Session with Joseph Goldstein: Non-Clinging, Māna, and the Unborn

Joseph Goldstein · Notable Dhamma Teachers — Joseph Goldstein · 2:36:35

So we'll begin this morning with a twenty-minute practice. I invite you to take refuge, and I will use a refuge formula from the Bodhicaryavatara, the Guide to the Bodhisattva's Way of Life.

Buddham gacchami saranam yavanabodhi mandata dharmam gacchami saranam bodhisattva ganantata buddham gacchami saranam yavanabodhi mandata.

I go for refuge in the Buddha, I go for refuge in the Dharma, and I go for refuge to the host of bodhisattvas until I attain awakening.

And now, bringing to mind your closest teacher or teachers. Feeling their presence in the space before you. Feeling them connecting to their teachers and their teachers' teachers. Have a sense of their kindness. Feel your gratitude and allow that connection to bring forth as light from them a blessing that enters the top of your head, gently fills your body with the blessings of wisdom and compassion, and brings to mind your highest aspiration—perhaps the aspiration of bodhicitta, to attain awakening for the sake of all beings.

Settle now into your practice. I invite you to practice whatever you like, but you might consider these simple instructions: Do not follow the past. Do not anticipate the future. Allow the mind of now to settle non-conceptually and clearly.

It can be difficult to follow such simple instructions. Just allowing the mind to settle on its own, not making it settle, not trying to do anything, not trying to fix the mind, not correcting anything. If thoughts capture attention, simply look at the thought. Recognize the thought as a thought. The thought is not what it represents. It's just a thought.

If the mind is too scattered, you may settle the attention on the sensations of breathing at the abdomen. But this is not your object of meditation. You're just giving the mind something to do. So allow it to do that and sit back and let go if you can.

If you don't stir up the water, it's translucent. If you don't try to fix the mind, it will be clear. Just allow it to settle.

Saraha said, his mind tied up in knots, if you just let go, it will be free—there is no doubt.

In these last moments, here's an invitation: let go even of the idea that you're meditating.

Last night as I was talking a little bit about the evolution of One Dharma, my idea of it anyway, I started out with that phrase "metaphysics as skillful means." That is, different metaphysical systems could be understood as skillful means for non-clinging, which is foundational to liberation.

But that was back in 2003, and in the years following, my understanding has changed a little bit. I kind of reversed the order—from metaphysics as skillful means to letting go or not clinging as skillful means for different metaphysical ends. Because I've come to understand, at least for now, that there are some significant differences between or among the different Buddhist traditions. And it felt to me that it was important to acknowledge the differences.

If you remember in the article, there was just one small section at the end where I highlighted some of the differences. So since you've all seen the booklet, today I'd like to elaborate on a few points in it and also to talk about a few things from my experience which I didn't include in the article.

So since non-clinging is one theme of this conference, I thought to begin the talk by highlighting some of the arenas that the Buddha pointed out in which we very habitually do cling. Because if we're clear about where clinging shows up most predominantly, then it becomes easier to recognize it—and if we're lucky, to let go.

One of the most obvious arenas of clinging, one we're most familiar with, I think, is clinging to sense pleasures. We like them. We like them because they're pleasant. And this attachment to sense pleasures, or the idea that somehow they will bring us some kind of fulfillment, is so embedded in our culture. I want to just mention a few advertisements I've seen over the years in magazines, storefront windows, on the internet: "Don't let desire pass you by." "Increase your desire"—as if that's a good idea. "The joy of getting more." "I don't let anything stand in the way of my pleasure." This is what we've been fed our whole lives.

Even as we acknowledge that we probably all do find some gratification in these sense pleasures—we enjoy them and they bring a kind of happiness—I think we all know that in the end they don't really deliver on their promise, which is why we're all here. So that's one very common area where we could watch our minds to see whether the craving leads to clinging or not.

On a more subtle level, we very easily can cling to different meditative states. As the practice deepens, we may experience a lot of light, or calm, or rapture, clarity, joy—a lot of very pleasant meditative states. And it's very easy to then get attached to them and to start practicing for them, instead of seeing that they too are just arising and passing phenomena.

I had a very powerful interview with Sayadaw U Pandita. I had been in Burma for a few months at that point, and my practice, I felt, was really deepening quite a bit. I was beginning to see the momentary nature of things at such refined levels. It was like each sensation in my body—as I was watching the sensation, I felt it just becoming like small distinct beads that were getting smaller and smaller and

smaller. And I thought, oh boy, this is really seeing into impermanence. So I felt really good about it. I go into my interview with Sayadaw, I give him this report, and his only comment was: "You're too attached to subtlety."

It was so revealing, because here I was thinking this is really good practice. But I wasn't assessing that in terms of what my mind was doing. I was assessing it in terms of what was being seen, missing completely the attachment to that level of subtlety. So clinging can take many forms, and sometimes it's very hard to see.

The third arena of clinging—after sense pleasures and meditative states—has tremendous application for our lives in the world. That is attachment to our views and opinions about things, attachment to being right. And what's so amazing is that often we're attached or cling to our opinions about things we know nothing about. But it does not stop us from having this strong opinion.

I want to share a story that has to do with Sariputta, who is the chief disciple of the Buddha, foremost in wisdom, and Dudjom Rinpoche, who was one of the great Tibetan meditation masters of the last century, also renowned for his great wisdom. This was in 1974. I was teaching at Naropa Institute in Boulder—it was the first summer that they opened—and I was walking around. Dudjom Rinpoche was visiting then and giving a talk. Just a little aside: some of you may not know, but the study center actually was given some relics of Sariputta, which are in the stupa. So you might want to visit—you never know.

I was walking around and I saw a poster advertising the talk he was going to give. And the poster said something which just put my mind on tilt. It said: "Dudjom Rinpoche, incarnation of Sariputta." Now, I don't know if that's anywhere in that Tibetan tradition or not, but it was on the poster. So I looked at that, having spent the last twenty, thirty years in Burmese Vipassana, quite certain that Sariputta was not reborn.

Because arhants, that's the fruit of arhantship, according to the Pali canon, early Buddhism. So that was on one side—this is impossible. On the other side, Dudjom Rinpoche was a great master. And well, how to reconcile those two?

The reconciliation turned out to be very simple: I had no idea. All I knew was that the Burmese said this is not possible, while at least the poster representing Tibetan Buddhism said this is how it is. And to realize that I didn't have to have an opinion about what I didn't know—it's amazing that it took that to realize that we don't have to have opinions about things we don't know, even if we've been conditioned to think in a certain way. So that was really helpful.

It's instructive to really investigate, I think, or take interest when we're expressing some strong opinion. Just ask ourselves: is this something that I really know from experience, or am I just repeating what I've been taught or heard? At least we can acknowledge that.

It's also wise to keep an open mind about things that we think we do know from experience, because it's

easy to develop attachment even to knowledge that we have, and to genuine insights that we may have had. The attachment to them does not enhance the insight—it's just grasping, just holding. And I saw this so clearly in myself in the very early years of my teaching, going back fifty years now. Looking back, I remember getting into these fierce Dharma arguments with friends about different Dharma points, and I was so firmly fixed in my idea of what I understood. Over the years that has happily lessened, and it's reflected in my now favorite definition of enlightenment, which is: lightening up.

In some way it's amusing, but I think it actually has deep meaning. We are lightening up the more we let go of both self-view and attachment to our views and opinions, not taking ourselves quite so seriously.

Just as a little footnote to not taking ourselves so seriously: in meditation, one of the things that I've found most helpful is having a sense of humor about my own mind. One meditator once came into an interview, giving a report on his practice. His great conclusion, his great insight was: the mind has no pride. Anybody who's watched their minds will know it will and can do anything. So we want to have a sense of humor about what's actually arising, so that we don't get so caught, so identified with it.

When we cling to our own points of view, even if they're based on some genuine insight, it really closes off the possibility of opening to other points of view, to other possible ways of understanding the Dharma, of understanding ourselves. And when we do cling in that way—to points of view, to meditative points of view, to points of view about the Dharma—it really plants the seeds for a lot of sectarian conflict.

We see this right in Buddhist traditions. What's so amazing to me is that often lineages within a tradition, that can be so close, are often the ones that get into the biggest fights about which is right and which is more pure and which is authentic. All of that is just attachment to view, attachment to opinion. It's not helpful. And we can see the tremendous danger of this in the world today, among different religious traditions—how much conflict and violence is happening because of that attachment to view.

So we want to watch in our own minds and the way we engage in Dharma conversation, just to watch out for when we're getting tight in some way in our expression of what we understand.

There is another possibility. I saw it very clearly at a Buddhist-Christian conference that I was part of at Gethsemane Abbey, the Trappist Abbey where Thomas Merton stayed for a long time. There were twenty-five Buddhists and twenty-five Christian monastics—Benedictine and Trappist. His Holiness the Dalai Lama was there. We would meet every day in the chapter house, with different people giving presentations and then discussion.

One day after the meeting, we were walking outside of the chapter house down a long corridor. At the end of the corridor was a little niche with a statue of the Virgin Mary. As we were filing out, I happened to be just a little way behind His Holiness, who was walking ahead. As I got to the end of the corridor, he stopped and bowed down to the Virgin Mary. Growing up Jewish, it was the last thing in the world that I would have thought to do.

It would never have even entered my mind to stop and bow to that statue of the Virgin Mary. But when I saw the Dalai Lama do that, it just opened something up. Yes—bowing to qualities of compassion, bowing to qualities of love, bowing to all the things that are common in our understanding of the Dharma or spiritual path. And again, it just opened my mind to see how easy it is to get confined, either by attachment to view or our cultural conditioning or how we're brought up, where we narrow our relationship to other ways, other expressions of understanding what our highest values may be.

And then interestingly enough, at the very end of that conference, the abbot of Gethsemane got up and was acknowledging the conference and thanking everybody for coming, this cross-religious dialogue. And he said that what he felt was the most meaningful exchange, the most meaningful expression of traditions coming together, was that he had seen the Dalai Lama bow. It's so meaningful to me—I can feel my eyes tearing up just when I think of it. So it's possible, I think, if we can see where we're holding, to open to a much broader, much more inclusive way of relating to the spiritual path.

The deepest attachment we have—and this is of course central to the Buddha's teaching—the attachment that so conditions our lives and our understanding is the attachment to, the clinging to, the view of self. The idea that there is someone behind all experience to whom it is happening. So that's where a lot of the investigation and our meditative exploration takes place. That's the arena in which we can really take a deep dive.

In many of the discourses in the Pali Canon, there are very clear expressions of both the means and the outcome of the practice. It's actually expressed in just one line: "Nothing whatsoever is to be clung to as I or mine." Non-clinging is the means. The understanding of non-self is the fruition of our practice. Nothing whatsoever is to be clung to as I or mine.

I don't know if you recall, but in the article there was a short quote by Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche. I wanted to repeat it because it just emphasizes this point. He wrote: "The idea of an enduring self has kept you wandering in the lower realms of samsara for countless past lifetimes. The idea of an enduring self—it is the very thing that now prevents you from liberating yourself and others from conditioned existence. If you could simply let go of the one thought of 'I,' you would find it easy to be free and to free others."

This is pointing really to what I would say is in some way the essence or key point of our practice: cutting through basically the illusion of self, of "I." And this is very deeply conditioned, as we all know. Our whole lives revolve around a self-center. And it's our Dharma practice which can really help us find the zero center rather than the self center.

The fruition of non-clinging and this transformative realization of non-self is often described in various Buddhist traditions as the experience of the unborn. The unborn. And from that first experience I had at the end of my Peace Corps time in Thailand to many years later in my initial practice in Dzogchen, I came to realize that the word "unborn" can mean two quite different things. And these two things in one way help explain the historical divergence of different Buddhist traditions. So I just want to mention briefly

two ways of understanding what unborn means.

In one meaning, unborn can refer to a capacity for awareness that is always there, and therefore unborn—it's always there, always has been there. And one expression of this is the Dzogchen description of what is called rigpa. That's usually described as the union of clarity or cognizance and emptiness. It's also sometimes described as self-existing wakefulness—because it's just unborn, an awareness, a self-existing wakefulness that is always there. The practice is really recognizing that and coming to rest in that, to stabilize it.

The second meaning of unborn is the reality of nibbāna. Now I'm referring to the understanding in early Buddhism. So the second meaning of unborn is the reality of nibbāna as cessation, non-occurrence. That before something occurs, it's unborn. Non-manifestation even of awareness or cognizance. And this unborn is not a mere nothingness. This is where the different Buddhist traditions have been going back and forth for two thousand years. But in the understanding of early Buddhism, this meaning of unborn—non-occurrence, cessation, non-manifestation—is not mere nothingness. It is its own reality. That's why it's described in the texts often as the nibbāna element. And there's a famous sutta where the Buddha is saying, "There is an unborn, unmanifest, unformed"—a lot of "uns."

And if there were not this reality, the freedom from samsara would not be possible. Without getting into the philosophical debate about that, the essential point is what the Buddha is saying—and those who have experienced it know for themselves—that it is not a blank nothingness. It is its own reality. And as the Buddha said very often, this is very subtle and hard to understand.

One analogy I have found helpful: if we think of the unborn as analogous to the number zero, nothing manifests. It's zero. But zero has its own power. Zero has its own function. Zero has its own reality, even though there's nothing manifest in zero. Years ago I came across a book called *The Nothing That Is* by Robert Kaplan—a history of the number zero. When I just saw the title, *The Nothing That Is*, I loved it. I thought that is the perfect description, or perhaps not perfect, but a good analogy for this meaning of unborn. The first line in the book was: "If you look at zero, you see nothing. Look through it and you see the world." I love that expression. That's about as far as I could get in the book, because it started to get very mathematical and technical.

This last meaning of unborn is pretty classical Theravada teaching, although it's worth acknowledging that some teachers in the Thai forest tradition hold a view of nibbana that actually seems closer to the first meaning of unborn. So even within Theravada, there are some divergent views. But for the most part, the classical interpretation is what I've just mentioned.

When we think of these two meanings—using a kind of shorthand: Rigpa, or awareness always there, self-existing wakefulness, and the experience of cessation, of zero—we find they are different, with different implications for how we practice, and also very different implications for what happens to a fully realized being at the time of their death. The two different Buddhist traditions will have very

different understandings of what occurs.

But even though there are these significant differences, each in its own way frees the mind from identity view, frees the mind from the sense of self, the view of self, the belief in self. In the early Buddhist view, identity view is uprooted from the very first realized glimpse of nibbana, of touching that zero center. A function of that experience is to uproot from our mind stream the view of self, because in that moment it has been transcended. We've experienced the reality beyond it, and from that point on, we're no longer holding that view.

From the other side, identity view is weakened and eliminated through the practice of stabilizing the realization of Rigpa, because in Rigpa also, identity view is not present. If my colleagues in the Tibetan traditions feel I say anything incorrect, they can let me know in one of the panel discussions.

But there's an important caution here in all of these traditions, whether we're practicing the later traditions which often emphasize this self-existing awareness as the ultimate understanding, or early Buddhism which sees nibbana, the cessation even of awareness, as the ultimate reality. The same caution applies: namely, that the uprooting of identity view, by whatever means, still leaves a lot to be done.

There's a very vivid example of this in a simile the Buddha gave, described in the Pali texts, for the different stages of awakening. The simile really struck me because it highlights this point so clearly. He likened people on the path to a herd of cattle crossing a ford in a very fast-moving river—quite challenging for the herd to cross over. He said the strong bulls and great mother cows cross quite easily, corresponding to those who are either fully enlightened or what are called non-returners, the third stage of enlightenment, but powerfully awakened because they have already uprooted desire and aversion. You can imagine it's quite an accomplishment. These are the powerful practitioners who cross quite easily. Then come the young cattle, who have attenuated desire and aversion. They cross, but with a little less firm footing than the great bulls and strong mother cows. And finally the stream-enterers—these are people, again in the tradition of early Buddhism, who have already uprooted identity view, who have had the first glimpse of nibbana. This is not a small accomplishment. The view of self has been uprooted. But the Buddha likened them to feeble young calves who will make it across, but with difficulty.

The image points out that even practitioners who have had deep realization and have uprooted the view of self are not quite at the beginning, but there is still a lot of work to do for full awakening. As I mentioned in the article, I think this is so important to emphasize, because something I've seen—and perhaps many of you have seen—is that very often people can have genuine realization and some really deep understanding, and then get attached to that as if everything is done. These folks can then get engaged in rather unskillful behavior, thinking it's all coming from their deep realization, but it's not. It's really coming from all the work that still needs to be done. It's important that this be seen and understood.

So how do we reconcile the uprooting of identity view with the understanding that there's still a lot more to do?

And I came across it in a book on the teachings of the 11th or 12th century Korean Zen master, Chinul. There's a book of his teachings called *Tracing Back the Radiance*. It's a wonderful book highlighting his teachings, and he framed them in a way that I so appreciate. The frame for all of his teaching was sudden awakening, gradual cultivation.

So he's acknowledging, yes, awakening can be a sudden moment where we really penetrate through the illusion of self. But that's not enough. Sudden awakening, gradual cultivation—that's what's needed after those moments.

This is what he said, and I think you'll recognize very clearly the point that he makes: "Although we have awakened to original nature"—here's the line—"beginningless habit energies are extremely difficult to remove suddenly. Hindrances are formidable and habits are deeply ingrained."

I love that. Hindrances are formidable. They are, and they are deeply ingrained. And that's why even after a moment of sudden awakening, the gradual cultivation is necessary.

He goes on: "After awakening you must constantly be on your guard. If deluded thoughts suddenly appear, do not follow after them. Then and only then will your practice reach completion." But then he adds a very important point: "Although you must cultivate further, you have already awakened suddenly to the fact that deluded thoughts are originally void and the mind's nature is originally pure."

Do you see how he puts it together? He's acknowledging the power, the transformative power of that moment of cutting through, that moment of going beyond the view of self. He acknowledges the power of that and how it changes how we relate to everything in our lives. And yet the gradual cultivation still needs to happen. For all of us, and certainly for myself, I felt that this is a very complete expression of how our path unfolds.

In the Theravada tradition, there is a pretty clear framework for understanding these two elements—sudden awakening and gradual cultivation. As I mentioned, from the first glimpse of Nibbana, the view of self is uprooted. That's gone; it is not going to arise again. From that point on, there is no doubt about the path. Enlightenment is guaranteed. We're firmly on the path, and there's no going back. But still, the other defilements remain. We're still like the feeble young cattle. There's still desire and aversion and restlessness and conceit. All of these qualities are still present in our mind.

I want to spend a little time focusing on the particular defilement of conceit, which in Pali is called *māna,* because it highlights how we can have realized the truth—realized the truth of non-self—yet still have a persistent, underlying feeling of "I am." That's the meaning of *māna*. It's translated as conceit, but there are different connotations in English. In this Buddhist context, conceit is this I am-ness. It can be very obvious, and it can be a very subtle background.

Māna, this conceit of "I am," can take different forms. It can take the form of comparing ourselves with others—I am this in relationship to others. That is, feeling better than, feeling worse than, feeling equal to.

We may think, "Well, I don't really do that." But it would really be interesting to notice—I've observed this in myself. We meet somebody, maybe for the first time, and we're friendly and engaging. But how often are there some background thoughts of comparison going on? "Oh, they're shorter than I am." Or whatever. "They have more hair than I do." It can be that trivial, or it can be a little more meaningful.

But that's an expression of this māna, this conceit—"I am" in relationship to this.

It can also refer to the projection of this "I am-ness" over time. Every time we're caught up in thoughts of, "Oh, I was this," or "I did this in the past"—notice what the subject of that sentence is. "I was this in the past. I did this in the past." Projected into the future: "I will do this. I will go there." And of course in the present: "I am this now."

So this māna—I hope you can get a sense of why it's so deeply conditioned, why this pattern continues even after the view of self has been uprooted. We understand that there's no self, but "I am-ness" continues until full enlightenment. That's how deeply conditioned it is.

But because identity view has been uprooted, we can then begin to see māna. Even these thoughts and feelings associated with "I am," this "I am-ness"—we begin to experience and understand the very "I am-ness" as being selfless. It's just a pattern. It's a deeply rooted pattern that's there until full awakening, but after having uprooted identity view, we see: yes, this is just an empty pattern, empty of self. We see this as being selfless.

Having finally put all this together, these days I am totally delighted when I see māna arise in my mind. I love it. And I love it for two reasons. And it arises quite enough to be delighted a lot of the time.

One of the reasons I'm delighted is that I would much rather see it than not see it—to recognize, "Oh yeah, that's māna," instead of not recognizing it and being caught up and identified with that pattern. So just the seeing of it is freeing.

And then the second reason I'm so delighted is knowing that it's not uprooted till full enlightenment. Every time I see it—"Oh, māna"—I feel like I'm working on full enlightenment. I'm working on the end of the path. So that gives me a lot of joy to see that, okay, I'm really investigating something that is that deep.

This understanding has very practical applications. I'll tell a little story about this. I think most of you know Bhikkhu Anālayo, who lives right down the lane here. We had become friends during the time that he's been living here at the Study Center. And one year—he's on retreat a lot of the time—during one period, we were both going to be on retreat at the same time. I was doing a self-retreat in my home, just up the road. He was down in his cottage here. So I knew we were both practicing.

And in my practice, just one afternoon, I was frittering away some time. I didn't know what I was doing. And the thought that arose in my mind was, "I'll bet Anālayo doesn't fritter away his time. He's so disciplined and such a good yogi." When I had that thought, I just started getting down on myself a little

bit. "Joseph, get it together. Be a little more disciplined."

But it didn't take long—I don't know, maybe five minutes of wallowing in that self-judgment—and then I realized: that's just māna. That's just comparing mind. As soon as I recognized māna—yeah, just another empty selfless pattern—in the moment that I recognized it for what it was, the whole thing just dissolved. The comparing dissolved.

All the feelings I had about that self-judgment dissolved because I recognized that it was just mana creating that result.

I find this tremendously freeing because we get caught up in this kind of comparing so often. And then to the degree that we're identified with it, we can have all kinds of self-judgment going on. To see it for what it is, is very freeing.

A few years ago, I had an experience which really showed me the very ways conceit, this conceit of "I am," arises and is sustained. It turned out to reveal just how radical the Buddhist teachings are.

Just as a little side note, the usual refrain at the end of the Buddhist discourses—again, these are in the Pali Canon—the little sentence at the end of almost every discourse is, "The bhikkhus were satisfied and delighted in the Blessed One's words." But at the end of one sutta, it says, "The bhikkhus did not delight in the Buddha's words." That's very startling.

This is at the end of the first discourse in the Middle-Length Sayings called "The Root of Existence." It's a difficult sutta to understand. It describes the very subtle ways the sense of self is conceived in the very subtle stances the mind takes in relationship to experience. This is pre-thought, way beneath the level of thought. Just in the course of everything we do, the mind takes stances, different stances, in relationship to those experiences. This sutta describes four different stances the mind takes which create—and the Buddhist term is "conceives of"—the view of self.

I had read this many times, and kind of my mind glazed over it a little bit because the sutta is very complicated. I thought, well, that's interesting Buddhist philosophy. But what I've done for quite a few years now on my self-retreats, instead of reading the suttas, I listen to them on Audible. They're all there. For one credit, you get the whole Majjhima Nikaya. It's quite amazing, and it's read really well. I've just taken to listening to the sutras, so it's like the Buddha's giving the evening dharma talk.

What I found is that listening, things go in in a very different way. For me—and I think perhaps it's common—much more powerful. Every retreat I do, every self-retreat, I'm always learning something from the suttas that I had read but hadn't had any impact. In listening, suddenly: oh, that's what this is about.

In listening to this very complicated sutta, there was one aspect that became clear. The four ways it describes the stance the mind can take in relationship to experience: it can conceive, and again, this is pre-thought, not thinking about this, just a habitual way of relating. We could conceive of the self as being

the experience—"I am this experience." Or we can conceive of the self as being in the experience, or being apart from the experience, or that the experience belongs to me. Those are the four ways outlined in the sutta.

When I heard this, it was particularly one of those stances that, as I was listening, just jumped out. I could connect totally with what it was saying. It was very apparent, kind of in walking meditation. It was the line "conceive of the self being apart from experience." I realized that when I'm walking—and it's in the sitting too, but it was just very obvious in the walking—being really mindful, mindful of the sensations and of the movement and all of that, the mind was taking a stance apart from it, in being mindful of it. That was just super clear to me.

After I had heard this, I was outside walking up and down my driveway. I wasn't doing the Vipassana creeping along—I was walking at a more or less normal pace, but being mindful. And seeing, yes, being mindful of. There was a stance apart from the experience.

I was seeing it clearly. But then I thought, well, what do I do about this? Because there's no instruction, at least that I remember, in the sutta that says, okay, these are the four ways, now do this, this, and this, and you'll be free of them. I had no idea. I saw it clearly, but I had no idea what to do.

So I just started playing, which is my wont on retreat.

I really like to play with my mind. So I just said to myself, "Joseph, stop conceiving." That's all I could think of to do, since it was this conceiving of being apart from. "Joseph, just stop conceiving."

And then quite amazingly—this was completely out of the blue and unexpected—for a very brief period of time, maybe ten or twenty seconds, not long, all that sense of I am-ness completely fell away. There was no residue of I or self in that brief period of time.

Then I thought, well, am I just making all this up? But it turned out to be replicable. Periodically I would say, "Joseph, just stop conceiving," and again, for ten seconds, fifteen seconds, it all fell away. There was no sense of anyone there at all.

This experience reminded me of the famous Bahiya Sutta, which I also mentioned in the article: "In the seen, let there be just the seen. In the heard, just the heard. In the sensed, just the sensed. In the thought, just the thought." The sutta goes on, but the person to whom the Buddha was giving this teaching heard it and became fully enlightened, because this sutta gets to the heart of non-self. In the seen, just the seen—just what is seen, just what is heard, just what is sensed, just what is thought.

The second part of the sutta says, "When for you there is only the seen, and so forth, then there is no you in connection with that. When there is no you in connection with that, then there is no you there. When there is no you there, you are neither here nor there nor in between the two. Just this is the end of suffering."

For me, this was such an unexpected experience. It revealed a new level of understanding what non-self means. It goes beyond uprooting the view of self—even the deep realization of that, the uprooting of that identity view as the frame for how we experience life. It went beyond that to not having any sense at all of I am. There's no you there, there's no you here, there's no you in between.

I'm going to add a little side note here. One time I was in India with my teacher Munindraji, and he gave a three-hour talk on twenty-one kinds of silence. So I've been very conscious of time ever since then. I hope you're doing okay for another five or ten minutes.

Talking about that experience, when even the conceit of I am completely falls away—just for those short periods of time, but it was a glimpse, a taste of what that is—I want to give two examples of why I felt this to be so radical in terms of what the Buddha is really teaching.

In one sutta, the Buddha is talking about the five aggregates as being impermanent, unsatisfactory, and non-self. He goes through the physical elements, feeling tone, perception, mental formations, consciousness—referring to these five aggregates, which is really the totality of our experience. He said, "Whatever is not yours, abandon it. When you have abandoned it, that will lead to your welfare and happiness."

Now, abandonment here doesn't refer to abandoning the aggregates. It's referring to abandoning the clinging and attachment to the aggregates. But then he gave an example of what that would mean, and the example to me is startling and radical.

He said, "Suppose people were to carry off the grass, sticks, branches, and foliage in this grove, or to burn them, or to do with them as they wish. Would you think, 'People are carrying us off, or burning us, or doing with us what they wish'?" And they replied, "No, Venerable Sir." "For what reason?" "Because the branches, the foliage, the sticks—that is neither self nor what belongs to self."

Then, referring back to the aggregates: "So whatever is not yours, abandon it." He had been teaching that the aggregates do not belong to anyone.

They're empty of self. There's no self contained in them or within them. Whatever is not yours, abandon it—again, abandon attachment. When you have abandoned it, it will lead to your happiness and welfare.

The reason this image sticks in my mind so powerfully is that even after identity view is uprooted, even with the understanding that there's no self, if people were to burn me or carry off my legs or my arms, I would probably be a little reactive. But the Buddha is giving the example for somebody who is fully realized—they would not be taking any of that to be self, as self.

There are different stories in the texts where the Buddha describes past lives. In one, he was a hermit, and a jealous king saw him teaching the queens. The king became angry and ordered his soldiers to cut off the arms and legs of this hermit. As the Buddha tells the story, even then, he felt no aversion, wishing only for

their welfare and happiness. Okay, I think there's a little more work to do here.

So that's one example of why this seems so radical to me. And I want to emphasize one point: it also means, or includes, non-attachment to and non-identification with consciousness. We often forget that piece. We think, okay, I can really let go of attachment to the body, to thoughts, to emotions, perhaps for some periods of time. But we still subtly identify with the one who's knowing it all. Consciousness very often becomes the last holdout of this sense of self, because it's very hard to see.

One other example of how this experience felt to me—an image that came to mind afterwards, which perhaps highlights just how mind-blowing this understanding is. I wish I knew another name for "radical," because it really is such a profound shift.

The example that came to my mind was of a character in a movie. The movie is telling some story, and there's this character engaging with everybody else. Then at a certain point, he or she—the character—understands or experiences that all they are is pixels of light. That's all that's really happening. Pixels of light not belonging to anyone. And it's not that the character is aware that it's pixels of light. The character has disappeared. The character is no longer there. It's just the reality of what is actually happening.

Does that strike you? I find that a totally amazing understanding of what our practice is about and where it's leading.

Of course, a very big question remains for us along the path, even just conceptually, or if we've had brief glimpses of what this means—real experiences where the character is no longer there, where it's just the mental and physical elements playing out, analogous to pixels of light. No one there.

So the very important question remains: how do we integrate these two levels? The level of no one there, and the level of being the character, living our lives, engaged in conventional reality—which is where we spend most of our time. It's really important to explore what we do with this understanding, with this insight, in terms of how we live our lives.

One way of understanding this integration is contained in the teaching on the two truths: relative truth and more ultimate truth. Relative truth is simply our conventional way of being. There is a sense of self, and we engage—I'm here, you're there—just our ordinary lives at the relative level of truth. The more ultimate level of truth, and this could be parsed in many different ways, but one way of understanding it: more ultimate truth is the level of pixels, just the rise and fall of the aggregates moment after moment, where there really is the felt experience of no one there.

This integration was expressed beautifully by one Tibetan teacher when someone asked him, "Is the self real?" He said, "Yes, the self is real, but not really real. You exaggerate it."

I think that captures it. The self is real in the sense of how we live our lives, engaged on this relative level,

but it's not really real. When we understand that from the more ultimate level, then we can engage on the relative level with much greater freedom, with much less attachment, with much less clinging. We begin to live with more spontaneity, with more ease.

The question that still remains in my mind: what will it be like when it's more than just glimpses? These were ten seconds, twenty seconds, really brief. What will it be like when the mind is fully awakened and it's not just glimpses? I realize that remains to be seen. But it's a real inspiration, continuing on the path.

Thank you for your kind attention. I didn't go three hours.

After a break for discussion

*Norman Fischer:** I really loved this, Joseph. I have something to say because I just said this to you—it was very inspiring and illuminating the way you described with some precision moments that came to you, unexpected as they do. This is lovely to hear. And I appreciate very much the granularity, the precision with which you describe these things.

I feel that's something good to learn as a practitioner—that it is very liberating to see the pixels and not get lost in the whole. And in that way, as you suggested, to actually get the wholeness that also includes oneself. So yes, it was very inspiring.

We share a love, I think several of us, for Chinul. I was telling Joseph I taught with Robert Buswell decades ago at Stanford and learned about Chinul then. He has really stayed in my heart since then.

I also really appreciate the way you are showing different echelons, different dimensions of the path that can look very different indeed. Dzogchen looks very different. It's very shocking to be a sutra practitioner, even in the Mahayana, for a long time and then hear, "Oh, you know, you have a moment of rigpa and that's the realization of emptiness." And we're taught, "No, that takes three countless eons. Don't get ahead of yourself."

So these have been koans and riddles for me for a long time, and I think it's worth reflecting on how that could possibly be. Either way, if you get stuck on either notion as being the only option, you're definitely going to be in trouble, because the world of awakening is way more wide open than that. I feel you have suggested that, and I really appreciate it. And also, my first time hearing a talk by Joseph Goldstein—so, big day. Thank you.

*Guo Gu:** Thank you so much, Joseph. Of course I appreciate your talk, but I appreciate more your selfless presence, your humility. So thank you.

There are several points I want to touch on. Since we're on Chinul—Chinul got it from Zongmi. Zongmi, this Chinese master from the eighth century, elaborated on these different variations of sudden and gradual. He was both a Chan master and a Huayan master. So he elaborated: gradual practice, sudden awakening; sudden awakening, gradual practice; gradual practice, gradual awakening; sudden practice,

sudden awakening—different calibers of beings. So it's a delight to hear you cite Chinul.

Some of the other points: in the Chan tradition, the glimpse of no-self awakening—it's not the uprooting of the identification of the self. It's way down the preliminary stages. So I think the terminology... a lot of people use these terms, but there's more to explore in that.

And for the seeing one's self-nature, which is none other than the selfless state—even though the language may be phrased as "seeing Buddha nature," Buddha nature is the nature of emptiness. It's not self.

For the Chan tradition, a person may be in that state—a glimpse—or may be in it for days, weeks, months. And it's important to understand that the practice is definitely not finished. Definitely. It's important to continue the practice, because at that point, it becomes very clear when self is present. Once a person has the experience of no self, it becomes very clear what selfing is.

Sometimes I use the analogy of cleaning windows. A person can polish the window so it's spick and span. Even birds may not know the window is there—they might fly right through it. But the difference between window and having no window at all is completely different. It's like night and day.

Any subtle reification, any selfing—the four ways of identifying with experience—it's like a thorn poking at you. Now, of course, depending on the depth of the experience, if a person has a shallow experience, then it's possible to take the window as a thing. But for a person who has had—I'm going to just use the word experience even though that's problematic—no window, for them to fall back and start taking windows and taking "spick and span" as something... it's just stupid, silly.

And that transition, that shifting, the person needs to experience this again and again and again. Not in a seeking way, but in a natural way. There are methods in the Chan tradition to cultivate this, because cultivation continues. Most of the Chan teachings bring the person from a scattered state to concentrated, from concentrated to unified, from unified to the initial breakthrough. But there are approaches that continue after that, post-awakening.

And it's like what you have shared so intimately. It's these moments of unpredictability, unanticipated. Sometimes a person will slip into it. Sometimes it's like a breakthrough. And sometimes, even in dream, one can slip into it. Because the fact of windowness and no window at all is so radically different, these differences are readily apparent.

Another thing about Majjhima Nikaya 1, the sutta that you mentioned—the quick way that the Chan tradition identifies those fourfold problematic ways that we relate to everything, the shortcut approach to identifying the problem, is self-consciousness. Self-consciousness is like the raw, fundamental expression of grasping.

And this was in your booklet, your article about mindfulness. I feel this is a point that we can also explore. Because most people can't distinguish between mindfulness and self-consciousness. In other words, they

take whatever object of meditation as the fourth one—as mind. So they're watching themselves washing dishes, watching themselves walking, watching themselves. Or they're a bystander—the third one—apart from it, some kind of witnessing. All of that is just self-consciousness.

And same with the first two, which are subtle forms of identification: with it, and in the midst of it. So the first two are subtle, the latter two are kind of coarse. This may be something we can all explore to clarify: What is the popular term mindfulness? How does one actually engage in it?

So the Chan approach—one of the Chan approaches—is not allowing practitioners to have anything to abide in, to hold on to, to objectify. Because that's our tendency. We make everything into a thing. And once we make it into a thing, we're through.

That's why in one of the early suttas—Malunkya or Mulaka, I don't know which one—the Buddha says, once you experience the thing, if you experience the object of your meditation... I forget what the object was that he said, but if you experience it, that's not mindfulness. This is very radical. I think most people may not notice because I'm supposed to experience my breath, when I walk. But he says when you experience it, that's not mindfulness—you're already off, that's not it.

So what he's saying is, again, this is a facet of self-consciousness: making everything into a thing. The Chan approach, one way, is to engage in what I call the practice of wonderment—which is not a thing. It's a question that generates a particular feeling tone. And the feeling tone is grounded in the sense of not knowing.

But you cannot use your thinking mind, you cannot reify it into a thing, because that's making it into a thing. So one is just left in this kind of non-conceptual state, yet wakeful, receptive. And that is one way to answer your question.

I would just like to respond to clarify a point that you highlighted, which is that the description of that experience I mentioned at the end was not what I was referring to as the uprooting of the view of self. That uprooting function was not about what I described. Rather, the uprooting function happens in the experience of the unborn. And the experience of the unborn is very different than what I was describing as glimpses of a mind free of "I am."

So it was very clear that that was not the unborn or a nirvanic experience, because it's that one which, just as you said, is the radical uprooting. And interestingly enough, I'm glad you brought it up—one of the examples I've used in my teaching is the difference between a clear window and no window. That distinction is critical. And it's the experience of the unborn which is the no window. So what I was describing at the end was a different experience than that. I just wanted to clarify the two different levels.

Could you clarify that exactly? In other words, how does that experience of no "I am" relate to the experience of the unborn? Is it a step toward it in some sense? Are they totally unrelated?

I'm trying to find the right frame for the response. So that moment of the unborn, of that experience—that's the first glimpse of nirvana in the understanding of it in early Buddhism. That is the radical break. And I think that's what you were referring to. Everything is different from that point because we've gone beyond this whole mind-body process. And so that view of self, it just doesn't make any sense at all. One has experienced something beyond that, namely the unborn, non-manifest, non-occurring. That's the powerful moment.

But as I said, and we all know, there are many defilements which still remain, including the conceit "I am." So what I was describing at the end was more a deeper dive into that. But that's very different than that moment of uprooting. And the conceit "I am," the reason it was so momentary, you know, a short period, is because that level of experience did not uproot conceit. Because that level was not going beyond. It was still all of this, but seen free of the "I am-ing." But it's still—that was not a transcendent experience. That was like a deeper understanding of this.

Whereas the moment of the unborn, that's transcendent. Beyond this. That's beyond this. And that's why it's so powerful and has that uprooting function. And that is the difference between having the mind really still and clear and all that—the clean window—and no window at all.

If I may, I just want to comment a little bit and start by saying, Joseph, I really, really appreciate your talk. This is maybe the third talk that I've heard of yours, and I resonated so much with what you said. I appreciate also the sense of humor that you brought to it, and the introspection and intimacy.

But to John's question, maybe this: The constructed phenomena is what is being seen as experience. So if we want to see that clearly as a clean window, then those are the Bahiya moments where the observer merges with the phenomena, or that's what it feels like. Actually, it's more like the observer falls off, and the mere knowing is the thing. There's no separation between subject and object, and there's no one observing object. That's a conventional way that we talk about in early Buddhism. We do talk about subject and object, but that's a conventional way that can fall away very clearly. And that is still looking, though, at constructed phenomena.

But constructed phenomena, no matter how clear the window is, is ceasing. It's ceasing entirely.

And I really—you all will see that my talk tomorrow is going to dovetail very nicely with what Joseph said. But just to say, the connection is that by our ability to, with precision—even "allowing" is too much—but to be present for the cessation of one experience without picking up the next experience, then there is where

what Joseph is calling the unborn, or nibbāna, or the unconstructed, the non-experience, is apparent. And then another moment of experience arises and takes that as the object, and that's where we see very different understandings of what happened there, or how it's described, or how it was known. But it is for that reason—for the reason of cessation—that by studying the self, we can know what is the non-self, what is the unborn.

I wanted to say also, just leading on from that, or perhaps moving on a little bit, I really appreciated how you spoke about māna and seeing māna and knowing māna as also mere experience, mere phenomena. Phenomena rolling on, as we like to say. And it reminded me of a framework that I like to share with folks. If all things go as planned, I will be back here in January to teach about this. Sometimes I call it "three-layer cake," but actually it's more like three facets of the jewel, or three different forms of investigation of any particular kind of experience.

One being the content—when we talk about taints, or tendencies, or wholesome and unwholesome qualities. There's the content view, which is super important. Without actually doing that part of the work, that's called spiritual bypassing. So that's a very important aspect of practice.

But then there's another perspective, potentially, on any given experience, which is this process perspective that the five aggregates is really talking about. Contact happens, and it spins off certain aspects of mind that we can observe—responses, reactions to that, and so on. And that is one way of arriving at that more dry-eyed view of, yes, even deluded thought is just that. It is just that process unfolding moment after moment after moment.

And then the third view, which is one that the Buddha brings up very specifically on the night of his enlightenment, is the specific conditionality—getting even deeper into what can be known as present.

So to the question of whether there really is a self, my answer would be: well, is there really a mirage, or is there really a shadow? Go find out. Have a look. There is such a phenomenon, and yet it is a mirage.

*Another teacher:** Yes, indeed. That's what I really like. It's real, but not really real. So I think that's what you're pointing to.

I wanted to respond to John's question about the difference between a glimpse versus the unborn, the deathless. From the Chan perspective, it's not that they're wholly separate. It's more like different shades, different gradations. It's like getting a few drops of water in your mouth. Did you taste water? Yeah, you actually did taste water. But did that have any transformative effect? Pretty much none. In fact, the person can turn around, take that experience as a thing, and be very proud of it. So now it becomes another object of attachment.

But the water or the wetness is in line—you could say, in accordance. So the issue is, beyond these glimpses, to be in the experience and actually engage in the complexity of life. That's where one sees the functioning of the wisdom for selfless function, which is just compassion. So that's why the practice needs

to continue, again and again, so that these experiences will deepen.

The analogy I have is like a piece of paper. You poke a hole through it. Is there a hole? Yeah, there's a hole. But basically, you can still use the paper to write. You can do anything with the paper. It's still pretty much intact. Versus you start to poke it with a finger, or you just shred the paper. Now that paper becomes useless. But these little holes—you keep poking, keep poking.

So the litmus test would be the transformation in relation to—

In behavior, I guess. Behavior in relation to greed and aversion. The fundamental poisons.

Thank you. Thank you very much, both of you.

Audience Discussion

Anyone have a question they want to ask? Or comment. Yes, comment, correction, admonishment—no, that's welcome.

As I've been listening—for me, I've been practicing in the Theravāda tradition, reading the little booklet, and now listening to the different viewpoints. There's an understanding of the difference between, let's say, the two traditions. But experientially, I found myself listening to Guo Gu just now, nodding yes, yes. And so experientially, they do not feel separate.

It's like the self-view dropping away and then those flashes of nothing. It feels like what's been described as the obscurations disappearing. The seeing gets clearer, clearer, clearer. The obscurations disappear. There's no separation. So it feels very much like what's described in the other traditions—that unity and no separation, just function.

And with that, it's connected again to: if you look into that, there's no clinging, because who would cling and what would they cling to? I'm finding that experiences that sound like what's described over here are totally connected with what's described over there. And ultimately, the gradual cultivation is that with more clear seeing, more dropping away of separation, there's the dissipation of desire and aversion, and then it's love, kindness, compassion. That's it.

You've mentioned several times that these differences are really important, so I'm wondering about that. How to practice with that sense of—are they really different? I mean, I know they are, but... are they really different? Are they *really, really* different? Ultimately, it's all passing experience anyway.

I'll take a stab at this. Tell me if I'm misrepresenting the later traditions, but it seems to me the bottom line of any practice is: have the defilements been uprooted or not? It doesn't matter the technique or the method—if that's the result, then it's serving the purpose of coming to the end of suffering. Because when the Buddha was asked what he taught, very often his response was really simple: he teaches suffering and the end of suffering. That's what all our practice is about.

Ending suffering in ourselves and helping others with that—this is what our practice is about. What is the cause of suffering in our lives? It's the defilements in the mind. And I think there are different approaches and different methods. One is—well, I think they all share—seeing that the defilements themselves are empty of self. But that seeing is still not the same as uprooting them. And so that's why I say whatever method, whether it's Zen or Tibetan, that seems to me the critical point.

The only thing I would add is something that's already come up, which is—and I can even say this from personal experience—one can fool oneself about what one has realized. So in some ways the touchstone is also: have things actually changed? Especially my behavior. I can even fool myself about having fewer kleshas. "Oh, I've got fewer obscurations. I'm less angry, less attached." And then someone cuts me off in traffic and I'm like... So I do feel like that's the touchstone. And as you said, in life, out there, if that behavior hasn't changed, then all the talk about removing defilements is just talk.

I think probably if we can go to essence—maybe two questions, maybe one. We want to leave time for a practice. Is there another question or comment?

"The Buddha spoke of suffering and the end of suffering. I find myself wondering if there is actually an endgame. You described subtler and subtler levels of attachment to all these different domains. Who's to say that even the cattle in that Strong Heard story, that power across the fjord, who's to say that a day or so later, māna is not going to show up in that person? And then, if one actually uproots all the defilements, how does one know? What's the measure? It seems a little bit qualitative."

So I'd like to ask you a question. If you put your hand in fire, do you know that it burns?

"Sure."

Do you have any doubt about it?

"None."

In the genuine experience of things being uprooted, there is that quality of certainty. And it's very different than saying, "Yeah, it looks to me like the defilements are uprooted and I don't see them anymore." That's on a whole different level. That's just personal perception of how our mind might be. The experience that results in the uprooting of the defilements—which is the experience of Nibbāna, or the unborn, or whatever word you like—it has that same immediacy and certainty as putting your hand in fire and knowing it burns.

That's why one of the defilements uprooted at that first glimpse, in addition to uprooting the view of self, is doubt. Because it's exactly like that. You know from experience the zero center. That's very different than having various experiences and then misinterpreting them or clinging to them.

So again, I would just suggest two things. One, don't believe me. And two, as we continue our practice and each of us has different levels of these kinds of experiences, then we know for ourselves. We know whether it's like putting your hand in fire or not, because we've had the experience. So it's not a question of taking any of what's said as dogma. Take it as an invitation to explore, not to believe. And I think that's really important—that we find out for ourselves the meaning and implications and experience of these various experiences.

In order to leave enough time, should we do one more question? I think not, because the meditation needs a little introduction. So let's transition now. Thank you very much. Thanks to everyone for their comments, and to our teachers also. We'll move to a practice now.

This is a meditation that I actually have not taught quite in this way before, so you are all the guinea pigs, and you can let me know afterwards how it goes.

You may remember in the booklet I described briefly how the language we use to describe things very much conditions how we experience things. The language we usually use describing our experience in the world is in the active voice: "I'm hearing a sound"—subject, verb, object. This is our usual grammatical framework for how we language our experience.

What I found to be extremely interesting and freeing in meditation is to reframe the experience—the language of it—in the passive voice. So, for example, instead of "I'm knowing a sound," it becomes "a sound being known," "a thought being known," "a sensation being known." In this grammatical construction, the "I" has disappeared. The "I" is no longer the subject.

When we frame our experience to ourselves in this way, I found it's a very simple and immediate way of touching into the selfless nature of experience. It's very immediate.

If I can go out on a limb, in this way of experiencing—which is really a way of practicing that Bāhiya Sutta, "in the seen just the seen, in the heard just the heard," not "I'm seeing, I'm hearing, I'm thinking"—a sound being known, a thought being known, a sensation being known, no one there, things are known immediately, exactly, precisely, not a moment before, not a moment after. Going out on a limb, this might be one way of experiencing what later traditions called the non-dual.

So this is what I'd like to have us do in the meditation. I'll guide it a little bit, but just keep in mind the general frame is holding the question silently—although I'll guide it a little bit—in any moment: what's being known? Just what's being known, moment after moment. There's nothing to do. Everything is arising by itself. There's nothing to do, not interfering in any way. It's just letting phenomena unfold. And moment after moment, what is it that's being known?

Does this sound clear to you? Okay, let's just try and see what it's like.

Settle into a meditative posture, and at first just open to sounds being known. Nothing to do. Sounds are appearing by themselves and being known spontaneously. Really relax into it. It's completely relaxing and open. Just: sound is being known. No one doing anything. It's like listening to music—not interfering, not manipulating. It's all happening by itself.

Then begin to be aware of the sensations of the breath being known in exactly the same way sounds are being known. Really relax into the natural flow of the breath. Let it come and go just as it is. Don't try to manipulate or change or pull the next one in. Very relaxed, very open. The sensations of the breath are appearing spontaneously in the same way that sounds were appearing. Allow for the breath to unfold in whatever way it does. Trust that your body knows how to breathe.

Be aware of sounds being known now, sensations of the breath being known, and no one is doing anything. Watch out for trying to do something. It's all happening by itself. And if you notice a kind of trying or a little bit of efforting, then it's simply trying being known, or efforting being known. It's completely simple.

Maybe other sensations in the body are appearing and being known. Some may be pleasant, unpleasant.

Simply let them be known. It's all happening by itself.

Be aware of the tendency sometimes to pull the next in-breath in after an out-breath. You kind of initiate it or pull it in. That's just the self getting involved. The breath will come and go in its own time, in its own way. It's simply sensations being known.

In the flow of phenomena, thoughts or images may appear. Simply a thought being known, or an image being known, or an emotion being known. You can let the mind become very open and choiceless—just sitting with what's being known moment after moment, without any directing towards anything in particular. Simply settled back, moment after moment, with what's being known.

And if you feel like you're losing that sense of relaxation, go back to simply being aware of sounds being known. That's so easy.

In these last few minutes, consider this koan: known by what? Is there anything you can find? Things are clearly being known, but known by what?

There's nothing to find. And the not finding *is* the finding. The empty nature of knowing. There's nothing to find, and still the knowing is happening. No one there doing anything.

Sound being known.

Anticipation of lunch being known.

Session with Joseph Goldstein: Non-Clinging, Māna, and the Unborn

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