

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

Advaita deserves to be condemned

Mr Subramanian has replied to the article by Sri Vishwa Nandana Tirtha who had said that “Advaita is the worst philosophy”. This is the reply from Subramanian. After his reply, Sri Vishwanandana Tirtharu has replied to all his queries.

1. SRI MADHWACHARYA has established that DVAITA is the final because it continues to persist even at the time of salvation.

VS: Much before Sri Madhva, Sri Shankara established Advaita where dvaita is admitted only as the vyAvahArika satya. He has said in the Brihadaranyaka Up.bhashya: न उपदेशार्हं द्वैतम्, जातमात्रं प्राणिबुद्धिगम्यत्वात् । //Dvaita does not deserve to be taught (by the Scripture). Why? It is already known to even the just born living being.// DVAITA is called SIDDHANTA as it is the final result of searching SHASTRAS.

(SIDDHA means result, ANTA means end) DVAITA has stood the test of time. Whereas 21 schools of thought emerged during 8-12 centuries, no other school came into existence after the 22nd namely DVAITA. It is only Advaita that is not known that requires to be taught by the Scripture. If you say Sri Madhva has established that Dvaita is the final, Advaitins also can say that Sri Shankara has established that dvaita is only avichAritasiddha but upon enquiry it is only Advaita that is final. So, we can keep arguing for centuries on such matters.

VS: No new school need to emerge. It is for all to see that despite the advaita bashing by non-advaitins for the past 10 centuries, it is Advaita that reigns supreme today. None has been able to do even the least harm to Advaita over the centuries.

Eminent ADVAITA scholars like SRI PADMANABHATHIRTHA and THRIVIKRAMAPANDITACHARYA have later accepted and appreciated DVAITA school.

VS: The 'eminence' you talk about these scholars is just a claim, unproved. I have asked the top ranking Advaita scholars of the present day and they have > said that in all the thousands of Advaitic works that have come out so far, over the centuries, no one has ever seen the names of the above Pandits in Advaita. If they were really eminent' there must be some or the other Advaitic work they had written or some or the other sishyas they taught who have taken their names in their works. The names of these two pandita-s are completely unknown to Advaitins. If you have information of their advaitic works, kindly let me know. Someone who has really known the Advaita Shashtra will never lose in argument to another non-advaitin. Someone who is convinced about advaita will not see the need to switch over to any other ism. For, one will readily see that all other thoughts like dvaita and vishishtadvaita are already contained in advaita as steps.

You say:

You cannot cite a single example of an eminent DVAITA scholar either accepting or appreciating ADVAITA school. This also goes a long way in establishing that DVAITA is the final.

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

Eminent ADVAITA scholars like SRI PADMANABHATHIRTHA and THRIVIKRAMAPANDITACHARYA have later accepted and appreciated DVAITA school.

VS: The 'eminence' you talk about these scholars is just a claim, unproved. I have asked the top ranking Advaita scholars of the present day and they have said that in all the thousands of Advaitic works that have come out so far, over the centuries, no one has ever seen the names of the above Pandits in Advaita. If they were really 'eminent' there must be some or the other Advaitic work they had written or some or the other sishyas they taught who have taken their names in their works. The names of these two pandita-s are completely unknown to Advaitins. If you have information of their advaitic works, kindly let me know. Someone who has really known the Advaita Shastra will never lose in argument to another non-advaitin. Someone who is convinced about advaita will not see the need to switch over to any other ism. For, one will readily see that all other thoughts like dvaita and vishishtadvaita are already contained in advaita as steps.

You say: You cannot cite a single example of an eminent DVAITA scholar either accepting or appreciating ADVAITA school. This also goes a long way in establishing that DVAITA is the final. Eminent ADVAITA scholars like SRI PADMANABHA THIRTHA and THRIVIKRAMA PANDITACHARYA have later accepted and appreciated DVAITA school.

VS: The 'eminence' you talk about these scholars is just a claim, unproved. I have asked the top ranking Advaita scholars of the present day and they have said that in all the thousands of Advaitic works that have come out so far, over the centuries, no one has ever seen the names of the above Pandits in Advaita. If they were really 'eminent' there must be some or the other Advaitic work they had written or some or the other sishyas they taught who have taken their names in their works. The names of these two pandita-s are completely unknown to Advaitins. If you have information of their advaitic works, kindly let me know. Someone who has really known the Advaita Shastra will never lose in argument to another non-advaitin. Someone who is convinced about advaita will not see the need to switch over to any other ism. For, one will readily see that all other thoughts like dvaita and vishishtadvaita are already contained in advaita as steps.

You say: You cannot cite a single example of an eminent DVAITA scholar either accepting or appreciating ADVAITA school. This also goes a long way in establishing that DVAITA is the final.

1. Endeavoured throughout his lifetime to propagate Dvaita Vedanta

2. Dr. A.V.Nagasampige, Director, Purnaprajna Samshodhana Mandiram, a Bangalore-based premier Madhva research institution run under the patronage of Sri Vishvesha Tirtha Swamigalu, the seer of the Pejavar Mutt (whose disciple is the author), in his Kannada book 'mata traya sameekshaa' says . Late Dr.S.K.Ramachandra Rao, a Madhva by birth and an Advaitin by conviction, author of several books on a variety of subjects, writes in his preface to his book: 'Shankara and Adhyasa BhAshya' on page xii:

// My interest in this direction was aroused when, even as a school-going boy, I heard the then pontiff of the UttarAdhi Matha (of the Madhva persuasion), Sri SatyadhyAnatirtha, telling my grandfather that he was writing a new commentary on Shankara's commentary on the Vedanta sutra to show that he

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

(Shankara) did not differ much from Ramanuja or Madhva. I do not know if he completed that (But) it was the learned pontiff's view that Shankara had been grievously misrepresented. //

I came across the above only very recently. However, over twenty-five years ago, I had heard another anecdote about the above Madhva pontiff: It seems that the Swami was a very great scholar in Sanskrit and a greater admirer of Shankaracharya that he had committed to memory the entire Shaankara Brahma Sutra Bhashya! This, I felt was an exaggeration, though I have come across people who had memorised the Bhashya for the first four sutras popularly known as 'chatussUtree' totaling to some 25 pages in close print. It seems the Swami would remark to people close to him, in Kannada: ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಹಿಡಿಸುವುದು ಅದೇ (ಶಂಕರಭಾಷ್ಯ). ಆದರೆ ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಈ ಪೀಠಕ್ಕೆ ಇರಿಸಿರುವುದು ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಲ್ಲವಲ್ಲ? 'It is that (Shankara) Bhashya that appeals to the mind and intellect. But am I anointed to this peetha to propagate that?' The above Swami was greatly admired and respected by Dr.BNK Sharma, a great scholar of Dvaita who e -

.... Sri Raghavendra SwaminaH took forward this sampradaya:"शाब्दं भाष्यं जायदेवीं च टीकां भाट्टं तन्त्रं भामतीं गौरवं च ' (He respectfully refers to the Bhaamatee as a high-profile work).

In the 19th Century, Sri Krishnaavadhoota has composed glosses to the Brahmasutras as per the three systems. This work confines itself to just putting forth the views of the respective schools without engaging in any kind of criticism.

The book 'Mata traya sameekShA' of Dr. Nagasampige is also a similar work. The good work being done by Dr.Nagasampige:

He has taken up a mission which has won the welcome of many people interested in sanatana dharma. Upon invited to speak, he gives an hour-long talk on these lines: He opens the talk invoking the famous first shloka of Shankaracharya's Satashloki: dRShTanto naiva dRShTaH....on the immaculate glory and greatness of a Guru and pays rich tributes to Shankara, stating in brief the Advaita siddhAnta. He follows it by giving a bird's eye view of the Ramanuja school and finally a brief presentation of the Madhva system.

He never strikes a note of discord but argues for a 'unified' view of things where each school's contribution is seen as not contradicting each other but only complementing in order to result in the ultimate upliftment of the soul.

I heard about this method of Dr.Nagasampige and waited to hear him speak. The occasion came last year at the Sringeri Shankara Mutt where he delivered that standard talk. I was greatly impressed by this Madhva scholar who has over fifty publications in Kannada and Sanskrit on a variety of topics. I spoke to him after the talk and he invited me to his office at the Vidyapeetha. He and several other noted advaitic scholars are friends. His talk was attended by a number of Madhvas. He is the author of a best selling kannada book 'Mata traya sameekshaa' which presents, sans khandana, the position of

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

the three schools. I came to know at this venue that the Madhva institution that published this book is going for a repeat print. I have myself purchased and read it and have bought it for others too.

Says Dr.Nagasampige in that Kannada book about Advaita:

Dr.Nagasampige says in the concluding portion of the section on Advaita in his book: ...ವಿಶ್ವಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧವೂ ಅಪಾರಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಅನುಯಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿದ ಶಾಂಕರದರ್ಶನ ಪರಂಪರೆಯು ದೇಶ-ವಿದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ ಪರಂಪರೆಗಳು ವಿಶ್ವವಿಖ್ಯಾತ ವಿದ್ವಾಂಸರನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ತಪಸ್ವಿಗಳಾದ ಸಮಾಜದ ಡೊಂಕತಿದ್ದಿ ಮರೆದ ಶ್ರೀವಿದ್ಯಾರಣ್ಯರಂತಹ ಅನೇಕ ಸಂತರನ್ನು ನೀಡಿದೆ. ಸತ್ಯಬೋಧನೆಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅದ್ವೈತದ ಕೊಡುಗೆ ಅವಿಸ್ಮರಣೀಯವಾದುದು.

The above rendered in English: The ShAnkara darshana tradition is endowed with universal fame, with a very large following and has a spread all over the world. The tradition has contributed many saints, world-famous scholars and tapasvin-s and social reformers such as the legendary Sri Vidyaranya.

From the angle of examining the truth, the contribution of Advaita is unforgettable. (He says further).. Apart from revealing the emptiness of the Bauddha-Jaina avaidika schools and those schools which go by the name of vaidika namely saankhya, yoga, nyaaya, vaisheshika, Sri Shankara charya, through His lovely and easily comprehensible language brought to light the message of the Upanishads. Thinkers and other schools might harbour different opinions about Advaita. Yet its achievement and the efforts in the distilling of the truth cannot be left un-honoured.To conclude, the bringing to light the BrahmasvarUpa of the Upanishads that was missed by the Sankhyas and the Mimamsakas and presenting it in a very novel way by the Advaita system always deserves commendation. //

To conclude, I am not saying that Dr.Nagasampige has 'converted' to advaita; no not at all. I have recently attended the न्यायामृत-अद्वैतसिद्धि कार्यशाला at Vidyapeetha and seen his work and attitude towards Advaita and Advaita scholars.

There is a great thirst for knowing Advaita among Dvaita scholars. They have realized that they have not known Advaita correctly. Dvaita mutts regularly invite Advaita scholars for discussions and honour them with titles too. I have myself attended such meets.

In case you are interested you may visit my blog where the latest post is on 'Buddhism, Advaita and Dvaita'.

<http://adbhutam.wordpress.com/2011/05/14/buddhism-advaita-and-dvaita-1/>

You may convey your views to me to my email id. Let me make it clear that any such discussion should stay clear of personal attacks.

With warm regards,

Subrahmanian.

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

1. No doubt Shankaracharya propounded his Advaita philosophy much before Madhwacharya did his Dvaita philosophy. But, the latter brought out the fallacies of the former and established that only Dvaita is true because it exists even after salvation. Note that you have not touched this point in your reply.

There was no need to touch on this point since the non-Advaitic schools that came after Advaita have not made any impact whatsoever on Advaita. That Advaita reigns supreme to this day is a well admitted fact by non-Advaitins. That is the reason why only non-Advaitic mutts regularly invite Advaitic scholars for discussions. This feature is not reciprocated by Advaita mutts, at least the well known mutts. That shows that it is only the non-advaitic mutts that are concerned about the prime position of Advaita.

If the non-Advaitic schools had no impact on Advaita, how do you account for tens of thousands of followers of Dvaita school? It was only Advaita that was predominant before DVAITA schools came into existence.

Inviting Advaita scholars by non-Advaitic mutts doesn't support Advaita's supremacy in any way. If so, please substantiate your statement.

I hope you would agree that Sringeri mutt is well known. The past pontiff of the mutt was regularly inviting Dvaita, Vishishtadvaita and even Jaina scholars to participate in the seminars conducted by him. Does this mean that he had accepted Supremacy of all of these schools of thought?

So, your argument is baseless.

Moreover just as Garuda may invite snakes to his home, snakes do not invite him to their home there by admitting supremacy of Garuda.

This type of reasoning to prove the supremacy is a never ending process. So it is better if you try to prove the deemed supremacy through scriptural evidence. This comment applies as well for your other responses also. Please also note that what persists even after salvation cannot be Vyavaharika.

There is no proof for this in the scripture. All loka-s including Vaikuntha, if it consists of dvaita is considered only vyavaharika and not mukhya mukti in vedanta.

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

This is an unfounded claim, because the entire 4th part of the 4th chapter of Brahmasutras clearly reveals that it is Dvaita that exists in MUKTI. A Nirnaya-Grantha can never speak of Vyavaharika or unreal things. There is no citation of your so called Nirguna-mukti in Vedanta. If so, please quote. Don't wash up your hands by referring to some text to which I may not have access.

Moreover, Vyavaharika is a technical term coined by Advaitins. You cannot find this term in Gita, Upanishads or Brahmasutras.

There is no niyama that every term used by a darshana should be found in the prasthAna traya. The terms 'swatantra/paratantra/vishesha/taaratamya/tattvavaada' for example are not found in the prasthAna traya. Still Dvaitins use them. As for 'vyavaharika', it is only a logical effect of the term 'avyavahAryam' of the mandukya Upanishad seventh mantra. What is not avyavahAryam is vyavaharagocharam, vyaharagogyam, the subject matter of the paada-traya. Let me also state that the terms swatantra-paratantra have been already used by Shankara in the Gitabhashya 14 chapter introduction.

You have admitted that it is a coined term. So it is baseless and makes no sense. The terms swatantra-paratantra accepted by Shankaracharya also cannot be subject of our debate. Vishesha is supported by Ahikudaladhikarana(3-2-28_31). Taratamya is supported by statements like 'इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्थाः'. Tattvavada simply means realistic theory. This is not at all a coined word like Vyavaharika. I brand this term coined and baseless because you are using it as standing for सदसद्विलक्षणम् which has absolutely no base. If व्यावहारिकम् stands for व्यवहार्यम् or व्यवहारगोचरः (not व्यवहारगोचरम्- note that the word gochara is masculine), Brahman himself becomes Vyavaharika since you are trying to explain him through Upanishad.

For the reason stated above, the term Avavaharya in Manduka cannot be interpreted as absolutely Vyavaharagochara.

If you admit that only Brahman is Avayavaharya and everything is Vyavaharya, it boils down to differentiating Brahman from others and thereby supports dualism.

Moreover Vyavaharyatva of the world would also be Vyavaharya and hence Badhya thereby rendering the world realistic. जगन्मिथ्यात्वस्य मिथ्यात्वे जगत्सत्यत्वस्य सत्त्वत्वं स्यात् ।

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

न उपदेशार्हं द्वैतम् जातमात्रप्राणिबुद्धिगम्यत्वात् ।” –Note that this statement supports Dvaita. What is experienced by every being cannot be wrong.

What is experienced by every being in the state of ignorance is definitely wrong and that is why the Shruti corrects it.

If the experience of Dvaita by every being is out of ignorance, why not be the experience of Advaita also out of ignorance since it is also an experience. This comment applies as well for experience of Shrutipramanya. Hence you will not be able to either decide or discard anything if you deny experience.

Then where is the need for teaching Dvaita? The answer is as follows. Although known to everyone, Dvaita was masked by wrong teachings by Advaitins. So Dvaita ought to be taught. You may refer to Vishnutattvanirnaya by Madhwacharya and its commentary by Jayatheertha for more details.

You may have a look at this article refuting some statements of Madhwacharya and Jayatirtha with reference to the Maitrayani Upanishad and the above work:

<http://atma.sulekha.com/blog/post/2008/11/an-advaitic-mananam-with-a-critique-of-some-dvaita.htm>

Instead of referring to your own work you may better answer to the point briefly so that we can go ahead with our discussions more easily quickly. Please note that I am put up on countryside where downloading and uploading speeds are very low. \$

In fact Advaita need not be taught. Let you answer my following query. Is Advaita identical with Brahman or different from him? In the first case, Advaita has to be Swaprakasha since Brahman is so. Then why should Advaita be taught or how can it be taught because Brahman is Avachya(indescribable).

Reply: Advaita is identical with Brahman. The Mandukyopanishat seventh mantra says: शान्तं शिवं अद्वैतम्. The Upanishad embarks upon teaching this Turiyam Advaitam Brahman in spite of its being svaprakasha. The method of the Upanishads in teaching the avAchya Advaita Brahman is to be learned from Advaitic teachers. This post is beyond the scope of such an exposition. Your objection stands directed at the Upanishad itself.

This is only an escape. My objection stands directed at the Upanishad itself if the Upanishad is wrongly interpreted as done by you. According to me the term Advaitam in the Upanishad stands for matchless and not unique.

The other alternative you have proposed below does not arise at all. You can easily see whose neck the rajju is tightening. And what you have stated below is another example of dvaitin’s wrong notion about advaita.

You are trying to escape unsuccessfully without answering to the point.

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

In the latter case, Advaita has to be Mithya(unrealistic), because anything different from Brahman is Mithya according to Advaita philosophy. So any Shastra teaching ADVAITA proves itself as MITHYAPRATIPADAKA (ie. Teaching unrealistic things) just like Bouddhashastra . So you are caught, as it were on both sides of your neck by unbreakable ropes. “उभयतः पाशरज्जुः”

I wonder how Advaita teachers indulge themselves in teaching well knowing that they are teaching unrealistic things to unrealistic students in unrealistic world!

This very common misunderstanding of dvaitins regarding Advaita has been highlighted by me in this post:

<http://adbhutam.wordpress.com/2009/07/20/an-advaitin%E2%80%99s-assessment-of-some-dvaita-remarks/>

The comment marked with \$ above fits in here also.

Advaiyta teacher is not Nirguna Brahman. If he were, he would not be visible. Agreed? So he must be Agnyanavacchinna Brahman. This means that he is himself an Agnyani. So how much credible are his teachings?

It is precisely because of such misunderstandings about Advaita that the modern day Dvaita scholars have found it necessary to know Advaita more accurately. Over eight centuries of objections against Advaita have yielded zero results and the reason is advaita shAstra ajnana among dvaita scholars. This is being sought to be cleared by engaging Advaita scholars in discussions, not debates.

I have already mentioned that the result is positive.

2. I have already shown how funny it is to teach Advaita.

I have shown in my above referred post how funny is the Dvaitin's understanding of Advaita. What you have stated above is the typical misconception pertaining to Advaita among dvaitins.

Once again I would like to remind you that you may try to answer at least briefly instead of giving wage responses.

Note that necessity is the mother of invention. Even after Shankara's theory(rather hypothesis) was put forth, there was necessity for a better and correct theory. Hence Madhwa's theory came into existence. There afterwards there was no necessity for another theory and therefore no more theory was proposed. Anyway you have accepted that no more theory emerged after Madhwa's. This is exactly what I have said. Thank you for concurring with me in this aspect.

I have not agreed with you the way you have concluded. I have only meant that there was no need for any other theory to emerge after Madhwa's because people could see the validity and relevance of Shankara's system which has ruled the stage for all the centuries before and after Madhwa. All non-advaitic schools admit this if not openly at least internally.

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

People who have prejudice cannot appreciate anything new.

How did you peep into internal feelings of other people? परबुद्धेप्रत्यक्षत्वात्

Shankara had wrongly stated that Dvaita is Avicharitasiddha. That is why Madhwacharya had to establish Dvaita theory in its correct sense.

What is the use? Could Dvaita take the number One position of Advaita?

Do you mean 1st position in the number of followers? Then the answer is 'no'. The number of followers never decides the rank of a philosophy. Otherwise Christianity would be the rank first.

You have accepted that we can keep arguing for centuries. Why only for centuries, we can keep arguing for millenniums. This proves that there are always two category of people accepting or denying Advaita or Dvaita. This boils down to accepting dualism without any doubt.

I saw this argument in your article too. It conveys nothing. Advaita has never proclaimed that there can never be two. Its avidyaka nature is always accepted in Advaita.

Once again, the term Avidyaka is an undefined baseless term because Avidya or Agnyana in the sense you use never exists.

You have accepted that in spite of bashing by Non-Advaitins for centuries, Advaita still persists. This is once again in favor of dualism according to which natures of souls are different and they cannot be changed. That is why all of them did not take up Madhwa's philosophy although it was so much convincing to some others.

You are contradicting yourself. If some Advaita scholars could accept Dvaita, does it not prove that the nature of the soul is amenable to change? Moreover, you are confusing the kshetradharma with Atman. What you call 'nature of souls' is not the Atmadharma, it is only anAtma, antahkaraNa dharma. Atman cannot be touched by sattva-rajastamas, only the anAtma is triguNakArya. Atma is triguNAteeta. Your argument can be seen as benefiting advaita: all people did not take to Advaita. Those who could not rise up to Advaita settled for something inferior.

Advaita scholars' accepting Dvaita never implies change of the soul. It only means that the antahkaranadharma has changed. Why did this change not happen in all of them? The answer is natures of souls are different. They cannot be changed even by hundreds of teachings or by any other means. This is why a staunch Advaitin never feels convinced by arguments put forth by a Dvaitin and vice versa. You and I are the ready examples for this fact.

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

I mean Atman only by the term soul. Nature of soul is not Antahkaranadharma. It is Atmadharma only. My Atman is not void of all Dharmas like the Atman of an Advaitin who thinks that Atman is Nirdharmaka. Note that you don't accept difference between Jivatman and Paramatman because Atman is unique.

The statement of Gita “श्रद्धामयोः पुरुषः यो यच्छ्रद्धः स एव सः” is in favor of difference among the nature of souls.

Whatever reason you may give for all not taking up Advaita or I may give for all not accepting Dvaita, it finally means that there are two categories of people with strong convictions. This continues until death and persists even at the time of death because there is no reason as to why the conviction has to change. So according to the famous Krishna's statement सदा तद्भावभावितः the same conviction continues for any number of births. Don't say that finally both will merge into one another or in Nirguna Brahman. If that is the case, there is absolutely no harm for a person with conviction in Dvaita because he is by nature Brahman himself and sure to be merged into the so called Nirguna Brahman. On the other hand if it is dualism that exists finally because convictions have not changed, the Advaitin will have to cut a sorry figure at hade. Beware of the Ishavasyopanishad's statement 'अन्धन्तमः प्रविशन्ति ये (अ)विद्यामुपासते'

3. Perhaps you have enquired with the so deemed Advaita scholars who have poor historic knowledge. PADMANABHA THIRTHA and Thrivikrama panditacharya were contemporaries of Madhwacharya. They were veteran scholars in Advaita school of philosophy before Madhwa's reign. Both of them had long discussions with Madhwacharya for several days and became his followers. Famous Madhwamutts like Uttaradimutt, Raghavendraswamimutt and Vyasarajamutt accept that they are descendents of revered PADMANABHATHIRTHA . He was previously known as Shobhanabhata. He was well versed in six Shastras and 18 branches of Vedas. He has to his credit works like SANNYAYARATHNAVALI, SATTARAKADEEPAVALI and many more.

As for THRIVIKAMAPANDITACHARYA, his descendents are still there at Kavu mutt, Kasaragod(Kerala). You may visit them if you would like to confirm. He has to his credit TATTVAPRADEEPA and many more works. His famous VAYUSTUTI has attracted the interest of Advaitins also. Late in 20th century, an Advaitin poet by name X has composed EASHANASTUTI Vs VAYUSTUTI. Note that this EASHANASTUTI is refuted by Balagaru Shrinivasachar a famous Dvaita pandit of today in his EASHANASTUTIKHADANAM.

Note that PADMANABHATHIRTHA was of such caliber that even Brahmandapuram records his name. You may refer to Sumadhwavijaya, Ed. Vyasanakere Prabhnjanacharya, 2002. pp152-3. The three books mentioned above have been recently published by Dvaita Vedanta Research Foundation, Bangalore.

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

So better you take back your ugly remarks like, their eminence is only a claim and so on.

All that you have said above does not prove that the said scholars were 'eminent Advaita scholars' which is what you had claimed in that article. I had questioned that alone. You could not produce even a single evidence to prove that they were eminent Advaitins except that they argued for days together with Madhwa and finally got converted. This itself is proof for their poor knowledge of Advaita. This is what you had said:

//Eminent ADVAITA scholars like SRI PADMANABHATHIRTHA and THRIVIKRAMAPANDITACHARYA have later accepted and appreciated DVAITA school.//

So, my remarks remain despite their sounding ugly to you.

I have given ample evidence for their scholarship. They were not Dvaita scholars before becoming Madhwa's followers. It was Advaita that was predominant at that time. So we can conclude that they were Advaita scholars.

Moreover you cannot discard history without assigning any reason.

Please note that Sumadhwavijaya is written by Narayanapanditacharya who happens to be son of Trivikramapanditacharya. You cannot charge him with giving wrong information about his own revered father. He mentions as follows "अतिदक्षमतिं सपादलक्षे समये मायिजनस्य युक्तिशूरम्" Hence his scholarship is undoubtedly proved.

As for Padmanabhathirtha history shows that he came from a smartha Badagunadu family on the banks of Godavari.

Anyone who has conviction in any school of thought may not switch over to another school of thought. All that I meant was as follows. The above mentioned scholars who had studied Advaita philosophy very well, did not have solace in that philosophy because of a number of drawbacks which they observed. Later Madhwa philosophy was so soothing to them that they accepted the same.

That does not change my remark: //Someone who has really known the Advaita Shastra will never lose in argument to another non-advaitin. Someone who is convinced about advaita will not see the need to switch over to any other ism. For, one will readily see that all other thoughts like dvaita and vishishtadvaita are already contained in advaita as steps.//

You might cite the sumadhwavijaya for these scholars' deep understanding of Advaita. Why would an opponent take this work as pramana? One can argue that the 'drawbacks' are all objections without understanding the Advaita shastra correctly. There is nothing to prove beyond doubt that the said

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

scholars were experts in the Advaita darshana. Persons with half-baked advaita or any knowledge are bound to be cornered in arguments.

Scholars with less wisdom take refuge in denying the opponent's quotations as either Apramana or Prakshipta. Don't try to exhibit that you are such a scholar. Note that anything cannot be discarded as apramana unless negated by stronger evidence. Your opponents can as well brand your whole of Advaita shastra as apramana from their side.

Just as the above mentioned Advaita scholars conceded defeat to Madhwacharya so also the famous Vidyaranya lost to Akshobhyathirtha who was fourth from Madhwacharya. Since he was an admirer of knowledge (vidyapakshapati) he erected a pillar in memory of the victory (jayastambha) near Mulbagal town of Kolar district, Karnataka where the argument was held. This is a protected monument which anybody can visit. Similarly Appayyadikshita lost to Vijayeendrathitha , Anantha krishnashastri lost to Sathyadhyana thirtha and still recently Karapatriswamy lost to Vidyamanyathirtha. How many examples would you need?

If at all any Dvaitin is defeated by an Advaitin, it may be argued on the same lines as you have done that they were not well versed in Dvaita philosophy and so on.

Stating that Dvaita is a step for Advaita is as foolish as stating that starting from Bangalore and landing at Kanyakumari is a step for trekking at Himalayas.

There are many landmarks in this route that prepare one in dvaita bhakti and that makes one more fit to trek the tough terrains of the Himalayas.

A person trained in dvaita bhakti can never go to Advaita where bhakti is meaningless.

4. Late Prof.Ramachandra Rao was a professor in English. He is not recognized as a great Dvaita scholar. So citing his example serves no purpose.

I never cited his case as an example. I cited him only to say something about Swami Satyadhyanatirtha. I know he is not a recognized Dvaita scholar.

Dr.A.V.Nagasampige is a learned scholar. No doubt about it. But his statements show that he doesn't have a conviction. It is true that he has edited a number of books of different variety. But it doesn't mean that he has accepted whatever the various authors have mentioned. The duty of an editor is to see that the book published from his side satisfies certain norms.

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

बृहदारण्यकोपनिषद्भाष्यम् (पूर्णप्रज्ञसंशोधनमन्दिरग्रन्थमाला-30) 2006 is one of his publications. Refutation of the famous statement अहं ब्रह्मास्मि as being in favor of Advaita runs in this book for more than a hundred pages. Can you explain how this same editor speaks for भामती?

It appears to me that he is playing a double game to become popular.

You perhaps know that Kalidasa raises Shiva to supremacy in his Kumarasambhava , where as he upholds Sri Rama in his Raghuvamsha. Similar is Dr.Nagasampige's action. He praises Jayathirtha on one occasion and Vidyanaraya on another occasion very well knowing that the two were rivals on Dvaita and Advaita issues.

Dr.Nagasampige had earlier written a book entitled MAATRAYA SAMARASYA. This was in 1990's when he was working as a research scholar at ORI Mysore. When I raised an objection, the gentleman replied politely."ನಾನು ಪರಮಪೂಜ್ಯವಿದ್ಯಾಮಾನ್ಯರನ್ನು (ಅಂದಿನ ಫಲಿಮಾರು ಮಠಾಧೀಶರು) ಕಂಡಿದ್ದೆ. ಮತತ್ರಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಮರಸ್ಯ ಇದೆಯೋ" ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ" ಕ್ಷಮಿಸಿ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯವೊಂದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇವೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವ ನಾನು ಹಾಗೆ ಬರಿಯಬೇಕಾಯಿತು," ಎಂದು.

Please tell me how you would go ahead with this gentleman.

Please note that just because one or two sheep take their legs of the track, you cannot say that the flock has left its stream.

You have yourself stated that he has not at all converted. This reduces my work. This example also doesn't fit to the context, because we are speaking about scholars migrating from one school of thought to other.

I can understand one's predicament. I had only questioned your claim:

// You cannot cite a single example of an eminent DVAITA scholar either accepting or appreciating ADVAITA school. This also goes a long way in establishing that DVAITA is the final. //

I had cited that example only to show how an eminent Dvaita scholar has appreciated Advaita. Now since his writings are there and cannot be denied, you are only trying to play it down. It is for all to see.

Appreciation of advaita by a dvaita scholar only shows that he has no conviction. Check with that person as to whether he accepts that Advaita is superior. The answer would be certainly negative. Moreover he is not an eminent scholar like the ones cited by me above.

If you are interested in knowing the rank of Advaita philosophy, you may refer to my article 'Advaita-the rank worst philosophy' available in the same website.

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

There are a number of articles to show how Advaita is the best ever philosophy. What you have written pales into insignificance before all that. What the stalwarts like Sri Vyasatirtha and Sri Vadiraja tirtha have written against Advaita have had absolutely no effect on Advaita. What can the article of your standard do to Advaita? These words of appreciation of an eminent Dvaita scholar Dr.Nagasampige are enough to refute what you have written in a whole article:

Once you accept ranks among philosophies, you are supporting Taratamyamatha. You cannot just wave your hands saying that all of this is vyavaharika, because your vyavaharika is itself not proved so far.

This comment applies to merits of articles also. I can brand yours as paling since I am rationally accepting a realistic world. Since everything is unrealistic according to you, your gradations, arguments, conclusions and so on can never harm your opponent.

Moreover Dr. Nagasampige's /Maheshanandagiri's remarks pale in front of remarks by stalwarts like Sri Vyaraajathirtha just as the whole of 1.25 lack Granthas long Advaita shastra does in front of a single statement by Madhwacharya. "अज्ञानासम्भवादेव तन्मतमखिलमपाकृतम्"

If works of great persons like Sri Vyasathirtha had absolutely no effect, there would not be so many of their followers. Advaita scholars would not have tried to retort to them.

// ವಿಶ್ವಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧವೂ ಅಪಾರಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಅನುಯಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿದ ಶಾಂಕರದರ್ಶನ ಪರಂಪರೆಯು ದೇಶ-ವಿದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ..... Apart from revealing the emptiness of the Bauddha-Jaina avoidika schools and those schools which go by the name of vaidika namely saankhya, yoga, nyaaya, vaisheshika, Sri Shankaracharya, through His lovely and easily comprehensible language brought to light the message of the Upanishads. Thinkers and other schools might harbour different opinions about Advaita. Yet its achievement and the efforts in the distilling of the truth cannot be left un-honoured.To conclude, the bringing to light the BrahmasvarUpa of the Upanishads that was missed by the Sankhyas and the Mimamsakas and presenting it in a very novel way by the Advaita system always deserves commendation. //

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

Note that Buddhism which was eradicated by Bhattas was brought back by Advaitins through their Mayavada completely resembling Shunyavada. Can you cite any attribute in your Brahman differentiating him from Buddhist's shunya?

While Sankhyas and Vaisheshikas have harmed Vedas partially, Advaitins have harmed whole of the Vedas by branding them as Atattvavedaka and interpreting Upanishads wrongly. Sri Vadirajathirtha has correctly commented that Advaita Bhashya has more offended Upanishads than defending.

One can easily see what someone who holds wrong notions about Advaita and a scholar who has portrayed Advaita correctly to the extent his book covers can say from comparing what you have written and what others have said about Advaita. Dr.Nagasampige's portrayal of Advaita in that book is correct and verified by an Advaitic scholar. His words of appreciation of Advaita are therefore quite in place. On the other hand, the views about Advaita, the Advaita jnani, the teaching, etc. that you have expressed above have no bearing in Advaita. They are completely wrong and have no approval in Advaita. Sri Vidyamanya Tirtharu also held such fallacious notions about Advaita and I have shown them in my article referred above. That is the reason why your ranking of Advaita has no appeal for someone who knows Advaita. It might fetch the applauds of those who are ignorant of Advaita.

I have logically shown that Advaita is worse than any other philosophy. Let you or your ally Dr.Nagasampige similarly establish superiority of Advaita logically. No purpose is served by just stating something which you think. However you have right of speech in free India and you may keep speaking anything sensible or not.

I am satisfied if some persons being mislead by articles like the one by Dr.Nagasampige come back to the groove of Dvaita on seeing my article.

I am reminded of a famous Subhashita :

“एकः पापानि कुरुते फलं भुङ्क्ते महाजनः। रावणोपाहरत्सीतां बन्धनं तु महोदधेः॥”

Quoted below is an excerpt from Swami Maheshananda Giri's introduction to the Chandogya Upanishad Bhashya, edited and published by Mahesh Research Institute, Varanasi, 1982:

// We have been studying the different commentators, such as Srikantha, Ramanuja, Vallabha, Nimbarka, Baladeva, Srikara, Madhva and the moderners, for over fifty years now. We have seen that apart from the criticism of the Advaita-view, there is little more in the content of their traditional view that is not found in Shankara, or is not just a logical corollary of what he has said. It is our challenge that apart from logic-chipping, not a single spiritual fibre, which has not been either supported or

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

contradicted by Shankara, can be shown in the works of these commentators. All the statements of the other commentators about God, are melted down in the crucible of the concept of Saguna Brahman of Shankara. The concept of Brahman of Srikantha and Ramanuja is practically identical with Shankara's concept of Ishwara, and they rarely try to contradict it. Similarly, Shankara's concept of Virat or Sutratman takes care of Madhva, Vallabha and others. Thus, what they contradict is the range outside their vision. Had they been true traditionalists, they would have presented different facets of the same Truth which Shankara had presented. When it comes to present a positive aspect of the spiritual Being, they have little to say, though they roar to assert what it is not. This gives the lie to their having received a different unbroken tradition. .but the traditionalist that Shankara was, he never criticized or disowned the views of Virat, Hiranyagarbha or Ishwara. He rather developed complete harmony between them. Thus, without any fear of contradiction, we can say that Shankara's is THE Hindu tradition. //

You can read what the physicist Schrodinger had to say about Advaita here:

Incorrect remarks as above emerge from people who have not studied Madhwa's Upanishadbhashyas properly.

<http://adbhutam.wordpress.com/2010/01/09/advaita-and-science-ix-schrodinger-and-vedanta/>

As regards Sri Sathyadhyanaathirtha, please note that I happen to be one of his PRASHISHYA and I know him better than you or Prof.Ramachandra Rao. My teachers have expressed to me several times that his aim in life was to condemn Advaita.

Sathyadhyanaathirtha had memorized portions of Advaitabhashya for the sake of quoting readily and certainly not out regards to that. Another intention was to show that Shankaracharya has made self contradictory statements.

The gossip you have mentioned is something like saying that Shankaracharya had mentioned to people close to him that he put forth the Advaita theory to mislead undeserving people.

So, hear no rumor, spread no rumor.

There is no special reason for me to discard what Prof.S.K.Ramachandra Rao or anyone else has said about the above Swami. These sources are quite reliable to me even as you hold the sources reliable to you close to your heart. Prof.Rao has said that he has personally heard the Swami's views on Advaita and that he was inspired to make a deeper study of Advaita only after hearing the Swami's views on Shankara. Why should anyone doubt the veracity of what Dr. S.K.R.Rao has written in his book?:

// My interest in this direction was aroused when, even as a school-going boy, I heard the then pontiff of the UttarAdhi Matha (of the Madhva persuasion), Sri SatyadhyAnatirtha, telling my grandfather that he was writing a new commentary on Shankara's commentary on the Vedanta sutra to show that he (Shankara) did not differ much from Ramanuja or Madhva. I do not know if he completed that (.But) it was the learned pontiff's view that Shankara had been grievously misrepresented. //

Advaita deserves to be condemned :-

However your views about the swami are only through someone else. What appears to be gossip is not so to me or to those who conveyed it to me.

I discard Prof. Rao's views because it is against the views of all the followers of Sri Sathyadhyanathirtha. It appears to me that Krishnavadhoota did not indulge himself in writing anti comments since his Guru had already done it.

Thus, this example also doesn't serve the purpose.

The above remarks clearly show that Sri Raghavendra Swamiji was not an admirer of Advaita.

I have only stated what Dr.Nagasampige has said in the Kannada Book. I have not quoted the above cases to show the 'admiration' of these scholars.

Madhwa mutts honor Advaita scholars and even give them titles. Perhaps, this is to make them come to them so that they can have debates with them. People do not respond if they don't have any profit, you see. This is something like throwing a piece of bread to attract fish to net.

It is only this attitude of Dvaita scholars towards Advaita and its scholars that has made Advaitins conclude that right from its inception the Dvaita school has not understood Advaita correctly. All their objections are based on faulty perceptions about Advaita. Despite several centuries of objections against Advaita the Dvaitins are not sure whether they are correctly raising objections against Advaita. One top ranking Dvaita scholar openly admitted to an Advaitin that 'we are unable to understand the Brahmanandi'. This is a work on the Advaitasiddhi and its correct understanding will ensure that one has correctly grasped the Advaitasiddhi.

Note that Brahmanandi is refuted by Dvaitadyumani.

To conclude I would like to say that this type of arguments and counter arguments may not be much useful. It would be useful if you either produce evidences in favor of Advaita or raise objections on Dvaita with evidences. What do you say?