation that we've, [Phil: Yeah.] that we're having here. And that's, I think that's, that is a, a fundamental nature of the, of the process that we're engaged in.

14:45 Comment: RTH has stated two fundamental DES principles here. First, the longer we talk about something, the less it is to be believed. Every part of a conversation muddies the water. And second, iterative training is necessary: the oobject is to acquaint Phil with the necessary discriminations so that *next time* he has those discriminations practiced and at the ready so that he can give a short, direct description (with therefore a minimum of water-muddying).

15:26 Phil: Okay.

15:26 RTH: And it's, it's just the way, it's just the way it is. If you're, if you, if you're trying to be careful about it, we ju, we just have to have this, you, I guess you could say saltatory conversation where, where we're gonna have a conversation, then we're gonna end it. And then maybe we're gonna pick it up again, later on with a *new*, a *new sample*, a new experience, *newly acquired*, but with the, with the alteration of Phil's and Russ's, and Amber's joint understanding of what we have to say to each other in order to make ourselves clear.

16:05 Phil: *Active and passive* seem to be issues, recurring issues, and *words and no words* seem to be recurring issues, I think. Um, okay, I'm, I'm gonna do beep number two.

16:05 Comment: The iterative training goes both ways: Russ will have to become more adept at hearing Phil's distinction between active and passive.

16:19 RTH: Good.

SAMPLE 7.2 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

16:21 Phil: [Reads from notes] I was flipping through the TV channels and paused on, (um, I'm slightly embarrassed to say this, but) *America's Funniest Home Videos, Animal Edition*. So Albert the cat was refusing to come down from a tree. Instead, he jumped, he jumped up higher into a different tree. His owner, a woman, was surprised and made an exclamation that I couldn't clearly hear. At the instant before the beep, I had just looked at the subtitle on the screen, (cuz the, it shows that are in English, get mostly get Norwegian subtitles). And the, the subtitle said "Albert, hva gjør du nå?" Um, it's hard to describe, but I retrospectively, automatically described her exclamation, her vocal exclamation while innerly hearing it. "Albert, what are you doing now?" which is the translation of, of what the subtitle said. Without words, I was beginning to ana, ana, analytically apprehend how the *now* in the translation didn't quite fit with the auditory trace of what she had said, which seemed shorter. (Um, like didn't have as many words.) I was realizing it might have been a bit of a mistranslation. Such realizing

might have occurred during the beep (like the, is she difficulty with the, the exact timing). But um, so basically she said something, there were words on the screen and then it was like, I heard an echo of what she said using the translation of the words on the screen and then, and had this realization that it might have not been quite right. [Finishes reading]

18:24 RTH: Okay. So this is, this is complicated-er than the last one. So the...

18:28 Phil: Yeah. [laughs] Yeah.

18:30 RTH: So at the moment of the beep, am I... let's, let's give this person a name just so we can call her, let's call her... well you gimme a name, or whatever.

18:30 Comment: DES strives toward specificity: it aims at Phil's specific experience at the specific time of the beep. I have found that using proper names (whether actual or pseudonyms) facilitates that specificity. To refer to "the woman" is to aim at half the population (which then requires some modification to indicate that we mean the particular woman with the cat in the tree). By (I think dramatic) contrast, to refer to her as "Jane" immediately calls the particular women in the tree to mind.

18:38 Phil: Jane.

18:39 RTH: Jane?

18:40 Phil: Yep.

18:41 RTH: Okay. Let's call her Jane. So Jane has said something about the cat and you haven't fully understood it.

18:48 Phil: Right.

18:50 RTH: And you're trying to understand it. And as you understand it, the word, the Norwegian translation appears on the screen?

18:56 Phil: Yep.

18:57 RTH: And now you are hearing Jane again? Now armed with the [Phile: Yeah.] now armed with the translation?

19:03 Phil: It was like I, it was like, I automatically heard her say the same thing again. And what I heard was the English translation of what was on the screen.

19:14 RTH: So this is a hearing phenomenon? I hear Jane again?

19:19 Phil: Yeah.

19:20 RTH: And does it seem like, an again, like I heard it the first time and now I'm hearing again or does it seem like I'm still hearing it?

- 19:27 Phil: I heard it the first time, but what she said, wasn't clear. And the second time I heard the exact translation of the words on the screen.
- 19:38 RTH: So the exact re-translation?
- 19:39 Phil: I actually, I, I, I could tell that it was just in, like, I automatically did it in my head to it, it wasn't, it wasn't like, I thought that she had said something again in, in, on the television. I, I just kind of put the words to the screen, what she, to what she had just said, and then it, it kinda didn't fit right.
- 20:05 RTH: So, so this is a, I wanna nail down the word *hearing*. I, I hear Jane's voice again at the moment of the beep? Is that true? In, in my imagination?
- 20:17 Phil: Yeah. Yes.
- 20:20 RTH: Okay. And now I hear her speaking plain English, which is the re-translation back from Norwegian?
- 20:28 Phil: Yeah.
- 20:31 RTH: And so my imagination has done this for me, it's, it's happening automatically?
- 20:37 Phil: Yeah. Yup. "Albert, what are you doing now?"
- 20:44 RTH: Okay. And that is, and, and that's in *Jane's* voice, not in Philip's voice imitating Jane, this is in Jane's?
- 20:56 Phil: Yes. Yes. It's in Jane's voice.
- 20:58 RTH: Okay. And, and at the same time (and using our definition of *simulta*, simultaneity, my definition of simultaneity as ongoing at the, when the beep happens, at the moment of that, the moment of the onset of the beep basically), the, I am thinking that this translation isn't right? This, the word *now* is?
- 21:24 Phil: Yeah. Yeah. Um, I wrote that it, it might have happened *during* the beep this, this inkling of, *hey, that didn't fit quite right*. So I, I automatically heard her voice again, saying, "Albert, what are you doing?" but then when it hit the "now" it was like, there was something wrong because what, uh, what she had just said seems briefer. Like it seemed like it didn't have as many words.
- 21:59 RTH: So at the moment of the beep, the *now* sounds wrong by comparison to the translation or the translation seems wrong by comparison to the sound?
- 21:59 Comment: This question is somewhat off the track. I should have said: "the *now* sounds wrong by comparison to the original?" I also make the same mistake (as at 23:28). So the analytical portion of the interview is likely corrupted.

22:15 Phil: Uh, oh, that's a good question.

22:23 RTH: But that's not necessarily meaningful...

22:24 Phil: I can't answer that. They're both kind of the same thing, aren't they?

22:32 RTH: What, what I'm trying to get at is, is this a, a hearing thing, *it sounds* wrong, or an analytical thing, *I judge that* to be wrong? [Phil: Um.] But I'm not sure that the, that that's possible to make that distinction?

22:54 Phil: I think, I think that it, I think it was more of an analytical thing. Cuz when it got to the *now* and it, it just, I, and it was like, I instantaneously realized that it didn't fit. And then I, yeah, I was just realizing that the, the *now* didn't fit in there.

23:15 RTH: So lemme see whether I understand that. So it, so at the moment of the beep, I'm hearing Jane say, what, "Albert what are you doing *now*?" And, and it seems like I'm hearing that accurately?

23:27 Phil: Yeah.

23:28 RTH: But at the same time, I'm judging that some, some kind of an, an analysis, well, that doesn't fit with the translation?

23:35 Phil: Yeah.

23:36 RTH: The, *now* the *now* portion of it doesn't fit the translation?

23:38 Phil: Right. Yeah.

23:39 RTH: And it's hard to know whether exactly where the beep came in. There seems like I'm, we're confident that the beep came while I was hearing Jane say for the second time. But we're not confident about where the analysis comes from? Might be, might be...

24:00 Phil: Correct. I, I would say, I think I, okay. I want to clarify that I believe that the realization that the *now* didn't fit in might have happened during, during the beep. And perhaps at the instant before the beep I, I was hearing, I was hearing her in my mind, say, "Albert, what are you doing *now*?" Like the, *now* didn't quite, I, I had more difficulty ascribing her voice to saying *now* than I did *Albert, what are you doing?* And then, and that made me think, that made me think without words, hey, there's some, there might be something wrong with this translation. A realization that might have occurred after the onset of the beep, but just after.

25:10 RTH: So does that mean that my inner hearing of Jane somehow degrades or warps or something when I get to the word *now*?

25:20 Phil: Yes.

25:26 RTH: So that makes it something of an *auditory* phenomenon that *now* doesn't *sound* right. And something of an analytical phenomenon, but maybe the analytical part of it is coming later?

25:39 Phil: Yes.

25:39 Comment: To RTH's ear, the part about the voice not *sounding* right seems believable.

25:41 RTH: So I think I'm pretty good about this then. I think I am, I think I understand.

25:49 Phil: Okay.

25:51 RTH: But, so Phil's engaged in a fairly complicated, if not particularly important task of trying to figure out whether this translation is right or whatever, but, uh, I think I'm good. Amber, you got questions about, about that.

25:39 Comment: That is not an apt summary of the beeped experience.

26:05 AG: Um, I think I'm good too.

26:10 Phil: Okay. We don't really know what happened to Albert, by the way! [laughs]

SAMPLE 7.3 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

26:15 [Phil continues] Okay, in the, in the context, beep 3, um, [Reads from notes] in the context of cleaning up after dinner, which involves clanking dish noises. At the moment before the beep, I noticed Eva-stina looking at me with very wide eyes, making a fast, double take motion with her head. She was indicating that the beeper in which I had in my shirt pocket was going off. Right before I heard the beep myself, visually, I apprehended the whites of her eyes, focusing on their whiteness. [finished reading] So in all honesty, I didn't realize that the beep had gone off. I only did after, after she looked at me like, hey, beeper's going off.

26:15 Comment: This is a good example of why using the beeper earphone is a requirement. The discovery that Phil was not using the earphone may present an explanation for why some previous samples have been difficult to describe. The earphone makes a big difference, so the discover that many of the previous beeps were obtained without the earphone casts a shadow over all those reports.

27:11 RTH: So are you using an earphone?

27:15 Phil: I was not at the, at the moment.

27:19 RTH: And how about the previous beeps? Have you been using an earphone?

27:24 Phil: Um, no. No I was not. I find it's quite loud in the earphone and, and I have, I have a bit more difficulty describing the, the moment at the beep or the moment right before

the beep. And, um, I, if I can carry it in my shirt pocket, I can usually hear it quite clearly.

27:55 RTH: So what we discovered, I would say, is that if you have it in your shirt pocket, that we end up with timing issues of the kind that we're talking about.

28:08 Phil: Okay.

28:09 RTH: And the reason for that is that, and this is a really good example of that, because Evastina could hear the beep before you processed the beep, but you were probably *processing* the beep. So it, when the, when the beep is in, when the, when the, when the, when the speaker is in your pocket, it makes it too easy for you to have the beep have a sort of a gradual onset into your consciousness. [Phil: Okay.] When the beep is in your ear [snaps fingers], it's pretty much the, pretty much the deal that, that's, the beep is happening now.

28:50 Phil: Okay.

28:51 RTH: So the beep, the beeper has a volume control is. [Phil: Yup.] And even when it's turned down all the way, it's still too loud? Cuz we've had a couple of people like that over the years and I have, I have something that I could send you, which is, or you could pick up or whatever, it's a dongle with a volume control in it where you can make it....

29:13 Phil: Oh, okay. Um, I might be able to pick up one of those relatively easily. Um.

29:20 RTH: Probably just as easy for you to find one and get it to you on Amazon or whatever I'll, I'll, but basic, but basically what you, what you need is...29:29 Phil: Yeah, something with a volume control would be good because, some honestly, sometimes it just startles me. And then, and then I've, I've had occasions where I don't remember. I can't, I can't describe what was happening. And, uh, and yeah, it's been difficult sometimes because it, it's, I do find, I do find it quite loud. Not impossibly loud, but sometimes, sometimes I get distracted by the beep to the point where I find it difficult, I find it easier to just have it in my shirt pocket or right next to me or something.

30:07 RTH: Well, I would, I would say that it's *likely* that the difficulty we had on the first beep might be from the ear, from the, the beep not being delivered adequately, crisply to your ear.

30:24 Phil: Okay. Okay. I will, I will try to use the earphone.

30:35 RTH: And I, I will, I will try to figure out exactly what I used as a dongle and we'll see how, we'll see whether we can figure that out. [Phil: Okay. That would be great.] Any, anything that, anything that serves as a, as a volume-control thing with an eighth-inch plug that, [Phil: Yeah.] one side male, male on one side, female on the other side with a variable resistor in the middle. [Phil: Yeah.] That's, that's all we're talking about, basically.

- 30:35 Comment: Later that day, RTH emails Phil some links to possible dongles.
- 31:05 Phil: Yeah. Yeah. Okay. Um, did you want to know anything more about that beep? Yeah, we haven't really, we haven't really discussed it.
- 31:21 RTH: So the, at the, at the moment you *heard* the beep was *well after* the beep was available to be heard in the environment cuz Eva-stina could hear it?
- 31:33 Phil: Yep.
- 31:34 RTH: What you noticed is the whites of her eyes?
- 31:38 Phil: Yes.
- 31:46 RTH: So, so, and, and, and, and is that basically all there is in your experience at the moment is the so...?
- 31:56 Phil: That's pretty much it. Yeah. Um, she has very blue eyes and she had just been, um, cleaning something up underneath the, um, underneath the sink, like tying a bag or something and she stood up and I think her face was a little bit red. [laughs] Um, being Scandinavian the, there's a stereotype about unusually red faces. Um, so maybe it made the whites of her eyes stand out a little bit more, but, um, she, she opened her eyes quite widely and was like, *hey, beep*.
- 32:38 RTH: And so is the redness of her face part of your experience right now? Or at the, at the moment of the be?, As best you can tell, it's just the white of her eyes.
- 32:46 Phil: It's just the white of her eyes. Yeah. Yeah.
- 32:51 RTH: Alright. Then I'm good for that. And, and, and so for how many, how many, what, what's this... Let's retrospect here about how many of the previous days beeps have been with and without the earphone?
- 33:06 Phil: Um, I would say, uh, maybe, maybe more beeps without. Maybe 60-40.
- 33:22 RTH: Okay. And is that usually across days, like within a day, half the beeps are with and half the beeps are without? Or is it over days I've just stopped using the earphone?
- 33:33 Phil: No, I, um, it, it's hard to say, but uh, if I'm going out, I will use the earphone. I don't just carry it and hope that I hear it. Um, if I'm doing something that involves some noise, or if there's noise in the environment, then I'll use the earphone. But if I'm confident that it's quiet enough and I'll hear the beep clearly without the earphone, then I, I prefer to do it that way.
- 34:15 RTH: Alright. Well, let's, let's, let's assume that that way's not as good as with the earphone.

- 34:21 Phil: Okay.
- 34:22 RTH: And, and I would, I would say the conversation we had about the first beep...
- 34:33 Phil: Yeah, I can, I can see where you're coming from.
- 34:37 RTH: ...is, is maybe an artifact of not using the earphone.
- 34:41 Phil: It could be, it could be.
- 34:45 RTH: Alright. Beep number four.

SAMPLE 7.4 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 34:47 Phil: Okay. [Reads from notes.] I was, I was viewing two photographs just on the screen, on my computer. I was viewing two photographs taken at the same location in Toronto. I lived in Toronto like I, I lived there for a long time. One in 1971 and the other from 2022 (this year). They were surprisingly similar and I was comparing them to spot differences. At the moment before the beep I had "1971" in my own voice, slowly echoing in my head. (And there's that word echoing again.) And I had just noticed a distinctive building in the 2022 picture and was about, was about to glance at the 1971 picture to see if it was there, or if it looked the same. It was like, there was a faint trace of the words "building there?" as in, *let's see if the building is still there*, but with only a faint hint somehow of those words without clearly apprehending them or hearing them. So this one, this one's a bit tricky I think.
- 36:06 RTH: So there's two parallel inner experiential traces or whatever you wanna call those things. One is "1971" and the other is *building there*. Those are the two things that we've gotta figure out, is that right?
- 36:27 Phil: Yeah, I think so. And if there was anything visual, which there must have been. I'm trying to remember. I, I wrote this down, but I haven't really thought about it since. Um, yeah okay I, I kinda remember now. It was like, I was, I, I was again, sort of halfway between hearing and speaking "1971." And it was, it was, it was quite slow. It was 19...7. Like I was looking at the 1971 picture and it was like, I could hear myself saying "nine---teen...seventy...one," but simultaneously I was checking the 19, looking at a building, cuz it was kind of distinctive in the picture, and I was looking at it and I was about to glance at the other picture. And I had this, this again for lack of a better word sentiment of *building there*, like is the, *is this building going to be there?* But those words or *any* words weren't, weren't very clear.
- 37:53 RTH: So of tho, of those two, is one of them seem like it's more salient to you, the *building there* portion or the [Phil: Oh.] "1971" portion? Or equal?
- 38:11 Phil: I would say it's around equal.
- 38:14 RTH: Okay, well let's start with the building there. So if there are... What I've got so far is if there are words there they're very faint.

- 38:23 Phil: Yeah.
- 38:25 RTH: And would that be as good to say well, there probably *aren't* words there, but the *meaning* is there?
- 38:41 Phil: No, I think there was something about *building there* as in, *let's see if that building is there*. But that, that's an interesting way that you put it. The words aren't there, but the meaning is there. It's, it's difficult for me to remember exactly.
- 39:07 RTH: Okay.
- 39:08 Phil: Some, somewhere, somewhere around that border. That's actually a really interesting way to, to put it: the, the meaning was there, but the word wasn't, the words weren't. Yeah.
- 39:28 RTH: So I think that's, I think it's very possible. I think the meaning, the meaning and the words are two separate deals and, [Phil: Yeah.] and when life is going easily they're *together* and the, the meaning and the words *match* each other. But, but, but I think of them as, as coming from sort of two different parts of the brain, or whatever. (I don't, I don't have any brain theory about it.) But, [Phil: Mm hmm.] but it's like when the meaning and the words come together and they, the words come outta your mouth easily, but sometimes the meaning comes, and sometimes the words come, and. [Phil: Mm hmm.] But, but they can be on different trains.
- 40:01 Phil: Yeah. Yeah.
- 40:04 RTH: And that I think is another reason why, why we have to be as precise about the beep, which is why the earphone is the, is, is a big deal. Cuz, cuz we're trying to separate things which are, which are sort of in, more difficult to separate. So what I, what, what I can, what I think we can say confidently is it's not *just* that the words "building there" are *clear* to me and are some kind of a condensation of the whole sentence "is this building really there in 1971?" It's not, it's not just a condensation down to *two clear words*, you in agreement about that?
- 40:45 Phil: Yeah.
- 40:46 RTH: That if we've con if we've condensed a fuller sentence, a more complete sentence, not only have we condensed the *number of words* in that sentence, but we've condensed the wordedness of the sentence.
- 40:58 Phil: Is it, is it possible that there, maybe it's possible that there was a, a, a faint trace of the words of the condensed sentence is, "is that building still there" or "let's see if that building is still there," but it, yeah, just condensed into "building there" but only very, very faintly present in, in the experience?
- 40:58 Comment: Phil's delivery of "Is it, is it possible that there, maybe it's possible that there was a, a faint trace" (produced with what RTH hears/sees as a perhaps slightly

smug smile) at the beginning of 40:58 jangles RTH's presupposition antennae. RTH is no mind reader, and he is well aware of the limitations of his antennae, but he has seen similar smiles many times across many years, so he will have to try to help Phil bracket whatever presupposition may (or may not) lie behind it.

- 41:24 RTH: So I think that's possible. And I would like us to bracket that as well. So the, when, what I would, what I, what I would like us to do is to say, "well, there is a theory out, out there that says that they, that we can con, we can condense inner speech." And I, and that's fine let's set that theory aside, maybe that's true or not. And if it's *true*, then we're gonna figure out well, "building there" was, those were clearly, clear words that was a true condensation or, or
- 41:53 Phil: I'm just saying that because I like, I'm trying to stick to the accuracy of my original description that I wrote not long after the experience in it, "it was like, there was a faint trace of the words, "building there" with a, with a question mark. As in, *let's see if the building is still there* right before I glanced at the other picture, but with only a faint hint somehow of those words, but without clearly apprehending them or hearing them."
- 42:29 RTH: Okay. So. What you said at the beginning of this last paragraph was I'm trying to be faithful to the words that I've written or something like that. Trying, trying to be accurate about the words that I've written. I don't think that's the proper way to think about it.
- 42:56 Phil: Okay.
- 42:57 RTH: I, what I think is what I, what I would like us to do is to be accurate or what I call faithful, faithful to the *next* experience. The, what you wrote about the *last* experience was framed by your understanding of the way inner speech is and the way the world is and the, the, the mechanics of the earphone and all that stuff. [Phil: Yeah.] And, and you did as, and I'm not being critical of you in the slightest. You did the best you could about that, but that's *not good enough*. What's what, what, what the object is, is to take all that stuff alone. This is what I wrote about that last time, and this is what the earphone deal is, and this is what, this is what the con, condensation means and all that stuff. And, and try to get into a position where the *next time* you got a better shot at it.
- 43:59 Phil: Okay.
- 43:59 RTH: That's the heart, that is the heart of the matter.
- 44:03 Phil: Okay. It is.
- 44:06 RTH: It is it, is it, it is indeed. And there's just, there's just no way around it. So much of psychology, I think, tries to analyze what people say and get accurate, y'know, get an accurate understanding of what people say, but it's not good enough. It just isn't. And thi, and this is not a criticism of Phil, and it's not a criticism of Russ or of Amber, of anybody. It's just, it is the way it is. If, if there is a phenomenon that is difficult, we

have got to go through this kind of [pause] confrontation or conversation or whatever you wanna call it of. I, it's sort of like building a better and better duck blind so that you can get a better shot at the next bird that comes past, y'know.

44:51 Phil: Uh, a, a better what?

44:51 RTH: A better shot. Like, like if you're a hunter, [Phil: Okay.] and you go out the first time and you, and you put up a piece of plywood, and then the next time you, you put some branches on it or whatever, and then pretty, pretty soon you get yourself really hidden out there so that you can get a really good shot some...

45:07 Phil: Oh you've got a shelter. Okay. Yeah. Yes.

45:11 RTH: But it, it just, it takes time and effort and honesty and genuineness and, and, uh, acceptance and.

45:25 Phil: Okay. Um, I will, yes. That's a good way to put it, *consider the next*, like, what can I do better for the next beep?

45:34 RTH: That's exactly right.

45:36 Phil: Each time. Yeah.

45:37 RTH: And if, and if it turn, and if it turns out this word, word phenomenon, what, what you, you summarized them a little bit, but I can't remember what you said. There was words or not words and time and...

45:51 Phil: ...And something between yeah um active and passive and words...

45:56 RTH: ...Active and passive yeah. So we gotta get better at, at being able to discriminate those things within a 10th of a second after they happen. [Phil: Mm hmm.] And *then* you can, when you get, when *you* get good at it, then you can tell us about what was going on there. [Phil: Mm hmm.] And, uh.

46:17 Phil: It might need some practice, [RTH: Yup.] but I'm, I'm going for it.

46:24 RTH: I'm, I'm, I'm happy to, I'm happy to do it. Cuz I think, I think it *is* the fundamentally interesting thing. It, you can slide over it, which I think psychology generally does, they most generally do, *or* you can work at it. And I don't think there's any middle, middle ground. I think it's it, it is a work, it, we have to work at it.

46:24 Comment: For the last five minutes (see the comment at 40:58) RTH has been pursuing, cajoling, confronting, supporting, explaining the desirability / necessity of bracketing presuppositions. Bracketing presuppositions is the heart of DES. If Phil can get to a place where he genuinely prefers to apprehend phenomena with fidelity *more than* he would like to confirm his theories (about condensation or whatever), *then and only then* can he discover whether his theories (about condensation or whatever)

deserve to be confirmed. Only when you don't care about the direction of the result can you see without distortion.

This also sheds some light on why RTH's antennae jangled at 40:58: the slightly smug smile (as RTH's antennae feel it) betrays a preference for confirmation (as if to say, isn't this a really cool theory I'm advancing?). Recognizing things for the way they are is not cool—you wouldn't think it was cool to notice that things fall downwards.

Note that RTH has not tried to discredit Phil's condensation theory (presuppositions are delusions, and any experienced professional has observed that it is not productive to try to talk someone out of a delusion), nor tried to support it. He has tried, in the context of what *may have been* the voicing of a presupposition, to raise the stakes on the bracketing of presuppositions, to help Phil value fidelity over theory confirmation and to recognize the hard work that is necessary to realize that value.

46:49 Phil: Mm hmm. Okay.

DONE TO HERE

46:54 RTH: Number five? Well, I guess in 1971, I, I still wanna let's, let's, I still wanna deal with the 1971 portion. [Phil: Sure.] The, so we're, we're still, we're still calling this I hear myself say "nine...teen...seventy...one."

47:11 Phil: Yeah. Yes. Slow. [RTH: And.] Like you did. Yes.

47:26 RTH: *Hear myself say* is the same thing as if I were, if it were a *true echo* and I was in a canyon and I say *hello*, and a second later I hear myself say *hello*, coming back to me. But that second hear myself say is an entirely auditory phenomenon. If I, if I'm in a true echo canyon, [inaudible].

47:58 Phil: Can, can I say that, can I say that it was like, uh, 70% auditory phenomenon? Just like an echo you have to, well, if, if you hear your, your own echo, that means that you did actually say something, beforehand. So there is, there is an active component, even though it's an echo, but.

48:24 RTH: There *was* an act, there *was*...

48:26 Phil: It's not, there *was* an active, yeah. It's not a, it's not a proper comparison. But um, yeah, I, I was hearing, I was hearing my voice say "1971," cuz I think I had just read something about like, um, these two photographs saying, oh comparison on, I forget what street it was from 1971 and 2022. And then I looked at each photo and then I started, then I realized that it was it wasn't so easy to spot the differences. And then I, I was, I think I, I tried to put more *effort* towards it and I thought: *I'm gonna have a good look at the 1971 photo*, examine it and then have a good look at the 2022 photo. And what I noticed in the 1971 photo was that *building*. And as I was looking at that photo, I could sort of hear myself saying "nine...teen...seventy...one," but I wasn't, it wasn't something I was actively thinking about or, or putting effort towards, or it was, there was, there was more of a passive component to it.

- 49:46 RTH: So we could call this maybe a *passive speaking*? [Phil: Yeah. Yeah.] Or a *hearing*?
- 49:54 Phil: A passive speaking. Yeah.
- 50:00 RTH: Or we can leave this as in the un, somewhere in the never-never land between speaking and hearing maybe 75% or whatever. [Phil: I suppose. Yeah. I suppose.] Maybe 70% or whatever.
- 50:12 Phil: Yeah.
- 50:12 RTH: And, and, and it is definitely the case... So one of the things that we need to keep clearly in mind is that the, the words that we used to describe these things in the external world *don't* necessarily apply. In the, in the real world, like in the, in the, the *external* world and the, in the echo situation, there's clearly a difference between speaking and hearing. When I say *hello*, and then a second later I hear *hello*, well, the one was a speaking and the other was a hearing and there's no question about that, in the real world. But in the *experiential* world, it is not necessarily that clear. And, but, but the question is, is it because experientially, it's not so clear in my, in my head, in my experience at the moment of the beep whether this is a hearing thing or, or a speaking thing, or whether I just am not clearly enough using the words. So we, you have to, we have...
- 51:06 Phil: I don't know. I, I was, I, you, you could imagine it, like *maybe* I could've said it out loud and I could've been looking at the photograph and saying "nine...teen...seventy...one" and then just catching myself saying that. So, *sure* you're *speaking* it, but it's not like, it's not speaking in the same sense that I'm speaking to you right now. Like I'm trying to communi, like for communication, you, you could just find yourself like, um, thinking like the, like the phrase, thinking out loud. And looking at this photograph and saying, okay, "nine...teen...seventy...one." and then not even realize that you're actually saying that out loud. So in this case it was kind of something like that, but I wasn't saying it out loud for, for lack of a better way to put it.
- 52:08 RTH: So I, I think that sometimes speaking out loud or innerly can be more or less like a gesture. Like if we're in an animated conversation and I make some kind of a gesture [waves his hand], I don't plan that gesture, it just sort of comes out of me while I'm in the process of saying whatever it is that I wanted to say. And I wouldn't, most of the time, I wouldn't even notice that I've, that I've, I've gestured that. It's part of the, part of the bag of bones that, that, uh, I'm engaged in and the gesture comes out. Well, I think *words* can be like that as well. So for example, in, in your first beep you said something like, "I don't really want to." That was, you could think of that as a gesture. These words came out of me, I don't, they didn't have any, any particular meaning any more than this [waves his hand] hand wave has a particular meaning. It came outta me. I waved my hand and it certainly had *some* meaning I was trying to make some kind of a point, I didn't say this I said that or whatever. But it's, it is more gestural than it is linguistic, I guess you could say.
- 53:16 Phil: Yeah. Yeah.

- 53:18 RTH: And, and it could very well be that, uh, “I don’t really want to” and the “nine...teen...seventy...one” are both sorta like that. They’re my verbal, my verbal gestural apparatus.
- 53:32 Phil: Yes, yes. Yeah.
- 53:37 RTH: And, and in that kind of a situation, in my gesture kind of a situation, it’s, it’s an active thing. Of course I’m doing it. It’s not like I’m a marionette and somebody’s moving my hand back and forth. But I don’t, but I, I don’t planfully make a gesture either. It comes out of me.
- 53:59 Phil: Right. Yeah. Yup. I completely agree. That’s why I say it has, had more like a passive than an active component to it.
- 54:17 RTH: So more like a passive speaking than a hearing of my voice?
- 54:25 Phil: Yeah. Yes. I would go with that. I would go with that.
- 54:30 RTH: And here again, I’m not trying to *answer* the question. What, this is... The conversation that we’re having here from my perspective is about tomo, is about next week. It’s, it’s too late for this... It’s too late, it’s... ev, Every conversation that we always have is *always too late* about these beeps. There’s....
- 54:30 Comment: This may serve as an example of the difference between theory confirmation and fidelity aspiration. RTH advanced (in 54:17) what might be called a theory: Phil’s experience was more passive speaking than hearing his voice. But when Phil (hesitantly) agreed with that (at 54:25), RTH undermined the significance of that agreement. RTH does *not* want to confirm his theory; he wants to help Phil and Russ get into a position *in the future* to apprehend some experiences not as confirmation or disconfirmation but as phenomena apprehended as they occurred.
- 54:45 Phil: Yeah. [laughs] Yeah.
- 54:46 RTH: It’s just the, it’s just the way it is. And so *this* conversation is what let’s, let’s, let’s try to figure out how we can talk to each other about this stuff in, in an ever more faithful way. [Phil: Yup.] And maybe, maybe this distinction between gesture and, and whatever is gonna be helpful to us and maybe it’s not. And...
- 55:14 Phil: I think it will, I think, um, I’m going to, I’m going to think about that more and I’m going to have that in mind.
- 55:14 Comment: RTH has misgivings about Phil’s saying that he’s going to think about it—that suggests the possibility that the gesture thing might become a new theory that will then have to be bracketed. He would prefer that Phil treat the conversation about gesture as just one more way of thinking about experience, one more contribution to the compost heap of vocabulary that might contribute to a fertile discussion somewhere in the future. However, probably because we have been

talking about bracketing presuppositions for a long time (since about 40:58), he elects to move on.

55:28 RTH: Alright. Well, we're up on an hour here. Do we wanna get the last two beeps or do we think we have?

55:34 Phil: Um. I think we're, let's go for it.

55:47 RTH: Alright. Number six, five, number five.

SAMPLE 7.5 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

55:50 Phil: Okay. [Reads from notes.] I had just heard a sudden noise after a gust of wind had blown. Um, at first, (so I was inside and I could hear the wind outside through the open windows). At first, I thought it was a door that had blown shut (like the front door). Um, but then I realized it might have been our clothes-drying rack, which had some clothes on it, out on our, out on the patio. At the moment before the beep I was visualizing the dry rack with the clothes on it falling over. [finishes reading]

56:29 RTH: And so at the moment of the beep is your experience primarily of this visualization?

56:34 Phil: Yes.

56:34 RTH: What do you see?

56:36 Phil: I see the clothes on the rack on the patio falling over. [laughs] Um, I see them where I had just moved it from a different from, from a previous spot where I, where it had blown over. Um, so I had just seen what it looked like. [laughs] I had just seen what it looked like. [Eva-stina appears in video. To Eva-stina: Everything okay?] Yeah. Yeah.] Um, I had just seen the clothes rack on the ground, fallen over, I put it back up and moved it to a different spot, and then I was inside, and then I heard the noise, and I, the picture I had in mind was similar to what I had just seen, but with the close rack in, in the new location.

57:29 RTH: And when you say falling over, do you mean in, in motion? I see it in the act of falling?

57:35 Phil: Yes.

57:36 RTH: And how, and so do you see it from upright to all the way over or what, what do you see?

57:42 Phil: I see it, um, perhaps par, already partially falling and continuing to fall [gestures].

57:53 RTH: Okay. And, and this is in color and?

57:59 Phil: It's in color, yes.

58:00 RTH: And does it seem like an accurate view of what you've seen or what you could see?

58:05 Phil: I would say that, yes. Yeah. *Unlike*, um, when I was imagining that backpack being crooked, being slanted on my back, which didn't, and *that* backpack didn't look anything like my actual backpack. [laughs] [RTH: Okay.] This one I think was a lot more accurate, probably because I had just seen it. Although I saw it fallen over, but I was visualizing it *falling* over.

58:40 RTH: And, and does this seeing have a border to it, like a photograph would have a border? Or does it just seem like I'm seeing it and the, the borders disappear?

58:52 Phil: I was, oh yeah! I think maybe I was going to mention something about this. I was looking out the window and it was almost like, um, oh, it was like, you know what, um, I remember from high school photography, you could burn an image into another image. And it was, it was kind of like this image was burned into the, what I was actually seeing. Slightly, but it was very, very dominant.

59:36 RTH: So I'm not a hundred percent sure I understand that. So, so do you mean [Phil: Yeah, I don't] that my, my real eyeballs are aimed at the window? [Phil: Yeah.] And I'm somehow registering that, but more so I am seeing what my mind's eye is seeing, which is the falling clothes rack?

59:54 Phil: Yeah. Yeah.

59:56 RTH: And do they seem super imposed, which would be the case if you were burning an image into a photo plate? Or does it seem like they're just sort of simultaneous, I'm seeing both of them?

1:00:08 Phil: I would say that it was like 90% I was seeing the clothes rack falling.

1:00:21 RTH: So let's set aside the theory that we have one visual experiencer, and maybe we've got several simultaneous experiencers that can go on at the same time. So does it seem like I'm 90%, does that 90% mean I am more dominantly seeing the internal scene, the imagined scene?

1:00:47 Phil: Yep.

1:00:49 RTH: And then separately for 10%, I'm still seeing the other, the real scene?

1:00:57 Phil: Maybe, maybe seeing isn't the word to describe it, but it was an awareness of, of my gazing out the window. I don't know! I might have, I might have messed this one up. I might have distorted it.

1:01:13 RTH: Okay.

1:01:16 Phil: I don't know. Perhaps I was. I think I heard the noise and then I, my immediate reaction was to just look outside. And then I thought it was the door. And then, and then I thought, oh, no, maybe it was the clothes rack falling over. And then I could, I could visualize it, but I was still just like, I am now looking in at the wall here. I, I don't

know. I don't know if it entirely, if, if I went there to like being. So I could also describe it as me being outside, looking at it, falling over where it was. I don't know, I, I might have.

1:01:16 Comment: This kind of difficulty has the flavor, to RTH's ear, of the problematics caused by not using the beeper earphone. If the beep comes from some remote location (like in the pocket or on the desk), rather than injected unambiguously into the ear, then the relatively slow cognitive recognition of that's-the-beep! can lead to temporal unsureness of what was happening in experience at the moment of the beep.

But there are other possibilities as well: perhaps Phil's experience is indeterminate in this way; perhaps Phil's way of apprehending the beep is relatively slow regardless of whether the earphone is worn or not; perhaps Phil has the (relatively common) presupposition that if my eyes are open, I must be seeing what my eyes are aimed at; perhaps Phil has a more-complete-than-average way of describing; and so on. We have to keep all those possibilities alive until we have enough practice that they fall away.

1:02:09 RTH: So the distinction that I would make there is, is, is the *me being outside* part of the experience or, or does that mean, I have a perspective as if I had a video camera out there watching this thing go down?

1:02:24 Phil: The, I had a perspective in my visualization of the clothes rack falling over.

1:02:30 RTH: So my experience is of the clothes rack falling over as if there was nobody out there watching...

1:02:36 Phil: ...As if I was standing outside looking at it, falling over.

1:02:39 RTH: So that's the distinction that I'm trying to tease apart here, for the future reference, basically. [Phil: Okay.] Is it, is this experience of *myself being outside*, in which case there's some experience of *Phil* in this, Phil is being outside watching this happen? Or [Phil: No it was like...] is there just an external perspective on this thing falling over?

1:02:58 Phil: Like you mentioned with the video camera, it was like, um, it was like, I was watching what a video camera would've filmed of the clothes rack falling over.

1:03:08 RTH: So I, so I see the clothes rack falling over. It doesn't have anything do with Phil. This is the, [Phil: Correct.] Phil has created that, [Phil: Yeah.] but the experience is of seeing the clothes rack fall? And in the *real* world, I would've had to have been out there seeing it, but in my imagination, I'm seeing it from a perspective as if, but what I see is the thing falling over?

1:03:31 Phil: Yup. Yup..

1:03:36 RTH: Alright. Number six.

SAMPLE 7.6 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 1:03:41 Phil: Um. Yeah, this one was difficult. [Reads from notes.] I had turned a wall light switch on, but the light did not light. I pressed the switch a second time and a third time, and I heard the noise of the flick of the switch each time. At the moment before the beep, I was, innerly saying the word “on.” I believe I had just innerly said *it’s not coming on*. And now the word *on* seemed to, seem to repeat. Perhaps I heard *on*, as I pressed the switch to the on position. The light flashed faintly around this time, which I noticed, but I’m not sure if it flashed after I pressed the switch for the second time or the third time. The pressing of the switch, hearing it sound, seeing the light flash and, in hearing (I guess. I could modify this now to another sort of gesture of the word “on”) were sort of too close in time where they were too close in time for me to accurately discern the sequence of events at the moment. [RTH: So let...] Yeah.
- 1:05:03 RTH: So let’s not worry about the sequence of events for the moment. And let’s, let’s think about the word “on.” So is “on” present to you and, and also let’s set aside what I might have said, or didn’t say about *gesture*. [Phil: Yeah.] About the word “on” and the word “nin..teen...seventy...one.” [Phil: Yeah.] Do those appear to, to you in the same way or a different way?
- 1:05:26 Phil: They appear to me in the same way.
- 1:05:31 RTH: So about “on” you said, “I was, innerly saying ‘on’,” and about “1971,” you said, “I hear my own voice saying,” I think. But that was then, and is now and we’ve had a conversation.
- 1:05:47 Phil: Let’s just be clear though because I had just, I had just, I had just, innerly said to myself and I, I remember this, um, *is it not coming on?* But then slightly after that, when I was still fussing with the switch I heard “on” *again* in, in my own voice. But again, there was more of a passive element to it than an active saying, like. There was more of a passive element to it than an active element as there had been when I had just said to myself, *is it not coming on?* It was almost like an echo of the word “on,” and I had, I was pressing the switch *on* which might have had something to do with that. [RTH: Okay.] Well, I was, I was actually turning it on and then off and then on, but it was, I was *trying* to get it on. [laughs]
- 1:06:58 RTH: Okay. I think we’ve probably covered as much as we can cover on for one day here.
- 1:07:04 Phil: Okay. [laughs] Are we, are we sort of jumping ship on that one or?
- 1:07:12 RTH: Well, I’m what I’m worried that I, that *my* conversation about the gesture has, has screwed things up. So I’m, I’m willing to let that sort of settle into the, [Phil: Okay.] the cesspool or whatever of what things that have been said. Cesspool is a little degenerative, more than I have to say, but, but [Phil: It’s a bit harsh!] compost, compost heap. That’s the word! *Compost heap* is what I’m looking for. The, I, I, I don’t want any particular word that I say, or that you have said to get in the way of, of, of, or looking at things that are coming up. So, so compost heap is pretty good, actually, because everything that we’ve said goes at the fertilizer pile and, and maybe we’ll be

able to eventually grow something that's, that's, you know, better than, better than what went in.

1:07:12 *Comment: RTH is also worried about the earphone issue. The temporal indeterminacy of the present beep might be due to not wearing the earphone.*

1:08:10 Phil: Better than what went in. Yes. Okay. That sounds good.

1:08:10 *Comment: They compare calendars.*

1:12:03 Phil: Is it possible, like, do you think it would be okay to do seven or eight beeps?

1:12:15 RTH: Well, why don't you record seven or eight beeps and we'll see how far we get.

1:12:19 Phil: Okay. Sounds good.

1:12:21 RTH: And, and let's see whether we can deal with the earphone. Let's do 'em with the earphone.

1:12:27 Phil: Yeah.

1:12:29 RTH: And I will, I will do a little research about it. It's been a while since I bought the dongles, but I'll, I'll see whether I can figure out how, where those came from. They seem to work pretty well and.

1:12:39 Phil: Okay. And I'm, I'm going to try to see what I can do on, on this end as well.

1:12:46 RTH: Okay. So I can send 'em to you, but it, it took took us so a long week to get something.

1:12:46 *Comment: Later that day, RTH emails Phil some links to possible dongles.*

1:12:52 Phil: Right. I'll I'll, I'll look into what I can do. I have different earphones, maybe Eva-stina has access to some at work that have a volume, a little pot.

1:13:03 RTH: Right.

1:13:03 Phil: Yeah.

1:13:10 RTH: Alright. So we're gonna do Tuesday. You're gonna call me, when are you gonna say let's zoom at a particular time sometime between now and then probably. And, uh.

1:13:20 Phil: I hope so. Yes.

1:13:21 RTH: And that's, that's fine with me whenever, whenever you're ready. Um.

1:13:24 Phil: Thanks very much.

1:13:25 RTH: I'm not going anywhere.

1:13:27 Phil: [laughs] Okay. That sounds great. [AG: Thank you, Phil.] Okay. Yep. Take care, Amber.

1:13:33 RTH: Alright.

1:13:33 AG: You too.

1:13:34 RTH: See you later.

1:13:34 Phil: Yep. Yep. Have a good day.