

**An Introduction to The ‘Radical’ Reality-Way Teaching of  
Adi Da Samraj:  
That Which Is Always Already The Case**

**Dean Nugent  
Senior Lecturer, Adult Learning and Teaching,  
School of Education, AUT University**

*There are many who seek knowledge for the sake of knowledge: that is curiosity. There are others who desire to know in order that they may themselves be known: that is vanity. Others seek knowledge in order to sell it: that is dishonourable. But there are some who seek knowledge in order to edify others: that is love.*

St Bernard of Clairvaux  
(cited in Carr & Haldane, 2003, p. 135)

*During their waking hours, people of the modern era typically presume they are ‘in’ the only ‘real world’ — which, to them, means the physical ‘world’. In actuality, however, such people are merely in the waking-state mind — not in the Real (or non-mental) ‘world’, not in the ‘world’ As ‘it’ Is (Prior to mind), and, indeed, not ‘in’ any thing at all that is not merely the perceptual-conceptual mind itself. Therefore, being ‘in’ and of mind- only, they do not recognize the apparent perceptual-conceptual ‘world’ As ‘it’ Is.*

(Avatar Adi Da Samraj, 2010, p.1728)

In order to respond to the local and global difficulties humanity is now experiencing we are required to seriously examine all dimensions of our lives. Education is an important dimension and many are exploring the possibilities of change. This Mindfulness-SIG Conference is one such possibility. Our conference’s theme of “Wisdom Traditions and Universities” can open up many aspects for investigation. It can refer us to the genesis of universities in the ancient and medieval spiritual and religious communities as well as oblige us to consider the development of secular modernism and the context in which we find ourselves in the early 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

In the West we can describe this secular context in many different ways —including, ‘post-Fordist capitalism’, ‘late-authoritarian-capitalism’, ‘the age of scientific and political materialism’, ‘worker asceticism’, ‘modernity’ ‘liquid modernity’, and ‘post-modernity’. What I think is clear is that we are now living in the context of an emerging globalised societal and planetary imagination that presses to transform all our traditional, and usually uninspected, ‘tribalised’ points of view and traditions of belief and thought. All the cultures and beliefs of the human species are now face-to-face and requiring a respectful (and discriminative) hearing from one another.

However, it is no simple task to gather our collective understanding and to agree how to distinguish those patterns of belief, knowledge, and behaviour that offer our species a benign and creative way forward from those they may once have adequately served in a local circumstance but now may be proving to be destructive for Earthkind as a whole. What authoritative criteria can we agree on in order to make useful distinctions and evaluations?

Nicholas Maxwell is one who suggests that the basic aim of universities now needs to be the seeking and promoting of ‘wisdom’.

“We need to bring about a wholesale, structural revolution in the aims and methods, the entire intellectual and institutional character of academic inquiry. At present academic inquiry is devoted to acquiring *knowledge*. The idea is to acquire knowledge, and then apply it to help solve social problems.

“This needs to change, so that the basic aim becomes to seek and promote *wisdom* — wisdom being understood to be the capacity to realize what is of value in life for oneself and others (and thus including knowledge, know-how and understanding). Instead of devoting itself primarily to solving problems of knowledge, academic inquiry needs to give intellectual priority to the task of discovering possible solutions to problems of living...

“Education needs to change so that problems of living become more fundamental than problems of knowledge, the basic aim of education being to learn how to acquire wisdom in life... replacing the aim to acquire knowledge by the aim to promote wisdom by cooperatively rational means.”

(Barnett & Maxwell, 2008, pp. 2-3)

By founding themselves in ‘wisdom’, universities may yet distinguish themselves from other centres of knowledge-creation in the so-called ‘knowledge society’.

Ronald Barnett elaborates on Maxwell’s notion of promoting wisdom by ‘cooperatively rational means’,

“Universities, it may be said, live in the realm of the infinite. It is almost a *sine qua non* of the legitimate holding of the title — ‘university’ — that its members keep themselves open to all manner of potential frames of understanding. *A priori*, no frame of understanding can be repudiated, unless it itself comes with bigotry or closure in its wake. The forms of life that characteristically accompany the university have to be epistemologically generous or we are not in the presence of a genuine university...

“[S]uch a university would surely encourage broad perspectives, it would energize interdisciplinary approaches in its activities, and it would engage with society (but retain some epistemological distance from it). The process of engaging with society is crucial here since the formulation of wisdom in particular settings requires dialogue, not least in communicating and developing ideas and problem solutions.”

(Barnett & Maxwell, 2008, pp. 101-102)

This ideal of the secular university as a community of rational dialogue and truth-seeking can be traced back to the eighteenth-century Enlightenment philosophers (Bauman, 1987). Although as educators we need to critically examine our assumptions about the pedagogical use of ‘dialogue’ (see, for instance, Ellsworth, 1997) this ideal may still

fruitfully serve the endeavour to expand the ‘democratic speech situation’ and the ‘public space’ of the university. The kind of practical and social wisdom that Maxwell and Barnett are advocating is very important for these times. Peter Sloterdijk also reminds us of the important ideal or basic law of ‘academic pacifism’ — that ‘even the fiercest argument between scholars and forcefully stated opinions of specific schools should only ever be conducted in brackets of theoretical peace’ (Sloterdijk, 2012, p. 34).

There is another understanding of wisdom that I suggest we might also consider. We may be in the middle of a revolution in the understanding of our ‘beingness’ at least as profound as at any time in our species’ existence. And there is much to be gained from the discriminative study of the wisdom and cultural traditions of humanity.

An understanding from the esoteric traditions of spirituality and religion is that the attainment of wisdom is most fully realized in the context of ‘spiritual practices’. Such practices are usually applied (in some form or another) to all aspects of life including diet, sexuality, bodily exercise, social relations and money, as well as various sacramental exercises of meditation, prayer, chant, study, and disciplines of mind. Moreover, this life of spiritual practice is usually undertaken in response to some kind of ‘conversion’ or ‘realization’ or ‘revelation’. Often, it is also emphasized that one must maximize the time one spends in the ‘company of the Realizer’; one must spend significant energy and attention absorbed in their teaching and their spiritual force, presence, and state of being. Thus, one is grown in a wisdom-oriented life.

My own experience is with the twentieth-century Realizer, Adi Da Samraj. I will offer here something of his revelation and teaching as an example of the esoteric understanding to which I am referring. I will make some commentary but mainly give space for his wisdom word of instruction. I don’t wish to suggest his instruction is easily made by a conventional presentation of ideas. His is a communication coming from a unique state of Realization – beyond (and prior to) conventional uses of mind. Perseverance in study will reveal over time, however, how artfully he uses the English language to communicate to us something of the reality *of which, from which, and as which*, he is speaking.

When Adi Da Samraj began to formally teach, on the evening of 25th April, 1972, he initiated his profound critique of the usual life-technique of the human being. That night, in his spontaneous spoken response to a man's question about what we need to understand, he began a tireless 36-year teaching-ordeal in order to gift humanity with a unique understanding of, and process for, human transformation.

“There is a fundamental self-contraction in the process called ‘Man’ – and that contraction seems to change the quality of Consciousness Itself. The contraction itself creates (or seems to imply) the identification of Consciousness Itself with the self-contracted sense — the sense that you are this form, this body, this mind.

And, in making such an act of identification, that form, that body, that mind differentiates itself from other forms, other bodies, other minds – other beings (or selves).

Then the rest of life is spent attempting to overcome that self-generated sense of contraction, by exploiting the movement of desire.

Through the movement that is desire, people are constantly seeking to create a connection, a flow of life-force, between the contracted identity and everything from which it has differentiated itself.

The usual philosophy, religion, Yoga, Spirituality – all your strategies (even your simple psychological strategies, your lifestyles) have this same basic form, this same basic purpose.

They are all attempts to restore the flow of life-energy between this contracted, separated one and everything from which it is differentiating itself.

Thus, all ordinary activity is founded in this dilemma, this self-created contraction...

When you begin to see the dilemma that motivates your strategic

method, then that seeing is self-understanding. As long as you are merely seeking, and have all kinds of motivation, all kinds of fascination with the search, this is not self-understanding – this is dilemma itself. But, when the dilemma is understood, then there is the clear noticing of a structure in conscious awareness – the activity of separation...

In the beginning ... you are aware of the self-contraction only as a sensation, a sense of dilemma, a search. But the more directly you observe the self-contraction, the more clearly you recognize it as your own activity. At first, you see the activity, the strategy, the life-technique of avoidance. Then you begin to become aware of what that activity is excluding, what it prevents, what it is always eliminating from conscious awareness. What is always being excluded is the condition of relationship.

Ordinarily, you are not aware of relationship – and you are also not aware as relationship. You are only living the drama of separation.

But, when you become directly aware of (and thus responsible for) the root-activity of separation, then you are spontaneously established in relationship as the Real condition of life.

When the self-contraction is most fundamentally understood, then there is only relationship, and no obstruction.

Ultimately, even the feeling of relatedness is transcended in the inherent Feeling of Being.

When such transcending is most perfect, then there is Most Perfect Feeling-Awareness. The Most Perfect Feeling-Awareness Is the True Divine Heart, Reality Itself.

That Most Perfect Feeling-Awareness Is That Which Is Always Already The Case.

(Avatar Adi Da Samraj, 2005, pp. 58-60)

Through the process of *identification*, *differentiation*, and *desire*, the ordinary body-mind entity is moving out of its prior condition of relationship. Without the intervention of wisdom-understanding we live our entire lives as a ‘drama of separation’. Everything we do, no matter how virtuous-seeming, is a search, or an effort founded in dilemma to connect. This is a fruitless search because there is nothing to be found or gained; there is nothing lacking. We are always already right now in the condition of relationship. There is no separateness. We are making and suffering an error. The wisdom purpose of life is to grow in the understanding of this error and to be able to fully live in (not just philosophically consider) the unobstructed freedom of relationship and feeling-awareness.

“To come to a firm and intelligent (and not merely intellectual) conclusion about Reality requires right use of the faculty of mind. Human beings characteristically allow the mind to wander constantly. What is typically called ‘thinking’ is, in fact, simply a train of thoughts determined by ‘subjective’ and ‘objective’ changes or intrusions. Such so-called ‘thinking’ is merely a succession of mind-forms – which cannot result in an intelligent conclusion about Reality.

“Right thinking is an activity of intelligence, exercised relative to everything arising in your ‘experience’— ‘subjectively’, ‘objectively’, and altogether – to the point of coming to firm conclusions. If you are merely ‘experiencing’ mind-forms that change from moment to moment and day to day, no real conclusion is registered – or, stated differently, only one conclusion is suggested: that you are bound to body, to mind-forms, and to perceptions of the physical ‘world’. Such is the inevitable tacit conclusion about Reality – if you are merely wandering in mind...

“The force of intelligence is at the ‘root’ of mere thinking, random thoughts, and mind-forms. If the mind is used with clarity – or, in other words, with deeply aware intelligence – then there is a conviction about Reality that intensely (and intensively) relates to mere mind-forms and constantly disciplines them.” (Avatar Adi Da Samraj, 2010, p. 503)

As a formal student of Adi Da's for many years I obviously find his teaching provides an authoritative guide to the investigation of life experience and what is to be done. Any authoritative means for comprehending human existence must be one that provides the most inclusive orientation. We can describe limited, or 'false', authority as one that localizes and polarizes, recognizing only 'difference'. True authority is one that promotes a universal disposition, and therefore tolerance and cooperation. True authority provides people with a resource by which to encounter life experience with a fundamental integrity and certainty.

Consider the following:

"If you allow yourself to feel deeply, you can discover a feeling-depth that, intrinsically, has no sense of the body.

As a matter of 'experience', there is already a depth in you, as in deep sleep, that has no association with the body.

That is your deepest place.

Thus, you always stand, most fundamentally, in a position without bodily awareness.

In any moment in which you are invested in that depth, you are (thereby) established in the condition that is beyond and prior to body-consciousness, and beyond and prior to even all psycho-physical noticing.

Already, in that in-depth awareness (which is always already the case), there is no fear of death.

That in-depth awareness is not the 'personality-depth' of the waking state.

Rather, that in-depth awareness is the in-depth dimension of the 'I' that is (otherwise) apparently in the waking state and identified with the body.

That in-depth awareness has nothing to do with the body, and nothing to do with the mind.

That Which Is to Be Realized Is Prior to separate ‘self’, Prior to the ‘self’-contraction, Prior to the ego-‘I’, Prior to body and mind, and Prior to the any present-time ‘point of view’.

Therefore, That Which Is to Be Realized is not in or of the waking state, not in or of the dreaming state, and not in or of the sleeping state.

That Which Is to Be Realized is in and of The State That Is Always Already Prior to waking, dreaming, and sleeping.

No human being is intrinsically obliged to identify with a mortal ‘self’-condition, or separate ego-‘I’.

Every human being is — even at birth, and constantly thereafter — always associated with the ‘equipment’ to be established in the depth, rather than merely being entangled in what is superficial and threatened.

To be established in the depth-position is what must always be done.

The more superficial you are, the more you lose the depth.

The more you distract yourself with that which is other than the depth, the more you become bound up in that which is other than the depth.

You become what you meditate on.”

(Avatar Adi Da Samraj, 2010, pp.528-529)

Adi Da Samraj argues that instead of being left to encounter life via the limited cultural point of view we happen to be born into, our most important education and cultural process must guide us to locate our actual ‘position’ — which is always already the case no matter what space-time circumstance we find ourselves in.

“The human being is a pattern — not an entity, or an independent, separate anything. Indeed, the conditionally apparent total universe is a pattern — and not a collection of independent, separate entities and forms.

All patterns are both ‘caused’ and ‘causative’.

All patterns are dependent — or ‘caused’ and non-separate.

Thus, the conditionally apparent total universe is a universally-extended, and self-replicating, and all-patterning, and self-organizing pattern.

There is no separateness and no independence.

There is no separate ‘point of view’ — and no ego anywhere.

All that apparently and conditionally arises is a transparency (or merely apparent), non-necessary, and non-binding pattern of mutually ‘caused’ and mutually ‘causative’ patterns.

The conditionally apparent total universe and all conditionally apparent ‘beings’ and ‘things’ are — Intrinsically and Perfectly and Always Priorly — A Unity...

All of This must be universally Taught and understood (and by means of a right and true ‘School of Life’, Self-Realized) As Such and — on the basis of right and true life-education, life-adaptation, life-obligation, and truly globalized life-acculturation — practised As The Way of Life by all-and-All of humankind’.”

(Avatar Adi Da Samraj, 2010, pp.1166-1167)

Adi Da Samraj describes that which is always already the case in different ways, including, ‘Consciousness’, ‘Reality’, ‘the thoughtless Feeling of Being’, ‘Self-Radiant Conscious Light Itself’, ‘Prior Unity’.

We are not presuming to abide in our true and real state of Consciousness. Rather, each of us is contracting from our real state via an enactment, and tacit presumption, of separateness; of identification with a particular body-mind. Because we are not abiding in and as our Real Condition we are only aware of the perceptual/conceptual functioning of the body-mind in a particular time and place, with a particular socio-cultural-mind-psyche and bio-chemical-body information.

This presumption and activity of separateness Adi Da also refers to as the 'ego' (or, ego-'I').

We presume, in one form or another, a separate 'self', separate 'world' and separate 'others'. Unless we are aware of our Real Condition, awakened to the state of prior unity, we are living in a 'world' of illusory 'otherness'. We are unbalanced, 'self'-possessed, seeking, without equanimity in the body-mind; fundamentally in mortal fear, threatened and threatening, enacting a form of madness.

Most fully felt and understood, his is a devastating critique of the present human situation as well as all the forms of human life, culture, and destructiveness that have resulted from the search to overcome the imaginary dis-ease of 'separateness'.

As he admonishes:

“You must (in Reality Itself) understand the illusory nature of the 'world' and the 'self' as separate and necessary categories of existence.

You must penetrate the illusion of conditional 'experience' as 'categorical existence' — or, as a structure of existence that is 'other' than the Intrinsically egoless, Indivisible, Acausal, and Self-Evidently Divine Self-Nature, Self-Condition, and Self-State of Reality Itself.

You must transcend the 'point-of-view'-based illusion of separateness, relatedness, otherness, and 'difference.

Do not accept the 'idea' of ego-'I', or separate 'self'.

Do not (in any moment, context, or apparent situation of relatedness) believe.

Do not 'worship' (or irreducibly 'objectify', fixedly adhere to, or identify with) any concept at all.

Merely participate in Reality Itself.

Only participate in Reality Itself.

Always whole bodily — or as a psycho-physical totality —  
participate in Reality Itself.”

(Avatar Adi Da Samraj, 2010, pp.1190-1192)

How this is to be done is at once a simple as well as complex matter. We begin, however, by considering his argument relative to our ‘experience’ of existence. In due course we will be made profound and will truly testify that,

“There Is Only One Self-Evident Reality and Event.”

(Avatar Adi Da Samraj, 2006, p.519)

## **References:**

Avatar Adi Da Samraj. (2005). *My “bright” word*. Middletown, CA: The Dawn Horse Press.

Avatar Adi Da Samraj. (2006). *Eleutherios*, Middletown, CA: The Dawn Horse Press.

Avatar Adi Da Samraj. (2010). *The aletheon*. Middletown, CA: The Dawn Horse Press.

Barnett, R., & Maxwell, N. (Eds.). (2008). *Wisdom in the university*. London, England: Routledge.

Bauman, Z. (1987). *Legislators and interpreters*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Carr, D. & Haldane, J. (2003). *Spirituality, philosophy and education*. London, England: Routledge.

Ellsworth, E. (1997). *Teaching positions: difference, pedagogy, and the power of address*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sloterdijk, P. (2012). *The art of philosophy: wisdom as a practice*. (K. Margolis. Trans.) New York, NY: Columbia University Press.