

# Éric Baret: The Yoga of Non-Duality

[Interlocutor]: ...in talking about that.

[Éric Baret]: At a psychological level, effort is an imaginary. In other words, it implies an imaginary scenario of personal entities. And that does not exist. There is no one to make an effort. In reality, there is never an effort.

When you do something, if you have motivation—if the house is on fire—you are going to act. You don't need to make an effort to try to put out the fire. For the external observer that seems like an effort, but for you it is an obviousness. The notion of effort is a bad interpretation. It is often used in a psychological way, but it is simply about using one's capacities functionally. There is no effort in the psychological sense. You function corporally and mentally according to your capacities.

When I have the impression of making an effort, it is usually a matter of poorly applied techniques, but I am simply using my capacities more intensely. When you walk... you don't have the impression of making an effort. If you run, you have the impression of exerting yourself. What is the difference between walking and running? It is only an intensity of enthusiastic activity.

But what presents itself, the deep sense of what is, that is to say, that availability, that inner silence, cannot be the result of mental activity. You can make an effort to put out the fire in the house, you can make an effort to run in the mountain, but to sense what is essential, the effort is imaginary. Because what is essential is not causal; it is not the result of any mental activity nor of any action.

If we take the deep perspective, we understand that what we seek cannot be acquired by effort or intention. Then, the dynamic \*towards\* something is replaced by a dynamic \*from\* something: you become available without direction. And it is in that availability without intention that eventually what resonates for you will be able to be fulfilled.

The traditional perspective is always availability. There is never an effort. This availability can be expressed very intensely. For example, for someone who does not have children, taking care of a child seems like an effort; but for a balanced mother, what a child requires is something natural. There is a physical deployment,

but there is no psychological weight.

The one who has felt this traditional perspective... how does that presentiment continue? For someone who does not have that presentiment, perhaps their life seems like a form of external intensity. But you can realize that you had understood conceptually that life was without intention, without necessity, but that you still do not live it deeply.

Then you are going to try to transpose corporally and mentally that intuitive understanding. At that moment you can enter into a practice, a *\*sadhana\**, as they say in India. Why not? But it is not to reach something, but simply to leave more room in you for that presentiment. A musician who practices may seem to make efforts, but the efforts only appear to the one who is not a musician. The musician does not make efforts, he does what he has to do.

What was often interpreted in India as *\*tapas\**—which is usually translated as effort or dynamism—is a poetic or romantic way of speaking. The yogi who practices does not make efforts; for him, an effort would be having to go to the cinema. Each one does what naturally imposes itself, and eventually that way of life is going to reflect that deep conviction.

That reflection has multiple possibilities. The ascetic way is a way of expressing that balance, but in India there were also kings like king Janaka, who were considered sages and who did not renounce their duty as "kshatriya", their duty as king to live wisdom. The ascetic is not more in hatred than the king, nor the merchant, nor the soldier. Whatever the place where one is, that is the right place to express this deep presentiment. Then, the word "effort" is going to disappear equally from that element.

From the outside perhaps they will say: "Look how he exerts himself", but when there is resonance with something, the word no longer has a psychological sense. No effort is necessary in a spiritual practice, at least in the tantric perspective. There are other perspectives that put the accent there, like the *\*Samkhya\** of Patañjali, which is an authentic *\*darshana\** of India, it is not in contradiction, it is simply another orientation. There is never contradiction; there are different points of view on the same thing.

In the non-dual perspective of Kashmir Shaivism, the notion of effort is not present psychologically. In the *\*Tantrāloka\** of Abhinavagupta there are references to effort, but it is an effort that comes from resonance. It is not a psychological effort. There are other respectable ways that speak of phobias, but for us it is resonance.

Eventually you are going to suggest to your body and your psyche that they become more available to that evidence. It is not an effort, it is an integration of resonance. Availability is the result of having seen the perspective clearly. When you understood deeply that there is nothing to reach in life, that there is nothing to change, all the energies that before were used to force positive things or prevent negative things suddenly remain free. It is an organic functioning.

How does this present itself? I would say it is very individual. In each one, the way in which availability is expressed is different. It will be expressed in one way in a soldier, in another in a prostitute, in a banker, in a gangster or in a bricklayer. There is no pre-established "right way"; it depends on where you are. If you live with men, with women, with dogs, with children... this availability is going to be expressed essentially under the form of listening. You no longer have anything to prove, nothing to impose. What remains at that moment as intimacy with the environment? Listening remains.

That listening can be expressed in very different ways. It is a bit as if you have two children: one with intellectual difficulties and another very brilliant. Are you going to have the same listening for both? Yes, but they are going to express themselves differently. With the child who has difficulties, you are going to be much more present externally in the listening; with the brilliant child, perhaps you are going to be less on top of it, because he doesn't need it, but not for that are you less listening. It is the expression that seems to be different. The situation gives you the phenomenal expression of listening.

If you are a military person or an architect, of course listening is going to be expressed according to what is functional for that situation. For that reason one can never judge someone and say "this person is listening because he does such a thing" or "he is not because he doesn't do it". No, that depends on criteria too complex. There are people who seem to be listening and are not, and people who seem not to be at all and are.

Listening is not something definitive. There are moments when you are more or less free of yourself, and there listening is really going to be intense. And there are moments when the mechanisms of appropriation and pretension return to you; in those moments, listening diminishes another much. It is something that is simply stated. There is no "way of being" that is the correct one; what is correct is listening, but it is expressed in a thousand ways.

Krishna Menon, the great master of South India, said that being a police officer was the best of trades to live listening and freedom, because there were very many temptations. He said that the police officer who lives listening is someone really free, because it is a difficult situation. But he was a police officer from his point of

view.

[Interlocutor]: In moments of extreme danger, accidents... there is like a forced abandonment, something that acts in an extremely precise way. In extreme danger there is a sort of liberation. What is that?

Very often it is the reptilian brain. It is the ancient brains that take command, based on survival, which are very fast. It is those brains that, for example, advertisement tries to capture. Advertisement is stupid, but if your cerebrality is mature, you don't let yourself be fooled; instead, the reptilian brain can be fooled because they show him things that symbolically stimulate survival or need.

If you go driven by the reptilian brain to buy something you don't need, it's because a survival instinct was activated there. It is this brain that generally makes us act in deep situations. It is not necessarily "listening" in the spiritual sense, but a functionality: the body is listening to that functionality. If your head is submerged under water, naturally you are going to try to take it out; it is the reptilian brain that acts. That is true for everyone.

The functionality of the reptilian brain makes you survive. When danger is there, it acts. If a dog attacks you, adrenaline rises; you are going to feel less pain if it bites you, you are going to hit harder, you are going to run faster to climb a tree. All that happens despite you.

But when the dog goes away, fear is no longer necessary. If fear continues once the dog has left, it is that the psychological symbol took the command. It appropriated the situation. That is where the psychological trauma comes. Physiological trauma is never traumatizing in itself: the body is used to surviving, and if it is too much, it faints or the heart gives way. Everything is well organized in us as long as we survive, as long as we can manage the thing physically.

But when the emotional brain takes the command, there the trauma is born. You can be afraid of dogs for twenty years because once one attacked you. Listening consists precisely in letting that, when the reptilian brain takes the command (because there is no choice at that moment), that functionality deploy; but when the dog goes away, fear goes away and memory also goes away, because it already fulfilled its function. Adrenaline goes down and all systems return to normality.

The one who continues having fear when the dog is no longer there, entered into a psychological scheme of learning. Listening is realizing that, when the dog went away, there is no longer a reason to be afraid, and then let those cerebral elements calm down. If listening is not present, I am going to find another dog and the same mechanism as with the first one will be recreated. Fear will return. Listening is this

functionality that allows you to have fear only when it is functionally necessary, in the instant.

You see a dog you don't know: you don't know if it's going to bite you or lick you. That's what's interesting when you find a dog or a cat: you don't know. And then, you listen. That non-preparation is what allows presence. You are ready to grab the dog if it bites, or to melt into it if it licks you. That not-knowing is what allows listening in the instant. When we look deeply at life, we see that in each instant is that element: we never know what's going to happen. An extreme violence or an extreme tenderness can appear. The beauty of life is precisely that availability to both. There is no preference; what we prefer is what happens, because there is no other option. And it is that listening that is going to allow reacting in the most functional way possible.

When one thinks of something, automatically you identify with that thought. Being free of thoughts is a form of imaginary. The one who wants to be free of his thought is, himself, a thought. In India there are respectable traditions where they try to observe thoughts, but that doesn't make sense: the observer is in itself a thought. The idea of wanting to interfere with the thought ends up being eliminated because thought is the result of your affective, psychological and intellectual state. You don't decide it. It happens despite you, in function of your experiences of the past.

You are "thought", you don't think. There is no autonomy in thought. If you take such a drug, you are going to think such a thing. If you see a child being run over in the street, you are going to think that. It has no importance what one thinks. For that reason, in the traditional approach, we don't occupy ourselves with what we think. We put the focus on the tactile, corporal impact of what we think.

Tomorrow you are going to read new things, you are going to listen to things and you are going to think differently. What you think today has no interest, what you are going to think tomorrow neither. Thought is the result of all our affective baggage: if you had a very affectionate childhood, you are going to think differently. Trying to «rectify» the thought so that it is «clear» is a lack of clarity, because we don't think in function of clarity: we think in function of us, of our racial, biological past, etc.

Then, at a given moment, we stop occupying ourselves with our thought and we occupy ourselves with seeing how a given situation reacts in us. If someone tells me they love me, how do I feel it? If they insult me, how do I feel it? That "feeling" is what becomes the functional subject of study, because feeling is a direct door towards silence. Thought, no. Thought is always conceptual. Your affective life is what matters, not what you think.

You are not responsible for what you think; it is your education, your family, what you read... all that makes you think one thing or another. It has no importance what one thinks. On the other hand, feeling what happens... that is indeed important. Feeling if the situation is blocked, if there is violence... very few people are going to feel that really. In that feeling there is a form of intimacy that is created, and that intimacy is the door towards the essential.

[Interlocutor]: What about dreams? Sometimes I wake up exhausted after many dreams, but after a light sleep, I feel composed.

[Éric Baret]: A dream is a state of wakefulness. When a crocodile bites you in a dream, it's not a dream: it's reality until you wake up. Dreams often release psychological movements from the day. If you want to strangle your neighbor but don't have the courage, you might do it in a dream. If you have a neutral day with a diminished image of yourself, you need very little sleep; perhaps 3 to 5 hours. The rest is "compensation sleep".

In French we have the word *\*songe\** (visionary dream). It is in these *\*songes\** where great luminaries like Ibn Arabi or Maheshwarananda "received" their deep texts. That is why traditional texts (like the Vedas) have no "author": the writers were in a space where truth was simply inscribed. They did not take themselves as the authors.

You can't lie in a dream. During the day, you can pretend you are not jealous or that you are not traumatized through control and pride. But the dream will show you the truth. If you believe you overcame the fear of dogs, but in your dream you are still terrified, the fear is still there. On the contrary, if you still feel a bit of fear during the day but don't have fear in the dream, fear is really leaving you. It's important to *\*listen\** to the dream, but not to *\*interpret\** it intellectually. Feel the resonance of the dream upon waking: the excitation, the joy, the panic. Stay with the sensation. Like waking up from a drug trip, the "vibration" or the "perfume" of the experience needs time to integrate.

Lucid dreaming? That is a fantasy of control. Who is it that wants to be lucid? It is the same ego that wants to be "lucid" during the day. It creates a dichotomy. Authentic non-duality is not about control or "objective consciousness".

[Interlocutor]: Let's talk about pain.

Pain is what it is. Pain becomes "painful" when a psychological element intervenes: fear and rejection. That's very interesting. It's seen with small children. About twenty years ago I was in a hospital in the United States accompanying my daughter, and I spent ten days in the room where very small children were in a

state of survival. Some died, others lived. Some could not speak, they were one, two, three years old. I observed a lot how those children functioned when the pain rose: the screams, the crying. And observed the parents who were around.

A one-year-old child feels a great pain and screams, but when the pain stops, he stops screaming. He remains calm. If the pain returns, he screams again, of course. But when you look at the parents, even if the child no longer screams, the parent internally continues to scream. Why? Because of memory, because of the psychological knot. The parents already see the signs that the pain is going to return and they suffer before the child suffers. The parents premeditate that. What I mean is that a part of pain is a psychological aggregate, not all.

At the functional level, pedagogical exploration consists in seeing what is purely functional. What is functional, the body can always endure: if it is too much, we faint; if it is more than that, we die. But psychologically it is different: fear comes. That is seen very well in combat arts. You see how people react to pain. At first, the first years of combat consist in learning to absorb blows.

When someone starts, as soon as they receive a blow, it hurts a lot. But little by little they understand that it doesn't hurt because the blow itself hurts; blows are neutral. Ask a boxer after a fight if it hurts; he's not going to understand the question. What hurts is the resistance to the blow. One learns to absorb blows. And when you receive a blow absorbing it, the blow is a blow. A boxer, after receiving 300 or 500 blows, does he feel aggressed? No. Does he suffer? No. He can have pain in a region of the body the following day, but there is no psychological pain.

Someone who is not a boxer receives two or three blows and it hurts immensely because of the resistance. That's why they sometimes ask us what to do, because the yoga we teach is very soft. If someone wants something more intense to understand this perspective, I ask them to do contact combat arts. There you realize that the blow doesn't hurt; resistance hurts. And that transpires to daily life: it's the resistance to a situation that hurts.

Exploration consists in seeing when pain is purely functional and letting it be what it is, and when fear or rejection intervene. When you have a very strong toothache, you contract so that it hurts less, but by contracting it hurts more. If technically you manage to let the pulsation of pain extend to the whole body—like a boxer who absorbs a blow with the whole body—pain decreases immensely. The natural movement of the body is to reject, which is normal.

When you receive a blow in the shoulder, you push the shoulder forward because you reject. But when you know how to receive blows, you absorb. At the level of pain it's the same: I feel pain and I get rigid. That is my natural movement; I reject

pain. But there is a possibility of tactile exploration to see to what point that rejection is anchored in us. And if I didn't defend myself... what would happen? It's like when your lover puts his hands around your neck and squeezes. The first reflex is to defend yourself. But if I tell myself: "Finally, he loves me well, he doesn't want to strangle me...", maybe there's something there.

I have worked a lot on strangulations in combat, and the first thing you want is to get out of there. But what you have to do is the opposite: it's let go of control what allows something. It requires a lot of training to let yourself be strangled until fainting, for example, without resisting. Some friends with whom I worked didn't defend themselves, but for many people it's impossible not to try to defend themselves. With pain it's the same. Can I let tactile sensitivity live? When you let pain live, it begins to lose its local characteristic. It becomes a rhythm, a movement, a pulsation.

It starts at a point and naturally it extends... and a moment comes when you even feel that the pain is in space. When pain expands like this, the characteristic of "my" pain is lost. There is something there, of course. I don't say that this is possible in all pains, but I remember Jean Klein when he had prostate surgery in London. He was prescribed painkillers that were female hormones. He saw the prescription and said: "I don't want them. I'm not going to look at a woman like a man, I won't take that". The surgeon said that no one could endure that pain.

Jean Klein said he was leaving the hospital, a discharge had to be signed. The surgeon told me: "Look, we keep the room empty because he's going to have too much pain". We didn't go back. Upon arriving home he lay on his side and started to describe to me that extraordinary pulsation of pain that entered into him and expanded. He was white, but completely calm. Suddenly the phone rang. It was for me, I passed it to him. It was an English woman who was asking for advice on how to find her lost cat. Jean Klein was for five minutes giving her advice with all naturalness. When he hung up, he continued describing the pain to me. I saw it with my own eyes. That same night he said to me: "How good it feels to be free of one's own body".

Each one does it according to their capacities. I never had a pain that intense, I have no experience there, but on relative pains... as in combat arts, it is an absolute evidence: what hurts is resistance. It's important to see to what point my movement of contracting the pain is important for me. Someone insults you, do you want to insult the other? We function like that. I have to discover that mechanism tactically and sensorially, because it is also built psychologically.

There are elements that I interpret by my defensive system as an aggression. There are people whom one cannot insult or despise... For what? Why should I feel

despised if someone despises me? Why should they respect me? If they don't respect me, I respect that, I don't have a problem. Why should they love me if they don't love me? That is the problem. That is where I don't suffer from anything. When I understood structurally the mechanism of rejection when the situation is not conforming to my imaginary, in that moment, that imaginary is going to cease.

That need to be recognized, loved or heard are pathological diseases that make life more difficult than physical pains. You have to feel it corporately first, because intellectually it's easy to agree, but under a crisis, intelligence no longer plays; it's the reptilian brain that takes the command. Everything you learned or understood serves for nothing in a crisis. For that reason modern combat arts have no functional value: they train in situations without fear. The only combat arts with real value are where you have fear. Because when they assault you in the street, you are going to have fear and you're going to lose 95% of what was learned.

You have to work with fear, if not, you are not functional in a crisis. You have to feel the rejection without justifying it nor criticizing it. The only fact of feeling that I defend myself, sometimes, makes something start to move. I stop defending myself a bit less, the sensation expands... it's a game. Exploration is listening.

[Interlocutor]: You talk about balance...

[Éric Baret]: "Balance" is a pedagogical word. It follows referring to "imbalance", reason why it is a hollow concept. Like "good" and "bad", these words are for teaching children. What is the criterion for balance? There is only consciousness. Things are what they are, neither "right" nor "wrong". In practice, balance is useful, but practice is always a contradiction of theory. Non-duality is not a practice. Practice is dualistic by nature. Intellectuals cannot understand practice because they ask "why". If you ask "why yoga?", you are not made for yoga. Balance or "verticality" are just ways of speaking. The horizontal is only verticality poorly seen. When you look closely at imbalance, you see absolute balance, because nothing else could exist in that instant except what is there.

We should not try to reconcile theory and practice. Art and wisdom are made to be \*heard\*, not read. Reading is a form of degeneration. Wisdom is \*śruti\* (what is heard). Listening to the text brings you closer to listening. Translations often lose the "silence" that is present in the original sounds.

[Interlocutor]: And hashish? Does it have any place in tradition?

Folkloric Shivaism, both in the Himalayas and in the south of India, uses hashish a lot. Honestly, I don't have textual references of hashish in Abhinavagupta, but I read translations, not Sanskrit. Ritual use is always part of an intentional focus of

purification. To the \*sadhus\* it allows them to endure a life physically very hard. I remember a long time ago in the Himalayas, we found a temple in ruins with a large \*lingam\*. A \*sadhu\* appeared and asked us why we were there. I replied to him that he should ask the \*lingam\*, that he was the one who knew. He liked the answer.

He sent a boy to look for a huge \*chillum\*. When he brought it, he began to recite rhythmic mantras while lighting it. He passed it to me and I grabbed it with one hand. He almost jumped on top of me and said: "With both hands, for Shiva!". I realized that for him it was purely ritual. The domain of drugs is that of the \*ganas\*, the elementals of Ganapathy, the son of Parvati and Shiva. But in the Kashmiri tradition properly said, I have not seen that it is a fundamental means.

Indian masters knew the brain damages that drugs produce. It is unlikely that they were used as the main functional means in the rites. In India there is no traditional wine. It may have had its place as celebration, like watching a dance spectacle, but not as a means, because the "means" is not part of the traditional approach.

What serves us here is what Jean Klein transmitted: the metaphysical element, not the religious part. The religious element requires a cultural knowledge that most Westerners do not have. Appropriating the Shaiva religion in the West is usually pure exoticism, tantric imagery without real metaphysical interest. What interests us is the essential, what the chapter 2 of the \*Tantrāloka\* says: that which is beyond the path. That resonates for everyone, it doesn't ask for purification nor functional changes.

My father, the first time he saw Jean Klein, asked him what he thought of drugs. Jean said to him: "If you know how to use it —putting the accent on the 'if'— it can lead you to the summit of the mind, just like yoga". But for me, the summit of the mind and the base are the same. It's not what interests us. It's a lack of perspective.

[Interlocutor]: And when I practice yoga or massages? I feel that there is a «I» inside, like layers of an onion.

When you massage, there is no masseur, only sensitivity. Smooth, rough, hot, cold... psychotactile. You don't need to take yourself for a masseur. Let your hands follow what imposes itself. Technique is secondary to feeling. You can peel all the layers, but it's like the onion: at the end there is nothing in the middle. Information is how to forget about oneself.

In combat it's the same. Only the other exists. If you think about yourself, you lost, you no longer feel the other. One has to make abdication of oneself. There is no

masseur. At the end of the massage the "I" returns and believes itself a masseur... it's a useless image. Tomorrow you have different opportunities: you can do yoga, go fishing or play boules. It's not someone who decides. You let those possibilities live in you and one imposes itself. It is not personal.

Never is there a personal decision. If I decide personally it is because there is an expectation, and if there is expectation there will be disappointment. Why do we do yoga? It's absurd, a loss of energy. Someone rational would not do yoga. Being seated is bad for the knees, being on the head is bad for the cervicals... talk to an osteopath and you will see what he thinks of yoga. It serves for nothing at the inner level.

If you come it is for resonance, not for thought. If you think it, you don't come. Why go to get hit for two hours in martial arts? If I thought, I would not go. Today I cannot stretch the legs because I destroyed myself with blows for years; if I had thought, I would not have done it. But there is a resonance and one follows it. If you think, you don't play the violin because you stay deaf. Musicians don't think, they cannot \*not\* do music.

One must not decide anything. Whatever you decide, you are going to regret it. It is not decided, it must be done. If you seek something from yoga, you will be disappointed. Yoga doesn't bring anything. There is nothing that brings anything. If there is a dynamic towards something, energy is not available for listening. The one who does yoga with hope cannot open up to listening because he goes in one direction, and listening is multidirectional.

It's like in the first years of combat: if someone raises the arm, you have awareness of that but you maintain the visual globality. If you tune into only the arm, they put a kick down. Metaphysics is not expecting anything. That doesn't prevent action, but action is no longer \*for\* something, but \*by\* something. It is done by joy, by evidence, not by strategy.

I remember Tamura, a direct disciple of the creator of Aikido. In an interview he was asked why people did Aikido. He said: "Some come for flexibility, once they have it, they keep practicing. Others come for fear, others to learn to fight... but when they achieve that, they keep practicing". What he wanted to say is that practice is beyond the initial imaginary. Practice "for" something is replaced by practice "by" something. You become a disciple of the practice, not its owner.

[Interlocutor]: Is there a "way of energy"?

[Éric Baret]: The individual way, the way of energy, the way of Shiva and the "no-way" (\*Anopaya\*) are poetic pedagogical simplifications. If a perception unfolds

in a mind cluttered with concepts, that is the "individual way". If it is felt as tactility and energy, that is the "way of energy". If it is verticality, it is the "way of Shiva". If there is no perceiver nor object —only non-perception—, that is the "direct way". They are like candies that are given to children to calm them. In reality, each perception is an opportunity for listening.

India has a mania for categorizing and cutting things in pieces, like the 18 classes of "emptiness" in Tibetan Buddhism. They are representations. They can be beautiful, but they are not the reality. A text is not the revelation; it is a machine to bring you back to silence. The text is an "extermination camp": its objective is the total elimination of the concept. If you read it to "learn", you have not understood anything. Revelation occurs when the text dies in you.

The base of yoga is living the presence. There is no future. When I inspire, I do not anticipate the expiration. That presence is the base of all traditional art. There is no choice. You didn't choose your body, nor your intelligence, nor your political or musical tastes. You didn't choose if you want to love men or women, nor if you are capable of living or not. Some are not capable and commit suicide; it is not a choice, it is an evidence for them.

There are no hierarchies in life. It is the egoic system the one that says "this life is a success" or "this life is a failure". There is no failed nor wonderful life. When conceptualization leaves you, intensity remains. And there are no longer questions about life. When you realize that you have nothing between the hands, life becomes light. You don't know if you're going to return alive to your house tonight... that is superb, because you don't need projects. What happens to you is the indispensable, by the single fact that it happens to you.

There is no past nor future. The past is dead, it is a present idea. The future is a present idea. Ten thousand years ago... that is an idea of the instant. Tomorrow... it is an idea of the instant. Life is not in thought, it is in feeling. Nobody is old. Ask an old man if he is old: he is not, young people see him old.

The body ages physically, but the feeling of life has no age. You hear a sound: it is a caress. If you stay on the sonority, there is no thought. A phone that rings is a caress that goes out in your body. There is no «phone», there is tactile life. The problem is that we think life instead of feeling it. Noise bothers the thought, not the body. In tactility there are no psychological problems.

But to understand this one has to feel it. If you understand it without feeling it, it only serves you when everything goes well. When disease or pain come, the conceptual idea does not hold. But if you give yourself to that tactile feeling, if a sound or even a sting is only a sensation that is felt without judgment nor criticism, that is when

understanding becomes functional for real, both in calm and in chaos.

And that is the functionality of life. Thanks for coming.