RP: My question is about the relationship, if any, between the psyche and the soma. According to J.Krishnamurti, at the moment of liberation there is also a physical transformation of the brain cells. Is this correct or incorrect, or are in a way perhaps both correct and incorrect? Another thinker, U.G. Krishnamurti, relates that psychological transformation is wholly a bodily process and cannot be affected in any way by one's mode of perceiving reality. I seem to have discerned the proper answer to these questions the other day when you said that in real freedom there is no longer even the mind, thoughts and the body. So all these points of view have dropped away as unnecessary and irrelevant conceptualizations. Am I understanding you correctly?

Poonjaji: To speak of any cells in the body, brain cells, is merely a physical idea, because the cells are in the brain; so it belongs to physicality.

As to the other question, U.G. says he does not agree. So both these concepts are not correct in my view. Because whether you agree or disagree, belong to the same mind. They come from the mind. So the total freedom, ultimate reality, is that never ever anything existed. So who is to understand if there are body cells or not? Who is to say to be against or in favour? To say something in favour, you need mind. What is mind itself? You don't need any mind. You never existed. Nothing ever existed. Not even the creator itself. And we all belong to the creator. The creator must have existed. When you speak of creation, there must have been a creator. I don't think a creator had been created before any creation. Before creation there must have been something, which cannot be spoken of or described. You can't give it a name of even Nothingness, Emptiness, Enlightenment, Freedom or whatever. There is no word . . . Word is only a definition of communication between two persons, even a single person, is there not alone. Nothing but God was there, that is God, ultimate reality and that is always there, here and now. Not that you have to gain or attain it through some teacher. You have to return to your ultimate understanding: Where does this concept come from that I exist? "I exist." So if you search for the source of "I," it will straightaway takes you to this place or no-place I just spoke about.

Further Comments by RP: Poonjaji's statement reverberates with that of Zen Master Hui-neng's famous statement: "From the first, not a thing is."

Even on the level of physicality, the Krishnamurtis' comments are a moot point, since the one-to-one relationship between mind and one particular body -- which forms the basis of that "one" who has a particular body, makes statements about "me" and "mine," and also about that particular body's cells -- is seen to be invalidated. You see, to talk about "body" implies a question of exclusivity -- "body" being synonymous with boundaries -- and the unspoken question in the background remains: "Whose"? Whose body are we talking about? To tie any particular body to a particular entity or "I" is the basis of all ignorance and the foundation stone of duality. In other words, from the point of view of *advaita*, to talk about "my body" or "somebody" immediately opens up a can of worms.

Then when that level is further transcended, in going from consciousness to Awareness -- the ultimate background to experience -- there is no longer even mind or body. For body rests on mind, as Poonjaji once said "Body is only a thought." Then what is talked about as "body" is a concept and definition by "mind" -- and mind in turn is only an abstraction, a fixation through memory in the stream of time, and otherwise non-existent. Can you show me your mind? Time in turn is nothing but a stream of thoughts, and can only be seen as actually existing through memory, as a projection. So in effect mind is time, and time is mind. Both are figures of speech. When time is seen for what it is, what is left only is the Present -- not as an intersection between the future and the past, but as pure "isness," or as it is called in Zen, "suchness." That "suchness" is totally alien to the concept of time; in fact, it is timeless or true Eternity. In that isness, there is not the slightest trace of mind, body or thought, and so to talk about what Nisargadatta would call "grossified forms," such as cells and their biological mutations, is no longer relevant.