

## CAN'T LOSE A FRIEND I DON'T HAVE

*“It is your attention, your genuine interest and hunger for things that you want to hear—something from you is triggering something in me, which is gathering information and pulling it out. Of course, information has to be there to start with. What you do not know you cannot say, but without you these things would never have been said.”*

Q: In the light of whatever happened to U.G., what do you think of advaita?

GUHA: These are concepts and they came to us through intellectual and logical thinking, therefore it is always problematic. How do we address the oneness of life? It is just a concept, one cannot experience such a thing. By trying to understand the concept one will invest tremendously in the dualistic nature of thought and imagination and in the process one is going to experience various things—trying to further understand the experience logically you create ideas and various aspects of advaita. When you really want to experience the nature of advaita for yourself, you will begin to see the problem. What can you do? You can try to find out through introspection, by saying to yourself that you are experiencing pain, experiencing pleasure, feeling high, you are afraid and so on. We have various ways of finding out what happens to us physically during these experiences, and we can even see by sophisticated instruments how different parts of the brain get activated. We develop concepts like perception, images and thoughts to explain the way we function, and what are the possible sources and how the brain processes. You just go on thinking about it, and then come to conclusions. We can even use information from the brain scan and see what happens during sleep and come up with different stages of sleep. As a result of those theoretical, logical conclusions, you come to discover that there is something going on—the stimulus and response. Then you come up with the idea of oneness of life. These are all theoretical constructs.

Q: So, U.G. also wouldn't agree with advaita?

GUHA: How could he? As a functional species in the thinking world, I will not experience the state of unity. I cannot. I cannot report anything that is going on there. The reporting mechanism is itself a divisive process.

Q: Like seeing that non-duality is a conclusion ...

GUHA: ... a conclusion, an inference. So, when you try to understand certain aspects of it, you say, for example, these are the things that I thought. Say I ask you, “How do you know god exists?” Then I devise some methods—if you close your eyes and sit for meditation, in the beginning you will not be able to concentrate. Gradually, after

practicing for some time, you will be able to concentrate better, which means you will perhaps have a larger space of absorption or a kind of drowning—a little different feeling and then you will experience certain things. That's what I thought I was experiencing and I will tell you, you will also experience it—there will be some common experiences. You will see something, you will hear something. The nature of those things will be different because your background is different from mine. Instead of saying that maybe this is just a fundamental property of the human system, you are saying, "Since you are experiencing that, something else is responsible that must be the source of divinity." So, that is the construction of a model. I have a model—the model is an assumption. All science builds on that model. So, I give certain attributes to this model. If this model is true, then logically it should produce this, and then I match that. All the psychological theories are also like that. To match this model, human intentionality twists the facts. It's the nature of it, and that is where the self is standing. It strengthens and fortifies, and aggrandizes when it is confirmed by its predictions. And so, even if I am not intentionally twisting the facts, my filtering mechanism to see things in a particular way will make that appear differently—it will manipulate the process. If I am talking to five people, each one will be conditioned to hear in a different way. Even if they don't understand that, their conditioning itself creates an intention and a disposition, and in that, this information, this set of words, is creating a meaning in this particular way. So the whole thing has a constant feedback loop of its own justification.

Q: So, is it possible to listen open-mindedly and let something new come in without conditioning?

GUHA: No.

Q: It's not possible?

GUHA: Not possible. So, anything that you construct out of a discussion is essentially either supporting or denying a pre-existing set of ideas. It's always going to do that, and there is no choice. That is the way things are—there is no way one can function with the concept of advaita. Similarly, you cannot function here and now.

Q: And Ramakrishna, was he not talking about non-duality?

GUHA: Not non-duality. I think Sri Ramakrishna was very authentic, and also very intelligent. He was clearly expressing that in the field of life, those things don't exist. They exist in dream, in trance, and in bhava—bhava means your thought-world and ideas, and in that world. So, that world is a dual world. It is a dual world because that's what the imagination is. We are talking, completely forgetting about what's going on around us, what is falling on my eyes—she is also in the retina but it's focused on you. So, we are caught up in this idea and flow. There is no other way. You can predict that in a certain context there is a possibility of a certain state of existence—because, well, I have to say this, there are moments when you can't remember anything that just happened, you can't

recollect anything even in your waking state. From that absence, you can perhaps predict that absence is an indication of something else existing compared to what we are normally recollecting and saying. So, honestly you cannot tell what happens there.

Q: So you think even Ramana didn't describe an experience but it was ...

GUHA: Describing an experience itself is duality. There is nothing you can do. So that is the reason U.G. was always saying, "You stop what is." The moment you are describing what is, it's a cock n' bull story. This bliss, beatitude, immensity, everything. And, why it is bad? It is not bad. It is bad because you are solidifying wrong concepts. You are looking for an existence of an advaita state through duality. This absence of duality is not knowing—nothingness. You cannot say, "I have experienced non-duality." What is the silence that you are talking about experiencing? It is absence. Not silence. Silence means you don't hear anything. So what do you say? It's like formlessness that she was telling. What is the formlessness you can talk about? Anything that you talk about, either images or words—where does that formlessness come? It's just a word. It's an absence of things. Absence of images, absence of ... and you can't talk about that. All you can say is absence—over! You cannot say anything about it. That can happen in your sleep. You don't remember many things. And, in the concept of modern day brain research, our description of the deep sleep is not all that correct. There may be dreams in the deep sleep.

Q: There's no dreamless state?

GUHA: No. Hardly.

Q: I thought there is a state where there's no ...

GUHA: They have changed the definition. It's called rapid-eye movement ...

Q: Yes, that's the dream.

GUHA: That's the dream, and in non-REM, patterns are different but that does not mean that thought processes are completely stopped there. Of course, you as an individual will not know anything. The boundary between dreaming and not dreaming, is not sharp.

Q: And when U.G. talked about, I don't know the words he used, but like "natural state" or "natural functioning" that's something that can be experienced.

GUHA: No, no, no, no. The experience is also similar, the natural functioning is also an outcome of his knowledge of advaita and oneness of life. Don't be taken away by any description. Also, there is a danger in the description of a natural state. What he described as a natural state—if you try to follow, your life is going to be even worse and more miserable than the guy who is following and copying advaita existence.

Q: You can't imitate that.

GUHA: It is not possible. And mind you, science is not yet able to describe the unique behavior of a particular simple cell organization—it is unknown. How you will behave if such and such and such happens, is unknown. So, if you try to imitate a behavior based on your knowledge about a state and try to prove that you are functioning this way, you will definitely falsify yourself. There is no doubt about that, no matter who says what.

Q: So, there's nothing you can say about it?

GUHA: Nothing you can say, all you can feel is that you are feeling those things, and you have no desire to project yourself to the future. From there, you might conclude, or somebody else might conclude that something has happened. These things are different—all supposition and speculation. About life, you really have to come down and say, "If you ask me honestly, I f..ing don't know." But I feel if I project my knowledge, if I try to recollect how I feel, I will come up with that and they're all in the field of duality. Anybody says anything, I don't give a damn, because even according to definition they are wrong. I even don't believe the definition. So there is no truth that I can find out, even if I consider the definition, according to definition—the description is false.

What you can feel is the absence of conflict. That is something that you can definitely feel, and the power that will come out of the absence of conflict is something that you cannot convey to anybody else. You will feel it, and I think that is what I felt in his presence. The absence of conflict itself is a tremendous outburst of energy. We have this strange thing about the superconducting proximity effect. The superconductor—when I described this thing, U.G. loved it—the superconductor is something where in a medium no matter how much energy you put out, it can effortlessly flow. So, depending on need and necessity, the energy that can flow in a frictional situation in a non-superconductor in the proximity of a superconductor, in a condition of a particular life's disposition where the conflict is minimized, can be enormous. How it is involved, and the field or the orderliness that will be established and produces power and sustains it, is a different story altogether. That means, if you are extremely receptive to U.G., the power that will generate inside that system in his proximity is boundless. That is giving an example from a scientific standpoint and definition. I am not telling anything about the validity of this in a living situation. Anyway, he is no more, so it is meaningless now. However, it is the nature of the superconductor. The energy that will be available depends on your conflict and that's how it's a variable thing, you know. You can feel in the system since there is no friction, there is no fear, there is no idea that it is trying to withhold or defend. You will come to know—there is a tremendous frictionless disposition of life energy and it is beating at its best inside you and there is nothing you have to do. That has a different kind of impact.

Q: And how does it impact?

GUHA: The impact is always like life's energy. When it feels the imposition of resistance, it means there is a challenge and the energy builds up. The system is trying to overcome that challenge and it builds up, builds up. It gets more and more animated. It's just pumping more and more and more and more. At one point it will obliterate you and you are out—literally. It just can't process any more information in the brain. It goes to a different kind of functioning that does not otherwise happen—unless you are forced to come to a state between being awake and being asleep. That is the forceful situation that you were asking me that time—that you are forced to when we were talking—forcing means some energy is almost trying to not let you move and process and recollect and often that happens and you don't know why you feel euphoric, because it somehow establishes in you a kind of frictionless condition, and you don't know what you feel—some kind of different disposition. So, that's why these theoretical concepts are all logical and the foundation of logic has to break down. Your investment in logic is based on certain suppositions—meaning that you will probably find the cause and effect of the movement of life. You have a hope, and with that, if it begins to break down, the information structure that is there with a very inept logic created by the human social intellect, begins to lose its grip. It's not that you will not believe anything, but that belief will always be in the context of functionality. The moment it addresses something outside of that—you have seen where it goes. You know it's a blind alley. But, the existence of that causality in the information structure is always going to put you back into that loop because the mechanism which has produced that kind of interest, the pleasure of understanding, lingers inside. And, that gets, that's what often U.G. said, you know—that is always trying to establish its past glory. It's lurking like a shadow. Something so radical happened in the brain, it does not find its space, like it did earlier, it has no place, it has to burn out. The system soon realizes that it's trying to establish its old circuitry where it goes for this imaginary space and begins to invest more energy unnecessarily, which comes through with hope—it's going to be nabbed and burned. And that is not anything for anybody—it is just for its own sake. The old cannot establish its imposition, so all the interest, all this trying to understand, is a part of that mechanism. But, it is always going to be there and so, if there is a female breast it's going to appeal, but it has no function, therefore no further action. It just ends there, nipped in the bud—it's over.

So, these are the things that you can see. You will not understand. You cannot say what is happening. All you will see is the impact of a different functionality. For that, you cannot infer anything. You cannot infer a particular idea. You cannot say that “because of this, I know I have become THAT.” That means you are still upholding a particular idea. You will not know. Even the scientists will tell you the outcome of an idea is a mechanism of an enormous process that is going on in the brain in its billion, trillion circuitry. It's just the tip of the iceberg. What is going on below that, you will never know—all you will see is the outcome. And, you have no control. It is doing by itself. So, for me, through logic I can tell perhaps your condition is moving this way or that way. There is no way you as an individual can have any idea or can have any possibility of knowing what is going on there, except the outcome—a thought popped up. You will have no way of telling how it

came. The knowledge that your brain is working through conditioning is not going to be of any use to you as a mechanism that brings up or throws out thought. There are two different regimes altogether. One is not going to help the other. So, it is out.

I am not interested in knowing what is going on here—I am interested in knowing how my knowledge is going to straighten things up. It's not going to do anything for me. So, gaining knowledge to straighten me up is an exercise in futility. Getting knowledge to make a living—yes—because the whole world functions according to that. So you see, the instrument that you use for a particular functionality has no place in the other, but you are trying to use it for that anyway. You try to find out if I know why I am sad, maybe I can address the sadness—no. If you know why you are sad and then you come to know that it is not in your hands, giving up means you are giving an opportunity to the system instead of giving more energy to the lingering thought. Allowing it, if you are lucky, maybe it will address something—maybe it can help. That's it. Or some drug, because you know chemistry has an effect. Our entire existence is the outcome of chemistry. You know if you take poison you will die. Plain, simple. Chemicals can do certain things there. If somehow you take alcohol, maybe it will just free you for a little while in a certain way, like chemicals can do—that's it. But ideas cannot do anything.

Ideas are like—happiness. Happiness is a function of your predisposed notion of what makes you happy. If I come to know my daughter received good marks in a particular subject, I feel happy. If I hear that she failed, I feel sad. These are all predisposed conditions, just an information-creating disposition inside me. That's it, that is happiness, there is no other thing called happiness. The chemical function or chemical order that can cause something that will suddenly change the complete disposition inside you is something acausal, you will not know but you will feel lucky. You cannot say, "Oh, something happened to me." All you can say is, "I am lucky." That's all, nothing else. If you say something else, it means you are using it for a different self-satisfying purpose.

Q: And it can't be exploited any more.

GUHA: Exactly. If it is so foundational, you know that there is nothing you can do about it. That is the only positive aspect of the experience. No other thing. Because if now somebody comes and tells me that, "If you do this you will see god," I have seen it. You don't have to tell me. Perhaps you haven't, but I have. So, for me, all your advice has no use. That is the only use of the experience. People do things to get the experience. Once you have that experience, then it will be difficult for others to fool you. But if you are really integrated enough, if you are honest to the core, if your purpose still has that power of discrimination, you will want to sort it out for yourself, not to just feel happy because you are having a vision or dream of god. If you have that discrimination alive inside you, then you will begin to see what that experience has done to you—nothing. When he comes with a grand promise that if you do this you will experience that, it will have no value to you. So, you become a useless entity for those phonies. But if you don't believe yourself, if you have not experienced, if you are naïve, if you are gullible— that is what we normally

are—then their camouflage works. They are doing everything for either self-aggrandizement or a living. Nothing else. If he really comes down to the level that it is not possible, I truly do not know, I have experienced everything—I still do not know how things are, he will never go to anybody in the name of helping. It's not possible. Because that person has to first feel there is absolutely no difference between you and him. That is the foundation. There is nothing, there cannot be—impossible. If that is the foundation, what authority have I or anyone to think that I will help you? That's a joke. It's a pretension. Brainwashed to believe that I can help you. It's not possible. It's impossible. Yes, I can give you money. You can make good food for me. These are all practical functional aspects. Nothing else. Nothing else is possible. If I have no investment, I don't care. Truly I will not care. And that itself will make you invulnerable, but at the same time, the system is so sensitive, so responsive, it normally, naturally functions. And that vulnerability also will be a thing of beauty—to me. You know when I saw the thing in U.G.'s eyes, that kind of flowing kindness, it just broke the whole thing. It just, but he didn't know. It was a normal, natural response. He didn't even know. People are always pretending, because they have an investment. If I know that this is the way I make my living, because this has a social value, and the value is created by the society's give-and-take, and I am very clear about that, then there is no friction. The friction comes in the investment that what I am saying is the truth that will help you. Along with it goes the fascism of thinking.

That is the only danger of not processing the relationship between experience and the inference. You are trying to uphold something without going through it very carefully and getting to the bottom of things, you suddenly—that's why U.G. was always saying, "You just feel a tickling in your head and you think you are getting enlightened. You just start scratching your surface and you think the kundalini is rising. All petty little experiences." That is so dangerous, you know.

Q: Like the J.K. people they always thought it's a great thing if they have a headache because J.K. had the headache.

GUHA: So stupid! Absolutely stupid thing! That shows the level of our gullibility—the justification of a thinking mind. When you try, you can experience, there are a lot of things that you can experience, but if you put in the proper framework that it could be this, it could be this, it could be that, why, fuck it, I don't know—then you are not standing in its way. The moment you try to interpret, you are not allowing it to bloom. Whatever it is, you know. Anything—a woman becomes pregnant, if she feels like vomiting and if she does not understand what's going on, she can have a miscarriage. If she thinks that with her morning sickness, she should go and run and jump, she may definitely miscarry. In this field, I think the best instrument is not knowing. But that needs courage. The mind never gets satisfied in a state where you don't know.

Q: Then basically if I just shut up, that's the best thing.

GUHA: Unless there is a demand.

Q: Then you think it's a practice—okay, shut up.

GUHA: No, no, no.

Q: Shut up, shut up, shut up....

GUHA: Unless she asked me, I would have never said all these things.

Q: I don't mean you ...

GUHA: No, I am telling you, that's the normal situation. It is always on demand.

Q: Not knowing.

GUHA: Yeah, even when I am with friends, mostly, unless somebody seriously pins me down, I just laugh, talk, chit-chat, ask her—all the time laughing and chit-chatting, making fun.

Q: What did U.G. used to call it—the glee of insanity?

GUHA: Glee of insanity. U.G. used to tell me, “You have the glee of insanity.” The insanity is the real thing. This is the insanity name game—Sri Ramakrishna—this book, this gospel—he said that there are many people who want to do sadhana, it means practice, and really become interested in knowing the reality, truth, god, whatever, and when they become very serious there is a lot of obstruction. No family, I mean it was like a fear in the Indian middle class family, if you become so close to the sense of god intoxication, you would be lost from the family ground. So, people who cannot withstand that pressure, they pretend to go mad. They know then everybody will leave them alone.

Q: It's funny that they set it up at the ideal, and then they try so hard to keep you from going for it.

GUHA: This is the beauty.

Q: It's like that in Christianity too. It's not any different.

GUHA: You go every day, you depend on Jesus, if somebody wants to say that I want to go close to Jesus, then it's all brouhaha, why ... isn't it?

Q: Saint Francis, you know, his parents were very rich. He gave up everything and went and lived in the mountains with a bunch of wild people. That was horrible, they couldn't stand it. But there are a lot of stories like that.



GUHA: So, one of the ways to avoid the social pressure is to act like you are mad.

Q: To act like a maddie.

GUHA: We have jokes—a mad guy, who was very wise mad—he was just peeing on the street in front of people. So one guy said, “Don’t you feel shy?” He says, “To pee in front of cats and dogs, do you feel shy?”

Q: That sounds like a familiar point of view.

GUHA: They said, “Wow, sorry. We asked the wrong person.” Indians are very good at storytelling. All these god-men, they are all very good, they can mesmerize. Actually, Rajneesh was a great story teller, in the talks and ...

Q: Except he talked too slowly.

GUHA: Too slowly? That means that thing is not there, the spontaneity ...

Q: In Ireland they call it, “The gift of the gab.” It’s like you are good at telling stories.

GUHA: Storytelling is the passing on of human culture, when we were young and living together, all brothers and sisters and cousins, we would be sitting around my grandpa, my mother’s dad, also a doctor, he was a fantastic storyteller. He would just totally mesmerize us with his stories. His stories were never-ending stories.

Q: It doesn’t exist any more, with this TV and computers and play stations ...

GUHA: The human contact is going.

Q: End of storytelling to kids.

Q: So Guha, the saying of Lao Tzu, “He who knows does not tell, he who tells does not know.” I think that he was very close to ...

GUHA: In the sense, that if something hits you hard, there is no need for you to project certain ideas. Really. There is no need, there is no investment. You know, why should I invest anything? The ideas are like that, they’re going to come in your way and make you go in a wrong—wrong means you will put a lot of investment in matching by believing me, or believing somebody, what he is describing. You will try to find a way to match those things inside you. And there’s going to always be a gap because life’s unfoldment will never be expressed by words and images. So, it’s going to be a struggle.

But if somebody asks about my experience, as far as the experience is concerned, and the action which produced those experiences, then of course I have a point of view.

My point of view is that when I fell extremely in love with U.G., it was like a pulsating sensation, I felt like eating that man up. Those were the times the experience would be just overwhelming. But I didn't know the connection. It was the feeling and experience, maybe it was producing certain effects in me, I cannot tell.

Q: Right, but you had no choice. It was not like you were trying to be in love or ...

GUHA: Yes, and I was feeling it more, like everything about him I was liking and it was just building up, building up and was feeling more and more for him. And that produced experience—he was putting fuel to that. He was responding to that like I never felt before. Especially, I am not justifying that I had done sadhana before, but coming from a spiritual community where you saw how difficult it was to get close to a revered one, and here you were fully entangled with that guy and he was just cooking for you and eating feasts together—like merry-making. That overwhelmed me further. Everything put together, it was simply great, but he was always making fun of me. He used to say that old habits die hard because I ran after my guru with full passion, and now I was running after him. I said, “Look, how can I explain this to you? A guy who was just walking on a desert, looking for an oasis, dying of thirst, suddenly put his feet in the deep water.” He said, “Wow, you have a vivid imagination.”

Q: One time I was talking to him and I said, “U.G., I've been around a lot of people and read all these things and there is no one like you.” It just came out of me that way. “There's no one anywhere like you.” And he looked at me and he just said, so simply, “Yes, some people tell me that.” It was so sweet.

GUHA: Very sweet.

Q: So unpretentious.

GUHA: His pretensions were play. But when you confronted him seriously, he was dead serious about the right thing.

Q: Yeah, you put yourself right there, and I think that's the difference in some way.

GUHA: Absolutely no sense of any investment. He would tell you the way things are with a complete possible outcome of losing you as a friend forever. It was that extreme. You know? “Can't lose a friend I don't have.” That was a sweet way of saying that you can f-off if you want.