

# Éric Baret: The Yoga of Non-Duality

[Éric Baret]: Are there any questions?

[Interlocutor]: I realized that inside myself I do many things with a specific intention, to achieve something. And I stopped doing many things... except blocking emotions. I feel that there are emotions trying to emerge: fears, anger, hopes... and I don't realize how I see them. Sometimes, for example, I'm eating and I feel my solar plexus closed. I try to let the emotion pass through me, I know there is nothing to "do," but...

[Éric Baret]: Everything you can imagine "doing" is part of the imaginary. You choose a strategy from memory, you want to apply it to the future, and that strategy will always return you to memory. You have to humbly accept that you don't know what to do. It is a dynamic acceptance, not a psychological acceptance or one of defeat. It is an acceptance by evidence: you don't know what is functional for you.

If you surrender totally to that evidence, without the slightest criticism or the imaginary that "you should be different," a great tranquility will inevitably appear. You might find friendly hands or a functional gaze that help you better discover your functioning, but if you look for a technique, a discipline to "get ahead," to be better, to listen to yourself better... then you enter into religious stupidity. Religion leads to violence; it cannot be anything other than a form of dictatorship.

I don't know what is best for you, and neither can you know. There we can be in profound agreement. But we must go further: there is nothing to know. He who pretends to know lives in the imaginary. He who says "this or that should be done" lives in the imaginary. How to know what is right? What is right for you? That addresses a personality that does not exist. You were not born to succeed or to fulfill a mission, like those unfortunate people who imagine a historical or mystical role for themselves. You were born to discover your humility, your absence, and the lack of need to fulfill anything. What is fulfilled is life, but it is not something that you do.

Stop looking for an answer. Live with that question, with that maturation. The only thing you can do is see how you project a negativity into your listening. Not knowing is the ultimate listening. I don't know what lack would be filled with a religious or

psychological fantasy of knowing. One must stay in that not-knowing, without commenting on it. If you truly have moments of intimacy and discover emotional elements in yourself, without the slightest dynamic of wanting to change them, transform them, understand them, assume them, or resolve them, you are going to discover an unknown space. It is the unknown space that puts an end to this questioning.

Don't escape into the search for answers or into an imaginary of action. Knowledge does not come from action. Even old Shankara from the 8th century knew it: action comes from an imaginary; there is no actor who acts. Stay intimately with your mechanism. Do you feel it well? Do you want to deepen that feeling? Don't listen to the stories of those who want to help you, of those who want to tell you what to do or how to do it. There you would enter into an ideological imaginary. You don't decide on your life. You don't decide if tomorrow you are going to listen to a wonderful Buddhist speaker with a great beard and become a Buddhist; you don't decide if you are going to join the communist party or if you are going to be more orthodox. You have no freedom in your life. You don't decide if tomorrow you are going to fall in love, nor if you are going to look at your lover and tell yourself that it's finally over. Do you really decide? Or do you simply confirm your emotions? Or do you simply confirm other feelings? There is no place for decision. For us, there is no possible escape. One cannot face it or flee, because that would imply a "personality." And personality is a romantic idea; there is no such thing. There is an expression; your expression and mine are different; we can call that personality, but it is only expression. What is expressed is not "something."

You cannot decide to face your fears; that is imaginary. You cannot decide to stop being jealous. You cannot decide to stop being anxious. What can you really decide? Decision is a fantasy. The alcoholic who decides every night to stop drinking... that type of decision has little value. In real life, in listening, there is no decision. Evidences arise from that listening. One can stop drinking, but not by decision, but by evidence. The decision only concretizes the evidence, but it does not generate it.

It's the same with music. When we gather for a concert, what touches people is both the quality of the listening and the concert itself. That's why it's enjoyable to be accompanied by a friend. There is a strange impression that listening stimulates listening. When a group of people surrenders to listening without restrictions or psychological categories—of the type "I like this" or "I don't like this"—it is really listened to as a musician knows how to do, without categories. That listening is what leads to rapture, much more than what is being heard.

That's why, in the East, what is heard was always secondary to the quality of the listening. Before, there were popular operas because people placed the emphasis

on listening. Today, the sense of listening is lost; people only want to go if a very famous tenor sings. He who needs to listen to a great performer is because he doesn't know how to listen. Whoever knows how to listen can hear a musician of much lower quality and have the same aesthetic experience. He who needs a perfect sound doesn't know how to listen; he replaces listening with technique. One can listen to a mediocre musician and have an absolute artistic experience. In traditional art, the important thing is not only the sonority, but the quality of the listening. And this applies to all arts. False notes, the irregularities of a song, are part of its beauty. It is the lack of listening that leads the current public to seek only technical perfection. Look at Korean or Japanese pottery from the 15th and 16th centuries: everything is irregularity. It was only in the 17th and 18th centuries that the perfection of the tea bowl began to be sought, but a century and a half before, imperfection was freedom.

Generally, that which we call "body" is not the body; it is a defense. It is a tool created to defend ourselves, and it is legitimate. When at three years old you receive kicks, you create movements to defend yourself. When you receive aggressions or insults, you create a whole mechanism to survive. You had no choice. But that survival mechanism stimulated muscle mass and created zones where you don't feel anything, because feeling was too painful. That sensation progressively covered the body. Sometimes you wake up in the morning and what you feel is not the body, but that defense you created to not feel it. The "Adamic body" would be that original body, not defended by all those structures you built to escape from fear. Blocking a blow at the right moment is perfect. The problem is when you keep blocking even though there are no more blows. For a child who received too many blows, an insult is a blow. But in reality, the insult does nothing; the real blows are the kicks, the punches. The insult is nothing, unless you have a past of aggressions. In that case, you transpose those blows to all elements of life. At 50 years old, you realize that it is no longer necessary to defend yourself; the blows ended long ago. Yoga is, finally, that exploration of the past, of that body of defense, of that body of survival. A body that does not need to defend itself to live. One should not confuse poetry with life. The poet takes his liberties. When Rumi says he is separated or united with God, both things are true; the poet has that freedom. The notion of chivalry, which is fundamental in Islam and Christianity, does not imply willful action. The knight walks straight, he does not deviate; if an enemy appears, he fights. Whether he lives or dies is decided by God. There is no personal decision. The knight does not "feel like" fighting; he does what he has to do. Right action does not pass through the mind. The "jihad" is not a decision; it is an evidence for the one who receives grace. The term "combat" has a romantic side, as do the decorative yogis in India. Look at Arjuna's penance: centuries on a single foot... that is a form of jihad. It is everywhere. But the solitary and silent life is not a decision, it is something that is not negotiable, it is a grace that catches you. There is no personal participation. The military jihad is something else, but in its original texts, Islam was much deeper than the Christian texts of the crusades.

Before a battle, the Christians asked for victory. The Turkish, Persian, or Arabic texts asked for God to decide and accepted His decision. There is a humility, an abdication of the personal imaginary much more marked in those texts.

[Interlocutor]: From what you say, I get the impression that free will does not exist for the human being.

From a legal point of view, free will exists; the law and society need that imaginary, otherwise no law would be possible. If you tell a policeman that "you didn't decide the speed of your car," it will be difficult for him or for a judge. But in the profound evidence of life, there is no free will. Did you perhaps decide your intelligence? Did you decide your failures, your successes or your diseases? Did you decide to be heterosexual or homosexual? Did you decide your musical tastes or your favorite food? What did you really decide? You didn't decide to be a pianist or an athlete; these are things that impose themselves. You didn't decide to fall in love or to get divorced. The decision is completely imaginary, although it has its place in the civil code of a society. That's why laws are different depending on the culture. But for the inner evidence, there is no personal responsibility. It is normal for a judge to condemn a criminal, but for a psychologist, the criminal is someone to listen to. We base ourselves on a more humanistic point of view: we listen to people. I have no problems with judges or policemen; each one does his job, but they cannot be mixed.

Sleep is like the waking state; it must be listened to with the same intensity. When you enter someone's house and look at their library or their refrigerator, you have many indications about their life; sleep is the same: it is a photo of your psychic life. But it is not about interpreting it, at least not from the metaphysical perspective. Psychologically, it is legitimate for a therapist to interpret it according to their school, but in the direct approach it is not interpreted, because interpretation is always ideological. That's why the dream interpretation manuals of the East—Korea, Burma, Nepal, Japan—are all useless, because they are cultural interpretations that out of context have no meaning. For us, sleep is like waking: we refuse all understanding. To understand is to reduce the immense to something tiny, to our affective state of the moment. There is nothing to understand in sleep or in waking. When you stop pretending to understand, to judge what is right or wrong, and replace knowledge with listening, a space begins to be created. At that point, sleep becomes a finer indicator than waking. If in waking you are afraid of black cats, but you dream of one and you are not afraid, it means that you will soon stop being afraid in waking. Sleep precedes our capacity in waking. That's why the great mystical transmissions occur in sleep; sleep cannot be manufactured. It is a space of revelation where presentiments are concretized which then flow toward waking.

The heart is invulnerable; only the ego is vulnerable. Therefore, do not be afraid of being vulnerable. Everything that touches you, makes you grow. What hurts you, purifies you. What weakens you, gives you your real strength. You only want to defend an image. But what you are deeply cannot be touched; they can kill your body, but you are not going to be reached. There is nothing to defend or anything to expose.

It would be a pity not to understand this. I'm not going to tell my daughter: "you have no father." That she herself discovers it will be her own grace. And one day perhaps she will tell me: "you know, you have no daughter," and I will tell her that I already know. But I'm not going to impose the fact that the father-daughter relationship is completely imaginary. When I'm with her, I am a father. But for me, I have no daughter. My daughter is not there, there is no father, but she enters the room and the father appears: it is her experience. Later, if she deepens in her life, one day she will know that this experience is useless. But never impose anything on the environment. If your husband thinks he has a wife, you have no reason to tell him: "but there is no wife." No, no, it's for him to see it, if grace touches him. The environment must be respected. You're not going to tell a Christian that God doesn't exist, right? One must respect. To those who imagine they have a future, if you tell them "there is no future," they will experience it as an aggression. Everything the environment thinks is right... for them. The communist, the fascist, the Islamist, the capitalist, the bourgeois... for me, they are all right from their point of view, because they cannot have another. If I ate like them, thought through them, saw the world like them, I would think the same. One must respect the other's point of view. Are we obliged to have the same one? Are we obliged to have a point of view at all? For what? It is rare for the tongue to have a point of view. How can I know what is right? It's as if they asked me what the right border for Kashmir is: the one on the Pakistani map, the Chinese one or the Indian one? I don't know what is right. Neither do I know what the border of Jordan is, nor of Iraq, nor of Palestine. Why should I know? There are those who know, and I am happy for them; depending on where they were born and their age, I understand that their knowledge is different. If you are a dictator, politician or military man, it is different, you have to act according to a point of view, and that is respectable. But we are not dictators or politicians; we have no reason to know what the right map of the world is. We look at the movements, the influences, and we understand that a Chinese person sees themselves in such a position, a Russian in such another, and that the European or the American have theirs. We understand geopolitics, but seeing that each country's map is a false map for the others. Thus, at a given moment, the other's point of view seems totally right for him. He needs it. The more space he finds in himself, the less he will need it. And at some point, eventually, it will no longer be necessary to take oneself for anything. Then one begins to breathe, one realizes that one has no parents, nor children, nor family, nor country, nor race... and life becomes infinitely easier. It is a grace that falls, or not. It is not something that can be discussed or imposed. Therefore, you should keep this in secret, very

intimate with yourself. The fact of not taking oneself for anything is a secret that we keep. On the contrary, the more flexible you are with yourself, the easier it will be for you to be with a communist, with a fascist, with a rich person, with a poor person, with a young person or with an old person. You will see how easy it is because you understand their point of view: "of course, he is like that," "of course, he needs to see the world like that to feel secure, to prove this or affirm that." You listen. It is wonderful to listen to others when you have nothing to say. And sometimes, very exceptionally, if you feel a space, if the other almost insists by asking: "I see things like this, but is there another possibility?", which happens once every hundred years... then you can tell them: "you're right, it's good that you ask yourself. You see it like this and it's right from your point of view, but look, there are other possibilities that are not necessarily false." You can lead the person to that questioning. But you are never going to say what is "right," because there is no such thing. The right thing is to listen. Things are not right; they are imaginary. At the same time, there is that immense secret of your inner space, which concerns no one, not even yourself.

It seems that the human being needs ritualization. Children of one or two years old, before going to bed, need to put a stone here, make a drawing there... if not, they sleep poorly. Religions codified those elements. It is a respectable form; they are not real initiatory rites, they are like the initiation rituals of students or the military; they exist everywhere. In the East, in Africa... the human being constantly creates initiatory rites. In sports, the same thing happens; sport is a somewhat degenerate initiatory rite, but it is the same combat codified by laws. It replaces real combat, but with the same adrenaline, the same intensity of violence that is sought in war. We look at that with affection, with sympathy; it is a bit childish, like the fact of believing in something or being religious, but it is sympathetic. I feel a lot of affection when I go to India and see tridents and lingams everywhere. It is sympathetic and useless, but sympathetic. I have Christian friends with crosses in their houses; I wouldn't have that, but I think it's fine. I have had friends attracted by rites of initiatory violence, and I understand it; I myself felt attracted by that. But there is a somewhat simple side to the religious and initiatory, in the sense that we are not obliged to go through rituals. The ritual is something mundane; the proof is that it is seen. What is serious is the invisible. Everything that is seen is secondary. A child needs to be congratulated; it's noticeable that they need it, but one day they grow up and no longer require it. If the man matures, he no longer needs these initiatory rites. They are fine if one feels they serve him; it's better than going to a nightclub or buying stocks to be richer, but there is no big difference for us. For someone born in a traditional context, you cannot ask them to be free of their religion; it is not possible. Meister Eckhart did not ask the Germans of his time not to be Christians; Abhinavagupta did not ask his own not to be Shivaists. But, is it really indispensable today? If someone is born in Corsica, do they need to appropriate an initiatory life? Perhaps yes, if they feel it so, but the football team also works for a time. Do I need to dress up afterwards? Abhinavagupta rejected

initiation to those who wore external Shivaite marks; he says it in the *Tantraloka*. Already then, there was a criticism of the external form. Tantric texts say that whoever has a clear perspective must behave externally as a Vaishnavite—that is, respect social forms and the immanence of life—be a knight in his actions, study the tantras and agamas—the metaphysical presentiment—and be in his heart a worshiper of the Goddess—which is not shown—. It is surrendering to the celebration of consciousness without contradictions. Vaishnavism, in the tantric texts, means being religious, which is the first intuitive level. Then comes the metaphysical presentiment and finally, in the heart, the realization of silence, where all external form disappears. Rites are passages. I respect the initiatory; it seems important and right to me, but eminently useless. Whoever needs to prove his virility in boxing, must do it. Whoever needs Masonic or Tantric initiations, let them receive them. But perhaps one day they will ask themselves: "What is it for? What do I lack?". Nothing is missing. To think that something is missing is a lack of respect for life, for the divine; it's like believing that God committed a mistake and I must rectify it with an initiation bought in India or Tibet.

When I was 20 years old, before my first trip to India, I went to see my master Jean Klein. He himself sent me. I told him: "I feel they are going to propose a Shivaite initiation to me there." I knew nothing in those days, but I felt it. I asked him if I could accept them. He told me: "Everything they transmit to you there, you're going to have to take off when you come back. So it's not worth the trouble. There is nothing to receive; that which you think is exterior." Later I understood why he told me. But for whoever believes that without the rite there is nothing, the rite is indispensable. It is better to go to church than to a football match, but there will come a day when you no longer go to church... although you still go to football. About drugs... it depends on the context. The difference is that traditional initiation does not alter the brain, while drugs force you to see something you hadn't seen before; there is a violence in that. And today it can be scientifically proven that drugs destroy brain cells. It's not serious, because we use very few of our capacities and we have plenty of cells, but drugs used in a ritual context—like peyote in South America, in a moderate way—can have a place. But if you abuse, the negative thing is that the drug is a gift you give yourself with your own money: it's a form of masturbation. Whoever is very sensitive reaches a moment in which they can no longer masturbate, because in the sexual act the pleasure is in the other; masturbation is unsatisfactory. Drugs are the same: you give yourself pleasure with your own money. What makes you happy is offering a gift, not receiving it. In initiation it's different, it doesn't come from you; it's a gift someone gives you so you can feel something. There is a passive state of good omen. One never "seeks" an initiation; it is the initiation that seeks you on a certain plane. It is more organic to be initiated in Sufism, Hinduism, or Christianity than to take drugs arbitrarily without knowing their specific ritual use. In a deep sense, initiation is the concretization of a presentiment. Whoever seeks initiation to "have" a presentiment has things backwards. Abhinavagupta said that it is Shiva who leads to yoga, not

yoga that leads to Shiva.

Shiva. Whoever inclines towards ritual practice does so because they already received grace. But whoever pretends to receive grace by fulfilling rituals, curiously excludes themselves from the authentic process. Yoga is not a means; it is an expression of life, a recognition of life; and initiation is an expression of that recognition. It is not a means to achieve something. It is often said that Shankara, despite his profound knowledge, went to seek the initiation of his guru, Govinda, simply by tradition. It is said that he knocked on the door and when Govinda asked him "who is it?", Shankara recited the Atma Bodha: "I am not the body, I am not the mind, I am Shiva, the consciousness...". Even so, he asked for initiation. Not to reach clarity, but as an expression of that clarity. Ibn Arabi also visited someone at the end of his life to receive an initiation he didn't need. There can be a ritualization to be in agreement with an initiatory path, seeing it as a stage or an expression of the presentiment of truth. It is not a problem, unless it is seen as a mechanical means. We see it a lot in Tibetan Buddhism, where people run after increasingly "high" initiations, falling into a kind of spiritual capitalism of accumulation. For us, that is far from the direct resonance.

Everything is a symbol if you look at it that way. The lines on the floor, the circle of the microphone, the white of the walls, the light... what would not be symbolic? In our modern society, people live so outwardly that they forgot this evidence. All forms have a non-conceptual, archaic, living sense. It is the pleasure of living with an antique object, made without mercantile reasons. When you live with an ancient ritual object, you see that the material was chosen because it corresponded organically to its ritual destination, in agreement with the forces of nature. The weight, the texture, the proportion... when everything is in harmony, the object becomes "magical". But in reality, everything is magical; there is nothing more magical than a tree. The ritual object is magical because it was conceived in total agreement with nature. The non-ritual object, on the other hand, was made without listening to nature. If a ritual object is made of wood, the tree was cut in a specific season and dried according to certain rites. That's why after centuries the wood doesn't move. A modern floor, at 30 years old, already ripples because the wood was cut in any way and without respecting the seasons, total we think that in 30 years we are going to remake the house. The old floor is ritual in a profound sense. Everything is ritual. The ritual object is that in which there was an excess of consciousness in its manufacture. But don't stay in that; the first ritual is looking at the sun, the stars, the sea, feeling the wind. The mountains, the valleys, the storms, the rains... that is the ritual. Seeing birth, death, suffering, love, hatred... those are the basic rites. Then we condense that into ideological forms according to each culture. From there comes the beauty of a Berber, Iranian, or Turkish tapestry; they are specifications, but the original symbol is nature. What is more symbolic than an inspiration, an expiration, the heartbeat, or the movement of the body? The first

ritual is scarring, digestion, the combat of the cells that defend the body: that is the true jihad. The ritual is only "becoming conscious". There is a kind of ecstasy in ritual objects because they were inhabited by people who used them consciously, with a sense of celebration, of gratitude and devotion. That's why the object is charged with those moments of humility. But don't become an ideologue of this. We don't need ritual objects; feeling life is already the maximum rite. The great ritual moment is death; the other moments are secondary or participate in it. That's why the sages don't celebrate birthdays, but the date of their death: that is the moment when the person is liberated, the moment to rejoice and gather. Celebrating birth is a last grotesque rudeness; what matters is how one dies.

[Interlocutor]: Your teaching could be summarized in this question of listening and what it engenders.

[Éric Baret]: First, there is no teaching here. But yes, every traditional approach is based on listening. What is not listening is ornamental, it is decorative. For pedagogical reasons, listening was adorned with cultural elements of different traditions, and that is respectable because people had no other possibilities. The human being needs forms, needs security. We invented marriage, fidelity, property, nationality... rituals somewhat in disuse, but that make us believe that we are secure or that we are loved. However, at the bottom of all ritual appropriations, even the most extreme mystical ones, is listening. Meister Eckhart did not speak of listening but he spoke of humility: it is the same. There are no degrees in humility; one cannot go "beyond" humility, which is total non-appropriation. He who detaches himself from things but keeps himself gave nothing; he who detaches himself from himself can keep everything and has nothing. Christians call it detachment, Sufis call it something else, but we are talking about the same thing. I use the word "listening" because it is the one that least lends itself to the mind. "Detachment" sounds to us like something difficult, almost like flagellation, because of our Judeo-Christian past. But if I tell you "listening", no image comes. There is no representation, neither for nor against. It is such a "null" word that one cannot even think about it. That's why we use it: it allows us not to create anything "magnificent". Every tradition is based on listening and on the silence that listens. You can read Meister Eckhart, Ibn Arabi or Rumi; they say extraordinary things, but when you finish reading them, what remains is the listening. The sermon is reabsorbed, what he said dies and destroys you, forces you to abdicate in your own humility. In a traditional text the important thing is not the text, but what remains afterwards, like the silence after a concert. Listening seems to me a fair word, but there are others, although sometimes they lend themselves more to the spiritual imagery that we want to avoid.

If there is one last question... I don't want to keep you here all night. Fear (\*la peur\*) is the motor of life. Without fear, people would stay inert. You marry out of fear, you

divorce out of fear, you sleep with the neighbor out of fear, you buy a car out of fear. You do yoga out of fear, you diet out of fear, you have children out of fear... you become brilliant out of fear! Fear is that dynamic of believing that you have nothing, that you are nothing, and that therefore you need to enrich yourself. But one day you realize that there is nothing to be afraid of, because what you are deeply is not in danger. Your body will die like everything else, but the essential is not afraid of life. What happens is inevitable. When you leave the ideological discourse of judging what is better or worse, fear disappears. When you are with a friend who dies, there is no fear that he will die, because you understand that it is life. There is presence, intensity, love for life and for that friend, whether alive or dead. Fear dissolves in intensity. Fear is a form of postponement: I believe I must "have" something and I am afraid of not getting it; then I seek increasingly strange securities. But life works like this: today they love you, tomorrow perhaps not. No matter how faithful someone is, they can have an accident or cancer. You cannot hold on to anything. You have children, you have a house... but realize that you don't "have" them. That fear of losing is replaced by listening to what is here now. You are afraid because you project a future. Give yourself small moments of "no-future," of "no-past," between two thoughts or between two perceptions. At night, when deep sleep arrives, give yourself that moment of not manufacturing anything. The past died, the future has not arrived... what am I in this moment? You will see that there is no fear there. Fear always depends on our futures. If every night you go to sleep in intensity, dying at every moment without imagining that you are going to wake up, that frequenting of the "end of the world" will take away your fear. As long as you fall asleep with a future, tomorrow will already contain the tremor of insecurity.

Feeling the fear is important; most people don't feel it, they don't imagine they have it. Whoever feels the fear already has a maturity; they realize that they only act out of fear: fear of losing, of not having, of not being loved, of not knowing, of not arriving... Seeing this is fundamental. When you see that your actions are born from fear, you can investigate that, not conceptually but by feeling it. Give yourself moments of doing nothing. It's four-thirty, your next activity is at five. Do nothing. There the sensation of the body appears, which is usually suffocated by action. When you stop doing, the body appears: the feet, the buttocks, the back, the belly, the face, the elbows... Everything begins to be felt: heat, cold, heaviness, density, vibration... It's like a wonderful tactile journey, as if you took a magnificent drug and awakened a whole tactile world. And then you go pick up your children or your dog. Another day, do the same: sit quietly and do nothing, not even yoga. You are going to be visited by a body that is always muzzled by action. Let that tactile madness, that intensity of spaces grow. If you do this in a poetic way—not out of obligation—you will see that in those moments there is no fear. And little by little, that tactile intensity will take up so much space that life will be too beautiful to have a future or a fear. If they tell me I'll die in half an hour, I don't have time to be afraid; I have an extraordinary half hour of life to feel, taste and breathe. Fear is a form of

"mièvrerie" (feebleness). Mystical traditions—Sufism, Indian rites, kirtans or bhajans, Christian homilies—seek that: to return to the present intensity. What is ecstasy? It is presence. Ecstasy is the sign of presence now, not of a future existence. Physiological fear (\*la peur\*) is indispensable to survive; pain too. If you didn't feel pain, you would leave your hand in the fire. Pain makes you withdraw your hand and save it. Physiological fear makes you run faster if a dog attacks you; adrenaline is important for survival. But psychological fear is what paralyzes you, what prevents you from running. That paralysis is eliminated with tactile intensity. The most direct thing is to give oneself those little moments of non-voluntary activity; you will see that the tactile intensity is so strong that you can no longer have fear (although you feel the physical reaction to a danger). This is the theory; the important thing is the practical work.

[Éric Baret]: Thank you, Edwin.

[Interlocutor]: Thank you.