Tracking Heart-Mind

Patrick Kearney · Notable Dhamma Teachers — Patrick Kearney · 49:30

This morning we're going to talk about the third satipaṭṭhāna, citta, or mind. But we're doing it in a particular context—the context of the method that we're applying.

Yesterday we looked at the thought stream. The thought stream is also part of the third satipaṭṭhāna, the mind, but in particular it's part of the cognitive aspect of mind, which is concerned with thought, perception, and understanding. Today we're going to look at the affective aspect of mind, which is concerned with feeling and emotion.

The structure that we worked with yesterday, and that we'll talk about again today, is that of grounding object and secondary object. The grounding object is where awareness makes its home. This is where we get the stability and the depth that we need to start looking at what's really going on. The way that Mahasi talks about distraction, we utilize distraction—we turn it into a meditation object. Something pulls us away from the grounding object, takes us somewhere else, and we are distracted. As soon as we know we are distracted, that becomes another meditation object, a secondary object, and then we return to the grounding, and so on.

When we were looking at the thought stream, we were looking at it when it appears as a distraction. "I can't settle down because I'm thinking all the time. I'm distracted. I've got to do something about it. What do I do about it?" I turn it into a meditation object. That's how we were working with it yesterday.

Today we're looking at the affective aspect of mind, again when it presents as a distraction. I'm distracted by disturbing feelings or emotions. What do I do about it? It becomes a meditation object. It's always the same response.

The expression that Mahasi Sayadaw taught was obviously in Burmese, and then his Burmese-speaking students translated him into English. What we've been calling "awaring" is what they translated as "noting." Burmese has an ordinary everyday verb meaning to note or be aware. English doesn't have quite the same thing. So the Burmese translators thought, "What can we do?" They chose the verb "to note." In classical English-speaking Mahasi circles, we talk about noting.

This approach of how to deal with a distraction really hit home to me one time in the eighties, when we invited Sayadaw U Pandita out to Australia. He ran his first retreat, which I think went for six weeks. It was quite popular. A lot of people turned up because his reputation had spread; he had become an international guru. But I think the Australian punters had absolutely no concept of what was about to hit them. Most people had a very difficult time.

The manager of the retreat was John Hale. I'd originally met him in India, in Bodh Gaya, but I'd got to know him in Burma. We practiced together for three months. He was the most advanced practitioner that I've ever known, and he was the manager. One of his jobs was that if the meditators needed something urgent and someone had to go to the shop to get it—something like more chocolate, for example—then it was the manager who would do it. He had a time each afternoon where if you wanted something, you could go and tell him. He was available to the meditators at a certain time each afternoon, and these sessions quickly turned into meditation counselling sessions.

I found out about this because the retreat was held at an old Catholic nunnery south of Sydney in the southern highlands. I had established a favourite place for walking meditation, and my route between the meditation hall and the walking place went down a breezeway. In the afternoon there was a lounge there, and that's where John would have his counselling sessions. I would walk past, and there'd be John and a disturbed meditator. When I was finished, I would walk past and there'd be John and another disturbed meditator. Of course, I noted "hearing, hearing" as I walked past.

Every encounter had the same basic structure: a disturbed meditator.

And at the other end of the sofa would be John, sitting there saying nothing but simply radiating compassion. Eventually the meditator would stop talking, and when they fell silent, John would say, "And did you note that?"

That's the only thing he ever said, as far as I could tell. But it summed up the whole situation. That's the method. "I've got this terrible problem. I can't possibly meditate because I've got this problem. What do I do?" You note it. That's the meditation object.

So this is the context in which we operate. You can see it's radically simple. And its very simplicity is what makes it difficult. I remember one time I was explaining that this practice is really, really simple, and one of the meditators objected. "No, it's not. It's really hard." I said, "Yes, it's really hard, but it's really simple." "No, it isn't. It's hard."

What that particular person was missing was that it is its very simplicity that makes it difficult. The conceptual mind is constantly making things more complicated, and we've just got to drop all of that and keep it really, really simple. That's one of the things that makes it so difficult. It also makes it so powerful, because it just cuts through everything. I think it was John who said that this practice is the ultimate paint stripper. He was a builder by trade.

Let's apply this to the affective aspect of mind. But before we go any further, we should talk about this concept of mind. The term being translated here is *citta*, and traditionally it's been rendered as "mind." But that doesn't quite work, because in the European tradition, mind is essentially cognitive in its nature. It's the centre of rationality. Most people, if you asked them what the mind actually does—once they recovered from their surprise at such a bizarre question—might say something like, "Well, it thinks." And

if asked to point to where the mind is located, most people would point to the head. In normal conversation, people often use the terms mind, head, and brain interchangeably.

So we have a very cognitive concept of what mind is, which makes the Buddha's teaching sound very cognitive, because he's always talking about the mind. But for the Buddha, *citta* is not just the centre of rationality. Certainly it is the centre of rationality, but not only that—it's also the centre of mood and emotion. This is the aspect of experience that, in the European tradition, most people would call heart. *Citt a* covers both equally, embracing head and heart. Broadly speaking, you could say it refers to our inner experience.

If you look at the six senses, the first five tend to be public to a certain extent—we share them. So if someone was sitting here this morning complaining about the heat, strongly anxious that the fan should be turned on and the back door opened to let the heat out, most people would be wondering, "What is the matter with this person? Do they have a problem?" Because it's obviously not hot, is it? We share a certain aspect of our experience, and so we have a social consensus about what's going on.

But what any of us thinks about the conditions in this hall is private. Nobody knows what we're thinking. This realm of private experience—this is the realm of the *citta*.

We could call it the inner space within which things happen, and in particular thoughts and feelings. Citta could be translated as "mind" — it works in a lot of contexts. It could be translated as "heart" — in certain contexts, that seems to be clearly what the Buddha is getting at, and sometimes that's what I do, sometimes I'll translate it as heart. Personally, I think the best translation by far is "soul." But that doesn't quite work because the Christians have taken it over and put all this theological meaning on top of it, and we'd have to disentangle all of that. But really, I think soul pretty much sums it up. What you find these days, and what I generally use, is the compromised term "heart-mind" to cover both the affective and the cognitive.

When I say soul, what do I mean? It's all of those things — internal experience. That was the way it used to be used in the European philosophical tradition. I think Aristotle wrote a book on the soul. Ancient philosophers would talk about the soul. I don't know what the Greek word is, but I think the Latin is anima. And, for example, it's what we most tightly identify with as "me" or "mine," looked at from a Buddhist perspective. So who am I? When I say "me," what am I referring to? Partly I'm referring to the body, this particular body, but in particular I'm referring to the citta.

Let's say I go home after the retreat and discover someone has burgled my house. I would feel very offended and I would feel like I have been violated. Well, I'm not talking there about the body, am I? I'm talking about the inner state. This is the citta.

When the Buddha introduces heart-mind, citta, in the Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta, what he talks about is understanding whether or not the citta is coloured by desire or aversion or delusion. He starts with what

is the fundamental colouring of the citta, of the heart-mind, as it presents now. And of course, citta — heart-mind — and vedanā, feelings, these are very closely entwined and cover pretty much the same territory.

So we're talking about what we do when we're distracted by the heart-mind. People sometimes stumble into this when they become aware of disturbing emotions or moods that distract them from their practice. These are quite common. Fear, anger, anxiety, irritation, desire, and so on — these are examples of heart-mind coloured by desire and aversion. What we need to do, again, is become intimate with them, to use them as the meditation object.

Some emotions have a flavour of delusion. Personally, I think boredom has this. It adds to boredom its sense of restlessness, a vague sense of dissatisfaction, and not knowing what to do about it. Usually, emotions flavoured by attraction and aversion are the easiest to notice and the easiest to work with — they're clearer. But emotions flavoured with delusion are more difficult to get a hold of.

So when emotions disturb, when they get in the way of the practice, how do we attend to them? How do we make them a meditation object? The essence of the practice is awareness, as we've been saying, and fundamentally it doesn't matter what the object of awareness is. What matters is the quality of the awaring. If emotion is present and dominant, then emotion becomes the meditation object.

As in working with thinking, when we're working with emotion we're not getting caught up in the content of the emotion. We don't care what the emotion is about. We don't care what story we're telling ourselves — that is irrelevant. It's the felt presentation of the emotion itself that we're looking for.

The other thing, of course, is that mindfulness and emotional difficulties go hand in hand in popular culture because mindfulness has been colonized by the psychology industry. Sometimes people get the idea that if they want to solve their emotional problems, they could practice mindfulness and that would do it. Which is nice, you know—it's good that people are getting into it. But what's important from a meditator's point of view is that when we're working with emotion, we are not trying to solve our emotional problems. That's not the project.

What we're trying to do is become intimate with the fact of the emotion itself. When we do this, we understand the emptiness, the not-self quality of emotion. Emotions are not me and they don't belong to me. They're just natural process, natural phenomena that come and go according to conditions. This is what the practice can reveal. It can't solve our emotional problems. But to discover the emptiness of emotion, we have to be intimate with them and not hold anything back.

Now, one thing which is interesting if we're working with emotion from a Buddhist perspective is that in Pali and Sanskrit there is no word that corresponds to the English word "emotion." The Buddha never talked about emotion because he didn't have a word for it. And this is not surprising because in English, "emotion" was introduced into the language I think in the late eighteenth century and became popular in

the nineteenth. So if you study your Shakespeare, apparently you will never find the word emotion. It doesn't exist because it really didn't exist back then.

The word "emotion" was developed by people who were, particularly in Britain, trying to establish a new supposedly scientific psychology—the science of psychology. And psychology up to then had been the province of religion. The psychologists were the clergy, really, and the language they used was borrowed from theology. The new profession of psychologists wanted to separate themselves from that. They wanted to create their own vocabulary, and they developed this term "emotion." And thus it entered into our language.

For the Buddha, it doesn't work because it's too broad, too general. You notice that we've been working with precision in the awareness. And "emotion" is just too big a target, too vague. We've got to zero in on something. Emotion is complex.

I'll give the example of the emotion of anger. I choose anger because in my meditation practice, the two really disturbing emotions I went through were anger and sorrow. Decades ago, when I was embarking on this practice, I would do these week-long retreats. The first two or three days I would gradually be settling in. And just when I was getting good, suddenly I'd get an upsurge of anger. I'd be really pissed off. I'd be pissed off with people who weren't there. I'd be pissed off with people who were there. And this would be quite disturbing. Then that would fade, and it would be replaced by sorrow. That dominated. Then that would fade, and then the retreat would end. So I never knew what was on the other side.

It was only when it clicked: anger, sorrow—they're both aversion. Anger is aversion directed outwards. Sorrow is aversion directed inwards. But they're both aversion. So when I practice, what becomes clear to me is aversion. Not surprising. Of the three basic movements of the heart—attraction, aversion, delusion—the one I'm most sensitive to, you could say my favorite one, is aversion. I'm definitely an aversion type. So hardly surprising that's what I experienced.

These are the categories of emotion I worked with the most, the ones that were the greatest barrier to me. That's the ones I talk about because that's the ones I'm familiar with. But of course different people have different sensitivities, and different emotions would arise for them.

Let's talk about anger. First of all, we cannot have anger without tension in the body. It is impossible to be angry if the body is completely relaxed. So there's always a physical aspect to emotion.

It's part of the first satipaṭṭhāna, body. And since all body sensations have physical location, we can speak of experiencing anger in the body—in our heart or in our gut. Normally somewhere in the torso, that's where the emotion will appear. So there's a physical aspect to it.

Emotion also has a strong feeling charge, generally either pleasant or painful. Now, I'm completely ignorant about Western psychology, but for me, I wouldn't say that something which is neither pleasant nor painful is an emotion. A mood, I'd call it a mood, sure. But for me an emotion is going to be either

recognizably, reasonably strongly pleasant, or recognizably, reasonably strongly painful—one or the other.

So anger, for example, can be experienced as pleasant. I can enjoy it. I enjoy it when it gives me a sense of power, like the energy—I can harness the energy of it. When I get to see that person next, I'm really going to let them have it. And there's pleasure in that experience. Or anger can be experienced as painful, and usually for me it's when a sense of powerlessness accompanies it. We have the expression "impotent rage"—acutely painful. So there's a feeling aspect to it. This is vedanā, which we haven't talked about actually. This is the second satipaṭṭhāna, the realm of feeling.

Emotion also usually includes some kind of narrative in the mind, some kind of story that I'm telling myself. And this provides the intentionality of emotion—what the emotion is about. So let's say I am angry. Then I'm angry at someone or something, some situation, about something. And this intentionality appears as a story that I'm telling myself, a story that paints me as the victim of some kind of injustice. There's a sense of values built into the story. So this is quite a complex narrative structure that's part of the emotion, an aspect of mind.

So emotion is complex. Very different things come together and then we call that "the emotion of X."

When we're working with emotion in meditation practice, I found that it's best to zero in on the felt essence of the emotion. And I might add, by the way, that in Burma, the Sayadaws never addressed this side of the practice. Never. What they were interested in was the fine detail of the physical sensation or the mental states or whatever. And if you were rocked by disturbing emotion, well, you couldn't do that. It was just impossible. And they had no real advice except "do mettā," which is very difficult when you hate everybody. Basically, they'd just leave you alone until you came out of it, and then you could come back and resume the project. So I had to figure out for myself what to do. This is just my own experimentation that I'm presenting.

I make as my meditation object the felt essence of the emotion as revealed in its elemental quality. And here we're using the elements that we played with in the body, but applying them to the mind, to the citta.

I begin by locating the emotion in my body. Where is it? Where does it live? And if I can't find any particular location, I keep awareness in the heart area. Then I'm directly aware—so I'm aiming at the body, but my target is not the sensation. I'm aware-ing through the sensation to the other side. And when you begin, this might be partly imagination—going through the sensation and looking for the felt elemental quality of the emotion that lies underneath.

So, for example, with anger, I found it to be usually hot, but sometimes cold. I've got a feeling that the most dangerous variety is the cold variety. It's energetic, often highly energetic.

One time I was aware-ing the experience of rage. This was in Chanmyay Yeiktha, in the men's meditation hall, which is quite big. Women always have their own meditation halls in Burma. As one Sayadaw

explained to me, "Men and women together in a dance hall, yes. In a meditation hall, no." And they're quite strict on that. I think it's really good for the women. Not so good for the men. At Chanmyay Yeiktha, the meditation halls were the same size because it was one building—the ground floor meditation hall for the women, top floor for the men, because the men included the monks. You can't have lay people of any variety above the monks.

So the men are on the top floor. And to get to the men's meditation hall, you would walk along the veranda and then up the external staircase. As you're walking along the veranda, slowly, mindfully, receptively, just to the right is the women's hall, full of meditators, and you could feel the blast of energy coming out. It was extraordinary. And then you go upstairs, you walk into the men's hall, and it's flat. Not surprisingly, fewer people there, and the energy just didn't compete. So I think the women are better off with their own meditation halls.

I was up in that hall and I was just getting right into rage. I did it in the standing posture because there's so much energy—I didn't want to sit. I made sure that I had plenty of space around me, eyes wide open, and I could just feel this energy of rage pouring through me. And I was naming it: rage, rage. It was really interesting. I was thoroughly enjoying myself. Very strong samādhi. I don't know if anybody seeing this would have thought, "Oh, he's really getting into it," or whether they were feeling the waves of rage coming out. I don't know. But it felt good. As I said, it was really enjoyable to be just so much with it. And of course at that point I didn't even know what the story was—I was just so fully into the actual elemental quality of it.

And then of course it goes: angry, as I said, usually hot but sometimes cold, always energetic, restless, moving, dry, rough, sharp, sometimes pleasant, sometimes painful. And if I had to put a colour on it—and here we're really getting into the world of imagination—I would say red.

Sorrow, in contrast, I've experienced to be cool, wet, gentle, smooth, and often very strangely pleasant. And if I had to put a colour on it, I would say blue. When I was doing this practice and playing around with it, I asked, "What colour is it?" Oh, it's blue. And it clicked. All those popular songs which I never understood—"I feel blue"—I could never work out why blue. But now it made sense.

So that's the elemental quality. And throughout the whole exercise, I am not interested in the stories I am telling myself. Again and again and again I get sucked into the story, and as soon as I notice it, again and again and again I drop it and just go back to the body. The story tells me nothing useful, except the one bit of useful data it presents: it tells me what emotion currently possesses me. That's useful data. And the rest of it is rubbish.

The work is done in the sentient body, in the feeling body. It's not done in thinking and in perceptions. It's not something we think our way through. The sentient body—this is where we find the sensitivity that lies at the centre of the citta, of the heart and mind. And it's in that central aspect of sensitivity, of vulnerability, that the work is done.

We talked about the Buddha's concept of a sentient being. Our circle of ethical concern extends out to all sentient beings—not with the border at the human species, but beyond that. And the first quality of a sentient being is that a sentient being feels pain. That vulnerability at the centre of the citta—that's what we're aiming for. That's where the work is done, not in the stories.

And if we find this sensitivity, and if we're intimate with it, one thing which is obvious about it is that it changes. So, for example, at some point, the emotion ceases.

Normally, we don't see the cessation, the ending of an emotion in real time. For example, I know I am angry, and then later on I realise I have already calmed down. But I usually don't see the moment that the emotion ends. And equally, we tend not to see the arising of the emotion. Suddenly I realise I am already angry, but usually I've missed the moment it began.

In this practice, however, we get to see the actual moment of cessation and, perhaps later on, the moment of arising. And when we see that moment of cessation—because we're tracking it over time and then it's over—it leaves no aftertaste. Normally, if I emerge from a strong emotion, then for some time thereafter I have a disturbed mood and gradually the citta calms down. But if I'm directly engaged with the elemental quality of the emotion, I see it end and in that moment it's gone completely with no aftertaste. Like I'm in the midst of this storm and then—oh, the storm's over. Sun shining. Oh, that's good. And there's nothing left over.

Tracking all this weakens my determination to identify with the emotions. I don't see the emotion as part of me or as belonging to a particular situation. One time—this was after Burma—I was doing my own meditation at a place in Malaysia. I was doing walking meditation in the evening and suddenly I was ambushed by a disturbing emotion. I forget what it was, but it was very, very familiar. Too familiar. And I was quite shocked because I hadn't experienced this for twenty years. What is going on? Have I made no progress in twenty years? What is this?

But as soon as that alarm arose, the mind went click. And I could see it's got nothing to do with progress because it's got nothing to do with me. When conditions are such, this emotion arises. When the conditions change, it ceases. It's not about me. It's not about my meditation. It's got nothing to do with progress or lack of progress. It's just that when the conditions are there, this emotion will arise. When the conditions change, it ceases. That's it. And as soon as I saw that—click—and it was over, because the conditions just changed.

This is what I mean by seeing the emptiness of emotion. Of course, being human, emotions flow through the sentient body. But we don't grab onto them and build an identity out of them and cling to them ferociously because "this is me and this is who I am and this is what the world is." Rather, oh, there it is—and now it's like a wave that passes through.

The result is a state of what could be described as emotional fluidity. Emotions flow easily and I don't get

stuck in any of them. Normally, there are particular emotions that are my favourites because I am particularly identified with them, and as soon as they arise I feed them with my thinking and use them to construct an identity which is permanent, fixed, stable. As a result, the emotion itself cannot express its natural impermanence. It gets bogged down. It's like there's a stream of emotion flowing through the heart and I'm building a dam, blocking it. No, I'm not going to let it go. And the water level builds up and up, and the pressure builds up and up.

But if I can use the emotion as a meditation object, they just flow completely naturally through the citta. And they're no longer problems because they're no longer about me. They're just events.

I heard something interesting from Joseph Goldstein—I call it "Cowboy Dharma." I was actually doing this last night with obsessive thinking. I'm just so sick of these stories, and I don't know how to handle them, so I sort of started waving at them in the most annoying fashion, going "Ah, bugger off!" And it was quite effective, but I'm not addressing the underlying theme. The Joseph Goldstein technique—this was to a group of beginners, mind you—he was saying that sometimes with loop thoughts, you get out your gun and you shoot the thought. You basically blow it out. Sometimes you've just got to do that.

Which is completely different from what we're talking about.

But it might give you a breathing space. Because basically this whole activity is supremely pragmatic. If it works, it works. Sometimes certain methods work sometimes but not others. For example, because there you're using imagination, you're conjuring up an image to deal with a situation. And I find that if you do that kind of thing, it works best the first time because it's a bit of a shocker. But if the mind gets used to it, it shrugs it off. "You're trying to distract me with that gun? Go ahead and blast away at anything you like. This is what I'm doing."

So as we said before, there's always an element of creativity in this practice, always an element of experimentation. Try something out, see if it works. Whatever works is great. And there's probably no end to the different things one could do. This is what I did. This is what I found successful. That's why I talk about it. But I'm not suggesting it's the only way.

Is there ever any benefit in understanding the story? For example, I've experienced a lot of shame, and it does give you information about skillful behaviour and speech—things you might do differently in the future.

Oh yes, definitely. Particularly once you—we're talking about context. In the context of actual practice right now, "What do I do with this?"—then the story is rubbish and you're staying with the felt elemental quality. But at some point that episode is over and you can reflect back. And that's where you get a clearer narrative sense of what's going on.

So, for example, the story that helped me when I was plagued with these emotions was simply: "Of course these are expressions of aversion. I am sensitive to aversion. So it's quite natural that this should happen." That story really helped because I wasn't blaming myself. I wasn't thinking, "I'm going crazy" or "I'm

incapable of meditating. Most people can meditate; I can't." It was a story that made sense. And it helped settle things. But it didn't stop the problem from arising.

So the context here is that when we're doing the direct aware-ing, the story just gets in the way. But when that's over and we're reflecting on what's going on, then stories can be very useful. And once you clear out the rubbish from the *cinta*, you get a much clearer story of what's going on. Much clearer. And that's very helpful.

So sometimes when you're doing this kind of practice—and the emphasis is on dropping the thinking, dropping the reading, minimum notes, and so forth, just staying with the experience—sometimes either a pressure builds up or something happens and you think, "I've got to reflect on this. What's going on here?" And that kind of reflection can be very useful and very valuable. But you've got to be careful with it, that you don't get caught up in addictive thinking.

So what I would do is make what the tradition calls *adhiṭṭhāna*—determination or resolution. I simply say to myself, "Okay, right now I'll drop the meditation practice and I will think about X." I create a clear boundary. I'm not mixing the practice with thinking. And then I go: think, think, think. I might even write it down. Then, okay, that's done. Now I'll drop the thinking and go back to the practice. I create a border.

And if I'm wondering when to stop? Well, one thing for sure—as soon as I begin repeating myself. Because then it's going around in circles. But the juicy bit is before the repetition comes. And if I look at the notes later on, I think, "Yeah, that was good."

"You said that if you've been aware of the elemental qualities of the emotion deeply, it will often completely drop away in a moment?"

You're potentially there to see that. I wouldn't say it's inevitably going to happen. But once you get into it, you're present the moment it stops. And you can see it. Bam.

"So the period of time where the aftertaste might linger could be very long, but you're aware of that and you notice when it ends?"

In my experience, if I see that moment of cessation, that moment of ending, there's no aftertaste. It's like the mind just moves on. "What's next?"

"So my question was whether if there is an aftertaste, that indicates you're not necessarily deeply..."

That just means the aftertaste is now the meditation object. Keep it simple. Don't start making judgments—"Oh, I wasn't good enough. Oh, I haven't quite got it." This just confuses the issue. There's an aftertaste. What is it? How does it feel? Where is it? And maybe I'll see the moment the aftertaste ends. It might be a boom, a click, or it might be something that fades out of view. It's like looking at the

sunset—gradually everything becomes darker, and at some point you realise now it's night.

These are the different flavours of impermanence. I mentioned the complete cut because for me that was the most dramatic and interesting—it really cut through the identification quite strongly. "Oh, there it is, it's gone. So what is it exactly?" But impermanence expresses itself in all sorts of different ways. You may get a clean break or you may get a fading, but at some point in that process you realise it's gone. And it really is gone.

And remember, when we talk about impermanence, we're not trying to make something end. We're not saying, "Go away now." We simply notice that it ends.

With the fading, when you have these more subtle movements of the heart, they are important. And as the practice develops, you become more attuned to the subtleties—you can tune into them more readily.

Perhaps what you hadn't noticed before, now you're noticing. And it just becomes part of the landscape.

So, for example, the sweet taste of dukkha. Sometimes there's a quality in pain—there's a sweetness to it. I don't know quite how to describe it, but one of the things about pain is that it points to you as a person who is susceptible to pain. So it says something about the more enduring quality of being human. And it points to that which I share with the whole of creation, the whole of sentient life. That which binds, that holds me together with all other beings. Because if it's not about me, it's universal.

Okay. Thank you very much.

Your mission, should you choose to accept it, is to go forth and suffer—and note it. But if you're not ready for that, you just be aware.

What if it's not an aversive emotion? Is this only for aversive emotions?

If you're feeling happy, just note it. It'll go away.

That's good advice, isn't it? Look for the color.

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