Q&A

Joseph Goldstein · Notable Dhamma Teachers — Joseph Goldstein · 58:32

Only easy questions.

I have an easy question. We have now moved to "there is a body, there is a whole body." Do we stay with a body scan through the entire sit, or would you suggest moving elsewhere if we have done a body scan, or do we continue using a body scan?

So in using the suggestion "there is a body," that doesn't necessarily imply doing a body scan, although a body scan can be part of it. But it's also possible to use just the frame "there is a body," holding that frame with an open awareness within it, where one is simply aware of whatever is arising. And in either of those approaches, you can move back and forth between the two—really whatever serves you. But it's not limited to a body scan.

I have one easy question. The second one, meh. The easy one is, could you say more about, from your perspective, the difference between sadness and unhappiness? And then the one that I'm not sure is easy is, over the years I've heard many explanations about that which is seeing, that which is aware, but I still don't get what it is that's seeing and what's aware.

What was the first one? Oh, yes. See, when you don't hold on to things. That's the charitable interpretation.

I think this came up in one of the groups. I was talking about how at one point I was having this experience which I was calling sadness and naming it sadness, but it really felt lodged. Even as I was being mindful of it—sadness, sadness, sadness—it just felt stuck. It was not moving through.

So that aroused my interest, and I started to look more carefully at what the feeling state was. When I honed in more carefully, I realized that it was not the feeling of sadness—it was the feeling of unhappiness. They're close, but they're really two different feelings.

What was interesting is that once I aligned properly with what was actually there—oh, unhappiness—that's when it all moved through. So it's just the importance sometimes: if we're feeling stuck, it may be because we're misperceiving something. It could be worth taking another look, particularly with emotions, because there can be so many varieties and things that are close to one another.

For me—and we may all have different experiences of this—but in a strange kind of way, sadness has a certain quality of sweetness to it. It's like a poignancy. Whereas unhappiness is a little bleaker. The feeling was quite different. And as I say, it was only when I could get aligned with "oh, that's what this is" that it

allowed for the release of it.

In terms of your second, difficult question—you actually answered it yourself. Because in trying to find what it is that knows, what it is that is aware, the very fact that you can't find it, as I said last night, is the finding. There's nothing to find, and yet the knowing is happening.

It might be somewhat analogous—I don't want to push this analogy too far—to space. Can you find space? "Oh, there it is." It's not like that. There's nothing to find, and yet we can become aware of it. But it's not a thing.

The mind is somewhat analogous to space. It's different than space in that space does not have any knowing capacity. Whereas the mind is space-like in that there's nothing to find, and yet the knowing is going on. So the fact that you look for it and can't find it—you might just rest in whatever your experience is of not finding. And just play with it.

A couple of days ago you mentioned almost in passing that therapy might be useful in conjunction with practice. And then last night as I listened to you, I wondered about therapy. Most of the modes of therapy I'm aware of have a central concept of the self—self-discovery, self-actualization, self-realization, false self, true self, self, self, self. So I wondered if therapy is actually dangerous, perhaps more than for the usual reasons, because it's so contradictory to the core teachings of Buddhism.

First I would say, for those of you interested in pursuing that, find a good Buddhist therapist. An enlightened Buddhist therapist.

That aside, I think I've mentioned, and I alluded to it last night, that there are two different levels of our experience. In terms of terminology, we might call one the relative level and one the more ultimate level. On the relative level, we're dealing with the sense of self and other, being and personality, and personal story.

And we often get entangled and caught up in all kinds of unwholesome patterns. So there are times when entering into that level with the concepts of self and other, and just taking that all in, is fine—good work can be done. It becomes problematic if that becomes the final understanding of who we are, because then we're imprisoned in that notion of self.

But if you can understand that this is a relative level of experience, and that there is a more underlying one—which is what we've been discovering here, where even the solidity of the body disappears—we perhaps get tastes of what selflessness means, the impersonality of it all, and the momentariness of it all. To the degree that we explore that realm and have some real experience of it, then when we operate on the relative level, we do it with much greater freedom. We can play on it and get whatever value there is from it, but we're not getting caught by that concept. And so I think the two can be synergistic in a certain way.

Question: Last night you spoke about having the saying come to you in meditation—"whatever has the nature to arise also has the nature to pass away"—and then that led you to this insight of "there's nothing to want." Similar to the relative level, where there is a relative self, I wonder if you could speak to an enlightened or skillful way of pursuing things, of having objectives and goals as we go about our lives, without getting caught.

Obviously, as we go through life, we all have goals and aspirations and things we want to do and accomplish. That's just part of being alive. I think the key point to explore—and this takes a lot of clarity and sometimes courage—is to really get into the habit or the practice of investigating and exploring one's motivation for doing things. Because it's the motivation which really, to a very large extent, determines the ethical value of the undertaking.

Very often, the motivations may be mixed—unless you happen to be a saint. Any saints? We can have a really good motivation, but still mixed in with it, there can be some shadow side. So it's just to be honest with ourselves about it so we're not deluding ourselves about what's moving us forward.

I'll give a very trivial example of this. This was back in the India days when I was still somewhat new in the practice, though I'd been there a couple of years. In the summer months we would go up to the mountains because it got really hot down on the plains. There would be a small community of people living in the mountains, doing their practice. Once a week, people would gather on the little lawn in front of the cottage I was staying in, and I would give a dharma talk each week to this group of friends.

It was a beautiful thing to do, sharing the dharma. But I noticed that each week, before I started speaking, I would count how many people came. "Oh, this week there were six people. Last week there were ten people. What happened?" My mind just did this. I didn't invite it—it just did it. But I was mindful enough to see it. I could smile at it and let it go. And then as soon as I got into the dharma talk, that was all completely gone, and it felt like the motive was really pure.

So it's just being sensitive to the range of our motivations so that we can strengthen the positive aspects and see the more negative ones and let them go. Motivation, I think, is really the key challenge.

Question: A couple of days ago you mentioned taking a moment of delight after realizing a thought. I'm wondering if you could elaborate on what you meant by taking delight.

As you know very well by now, we get lost in thought a lot. Thoughts come and carry us away, and then at a certain point we wake up from being lost. A very common tendency is to then judge ourselves for having been lost again for the millionth time—"I can't do this," whatever self-judgmental commentary arises. But of course that's just getting lost again.

I found it much more fruitful when I'm lost, lost, lost—and then awake—to actually take delight in the experience of having awakened, to appreciate that. And even more than that, right in that moment of having gone from being lost in the thought, which is delusion, to aware that we're thinking, which is

wakefulness—right in that moment of transition, it's possible to really experience very directly the nature of the deluded mind and the nature of the aware mind. We get a very clear recognition: "Oh, that's what a deluded mind is like—just lost in the story, not knowing what's going on. Oh, this is what awareness is."

Going back to the first easy question—or the hard question of the easy one—what is awareness? We don't have to have even a language for it, because in every moment of awakening from being lost, in that very moment, instead of jumping to some other object, we can take that pause and recognize, "Oh, this is what awareness is." And it's very clear in contrast to having just been deluded. So just that transition moment is very fruitful to explore. Mostly I think people tend to rush back to the breath or a sensation instead of extracting the juice of that transition.

Question: You've used the language a few times—you had some experience and then you honed in on it and learned something else. Can you give some examples of what "honing in" looks like? And similarly, what does celebration look like? Is it "yay"? Or is it "wow"? Or is it "how cool"? Is it a smile?

Well, the second question really depends on your personality. And in the context of a retreat, for the more exuberant types, you can probably tamp it down a little bit. I don't remember particularly whether I used the word celebration—I often use the word delight. It's just delight in seeing something that hasn't been seen before. I think I mentioned this in terms of working with māna, or conceit. When I see it in the mind, I'm delighted to see it, because I would rather see it than not see it. So every time it arises: "Oh yeah, there it is. That's māna, that's conceit." It's that kind of appreciation of the wisdom or the insight of seeing something that we might not have seen before.

In terms of honing in, it can happen in many different ways. The example was sadness and unhappiness. We're seeing something is stuck, and it's almost like holding the question: "Well, what's going on? What's here?" Just simple questions like that. Or, as we've mentioned throughout the week, often asking the question with respect to different experiences we're having: "What's the attitude in the mind about this?"

What's interesting to me about the use of these questions is that the power of the question is not so much in getting a printout of an answer. That's not the point of the question. We're using the question as the vehicle for honing in. It's directing our attention to part of our experience. We don't even have to have a verbal answer.

I can't remember whether I mentioned this to the group, but one time I was sitting and just watching the breath. I was just feeling the breath, completely ordinary sitting, nothing special going on. It felt easeful, just feeling the breath go in and out. But then the thought came to me, just to ask that question: "What's the attitude in the mind?" I didn't have any premonition that there was some big attitude. It was just a tool that arose. So I'm just feeling the breath, in and out, in and out. "What's the attitude?" Just by asking the question, I could feel my mind relax back from a wanting that I didn't even know was there—that leaning with the breath, wanting to get more calm or more peace or more concentrated. Some subtle energetic movement. So just by asking the question, the asking of the question had the effect, not the answer to it.

Sometimes questions are simply a way of honing in.

Question: Can you say something about awareness and levels of awareness? I'm here and I'm super concentrated, and then I go to lunch and there's a lot going on and I'm still really aware but not at that super deep level. And then when I go home, it's just like fifty percent awareness or something. How do we deal with that? How do we accept that? What's enough?

Don't take this as a metaphysical truth. It's just my impression of...

the experience you're talking about. I don't think, off the top of my head, I wouldn't talk about levels of awareness. It's like, at least to a large extent, we're either aware in the moment or we're unaware. What you're calling being less aware sounds to me like there are just more moments of being distracted from being aware.

So here maybe there's a kind of momentum built up where there's a flow of mindfulness, a flow of awareness which is relatively continuous. Then you go out and maybe in the dining room there's a lot happening. So there are still the same moments of awareness, but the mind may get distracted a lot more frequently. It's jumping in and out of awareness, and that's why it may feel less deep.

One thing which we have not talked a lot about, but which can be very helpful when you notice that the awareness seems to be losing some of its continuity: for most people, the visual field is the predominant sense door. For people who have good vision, any vision, we live in the world of what is being seen. But sight doesn't impact us the same way as a sound or a sensation, or even a thought. Even those thoughts slip in and they can be more impactful than sight. It's like there's not a very obvious impingement. And so we find that we're just living in this world of what's being seen, very rarely being mindful that we're seeing. We're just in it.

A good part of the reactivity in our lives comes from being reactive to something that is being seen. I had a very striking example of this on retreat. I noticed that when I would go into the dining room, trying to go in very mindfully, my mind would have a comment about almost everybody. Walking too fast, walking too slow, taking too much food. I don't like what they're wearing. It was totally ridiculous. I mean, it was just ridiculous. I was watching my mind do this. And then I realized that all of that mental activity and proliferation was happening in reaction to what was being seen.

So what I started doing was entering the dining room and all I would note was "seeing, seeing, seeing, seeing." On the line for food, seeing. Going to the table, seeing, seeing. It was amazing. Ninety-eight percent of the judgments and comments were gone because I was picking up, at that point, the point of contact of the sense object with the sense door. I was acknowledging, "Oh yeah, seeing, seeing, seeing." And it just cut all that proliferation which had been coming because of the unmindful seeing.

So that's an example of how you can begin to carry the awareness through more everyday, even faster-paced activities. Even in these last days of the retreat, I think it would be interesting for you to

incorporate the noting of seeing more often. Because if you connect with it, it could be a really powerful force for mindfulness in your life.

Let me just read this one question since it came a few days ago: "Can you give an overview of the precepts? Why undertake them? I don't recall anyone really explaining the why versus just talking through the what. I'd specifically like explanation on two: Why no sexual activity at all versus the less strict no sexual misconduct? And two, why no dance, music, etcetera? As someone who dances, I think there's a difference between art and entertainment. I'm doing all eight precepts, but I feel like I'm just going through the motions versus knowing why."

That's a good question. So the essence of the precepts—there are a couple of very juicy components to the practice of them. One which I mentioned just at the beginning of the talk last night: the precepts are all about commitments to non-harming. When we undertake the precepts, we're being very explicit about the fact that, okay, I'm not going to harm any being in these ways. And that's really the foundation of all ethical conduct.

Just think for a moment what the world would be like if people followed just one precept: not to kill. It would be a different world. And we could go through all of the precepts in that way. So they're very powerful expressions of non-harming. And one of the gifts that we give to others when we follow the precepts is the gift of fearlessness.

Because we're saying with our actions and our being, you need not fear me. I'm not going to do anything harmful to you. So what a gift. We're giving the gift of trust. We're giving the gift of fearlessness to everybody we're in contact with when we're committed to the precepts. There's really a tremendous value in this.

Another aspect of the precepts has to do with the cultivation of renunciation. Renunciation is one of the paramis, one of the perfections of the Buddha. Renunciation has always been challenging—that's my strongest parami.

I think in our culture, with that particular term, it's very easy for renunciation to carry a connotation of deprivation. "Oh yeah, I'll give it up. I know it's good for me, but okay." But at a certain point, when I really looked into the power of renunciation and what it was about, I reframed it in terms of non-addiction. When we're renouncing something, it's like settling back into a non-addictive frame of mind. And when I used that terminology, when I thought of non-addiction, the sense and feeling of freedom was contained right in that phrase. I think we can all relate to the suffering of different addictions and the freedom that comes from non-addiction.

With regard to the third precept and why we take the precept while on retreat of refraining from all sexual activity—you need not worry, because on Sunday we're going to take the lay precept of just refraining from sexual misconduct. You need not continue your monastic lifestyle when you go home. But

it's really interesting to take that precept here of refraining from all sexual activity on a couple of levels.

One, as we all know, sexual energy is very powerful. It's a powerful energy within us. And just by refraining, we're conserving that energy or gathering that energy, all in the service of the practice and awareness and mindfulness. So just on an energetic level, it's very empowering.

In addition, it really gives an opportunity to hone in on the nature and the experience of desire. Just because we take the precept to refrain from sexual activity, the mind might not have gotten that message. So it's not uncommon at all at different times—and also at certain ages—for there to be powerful fantasies, sexual fantasies, and for the desire to get very strong.

One of the great things I've learned in all these years of practice is in watching sexual desire arise in the mind and feeling it in the body, sometimes very powerfully, but having taken the precept, I'm just being with it and watching it. What we learn is—and this is not something we necessarily carry fully into our lives outside—but on retreat it becomes very obvious. This desire, this sexual desire arises very strongly, and just watching, watching, watching, at a certain point it goes away. It's not that we're pushing it away, and it's not that we're suppressing it. It's just in its nature: whatever has the nature to arise will also pass away.

That's a very powerful lesson, because I think more commonly we live with the idea that with desire of any kind—though it's very obvious with sexual desire, it could be any other—we're often living with the idea that I either need to express it or I'm suppressing it. That becomes kind of the duality of how we're holding it. But meditation shows us a completely different way of holding that's much freer, where we're not suppressing it. We're being with it, we're feeling it, but realizing it does not have to be acted on. It will arise and pass by itself.

This gives us a lot more freedom in our lives to be discerning about when to act on it, when not to act on it, when is it skillful, when is it unskillful. If we're caught in that duality of "if I'm not expressing it, I'm suppressing it," that can lead us into a lot of unskillful actions. So there's a lot to learn from these temporary periods of renunciation, because then we get to see the impermanent, impersonal nature of desire.

Of course, desire is a very powerful force in our lives.

Question: I've been struck by the use of words, the noting, the asking of questions even today, the importance of choosing the word "unhappiness" versus "sadness." But I felt there are other times where we've said those are tools and they may fade away for an open awareness. Can you say a little bit about when they're useful? Are they a step along the way?

The most obvious use of language in the meditation practice itself is just the tool of mental noting—when we're putting a word: in, out, thinking, hearing, seeing. For some people, this is just a very skillful way of helping us stay connected moment to moment with what's happening.

So it's a support for that connectedness. If there's an easeful flow of experience, the accuracy of the word is not that important. Sometimes people will say, "I'm feeling some sensation, I'm not quite sure what it is. Is it pressure? Is it tension?" If we can just be with it in an easy way and it doesn't feel bound up in some way, it doesn't matter. Any word is enough to connect us.

But when something feels caught—like with the sadness and unhappiness—that's when looking to see more accurate perception might help us to actually become mindful of it. But even when we're using the word skillfully, using the noting, did I mention to the group NPMs? So in the course of practice, the NPMs—noticings per minute—go way up. At a certain point in practice, our perception is so quick, things are happening much too quickly to note. The words are too slow.

So then, if you have found that the noting overall is helpful, you could maybe note every fifth thing, just dropping in one, just as a way of staying connected, or drop the noting altogether and just be with the flow of that rapidly changing experience. They can be used at times skillfully, but they're not the essence of the practice. The essence, you could say, is the noticing or the feeling into the experience. The words are really used just as a support.

A participant asks about the grief they feel at losing a close friend during the retreat, wondering whether that grief indicates attachment, and if so, whether that's a bad thing.

First, I'm sorry to hear about the loss.

When the Buddha died—and obviously he was this incredibly important person for countless beings—it's said that there was a lot of grieving among his disciples, except for the fully enlightened ones, the ones who had completely uprooted all attachments, all desire, all conceit, all sense of "I am," who had finished the work. I'm not talking from personal experience here, but the Arahants, the fully enlightened ones, abided in equanimity, knowing that this is the nature of things. It's not unlawful that what is born will die. That's true for everyone. So when our realization of that is complete, I think the mind can stay in a kind of equilibrium. For everybody under that very high threshold, there was a lot of grieving. And it probably did come from some sense of attachment and loss of a loved being, but it's kind of the natural expression of human life at these levels.

But even the Buddha—his two chief disciples, Sariputta and Moggallana, died before him. And given the Buddhist cosmology and the stories, these were beings who had been with the Buddha through countless past lifetimes, and they were all fully enlightened beings. You can imagine the communion that existed among them.

It's very interesting—after they died, the Buddha commented, and this will be a bit of a paraphrase: "This order of disciples, of nuns and monks and laypeople, now seems empty to me. It feels like the limbs of a great tree have been cut off." So he's clearly expressing a kind of poignancy, an acknowledgment of the loss. But then he goes on to say in that same teaching—and this phrase, I'm not sure whether I'm putting

this in or I remember reading it—but I seem to recall it said, "Isn't it remarkable that even in experiencing the loss, the mind of the Buddha, the Tathagata, is not grieving."

That was a very interesting juxtaposition for me, to see the difference between loss and grief, and how, at least perhaps at a certain level or in certain situations, we could be open to the feeling of loss and feel it deeply, as the Buddha did. I find that very poignant, in the loss of his great disciples—to see the possibility of opening to the feeling of loss, which carries its own kind of pain. It's not necessarily a pleasant feeling, the feeling of loss. But grief is something else. Grief is a different feeling. It's a response to the loss.

It could be interesting to explore. Often in these situations, people have come to me at different times describing just what you said. It's a very tender situation. The heart is very vulnerable and open at that time, and sensitive. So it's also a question of timing and interest.

Whether people just want to be with the feeling as they're feeling it, letting that work through, or whether there's interest in some people of investigating something like, "What is the feeling of loss? What is the feeling of grief?" There are ways of diving into it, but it's very individual—when one is ready to or interested in doing so.

But it's a very poignant and rich arena because it's universal. It's not only the loss of others but our own death. How do we relate to that? These are big issues, and at one point or another, worth exploring, so we come to as deep an understanding as possible.

A questioner said, "I think I'm a little confused about what insight is. You shared those moments of insight last night very graciously from your own personal journey. Would you consider those moments of awakening? And how do you discern between an insight and a thought that's empty? I'm asking because I have had thoughts that have arisen that I found useful in clarifying and going deeper. Would I even know an insight? I'm just a little confused on that front."

I was teaching at a retreat that Ram Dass was leading in Maui in December, and I was giving a talk, and there was something in my mind in the midst of the talk. The thought came of something that I really wanted to say, and by the time I finished the sentence I was saying, it was gone. I still remember that.

I think it's interesting to notice—at least for the most part, maybe not all the time—that the thought itself is not the insight. The thought is an expression of something you've understood. Just as a simple example: suppose you're sitting and you're tuning in experientially to the truth of things arising and passing, that things are coming and going and coming and going. You're experiencing that. And then the thought may come, "Everything really is impermanent." The thought is just an expression of the insight you already had. It's not the insight itself; it's just giving expression to the insight.

So when you have those thoughts that seem insightful, you might just check to see what was your

experience just then that gave rise to the thought. Just begin to play with that. Now, it is possible that maybe an insightful thought will come independent of what your present moment experience is. You could just acknowledge that and see if it's valuable for you. But mostly, insight in the context of meditation is really about different ways of viewing experience.

I think we mentioned in the hall, and Bonnie had talked about, the different distortions or hallucinations of mind. They're basically a few basic distortions: where we take what is impermanent to be permanent, we take what's unsatisfying to be satisfying, and we take what's non-self to be self. In the course of our practice, when we're seeing, "Oh, things really are impermanent, are unreliable"—that becomes a lived experience, not simply an intellectual understanding.

The questioner reflected, "But sometimes those lived experiences hit harder than others, right?"

That's true. Sometimes they're really impactful and sometimes they're mild.

"Is there a problem with that? If it hits more, presumably I will shift the way I think about the world more."

I think that's true, but don't also undervalue the small ones.

"Maybe I'm thinking about a hierarchy of importance of these things."

Don't. In one way, we could think of the practice as having a scientific element to it in terms of the methodology and the lawfulness of how it all unfolds. There are very detailed descriptions of the whole unfolding path. That is one aspect. But another aspect is that meditation is more like an art. As much as it's kind of a scientific methodology, we can view our life as art.

It's like we're artists creating our lives, and the world is the palette. One little dab of paint in a corner may have a big impact on the whole picture. But if you think it always has to be big dabs and big splashes of color, then we miss some of the subtleties of what's going on. That's why I say don't make a hierarchy.

Years ago, when I was a freshman or sophomore in college, I was in New York, going to some of the museums and just learning. I didn't know very much about art or even how to look at paintings, but I would just go and really look. One of the first things that struck me—and it's vivid in my mind even now, fifty or sixty years later—was that when I was looking at a painting, the curtains in the background were as important as the figure in the foreground. They were equally part of the painting. The tendency is to focus on what's most obvious, what's most in the foreground, and in some way diminish the importance of what's in the background. That was a great lesson for me: to see things whole rather than create a hierarchy. I don't know if that insight will stand up among the artists among you, but that was my experience.

One student shared a reflection: "After your talk on anatta last night, over the course of today I found myself noticing how often I said 'I' in my thoughts. And I felt a fatalism and hopelessness. Because short of

living in a cave where I never have to deal with people and talk about myself or be in the world, it just seems like—as you said—language is very conditioning, and it seems very difficult."

It's not a problem at all. It is totally fine—and I think I mentioned this—to use conventional language and conventional concepts. It would be very awkward to go through life saying, "These five aggregates are doing this and that." No, say "I'm going for a walk." There is absolutely no problem with that, and in fact there would be a problem if you didn't.

Even as we use conventional language and conventional concepts and relate in conventional ways, the whole metta practice operates on this conventional level. It's sending loving thoughts to oneself, to other beings. It's all on this relative level of experience, and that's the level we live in a lot, and it's totally fine. It's just that we also want to have a deepening understanding of what's underneath that conventional level. To the degree that we have some experience of the selfless nature, the impersonal nature, then as we're operating on the relative level, we get caught much less because we're infusing that level with a deeper wisdom.

In fact, I think the maturity of spiritual practice is learning the union of the relative and the more ultimate levels. They're not two different things. It's the same experience seen on different levels. Our practice is simply learning how to integrate all that.

Another question arose about the concept of time—looking at things as a whole. The student described doing walking meditation, feeling the sun, then coming to eat and feeling the temperature of the food, noticing the transition of how it was cooked. Being mindful taking showers while it's raining, feeling that connection. Is this looking at the conceptual and the relative? How does one go about being with the whole, the elemental whole?

What you described was beautiful. That was a good expression of how the whole gets incorporated or understood in very simple activities. One way of fostering that intuitive connection with the whole—I think it happens more when we're practicing in the mode of open awareness rather than directed awareness. When the mind is directed, and I'm not putting a hierarchy on this, there are times when directed awareness is really necessary and important, and at other times it's more open and choiceless. But in that openness or choicelessness, we really are open. There is no choosing what we're being aware of. We're being aware of whatever presents itself in the whole, and I think that allows the mind to intuitively make many connections we might not have made when simply focused on a narrower object.

So from the meditative point of view, it seems to me that it's in that open awareness that what you're talking about becomes more possible. And it is beautiful to feel into different dimensions of things—which is very hard to do if we're caught up in our own desire and craving. There's that famous little quote: "When a pickpocket meets a saint, all he sees is the pocket." When we're narrow in our wanting, we miss everything.

So, okay, gang. We could do this for a long time. But let's just sit for a couple of minutes and let everything settle.

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