Recognizing Delusion

Andrea Fella · Notable Dhamma Teachers — Andrea Fella · 1:05:28

We've been talking about checking the attitude, and there are four basic flavors of attitude: those associated with or in the bucket of greed, of desire, of wanting, leaning toward; those in the field or terrain of aversion, wanting to get rid of, to push away; those in the field of delusion, which is the topic of tonight's talk; and those in the terrain of basically balance of mind, wise thinking, wise attitude—that perspective that allows us to be at ease with whatever is happening.

They are all worth recognizing. I'd say that greed and aversion are usually the most familiar. We know what those feel like. We are pretty clear when those are present. Greed is that kind of leaning toward. There's often a visceral sense of reaching out, wanting, a grasping toward. Aversion is that pushing away or wanting to get rid of.

Delusion can be harder to recognize. But in a way, it's more foundational than the other two. Greed and aversion would not arise if it were not for delusion. So there's delusion embedded in the movement to want to hold on or grasp onto something, and in the movement to want to push away something. Delusion is all over the place, but often it's harder to recognize.

Sometimes people have the idea or the belief that we can't really see delusion, that it's one of those things we can't see—that in its very nature, if there's delusion in the mind, it means we're not mindful. That is not the case. We can begin to recognize delusion functioning. And then it's no longer driving the mind in the way it was. When we see greed as greed, it's no longer driving the mind in the direction of that wanting. When we see delusion as delusion, it's no longer obscuring the mind. It's no longer functioning as a filter or a confused perspective on experience.

So partly this talk is information about how delusion works, and ways that we can begin to be curious about recognizing it so that we can start to see it.

There are different levels to delusion. The most obvious, or the one that most people are more familiar with, is a kind of checked-out quality, a disconnection—just not being aware. That space where we're not aware, there is delusion happening there. That one is harder to see directly, but we can see it when the mindfulness returns. And we can begin to see flavors of that quality of being checked out: spaciness, dullness, and so forth.

The next level down is more what I'll call personal delusion. It's delusions that have been shaped by our personal lives, by our cultures, by our families—ways that we think the world works that are basically views or perspectives we're not seeing as views or perspectives. This is one of the key ways that delusion

functions: there's something happening in the mind, a belief or a view or a perspective, that's not seen as a belief. So we're just taking it to be truth. We're taking it to be how things are, how things are supposed to be.

These can be shaped in simple ways. Our culture, for instance—whatever culture we grow up in, whether it's familial or the broader culture—there are some basic, familiar ways that we learn about how close to stand to somebody that we don't know, or how much eye contact we make with them, or whether we touch somebody we don't know. These things are just embedded in how we interact, and nobody sits us down and tells us this is what we do. We just absorb it. Many views come in this way. It's not like somebody has taught us these views; they've been more absorbed through seeing how people interact with each other.

These kinds of views we can begin to recognize as perspectives, sometimes when they're challenged. When I was younger, I really enjoyed traveling around the world, and I found those edges fascinating—seeing where things were different, where this is not the way I'm used to interacting with a stranger, for instance.

So those are kind of neutral views in some way, and wars have been fought over less. These personal views, perspectives around how we interact with each other, what we believe about each other—this is the realm of this middle level of delusion, and it creates a lot of suffering.

But the most insidious level is the set of delusions that we share as human beings. At that middle level, we share the processes by which delusion works: this picking up of a view and believing it, thinking that this is the way the world should work or the way the world works, and not recognizing it as a perspective or as a view. That's a similar way that delusion functions across cultures, but they're different flavors of beliefs or perspectives that are picked up. At the more insidious level, the deepest level of delusion, are delusions that we share as human beings.

These misperceptions seem to be woven into the very fabric of our being, and to some extent into our biology, into how our senses function. These are the three basic misperceptions: we tend to take what is impermanent to be permanent; we tend to take what is unreliable to be reliable, or what is suffering to be pleasurable; and we tend to take what is not self to be self. I'll spend the most time on this third one, but let me say a little about those first two as well.

The first one involves a lack of awareness, a disconnection from experience. This happens to us all the time. When we get lost in thought, when the mind is pulled into thinking, we are not aware of what's happening. We become absorbed into a world. That absorption into that world, and to some extent believing that world—that's delusion. When mindfulness returns, we often can recognize, "Oh, wow, I've been lost in thought." Although sometimes we stay believing those thoughts.

I had one partner where I would find myself lost in thoughts, thinking about things he might do and

getting angry at him for things he might do. And then I'd wake up and recognize, "He didn't do this." But then I'd think, "But he could. He could do those things." And so the anger was still bubbling, even though I saw that I was now aware those were just thoughts. Sometimes even that imagined world creates a perspective we hold on to.

So this form of delusion we can really begin to get curious about in that moment when mindfulness returns. When mindfulness returns, as I've said, we have that sense of what it was like in the moments before—to not be aware, to be lost. In that return of mindfulness, we get the flavor of that mind that feels disconnected. We may even begin, through that recognition, through mindfulness returning and seeing that quality of the disconnected mind that was present moments before, to recognize the feeling of the mind starting to disconnect, the movement in that direction. We can begin to be attuned to that quality of checking out or moving into disconnection.

Doubt is also a flavor of this quality—doubt in the practice, doubt in our capacity. When these states are not seen, we're caught by that view of doubt. We believe, "I can't do this," or "Everybody else can do this and I can't," or "I'm failing." In that case, doubt isn't really obscuring our experience. We're still aware; we're just doubting our capacity, doubting whether we're doing it right. The doubt is functioning more as a perspective, as a view. When that view is not seen, we're caught in that wavering feeling: "Should I do this? Should I do that? How can I do this? I'm not doing this right." We're caught in that.

But if we can see, "Oh, what is happening is that doubt is arising," then it's no longer functioning as doubt. It's no longer in the way of the practice. It is just another experience. Any experience will do. It's an impermanent, constructed phenomenon that reveals the nature of experience. None of what I'm talking about here is a problem when it's seen. It's not in the way. But it does need to be seen, and delusion is particularly hard to see—hence this talk.

The second level of delusion concerns our views that are created or shaped by our lives, by our conditioning—our personal conditioning, our familial conditioning, our social conditioning in our schools or workplaces. We get immersed into a particular culture or setting, and people in that setting interact in certain ways. As I said a few minutes ago, we absorb that culture.

We have a culture here that, I think, the first time I landed in a culture like this, I thought was pretty strange. You don't make much eye contact, you don't talk. It felt very strange, and I felt very uncomfortable. But over time, I learned to really appreciate the value of some aspects of this culture and absorbed its flavor.

So we absorb these—what's the right word?—these ways of interacting with each other. That's not a problem in itself. We have shared agreements here. But where it does become a problem is when we don't understand that this is a shared agreement and we begin applying it elsewhere, in other situations. We pick it up as being the way things are supposed to be, rather than seeing it as appropriate for a particular context.

We're seeing it as simply the way things are supposed to be.

We pick up these views through a kind of absorption. When we're in a family culture, when we're in a particular culture from a very young age, we pick up some of these views without any articulation for them. They're just what we know, how we live our lives. This becomes a perspective that we bring to our experience, and that particular perspective begins to filter how we receive experience.

We have a belief or a view about something. And because that belief or view has been so embedded in us, the way our minds tend to work is that we see things that confirm that view, and we actively don't see things that disconfirm it. This is a well-documented psychological phenomenon called confirmation bias. The Buddha's languaging of this, from way before that term existed, is: whatever one frequently ponders becomes the inclination of the mind. Frequently pondering doesn't necessarily mean consciously thinking about something, but being in the field of something over and over again. It becomes how we orient to the world.

Again, views are not inherently problematic, but they become problematic—they create suffering—when we run into people holding different views. In this country, all over the world really, people holding different views about religion, about immigration, about political things—this is generating war. It's generating a lot of suffering in the world. This is not a small kind of suffering. It's not a small thing to begin to recognize: oh, this is a view that's being held. It's not necessarily absolute truth. It's one way of looking at the situation.

When we can recognize a view as a view, there's a little bit of space to understand it's not necessarily absolute truth—it's a perspective. That can create conditions for a little more room to have conversation, to navigate different perspectives. Views will happen. We need to recognize that they are views. This is part of the power of the question, to check from time to time: what is being believed?

Some of our own suffering, as I mentioned earlier, my tendency towards self-hatred was ultimately seen as a thought that was being believed. "I'm a failure. I'm no good. I'm not worthy of being loved." That perspective. Now, the thought or belief itself was not where the potency was—it was in the strength of the belief that it was so potent.

So much of our suffering around greed and aversion contains beliefs. There are views embedded in greed and aversion. Greed itself is that leaning towards, that reaching out, that tendency to want to latch on. Aversion is that pushing away, wanting to separate from. Each of those has its own view, and without the view, the greed or aversion would not be happening.

Within greed is the perspective: getting that thing will make me happy. That belief is not itself felt as a belief—it's just true. If I get that thing, I'll be happy. And in aversion, the perspective is: if I get rid of that thing, I'll be happy. Seeing or recognizing that thought doesn't necessarily feel like aversion. It just feels true. That unpleasant thing is in the way of being happy. I need to get rid of it in order to be happy.

There are beliefs embedded in greed and aversion. Most, if not all—I think all—of our suffering, when we are suffering, there is some kind of delusion at work. There's some kind of belief or view at work that's not clearly being seen. When we can really feel the quality of the emotional suffering, however that suffering is being felt—this is what I've seen for myself in the practice.

When I can really feel into that without resistance, when I can know it, it's like, "Yep, there it is. It feels like this." And it feels like it's okay to be with it. It's not pleasant necessarily, but it feels fine to hold it and meet it.

When I can hang out with some kind of dukkha, even for not very long—a minute or so—that can be a useful time to bring in that kind of question. Because it feels to me like being able to be with the dukkha, being able to be with the aversion, being able to be with the greed—when we can hang with the experience, feel into it, it's a place or a way of being with experience that allows for potentially something to be seen that hadn't been seen before.

So: what's being believed? Or a broader question: anything else want to show up? Just opening to something else. In that space where we can meet experience, we're inviting something that had perhaps been a little repressed. We're willing to see whatever wants to be here.

When those beliefs are not seen, that's the delusion. When they're seen, we can recognize, "Oh, that believing is happening."

I also find it useful, in that space of recognizing there's a belief happening here, to look more closely. Because sometimes when we see a particular belief, it can be like, "Yeah, I can see why the three-year-old me believed that, but I don't even consciously believe this anymore." And if we see that, we may think of just dismissing it: "Yeah, yeah, I know this isn't true. This belief is silly." But some part of the system is believing it. So not to dismiss the belief, but to really acknowledge: okay, this is being believed. This is the experience of believing this.

I find it interesting at times to see just how strong the belief is. Am I really on board with that one? Or is it that kind of place where I can see I don't consciously believe this, but at a deeper level, there's something saying, "Yeah, this is true. I am no good. I am a failure." I could see objectively I wasn't a failure, but it didn't mean that I didn't feel that way.

Now, the deepest level of delusion—the third level—these are delusions we share as human beings, quite fundamentally. We tend to take what is impermanent to be permanent. We tend to take what is unreliable to be reliable as a place for lasting happiness. And we tend to take what is not self to be self.

You probably recognize these as the flip side of what is often talked about as the characteristics of experience: that the nature of experience is impermanent, unreliable or dukkha, and not self. But what our minds do is attribute permanence, attribute reliability, attribute self to experience.

Sayadaw U Tejaniya says delusion doesn't obscure the object—it obscures the nature of the object. When delusion functions in this way, when we're taking something impermanent to be permanent, we're still knowing the object, but we're seeing it in a distorted way. We're attributing something to it that is not in its nature. And we will suffer because its nature is impermanent. Attributing the nature of permanence to it and thinking we can find happiness by holding on to it, we will suffer because it is going to fall apart.

In terms of taking what is impermanent to be permanent, there are so many pieces of our human system that create this tendency to believe in the solidity or stability of things—just the way our perceptual system works. When I'm looking around the room here, what I perceive is stability of the floor and all of you seated on the floor. But if I had a camera moving the way my head was moving, it would look kind of jumpy. There's a perceptual process that creates the sense of stability.

Our perceptual processes also take in rapidly changing information. We know this through how the eye works—the eyes receiving little bits of light and putting together an image. It's just like pixels. It's not anything whole. Our minds have this capacity to stabilize, and it's actually helpful. It's kind of helpful not to feel like we're walking on a moving ship all the time.

There was this exhibit at a science center in San Francisco that I went to with my nephew when he was ten. We walked in, and in the back of the building, kind of across the way, there were all these bars hanging up on the ceiling.

And they were probably six feet high and maybe three inches around, and they had flashing lights on them. There were about fifteen or twenty of these bars, spaced about two feet apart. So there were a whole bunch of these bars, and that's what I noticed—these flashing lights on these bars. I thought, "I wonder what that is. I'll have to check that out later."

At a certain point, we were sitting down having a drink, resting our feet, and my nephew kind of looked up. He said, "Oh, it's a school bus." And I looked up and saw flashing lights. I said, "What? What are you talking about?" He said, "Oh, now it's butterflies." What are you talking about?

So I had to stand there and let my eyes relax. At a certain point, I could see it—it turned into the perceptual processes. It's entirely perceptual, the way this thing works. I could see the entire place where the bars were hanging, like it turned into a screen. And across that screen, I could see a school bus driving. It's kind of like what you might see if you had slits in a fence and something drove past it. Your mind carries the image from one to the next, to the next, to the next. I think it's called persistence of vision. That's how the perception worked, and it created this illusion of a thing up there.

I mean, I knew there was no school bus up there. It was only flashing lights. But it was so detailed—I could see the name of the school district on the side of the school bus from those little pixels of information flashing past.

So this is the power of our human system to create stability. Of course we confuse. Of course this happens.

Of course we think there's stability. Of course we believe we should be able to find it.

Another way that impermanence is masked—so our perceptual systems will mask impermanence, kind of hide it from us—is that we tend to relate to experience through concept. For instance, our hand. We relate to our body often through concepts of our body. If we just look at our hand and think about it as a hand—what it does, how it touches things and reaches things—that's creating an idea that we are meeting experience through.

Now if we, just right now, let our attention rest in the hand and feel what that experience is like, it's probably quite a dynamic sense. Maybe pulsing, tingling, prickling, moisture—there's a lot of different sensations going on. And then think about it again as a hand that does things. When I do that, it's like I lose touch with those sensations. I have to work when I'm thinking about it as a hand to stay in touch with the sensations.

This sense of relating to experience through concept is a very powerful delusory function in our minds. We tend to meet experience not through direct contact with it, or even direct recognition of how it's being reflected in our minds, but through an idea, through a concept. We meet people through concepts. We meet meals through concept. We meet pretty much everything through concept.

So there can be a curiosity around: What is it that you're taking to be solid? What is it that feels like it might be permanent or solid or stable? When we start to look for solidity, there are times in the practice where there's a tendency to be searching for someplace we can land on. As we start to really feel into the impermanent nature of experience, our minds are just so wanting there to be some kind of solidity that we'll be looking, looking, looking for some place that's solid.

The encouragement in practice is: if it feels like there's something solid, have some curiosity. That pain in your knee—is it really solid? This was for me a kind of a place of curiosity for a while. When it felt like there was something solid, I would say, "Okay, let's feel that. What is that solidity?"

How does it feel? Is it really solid?

We sometimes take what is unreliable to be reliable, what is suffering to be happiness. And this is really a corollary in many ways to the impermanent nature of experience. When we take things to be permanent or stable, we believe that there's a lasting happiness that can be found by holding on to those things. The unreliability inherent in the nature of experience—its impermanence—makes it unreliable as a place where we can find lasting happiness. There's no experience in our bodies and minds that lasts more than a split second. And yet our minds are constantly trying to put things together and hold on to them.

It kind of feels like our minds think sense pleasure is as good as it gets. And that's, again, basically what we've learned through our lives—that's where we find happiness. If I get what I want, I will feel ease. I will feel better. I'll feel happiness.

The Buddha had a great teaching to help us recognize that trying to find happiness in unstable places is not ultimately reliable. This teaching is called gratification, danger, and escape. He suggested—he said—yes, we do experience pleasure when we get what we want. We experience pleasure with respect to sense experience. But rather than saying "don't do that," he said notice how far that gratification extends. Essentially, how long does it last when we feel gratified by having a sense pleasure? How long does it actually last?

Sometimes it can last surprisingly long. I played with this around chocolate and discovered that chocolate really works with my system. I get a real hit of the pleasure of the taste, and then there's something else that happens—a deep relaxation or something. The endorphins, I don't know what it is, but it feels pretty good. A piece of chocolate, if I'm not just shoving it in my mouth but actually tasting it and really meeting that chocolate—the pleasure of that chocolate can last about 45 seconds. I thought that was pretty long, actually. But it doesn't last longer than that.

So this is an interesting thing to play with. Not to make something bad around experiencing sense pleasure, but to notice. I began to see in my early explorations of this how in those first few moments of getting that hit of chocolate, there was the belief: yes, this is going to do it for me. Now, I knew intellectually it wasn't true, but some part of the system was like, yes, this is so good.

That exploration—how long does it last—helps us to see, again not to make a problem about it, but to see what happens when that pleasure ends. Do you reach for the next piece of chocolate? Is it looking for pleasure again where it's just going to be the next thing, the next thing?

I think this is how we tend to live our lives. It's like we're stringing together pearls on a necklace. If I can just keep stringing together pleasant experience after pleasant experience, that would be a life worth living. But it takes so much work. There's so much suffering in the orienting around getting, getting, getting, getting rid of, getting rid of.

So, some curiosity: what are you relying on for happiness? How reliable is it? The Dharma is a way of relying on something different—a different way of relying. It's not demanding any particular experience or any particular thing. It's landing with, or just streaming with, the changing nature of experience and not resisting that this is the nature of experience—this changing, impermanent, unreliable flow of experiences.

And then there's the third tendency: we tend to take what is not-self to be self. I'm not going to try to do a whole not-self teaching here. But this is basically, again, a misattribution. We tend to attribute to our processes of body and mind—this tumbling on of causes and conditions—we attribute a self to what is simply causes and conditions unfolding. Again, it's a kind of reification.

We're attributing something that's stable, that's permanent, that's reliable to this stream and saying, "That's me. That's who I am."

The basic exploration around this is to be curious when it feels like there is a sense of self arising—again, not to try to find not-self. There's that famous quote of Dogen: "To study the way is to study the self. To study the self is to forget the self. To forget the self is to be awakened by all things."

So we are curious about what—like with the other two—we are curious about what are we taking to be solid? What are we taking to be reliable? What are we taking to be self? When it feels like a sense of self is arising, what is that experience? How long does that last?

That's kind of fun to watch too. We think of the sense of self as being this stable thing that's always here, but when we start looking at it, we discover there are so many different senses of self, and they have no relationship to each other.

I was at IMS, practicing with a sense of self—at the time I was about forty years old, and I was right. I knew the right way that people should be doing things and how they should be asking questions in the hall, and this other person in the hall was asking questions in a way they should not be asking questions, and I was suffering. I was feeling the suffering of this analytical, argumentative self, and it was so familiar. It felt so heavy and so like me. But I was just watching it.

And then conditions shifted. A big truck drove up in front of IMS, and it had loud brakes and it crashed to a stop, and the doors banged, and I was standing right next to it, and I turned into a two-year-old. "Wow, it's a truck!" Split second—one identity to another. There was no relationship between these two.

Another time I was having a meal and feeling depressed, just feeling that depression, and then suddenly something else happened. It was like, "Oh, that's gone. Where did that go?"

So notice when there's identification. Notice when there's a sense of self. And again, see how long is it actually lasting?

There's so much evidence for not-self. This is one of those confirmation bias things—because we have this view that we're a self, we find evidence all over the place for a sense of self. But when we start being curious about not-self, there is also a lot of evidence for not-self.

The simple fact of the wandering mind. You sit down and meditate, tell yourself you're going to be present, and the mind wanders. You didn't decide for that to happen. It happened. That's evidence for non-self. The mindfulness returns—who did that? You didn't make that happen either. That was conditions coming together. But we give ourselves credit for it. "I did that." The sense of self sometimes is like this after-the-fact attribution. An intention arose, and then, "Oh, I did that."

But we can start seeing how the system is doing its taking-care-of-itself work. We sit for a while, we get a full bladder, there's an intention to stand and relieve the pressure. That can all happen without a me doing it. So again, just being curious about that sense of me, of I.

There's a teaching the Buddha often brings in—and this will be close to the last piece. We should recognize

that experience arising, usually framed around the aggregates, is not mine, is not who I am, is not myself. This is a useful three-part reflection on exploring the sense of self. We can turn them around to where we do create a sense of self: "This is mine. This is who I am. This is me." Those three have slightly different flavors of senses of self. The "mine" is the owner—that's the more obvious kind, in a way.

The owner of the body, the owner of things—that sense of "that thing is mine" or "that is mine." So that's one flavor we can feel into: that quality, that sense of ownership.

Now the next two—"this I am" and "this is myself"—this is my understanding of these. But it has been very helpful, so I share it with you.

"This I am," to me, is like the sense of self as the subject of the sentence. "I am this. I do this." It's the agent, the one who's active, the sense of the one who's doing. That's a very potent place of identification—the one who feels like they're in control. And the Buddha pointed to that piece around control as being a very powerful point of identification. So that, to me, is that kind of exploration around "this I am." It's like: when does it feel like I'm the one acting, I'm the one doing? Many of our emotions have this quality. "I am the one who's angry, and I want to get even"—our emotions have this kind of active quality.

And then there's another flavor, a subtler flavor, I think, of sense of self that we can start to see: that we're not doing things. At one point I was realizing, "Wow, perception is happening." Perception arises, things are recognized, there's knowing and there's feeling. It's all happening. I could see that I was not the one doing it, but it felt like it was happening to me.

This is, I think, that third flavor. This is the reflection: "This is not myself. This is not me." Or flipping it around: "This is me." It's the self as the object of the sentence, the one who's just being impinged on. So there can be the recognition that we're not in control, but boy, does it feel like it's happening to me.

I actually went and reported that to my teacher at one point. I told him that I was seeing that I wasn't doing the consciousness, the feeling, the perception—it was just happening, but it's happening to me. And I said, "I can't see through that one." And he, of course, simply said, "Well, just notice that that's what's happening. That is the feeling, the experience is that it's happening to me. Know that."

This is seeing through these—the sense of witnessing or seeing the way we take things to be permanent, reliable, or self. We don't do the understandings of impermanent, unreliable, not-self. It is insight. It is a result of practice to see through these delusions. So my teacher telling me, "Yeah, don't try to see through the sense of me, just notice that it's happening"—that creates the conditions for the potential for witnessing it falling away.

And this can happen with any of these. We can witness the mind shifting and letting go of how it's been holding on to these. There was one retreat where I was seeing suffering so clearly and seeing that it made no sense to cling to anything. I felt like there was somebody whispering in my ear: "Doesn't make any sense to cling."

And it's just like everything was just being released, released, released. It seemed so obvious. It was so clear. So that was a moment—or a set of moments, you know, it was minutes at least, maybe even hours of being in that space. And it was so clear. It was like, how can I not see this? I'm never going to cling again. This is just so obvious that clinging makes no sense.

But guess what? It's not so obvious. When you're in that space, it's obvious. But delusion returns. And when delusion returns, then you can really begin to see it much more clearly and know: thinking there's something to cling to—yep, I know that's delusion. Because there's been the shift, there's been the experience of seeing so clearly that it doesn't make any sense. But then the conditions change and the delusion of "I want that thing, I need that thing"—it comes back. But then we can clearly know that's delusion at work.

Through the practice, we at times get to see these veils, these perspectives of delusion fall away, and see so clearly. And it feels very obvious. It's like, how can I not see this? But delusion is very powerful, so it will come back. Yes, even insight is impermanent. But it does unwind. The delusion begins to unwind and it gets thinner. Sometimes we get those moments where there's such clarity—we're not clinging. And then it comes back. And we see again, it's almost like another layer, another layer of how we're clinging.

There was one point where the mind was doing this kind of seeing things just falling apart, falling apart—very slippery, seeing the impermanent nature of experience. And there was this yearning to want to find somewhere to land. Like, I'm so tired of just falling, falling, falling. I want some place—please let me land somewhere. And the mind was searching. There would be ease in just recognizing, yep, nowhere to land, it's okay. And then the mind would go into this searching thing.

And at some point I just got very tender with that part of the mind. It was almost sweet or something. "Yeah, you go ahead, you try. You try to find some place to land. I'm here with you. I'll hang out with you while you look." I knew at one level—I mean, I knew because I had seen that letting go is much more easeful. I knew that there wasn't a landing place. But some part of the system, again kind of like that thing I described earlier, just could not buy into that.

And so we get to be with that, hang out with that—not try to somehow stop it, saying "stop that." We can't. It's not self. It's doing its thing.

Transcriptions produced locally using Swiss low-carbon electricity. Corrections and rewriting by cloud-hosted AI.