The World of Insight

Patrick Kearney · Notable Dhamma Teachers — Patrick Kearney · 51:27

So tonight we're going to have the last of our series of talks on insight. This one is called The World of Insight. We'll start by revising what we've been through so far and bring it to a conclusion.

We started with the basic practice that we're doing, which is Mahasi Sayadaw's method of insight meditation. In its essence, this is being directly aware of whatever is arising in any of the six senses, as it arises. What we find is a whole flow of discrete, experienced events coming and going. In the tradition, these are called, in Pali, *dhammas*—in Sanskrit and English, *dharmas*—always in the plural. This could be translated in English as phenomena, as simply things that appear in experience. These dharmas are experienced events that come and go, that arise and cease according to conditions in general. They constitute the world of direct first-hand experience.

We talked about how our habit, and largely our preference, is to live in the world of concept. This is very different from the world of dharmas, of direct first-hand experience. The basic difference is that concepts are *about*. Let me give an example which I hope you all appreciate: a thought about a good cup of coffee is not a good cup of coffee. If you ever work in a cafe, I think you need to be really clear about that. The customer is sitting there wondering where their coffee is, and you explain, "Well, I just imagined this fantastic cup of coffee." So this is the world of concept. It's the world of second-hand experience that is about what is actually happening, that points toward whatever is actually happening.

For the Buddha, this world of concept is characterized by the perception of permanence. Remember that for the Buddha, permanent does not necessarily mean lasting forever and ever, but lasting unchanged over time. And of course, the classic example is the self. I come to a dharma talk, I listen to it, I leave, later I talk about it with my friends. This is an ordinary, everyday way of framing the experience of listening to a dharma talk. But it's framing the experience in terms of an "I" that lasts unchanged over time. I am the one who thought I should go to this talk. I am the one who turned up. I am the one who listened. I am the one who left. I am the one who talked about it later with friends. The whole thing is wrapped around, framed by this sense of I. And in all of this, the fundamental assumption is that this I is the same throughout the three periods of time: past, present, future. I act as if this I is actually more real than the talk itself. How I responded to the talk is more real, more significant to me than the actual experience of listening to it.

All of this is living in a second-hand world of concept in which I project all the importance and significance into that realm of concept. This second-hand world of concept, like everything else, arises because of conditions. It's constructed. And what is it constructed from? What are the basic raw materials?

The three roots of the unwholesome: greed, hatred, ignorance. This is the world of saṃsāra, the world of suffering and confusion. As we've seen, it's characterized by the perception of permanence, while the world of insight emerges from the first-hand world of direct experience, which is characterized by impermanence.

When the Buddha talks about how we relate to all this, he uses the terms seeing and understanding. Seeing is *dassana*, understanding is *ñāṇa*. Often you see this compound in Pali, *ñāṇa-dassana*. Sometimes when you translate the compound, what's last in the compound in Pali is actually first in English—that's the structure of Pali compounds. So: seeing and understanding.

Now what does he mean by these? Seeing indicates the direct first-hand encounter with what's happening here and now. When we see something, when you look out at the world, are you seeing the past? No. Are you seeing the future?

No. What we're seeing is the present. So seeing is all about the present. It's always and necessarily here, now, in the present.

Understanding, on the other hand, represents a perception that arises out of seeing, and it embraces past, present, and future. It embraces here and there. So it's much wider. One way of looking at the difference between seeing and understanding is to compare them with the difference between facts and interpretation.

Let's say that we want to understand what is happening in the world. How do we go about doing it? Well, we begin by finding sources that we feel we can trust. And so we read or watch our chosen media. We may notice, as we do this, that what we get from them is a mixture of facts and interpretation of those facts. Sometimes facts and interpretation are very clearly delineated: here are the facts, and this is what we think about them. This is, of course, old school journalism. But sometimes facts and interpretation are meshed within the same report. In fact, they can be meshed and mixed even in the same sentence.

Together, facts and interpretation build a perception. So we feel we know what is going on in the world, although most of what we "know" is actually an interpretation wrapped around a few facts. This is one reason why different people can come to different conclusions even when they get their information from the same sources. Let's assume that two people are getting information from the same sources. One person may doubt the statements that are being presented as facts. Another person may have no problem with the facts, but doubt the interpretation being placed on those facts. The result: two quite different views of what's going on in the world.

You notice that facts alone are never enough to tell us what is going on, because for facts to provide meaning, they must be interpreted. They have to fit within some kind of coherent narrative that provides the context for each fact.

The first time I came across this expressed was in my university days when I was studying history,

reading a book—I think it was called *What Is History?* One of the questions that arose is: what is an historical fact as opposed to an ordinary, everyday fact? The example given was this: in 49 BC, Julius Caesar crossed the Rubicon River from north to south, in northern Italy. Now, thousands of people crossed that river. In 49 BC alone, thousands of people crossed that river. But these crossings, although they're facts, are not historical facts. The historical fact is that Julius Caesar crossed the river in 49 BC. Why? Because it's a crucial fact that fits into a much larger framework that we call the history of ancient Rome. Does that make sense—facts versus interpretation?

Now let's apply this to the Buddha's teaching. The Buddha talks about saññā, what we translate as perception. Perception is the mind's recognition of experience. Let me give you a domestic example. At my house, every now and again—in fact pretty much on a daily basis—I enter my front room, located on the east side of the house. When I do that, I might notice a sideboard against the north wall. And on that sideboard is a wooden statue of someone sitting on the ground. Now, what is that statue? Well, for some people it's an exotic work of art. For some people, it's a bit of bric-a-brac that's obviously been around for a long time because it's a bit chipped on the top. But for me, it's a Buddha image. And it shows the Buddha in meditation. It's not just art. It's more than art.

It represents something sacred, something that conveys supreme importance. And its presence makes this particular room a meditation room—which means it's a sacred space.

Notice that it's not the piece of wood on top of the sideboard that makes this room sacred. It's my interpretation of the meaning of that piece of wood that makes this room a sacred space. Does that make sense?

So we have the same facts, the same way the eyes see the structure on the sideboard. And yet we can have very different interpretations of these facts. When these interpretations are fully internalized, they become perception. I walk into that room and I don't have to think about it—I know, I see, that this is a sacred space where certain forms of behavior are appropriate and certain other forms are not.

Notice how perception is something we learn over a period of time, because the same facts, the same direct first-hand experience, can be received and interpreted very differently. The facts generate the world of perception, and the world of perception is a second-hand world of concept. Now, it's not concept in the sense of thinking about—I don't need to think about this—but it's still concept. Concept buried very deeply, concept that seems to the perceiver to be inescapably entwined with direct first-hand experience. But nevertheless, it's concept.

If we've got some work to do in that room and a tradie walks in, I very much doubt he would step back and think, "Oh my God, this is a profound and sacred space. I can feel the vibes, man." It's very unlikely that would happen. For him, it would just be a weird room with kind of odd furniture.

So again, facts alone do not provide meaning. Facts have to be interpreted. And this interpretation, when

internalized, becomes perception.

The Buddha is saying that all our lives we have been busily cultivating the perception of permanence. I've learned to perceive the room I woke up in today as the same room I fell asleep in last night. I've learned to perceive the person who woke up this morning as the same person who fell asleep last night. I've learned to perceive that today is another day of the same retreat, the retreat I was attending yesterday.

This perception of permanence is very useful because it gives us a sense of stability, meaning, and a sense of being the traveler through the journey of our life. This is the world of me and mine, where "I" stay the same throughout the drama of my life. We all take this for granted as the truth, and we do not notice that actually it's the mind's fabrication. It's a fabrication that we work on every day. It's an interpretation, not a fact.

For the Buddha, any interpretation based on the perception of permanence is wrong. And he doesn't like it for two reasons. First, it conflicts with the facts of change once we start to pay attention to them—for example, in our meditation practice. But the other reason is that this interpretation leads us to pain and distress. It leads us to dukkha.

From the Buddha's perspective, if we are going to live flourishing lives, we need another perception, another interpretation. The facts may be the same, but we need another interpretation. And so the perception we're developing during the practice of insight meditation is the perception of change, the perception of impermanence.

We do this through cultivating momentary immersion or momentary concentration—khaṇika samādhi—tracking the permutations of the six senses over time. As we do this, our perception of the world changes.

One flavor of this perception of impermanence is quite common: practitioners report stepping out of the meditation hall and suddenly being struck by the fact that the sky is bluer than it's ever been before, the grass is greener than it's ever been before, the air is fresher than it's ever been before. Nature is more alive than it's ever been before. And they notice that actually none of this is stable—it's very much subject to change.

In one interview I did some time ago during a retreat here, the person had walked up that path into the interview room, and she said that as she was walking, the garden kept flipping. At one moment it was full of life and blooming. The next moment it was decaying, dying, falling apart. Then blooming, going great guns. Then decaying, falling apart—all as she walked up the path.

This is an example of the perception of impermanence, of change. Notice that if this happens, or something like this happens, it's not that we actually enter into another garden, magically substituted for the one that was there before.

There's no Harry Potter magic around here. The facts are the same. What's changed is the interpretation. And you notice that this new interpretation is not something I'm thinking about—it simply presents itself. Because the mind has been training to notice change, and at some point, the penny drops. Click. And you have a different perception.

We've talked about how the entry into insight comes through the perception of change, which opens up also the perception of pain and of not-self. But as we said, the perception of change here is the perception of universal change. Change all the way down, in every time, in every place, in every circumstance. Yet we do not experience events in every time and in every place and in every circumstance. So how can we know that they are all, without exception, subject to change? How does that come about?

This universal characteristic of change reveals itself as a perception, which, as we've seen, is a balance between facts and interpretations. So we've got two perceptions: the perception of impermanence, of change, recognised as universal and regarded as the entry into insight; and the ordinary everyday perception of permanence, disapproved of by the Buddha but constituting the world in which we normally live. So what's the difference between them?

If you look at the perception of impermanence, what we find is a fine balance between fact and interpretation. And in this perception, the balance is weighted very firmly towards the present. Right now, events are coming and going, and when I look, I can see this. This is direct, first-hand experience, and the interpretation built upon it is not based on a failure to see clearly what's going on. It's not based on awareness drifting away from what's happening right now to a memory emerging from the past or to an anticipation prophesying the future. It's based on a clear seeing now of this event as it comes and goes. This is the perception of impermanence.

In contrast, with the perception of permanence we find again the balance between fact and interpretation—but here, the balance is weighted firmly towards interpretation. Just as a mundane example: have you ever been embarrassed by a friend who says, "How do you like my new hairstyle?" And you realise you haven't actually noticed. In fact, you realise to your embarrassment that you still don't notice. Is this person having me on? Doesn't she look like she looked before? Or is there a change? This is the perception of permanence. We have memory—in this case vague, unclear—but it dominates present experience. We assume something. And even when challenged, we're reluctant to question our assumptions. Maybe she's having me on. So our perception is based on a concept from the past rather than an encounter with the present.

This is the difference between the two perceptions. The perception of impermanence is confirmed here and now by what is happening here and now. The perception of permanence is not confirmed by what's happening here and now—it's confirmed by habits inherited from the past. Both are perceptions. Both are conceptual. But the perception of impermanence is firmly grounded in the directly seen present.

When the Buddha talks about this understanding, he talks about it in terms of dependent arising—the

fundamental framework of the Buddha's teaching. This is a kind of systems view of reality: everything is connected, and the connections are causal.

Let me illustrate with a little story. When I was at the University of Queensland many years ago, one of my friends used to go to Stradbroke Island—Straddy, as we say—to hang out with the traditional owners, only the blokes, of course. One day he was going through a forest with a young fellow who was, I think in that clan, called a dugong man—a man of knowledge. Walking along a path on some errand, in the course of conversation the young man says, "We should go fishing tomorrow. The mullet are running."

My friend had the presence of mind to ask, "How do you know the mullet are running?"

And the man of knowledge stopped and pointed to the ground, where there was a line of hairy caterpillars crossing the path.

And he says, when you see those, the mullet are running.

Now, what was he saying? Was he saying that the hairy caterpillars caused the mullet to run? No, he wasn't. He's saying that the way nature works on Stradbroke Island is according to certain patterns that are consistent throughout time. Because his people have been living there for perhaps 20,000 years, they've observed how it all works. They've observed that when you see those hairy caterpillars, you're going to find the mullet. They're recognizing patterns that are stable over time, and yet any event within those patterns is dynamic, shifting, changing.

This is an illustration of how dependent arising works. In fact, it is very much part of the way traditional cultures view nature. So when the Buddha developed this teaching, he would have been drawing on existing traditions.

In the classical presentation of dependent arising, the Buddha goes through twelve conditional relationships as they play out over time. We looked at one last night: feeling conditions craving. Tonight we're going to again zero in on just one of them—the conditional relationship between birth and ageing and death. In other words, the teaching that ageing and death are the natural result of birth.

This is what he says: "What is dependent arising? Birth conditions ageing and death. Whether awakened ones appear or do not appear, just this endures—the stability of Dharma, the reliability of Dharma, specific conditionality." Specific conditionality refers to birth conditioning ageing and death. "This is what an awakened one awakens to. This is what he realizes. After awakening to and realizing it, he explains, teaches, declares, lays out, reveals, analyses, and clarifies it, saying: Look."

Of course, this is the instruction to practice. This is what we're looking at. The Buddha is saying that when we see the movements of events, we begin to recognize that events come and go, arise and cease, according to natural laws that are stable and reliable in how they work themselves out. In this case, a being who is born will develop naturally towards death.

Now this is just nature. It's not me. It's got nothing to do with me, in the sense that this is not a situation I have created, nor has it been created for me, nor is it something I can control. It's just the flow of nature.

So let's look at this in terms of seeing and understanding.

First, we see. We directly encounter the facts of our own lives—how the body's cruising along quite nicely and then bang, something happens. We realize we can't do this anymore. Or we get sick and the whole system collapses. We see in our own lives how we are subject to sickness, ageing, and death. This is seeing—direct experience.

It reminds me of an encounter John Hale had once with a longtime meditator who was going through a period where she was very worried about the future. She was talking to him about her concerns, and John finally said, "Look, I can tell you exactly what's going to happen in the future." She said, "Can you?" He replied, "You're going to get sick, you're going to get old, and you're going to die." Because he was dead set right.

So that's seeing. And then understanding—we understand that this movement from birth to death is an aspect of natural law, and it extends throughout the entire universe. It's entirely reliable. In contrast, for example, the different possibilities of how long I might live before sliding into inevitable death are uncertain, and so I might do everything I can to postpone that time. Lives will be lived very differently, but it's entirely, absolutely reliable that whatever I do is going to end in death.

What we see are discrete events, coming and going, arising and ceasing. What we understand are the patterns of this coming and going, arising and ceasing. This understanding goes way beyond our direct first-hand experience, yet it is confirmed by every mindful encounter that we have with our direct first-hand experience.

So our understanding—and here we're focusing on the understanding of change—remains firmly grounded in the facts of direct experience. The result is that a meaning and interpretation of these facts emerges: the universal characteristic of impermanence. This meaning is not divorced from the actual experience. It appears reliable, natural, lawful—and yet it's a concept.

So how does this play out in our everyday lives? Let's look at Majjhima 38, the Mahātaṇhāsaṅkhaya Sutta, the Longer Discourse on Dissolving Craving.

And in one little section of it, I find it quite interesting. Because when I first read it, I realised I was listening to the Buddha interview his meditation students.

Now, the language is very formulaic because this was memorised and put into chanting form so it could be recited, so it could be sung. But this is how it goes.

The Buddha says, "Seeing and understanding in this way, would you run back to the past? Were we in the past? Were we not in the past? What were we in the past? How were we in the past? Having been what in

the past, what did we then become?"

And the students say, "No, Bhante, we wouldn't do that."

"Seeing and understanding in this way, would you run forward to the future? Shall we be in the future? Shall we not be in the future? What shall we be in the future? How shall we be in the future? After being what in the future, what shall we then become?"

"No, Bhante, we wouldn't do that either."

"Seeing and understanding in this way, would you now be inwardly confused about the present? Am I? Am I not? What am I? How am I? Where has this being come from? Where will it go?"

"No, Bhante, we wouldn't."

So this is the dialogue. And what it's touching upon is the experience of understanding, of insight—how it feels from the inside.

These practitioners are tracking their experience over time. They've entered the world of ñāṇa, of understanding. Their perception of the three universal characteristics is clear, and the natural law of dependent arising is clear to at least some extent.

So how does this affect their relationship with time? Remember how we asked: How can I know that everything in the past and everything in the future, which I am not aware of, is impermanent when this is beyond my experience?

This is an answer to that question. Would you run back to the past? Would you run forward to the future? Would you be inwardly confused about the present? In all instances, the practitioners simply say, "No, that's not going to happen."

Notice that what's being presented is not a matter of doctrine. The Buddha is not asking them to confirm their faith or their beliefs. It's simply that these practitioners have become so firmly grounded in the felt reality of the present that they've lost all interest in the past and the future. It's like it's not interesting anymore.

Not in the sense that they do not learn from past experience, and not in the sense that they do not plan for the future. But even when they remember the past or plan for the future, they're doing it grounded in present experience. And they are fully satisfied with present experience.

Because what we find is that the present is wide and rich and enough.

For these practitioners, the present includes their memories of the past remembered now. It includes their plans for the future created now. They're not swept up into the emotional distress that comes about when they start feeding their concepts about their fates in the past and the future, where their fates in the past

and the future become more real to them than what's happening in the present.

They're very clear about the nature of present experience, which includes memory and anticipation. And they're satisfied with this experience in the present, which includes memory and anticipation.

All they need is here now, the present. But this direct experience of the present is held in an understanding that extends throughout space and time—and even in this case, beyond space and time.

So this is the world of insight, of understanding—a kind of glimpse into how the Buddha talks about it and how his students talk about it.

But just to end on a negative note, as they say, we can see that the path to insight does contain dangers. Seeing is direct first-hand experience. Understanding is interpretation. And there is an inescapable element of concept within understanding. Isn't it quite clear to us that we are easily seduced into the world of concept, where that world becomes so vivid and so compelling that we take it to be real, even when it contradicts our present experience?

So again, we live within a blend of fact and interpretation. And our default deluded perception—which for the Buddha means our perceptions of permanence, satisfaction, and self—is characterized by an over-reliance on interpretation.

Of course, the same problem can occur in our meditation practice. Practitioners can fool themselves into believing that they have attained understanding when in fact they have not. This is a real possibility. In Burma, the Sayadaws are very aware of this danger and they respond to it in different ways.

One approach might work like this: let's say you come in six days a week for an interview. This goes on for months. The interviews are quite brief. You simply report directly what happened—usually they ask you to describe what you felt was your best sitting period and your best walking period over the past twenty-four hours, giving a detailed analysis of what occurred.

Now let's say that even unknown to yourself, you report something which is actually quite significant. What would be the response? Sometimes the response is a frown and a glare, followed by an interrogation: "You didn't experience that. You're just telling me. You've been talking to other practitioners, haven't you? They've told you about their experience and now you're regurgitating it because you think you'll get gold stars. You must never do that. You must never give a false report to your teacher. It is grossly disrespectful to the teacher, to the centre, and to the Dhamma." And you get really scolded.

Now, if you say, "Oh, oh, I'm so sorry, this is terrible," and you crawl out the door—well, what to do? But if you say, "Sayadaw, with all due respect, I know what I experienced. That's what I experienced"—then the atmosphere changes. The temperature goes up, having dropped below zero. Big smile. "Congratulations. Welcome to the club. That's great." But they really want to be sure that you are sure about this, that it isn't

something you've conjured up.

I could see where they were coming from when I was teaching in Malaysia, because the Malaysians, like the Burmese, are very social and communal. They all gossip to each other about their practice and get the idea, "Oh, I'm supposed to experience this." And so they go in and say, "Oh, I experienced this." Not everybody, but sometimes. And you start to get suspicious. You start to get a feeling: I'm not sure about this. So a bit of cross-examination is necessary.

But you can see the danger that the teachers see, and they really emphasize this. You've got to be clear about the experience. They will push you. They will challenge you to see if you stand up and say, "Yes, Sayadaw, with all due respect, this is what happened. I don't know what it means, but this is what happened."

So this is one way that they recognize this problem.

We need to be very careful in how we estimate or judge our understanding, so we don't fall into the pit of believing our concepts when they're not supported by experience.

How would this happen? Well, let's say you become interested in Dharma and start reading different books written by famous and authoritative teachers. Let's say you are attracted by these teachings and these personalities, and are inclined to believe them. Have you ever done that—reading Dharma books? So you're attracted and inclined to believe. You take up the practice and hear talks about impermanence, for example, from people you trust. Then you mix with experienced practitioners who seem to have some insight into the mystery.

For example, one of them quietly leans towards you during a retreat with a knowing look and says, "Ah yes, the weather has changed again." And you're aware of the deeper meaning here—a meaning that someone outside the circle of adepts would be oblivious to. They would think it's just a routine statement. Your recognition of this deeper meaning puts you into the exclusive club of those who really understand what's going on.

If one is susceptible to this sort of thing, then over time your normal conceptual world comes to include universal change. Could you find yourself believing in the universal characteristic of impermanence and thinking you have experienced it when actually you have not? I would suggest quite possibly yes—it does happen.

So be very careful with your assessments of the practice, remembering that our habit, our default position, is to take the conceptual as real. We can do that just as easily in our meditation practice as in our everyday lives. Be careful.

My first encounter with this attitude came indirectly when I started practicing with Sayadaw U Pandita. I went there first in 1984. You could only get a one-week visa, so it was just an introduction. But I seemed to

have passed his test, because when I went in to say goodbye at the end of the week, he said, "Before you leave, go to the office and apply for a long-term meditation visa."

I made a mistake here—I dropped the ball. I said, "But Sayadaw, the country's closed to long-term meditation visas." There was just a brief moment of irritation. And he said, "Before you leave, go to the office and apply for a long-term meditation visa." Then I realised I'd blown it. I said, "Yes, Sayadaw."

So I went to the office and applied, and they brought out the forms. It turned out the government had just changed its mind and re-established these long-term visas. Off I went to Thailand, hung out, and eventually got back. When I arrived this time, I had to fill out a form about my background—religious background, practice background, and so on. So I put it all in.

At the first interview with the Sayadaw, he's reading the form. I think, "Oh, this could be problematic." He looks down at me—because I'm on the floor and he's up here—and says, "So, you're quite an experienced meditator." A deva whispered in my ear, and I said, "Oh no, Sayadaw, I don't know anything. I'm here to learn." He smiled, and I realised I'd said the right thing.

During that retreat—I practised with him for three months—he only ever gave one Dharma talk. He never explained anything. I realised that's the way he really likes it, because nothing's polluting the mind of the practitioner. Ignorance is bliss. It minimises the possibility of false interpretation, because you've got no data upon which to make any interpretation. All you know is, "Man, weird things are happening."

At the Mahasi Centre, when they assign teachers to interview the different categories of students, the most difficult category to teach are the learned monks—the monks who have finished their academic studies of traditional Buddhism and have come to meditate. Only the best teachers are given that job, because these monks are tough nuts to crack. They think they already know, and that makes it difficult to teach.

So concepts can be a problem. In his *Manual of Insight*—the book that Mahasi Sayadaw published in 1945—he talks about the arising of understanding as a mutual supporting of experience and concept. He warns that practitioners who are, quote, "intelligent, knowledgeable and prone to contemplate things," unquote—anybody recognise themselves here?

Such practitioners may get caught up in thinking about their experience and so lose touch with the actual experience. And he says, "Deliberate contemplation and reflection impede pure awareing. Therefore, be careful."

These are wise words for the practitioner. Therefore, be careful. Stick to the experience, not the concept.

A participant offered a reflection rather than a question, referencing the movie *Good Will Hunting*. There's a scene where the psychologist keeps telling the main character, "It's not your fault," referring to his childhood. The character responds, "Yeah, I know. It wasn't my fault." The psychologist says it again: "It's

not your fault." And again: "Yeah, I know. It's not my fault." This repeats several times until something clicks. He goes from that intellectual acknowledgment—"Yeah, I know it wasn't my fault"—to a bodily experience of weeping, suddenly *getting* it at a completely different level.

The participant sensed that this applies to what we've been discussing. On one level, there's the response: "Yeah, I know, change. Of course it's inevitable. I'm getting grey hair, things are changing, it's happening." But it felt like I wouldn't have talked about change to this depth over the week if there wasn't some bodily felt shift that transforms it from "Yeah, I know, change happens" into something much bigger.

This makes perfect sense. It *is* bigger. Recognising change is big. It's obvious on the conceptual level. But at the experiential level, it is very big. It turns around your whole universe.

This is an ongoing thing. You can get a kind of glimpse of it. It starts to filter into the way you experience and the way you live, and then it opens up more, and then it opens up more and more over a period of time. If you read the classic texts, you encounter people who have the big bang experience—bang, everything's completely different. But that's unusual. Usually it's a crack, and then it gradually gets wider and wider over years.

When you really start to absorb it, it's very big. And with change comes dukkha and not-self.

I hope your heads are firmly on your shoulders. Thank you very much.

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