



IJMRRS

**International Journal for Multidisciplinary
Research, Review and Studies**

Volume 1 - Issue 1

2024

© 2024 International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Review and Studies

THE VEILED SCHOOL: CHARVAKA

Name: Harsh Tomar

Institutional affiliation: Kirori mal college, University of Delhi

Email: harshtomar241241@gmail.com

“Yesterday, today and tomorrow are not consecutive, they are connected in a never-ending loop. Everything is connected” yes, now this quote seems to be unidentified to subject of the paper but if we provide light into the brimmed understandings in our hearts, we can count upon this quote’s relevance to our present situations. At the end of the paper, we will be able to decode this quote. For the one liner definition of The School of Charvaka, it is the ancient atheist school of thought which had the mainstream ideology of materialism. There are certain reasons for which I chose this subject. They are as follows :-

- **BEING HIDDEN:** Charvaka’s ideology has been kept deliberately hidden by other schools of thought. So I want to research on why it was kept hidden.
- **REASONS BEHIND BEING HIDDEN:** Charvaka followed extreme materialistic views which did not aligned with the then trend. So I was keen about how they managed those situations.
- **COUNTERING EUROCENTRISM AND ETHNOCENTRISM:** Before Charvaka came into light, The orld believed that materialism is the contribution of greeks and west but Thales of Miletus (c. 580 BCE) and some of the other pre-Socratic philosophers have only some claims to being regarded as materialists, there was no proofs with precision which allow western scholars to justify their claims. The real western philosophy of materialism begins with Leucippus and Democritus, Greek philosophers who were born in the 5th century BCE. Leucippus is known only through his influence on Democritus. According to Democritus, the world consists of nothing but atoms (indivisible chunks of matter) in empty space (which he seems to have thought of as an entity in its own right). Then it was just amplified by Thomas Hobbes and Denis Diderot.

MATERIALISM

Materialism has played a significant role in the history of philosophy, yet there remains no universal agreement on the definition of "matter" or the doctrine of philosophical materialism. Philosophical dictionaries often define materialism in its most reductionist and sometimes eliminative forms, echoing Robert Boyle's seventeenth-century coinage of the term. Indeed the roots of materialism traced back to the great Ancient Indian philosophy yet, when we examine its evolution from ancient Greek philosophy to contemporary times, we find more inclusive interpretations of materialism alongside intricate engagements with non-materialist perspectives, such as those found in Christian philosophy and German idealism. Philosophical materialism, broadly defined, asserts reality as fundamentally composed of matter,

emphasizing its attributes of changeability and plurality. It also involves rejecting the existence of disembodied living beings and the hypostatization of ideas. This inclusive view of philosophical materialism sheds new light on its critical historical trajectory from ancient India to the present, taking into consideration advancements in scientific thought. By tracing significant connections and discontinuities among various theoretical frameworks concerning matter, we present a cohesive yet diverse field of inquiry. Materialism in early Indian thought emerged as a critique of spiritualism and supernatural beliefs, evolving by the 6th and 7th centuries CE into a recognized school of thought known as Lokayata. Despite its formalization, it has persisted on the fringes of philosophical discourse. Let's light the materialism in the course of Vedic era, During the Vedic period, Indian Materialism was at its nascent stage, primarily associated with figures like Brihaspati and his followers. Brihaspati's approach was notably critical rather than constructive, focusing on refuting the doctrines of other schools of thought. Those aligned with Brihaspati were sceptical and aimed to challenge prevailing orthodoxies, often identified in Vedic literature as "unbelievers". This early Materialism was fundamentally opposed to Vedic teachings. One of Brihaspati's main objections was the ritualistic repetition of sacred verses without understanding their deeper meanings. However, Brihaspati's philosophy, known as "Brihaspatya," lacked a coherent positive framework until his followers embraced the concept of "Svabhava." Initially, Svabhava rejected the theories of causation and the notion of moral actions leading to good or evil consequences. This adoption of Svabhava marked a significant step towards establishing a metaphysical basis for Brihaspatya. The later sections of the Vedas recount intense conflicts between Brihaspatya adherents and the prevailing spiritual traditions of the time.

INTRODUCTION AND ORIGIN TO THE SCHOOLS'

To understand the school of lokayakta, we are not only required to study the precise school rather we have to trace the chronology of ancient Indian philosophy in short before. So starting with the popular statement by Maithili sharan gupt from Atit Khand in Bharat bharati "sansaar ko humne hi pehle siksha daan ki aachar ki, vyahvahr ki, vyapaar ki aur vigyaan ki" this is true but I would like to infuse philosopjhy as well in this statement. According to me, the chronology of the philosophical traditions should be divided into four strands. The first phase starts with the creation of vedas(1500BC). The vedas are not very philosophical rather they explain about the rituals and hymns to praise the gods. Vedas are divided into 4 sections, Sanhita(mantras), Brahman(rituals), Aranyak(rules to live in forests) and Upanishads. Upanishads are 108 in numbers but only 10-12 of them are considered widely across the subcontinent, Upanishads are philosophical in nature and are also known as the vedant i.e. the end of vedas.At the end of the first phase, Upanishads had cemented the beliefs of Atma, moksh, Rebirth and param tatva which is nirguna.The second and the third phase the clear distinct has been made on Nastik and aastik, there are around 9 prominent schools of Indian philosophy from which 3 are nastik and 6 are aastik.

The common consensus had been emerged since the medhatithi had cleared the confusion Manusmriti, in verse 2.11, defines Nastika as those who do not accept "Vedic literature in entirety based on two roots of science of reasoning (Sruti and Smriti)". The 9th century Indian

scholar Medhatithi analyzed this definition and stated that Nastika does not mean someone who says "Vedic literature are untrue", but rather one who says "Vedic literature are immoral". Medhatithi further noted verse 8.309 of Manusmriti, to provide another aspect of the definition of Nastika as one who believes, "there is no other world, there is no purpose in giving charity, there is no purpose in rituals and the teachings in the Vedic literature." The three nastik schools are Jain Bauddh and Charvaka. The six astik schools are Samkhya(kapil muni), Yoga(sage patanjali), Nyaya(aakshaypaat muni), vaisheshik(sage kanad), Mimansa(sage jaimini), vedant(rishi badarayana).They work in pair like sankhya-yoga, nyaya-vaisheshik, and Mimansa-vedant.The fourth Phase can also be designated as interpretational phase as the sutras that were compiled in 2 and 3 phase are now started to get decode by the acharyas. In order to interpret the sutras properly there is a prerequisite condition of studying the Prasthantrayi (the books of the starting) which includes three texts named the Upanishads(the prominent ones), geeta,and Bhramasutra (by bradarayana).At last in the fourth phase, advaita Vedanta by adi shankaracharya cemented a challenge too bhakti tradition by introducing the concept of mithya. To reintroduce the concept of bhakti the vaishnav vednt came into being with major proponents named ramanuj-acharya (vishishadvaitvad), vallabhacharya (shudhaadvaitvad), Nimbark(daviatadvaitvad), madhava-acharya (dvaitvad) and Chaitanya Mahaprabhu (achintyadvaitadvaitvad).In this long short story, our main concern is charvaka.

Charvaka, also known as Lokayata, represents an ancient Indian school of thought emerging circa the 6th century BCE. It stands among the six classical Indian philosophical systems, known as Darsanas. Charvakais distinguished by its skepticism, emphasis on empiricism, and outright rejection of religious and moral doctrines. Its radical viewpoints provoked significant opposition from other philosophical schools in India, contributing to its eventual decline in prominence over time. The emergence of Charvaka philosophy took place in ancient India around the 6th century BCE, marking its position among the heterodox schools known as the "nastika" schools. Rooted deeply in the materialist and skeptical traditions of Indian thought, it derives its name from its founder, Charvaka, also referred to as Lokayata. Although the earliest texts directly associated with Charvakaphilosophy have been lost, glimpses of its ideas can be discerned from references in other Indian philosophical works. Charvakaenjoyed a period of flourishing influence during the Mauryan era, spanning from 322 to 185 BCE. However, its prominence gradually waned following the Gupta period, which lasted from 320 to 550 CE.The founder of charvaka is supposedly to be considered as Brihaspati rather not having the proof some scholars considered shukracharya (the guru of demons) also as the establisher of it.

Lets talk about the name of the charvaka, charvaka is considered both the name of a single person and also a group of people following the school of charvaka philosophy. The single person is considered to be Brihaspati, interestingly we have hundreds of brihaspatis and the Brihaspati related to charvaka is the one who wrote Kamasutra text(2nd-3rd century BC) who is Vatsayan. The major proponent is Ajit keshkambali (the name keshkambali in shat darshan or sanatan darshan is given to the person who is penancing , here keshkambali refers to a person who wore a blanket of hair which keeps a man warmer in summers and colder in winters in order to brim the capacity of undergoing critical situations but here keshambali produces some

kind of doubt because charvaka people considers immediate pleasure as their priority) (6th century bc). Charvaka name is derived from a sanskrit word charv (meaning to chew something),so what did they chew? Some scholars say that they were non-vegetarians (chewing flesh), Gunaratna(14th century ce) the commentator of Haribhadra's SAD-DARSHAN SAMMUCCHAYA (A compendium of six philosophies) Another meaning relates to CHARU-VAK translates the people who were 'sweet-tongued'. The third meaning to the name charvak suggests chewing up of all moral and ethical considerations. Regrettably, the original writings of the Charvaka school have not survived, necessitating an understanding of its principles through references found in Hindu, Jain, and Buddhist texts. Charvaka's perspective underscores that spiritualism did not exclusively dominate ancient Indian thought; instead, materialism wielded considerable influence. The concept of matter as the fundamental reality traces back to Brihaspati Laukya of the Rig Veda, who initially shaped Indian materialism with elements of scepticism and agnosticism. During its early stages, Charvaka adhered to the principle of 'svabhava vada,' attributing an object's inherent characteristics to itself rather than to any external agency. It adamantly rejected the belief in divine or transcendent forces inherent in nature. For instance, according to Charvaka, fire's heat, water's coldness, and the moderate temperature of air are intrinsic qualities of these substances. Essentially, Charvakaposed that the diversity and order observed in the universe stem solely from the innate properties of objects, independent of any supernatural influence. The Charvakas reject the notion of a consistent cause-and-effect relationship, arguing that observing two phenomena together does not necessarily imply a causal connection between them. For example, they question whether the presence of smoke necessarily indicates the existence of fire, both in the past and in the future. Unfortunately, our knowledge of this school is limited, primarily derived from criticisms levelled by its opponents. While the Sarva-Darsana-Samgraha provides a brief overview, additional sources contribute little beyond what can be gleaned from existing materials. The term "Lokayata," another name for Charvaka, suggests a philosophy grounded in common sense. Given that many other schools of Indian philosophy primarily critique Charvaka's materialistic principles, it's plausible that these criticisms may exaggerate weaknesses or misinterpret its doctrines.

EPISTEMOLOGY OF CHARVAKA

प्रत्यक्षमेव एकम् प्रमाणम्।

(Madvacharya's Sarva-darsana-samgraha)

According to the Charvaka school of philosophy, perception (pratyaksha) stands alone as the sole source of valid knowledge. They assert that nothing exists beyond what is directly perceived by the five senses. In contrast to most other schools of Indian philosophy, which recognize inference (anumana) and testimony (sabda) as reliable means of knowledge, the Charvakas dismiss these methods.

They categorize perception into two types: external, which involves the functioning of the five senses, and internal, which pertains to mental operations. Knowledge arises when an external object interacts with one of the senses, and the mind may subsequently process and expand upon this sensory input. Thus, according to the Charvakas, all knowledge ultimately originates from sensory perception.

"Pramāṇa," a Sanskrit term denoting "source of knowledge" or "means of valid cognition," holds a central position in Indian epistemology by addressing the fundamental question of how knowledge is obtained and validated. Various philosophical schools in India recognize different numbers and types of pramaṇas. Among the commonly accepted pramaṇas are:

1. Perception (pratyakṣa): This refers to direct sensory experience, where knowledge is acquired through the senses.
2. Inference (anumāna): Knowledge gained through inference involves reasoning based on observation, pattern recognition, and generalization from specific instances to broader conclusions.
3. Testimony (śabda): This pramaṇa involves knowledge obtained from reliable sources such as scriptures, experts, or trusted authorities.
4. Comparison (upamāna): Knowledge derived from analogy or similarity is categorized under upamāna, where understanding is expanded by comparing a new object or concept to something already known.

These pramaṇas collectively provide a framework for understanding how individuals perceive, reason, and acquire knowledge within the diverse traditions of Indian philosophical thought.

THE REJECTION OF INFERENCE AND THE OTHER PRAMANAS

Charvaka philosophers critique the use of inference, testimony, and comparison as legitimate sources of knowledge. They argue that inference, often derived from assumptions and generalizations, lacks reliability across all circumstances, thus failing to offer certainty. Similarly, testimony is dismissed due to its susceptibility to deception, bias, and errors in transmission, challenging the credibility of scriptures and expert opinions. Additionally, comparison is deemed unreliable as it hinges on subjective interpretations of similarities and differences, making it incapable of providing absolute knowledge according to the Charvaka perspective. Instead, these philosophers advocate for independent investigation and critical thinking as superior methods for acquiring knowledge. The Charvaka philosophers raised several other objections against the validity of inference. Firstly, they argued that inferential knowledge lacks the vividness of direct perception. Secondly, inference always relies on other factors to determine its conclusions. Thirdly, it is asserted that inference itself depends on perceptual statements. Fourthly, inferential knowledge is not directly derived from the objects themselves. Fifthly, inference is considered abstract and not concrete in nature. Sixthly, it is often subject to contradictions. Lastly, they pointed out the absence of proof establishing the

universal and unconditional relationship between the reason (hetu) and the major term (sadhya), meaning there is no definitive evidence proving that the presence of the middle term always accompanies the presence of the major term.

The Charvaka philosophers dismiss the validity of testimony (sabda) as a means of acquiring knowledge. According to Madhvacharya's account in the Sarva-darsana-saṃgraha, they argue that testimony cannot serve as a reliable source because it can be countered by pointing out that its claims are encompassed within the domain of inference. Alternatively, they contend that testimony itself relies on recognizing linguistic signs, such as words spoken by an elderly person in the presence of a child, which does not surpass the barriers faced by inference. Furthermore, the Charvakas reject the idea that we should accept another's assertion that smoke and fire are invariably linked, likening it to blindly accepting statements like those found in the scriptures (such as Manu's dictums), which they outright reject. Consequently, the Charvakas do not recognize the authority of the Vedas, considering them meaningless and deceptive, created by individuals to manipulate and confuse the populace for their own selfish ends.

IN OPPOSITION OF EPISTEMOLOGY

I would like to display my personal opposition for the epistemology of charvaka, so completely depending upon the perception can be extremely disastrous in many strands. There are many delusional diseases in which people witness variants of unappropriated characters and things, does this means that a person with a condition witnessing a dead relative or a dead person (only he can see) provide the pramana of existence of the respective dead? Almost everyone's answer I presume is No. We cannot perceive the things as they appear. Another example, sun rises in the east and sets in the west, it's a complete perceptive statement, the sun never sets or rises, it is the earth that is rotating and revolving which creates the mirage of sun seting and rising.

A notable criticism against the Charvaka's rejection of inference is that their own assertions rely fundamentally on inference (created by Udayana). An often-discussed critique of the Charvaka's dismissal of inference is that their own arguments paradoxically depend on inference. Gangesa Upadhyaya ((ca.1350 CE) was a philosopher who established the Navya-Nyaya school) observed that the Charvaka position on inference, which states "inference is not a valid means because there is no guarantee that past observations will hold in the future," ironically relies on inference itself. Furthermore, he noted that there is no definitive proof or assurance that inference is indeed an invalid means of knowledge (pramaṇa). Thus, the Charvaka stance on inference appears to undermine its own rationale. Another significant objection to the Charvaka's epistemic theory is that thoughts and ideas, which are crucial for opposing statements or positions, are not directly perceptible but inferred. All forms of discussion, doctrines, proofs, and disproof rely heavily on inference. In practical terms, it is impossible to comprehend and engage with others without relying on inference. Udayana argued that rejecting inference as a valid means of knowledge would disrupt practical life:

“If this doctrine is consistently applied and people begin to disbelieve all that they do not perceive at any particular time, then all our practical life will be seriously disturbed and upset”

(Udayana’s polemic with the Charvaka in Nyayakusumanjali III, 5-6)

Perceptions can also be invalid (take any case of illusion such as mirage and the time when there is half-light and half-dark), and such mistaken perceptual data is contradicted by inference.

Some scholars suggest that there were more moderate Charvaka thinkers, often referred to as "soft-core" Charvakas (susiksita, Dasgupta, 1952:516). According to this view, not all inferences were considered unreliable. They accepted inferences based on perceptual experiences as valid. Purandara, a materialist philosopher from the 7th century CE, argued that inference is useful in understanding the nature of worldly phenomena where direct perception is possible within the empirical realm. However, he cautioned against using inference to establish doctrines like a transcendental world, the law of karma, or life after death, since these are beyond perceptual experience. Purandara also distinguished between inferences about the past and future, asserting that only inferences about the past, which can be verified through direct perception, are valid. This perspective on epistemology aligns closely with the defense of common interests and criticism of religious exploitation and deception by materialist thinkers.

Another perspective on the Charvaka doctrine suggests that while perception can justify beliefs, it is not necessarily seen as a direct source of knowledge. This indicates a potential evolution within the Charvaka School, with different branches interpreting the doctrine in various ways. Despite diverse interpretations, it is likely that Charvaka philosophers believed that the reliability of inference could ultimately be traced back to perception. The common belief that Charvakas completely rejected inference is largely based on writings by Madhava (the guru of Harihara and Bukka, establishers of Vijaynagara Empire), who belonged to the Vedanta tradition and may have portrayed materialists in a biased light as heretics, potentially misinterpreting their views. In fact, considering that materialists could have been among the earliest logicians in India, their philosophical views should not be dismissed as naive or used solely for polemical purposes. (Kautilya in Arthashastra mentions lokayakta as anvikshiki, and manusmriti suggests that charvakas were considered as problematic only on the basis of not accepting vedic viewpoints on heaven and all, (Chattopadhyaya 1968:25-7)).

METAPHYSICS OF CHARVAKA

Metaphysics, a fundamental branch of philosophy, investigates the foundational structure of reality. Often regarded as first philosophy, it is considered more fundamental than other philosophical inquiries. Traditionally, metaphysics explores mind-independent aspects of

existence, yet some contemporary theorists interpret it as an exploration of the conceptual frameworks that shape human cognition and perception.

- Cosmology

§ ५६५. अथ प्रमेयं प्रमाणं चाह— एकं च,
पृथ्वी जलं तथा तेजो वायुर्भूतचतुष्टयम् ।
आधारो भूमिरेतेषां मानं त्वक्षजमेव हि ॥८३॥

Ṣaḍdarsanasamuccaya (shlok 465)

§ ५६५. अब इनके प्रमाण और प्रमेयका निरूपण करते हैं—
किंच-और भी । पृथ्वी जल अग्नि और वायु ये भूतचतुष्टय ही तत्त्व हैं । पृथ्वी सबकी
आधार है । इन्द्रियजन्य प्रत्यक्ष ही एकमात्र प्रमाण है ॥८३॥

The metaphysics of the Charvaka School directly stems from their epistemology, characterized as "unqualified materialistic monism." They maintain that matter alone constitutes reality, as perception serves as the sole dependable source of knowledge. According to Charvaka philosophy, what can be known through perception is considered real, emphasizing that matter constitutes the only true reality. Sense-perception, they argue, does not reveal any metaphysical entities beyond the tangible. Their worldview identifies matter exclusively in its elemental forms: earth, water, fire, and air. Charvakas reject the existence of ether (akash), asserting it lies beyond perceptual experience. They affirm the reality of the four elements not in subtle or abstract forms, but in their gross, tangible manifestations.

- Theology

वचना एव भवन्तीति । ततः सा यद्युत्पद्यते—
§ ५६१ तदनु च तस्याः स पतिर्यदुपदिष्टवान् तदेव दर्शयन्नाह—
पिब खाद च चारुलोचने, यदतीतं वरगात्रि तन्न ते ।
न हि क्षीरु गतं निवर्तते, समुदयमात्रमिदं कलेवरम् ॥८२॥

Ṣaḍdarsanasamuccaya (shlok 561)

§ ५६१ इसके बाद उसके पतिने उस स्त्रीको जो उपदेश दिया, उसे ध्यानसे सुनिए—
हे सुलोचने, इसलिए आनन्दसे जो चाहो पियो और जो मनमे आये खाओ । हे सुन्दर,
यह चार दिनकी जवानी बीत जानेपर वापिस नहीं आयगी । जो गया वह फिर तुम्हे नहीं मिल
सकता । स्वर्ग और नरकके चक्करमे पड़कर इस परोसे हुए थालको मत छोड़ो । यह शरीर

नास्तिक पति—मुग्धे, पृथिवी जल आग और हवाके विशिष्ट संयोगसे बने हुए शरीरको छोड़कर अन्य कोई जीव नामका पदार्थ है ही नहीं, जो इस लोकसे परलोक जाकर शुभ और अशुभ कर्मके फलको भोगेगा। जो कुछ है सो यह शरीर ही है। और यह शरीर क्या है, बिजलीकी चमककी तरह हम हमेशा इसे नष्ट होता हुआ देखते हैं। कितने ही शरीर प्रतिदिन नष्ट होते हैं, चितामे जले और खाक हो गये। इस शरीरमे भूतोके संयोगसे उत्पन्न हुई चेतना भी बिजलीकी चमककी तरह जब कभी भी समाप्त हो सकती है। इसलिए परलोकका झगड़ा छोड़ो। उसे किसने देखा है? जो सामने है, सो खाओ पीओ और मस्तीसे भोग भोगो ॥८२॥

Since Charvakas do not recognize any reality beyond the material realm, they categorically reject traditional concepts such as God, religion, and an afterlife as mere "pure fictions, sheer imaginations of fevered brains." According to their philosophy, only the material world exists, and anything beyond it, including survival after death and a transcendent God described as an unmoved mover or creator, is deemed non-existent. They argue that because only perception provides valid knowledge, and since a supernatural God cannot be perceived, it cannot exist. Therefore, Charvakas deny the existence of God entirely, including the notion of God as antaryamin, who indwells within human beings.

Moreover, Charvakas dismiss conscience as the voice of God guiding humanity, asserting it has no basis in reality as perceived through their materialistic worldview. Consequently, they reject religion as well, viewing it as a construct built on faith and belief systems that assume a spiritual aspect of human nature directed toward a destiny beyond the material world. In essence, according to Charvaka philosophy, such spiritual yearning and the frameworks of religion are considered unfounded in the true nature of reality, which they define solely in materialistic terms.

- Psychology

Since charvaka only considered perception as the sole proof of existence, they only considers what they can see. Indeed they recognised the existence of consciousness or soul but not as the other schools accepted it. Charvakas acknowledge consciousness but reject the idea that it exists independently of the body. They view consciousness as a product of material substances. According to their perspective, consciousness does not inherently reside within particles of matter; rather, it emerges when these particles organize into specific forms capable of exhibiting signs of life. Consciousness, in their view, is always observed in association with a living body and ceases to exist upon the body's dissolution. When the four elemental components of matter combine in a specific arrangement to form living organisms, animal and human consciousness emerges as a result. Charvakas describe consciousness as an emergent and dialectical evolution, an epiphenomenon, essentially a by-product of material processes. They analogize this relationship by stating that "As fire produces heat similarly the combination of elements in definite proportion produces consciousness".

§ ५६७. अथ भूतचतुष्टयीप्रभवा^१ देहे चैतन्योत्पत्तिः कथं प्रतीयताम् । इत्याशङ्क्याह—
 पृथ्व्यादिभूतसंहत्या तथा देहपरीणतेः ।
 मदशक्तिः सुराङ्गेभ्यो यद्वत्तद्वच्चिदात्मनि ॥८४॥

Śaddarsanasamuccaya (shlok 567)

§ ५६७ अब भूतचतुष्टयसे उत्पन्न होनेवाले शरीरमें चैतन्यकी उत्पत्तिकी प्रक्रिया बताते हैं—
 जिस तरह महुआ आदि मादक सामग्रीसे मदशक्ति उत्पन्न होती है उसी तरह पृथिवी
 आदि भूतोंके विशिष्ट संयोगसे देहाकार परिणमनसे शरीरमें चैतन्य उत्पन्न होता है ॥८४॥

§ ५६८ पृथिवी जल अग्नि और वायु इन भूतोंके विशिष्ट संयोगसे भूतोंका शरीराकार
 रूपसे परिणमन होता है । जिस प्रकार गुड़ घातकी आदि शराबकी सामग्रीसे मादकशक्ति होती है
 उसी तरह शरीरमें चैतन्यशक्ति उत्पन्न हो जाती है । 'आत्मा' शब्दके अनेक अर्थ होते हैं । अतः
 यहाँ आत्मा शब्दका शरीर अर्थ ही लेना चाहिए न कि जीव । तात्पर्य यह कि पृथिवी आदि भूत-
 चतुष्टयके विशिष्ट संयोगसे देह बनती है फिर देहमें चैतन्य उत्पन्न होता है । परीणति शब्दमें परि-
 उपसर्गको विकल्पने दोष हो गया है । इन श्लोकका यह पाठान्तर भी देखा जाता है—
 पृथिव्यादिभूतसंहत्या तथा देहादिसंभवः । मदशक्तिः सुराङ्गेभ्यो यद्वत्तद्वत्स्यतात्मना ॥ अर्थात्
 पृथिवी आदि भूतोंका संयोग होनेपर देह आदि उत्पन्न होते हैं । पृथिवी पहाड आदि सभी पदार्थ
 भूतोंके संयोगसे ही उत्पन्न होते हैं । जिस प्रकार मदिराकी सामग्रीसे मदशक्ति होती है उसी तरह
 भूतोंके विशिष्ट संयोगसे शरीरमें आत्मता या चैतन्यता आदि है । वाचस्पतिने कहा है—
 "पृथिवी जल अग्नि और वायु ये चार तत्त्व हैं । इनके समुदाय—विशिष्ट संयोगमें शरीर उत्पन्न
 और विषयजनक पदार्थ उत्पन्न होते हैं. उनमें चैतन्य होता है" ॥८४॥

According to Charvaka philosophy, none of the physical elements individually possesses consciousness. Therefore, they argue that consciousness is not independent of the physical body. Instead, it arises when these physical elements organize into an organic pattern capable of sustaining consciousness. They illustrate this with an analogy: just as certain tastes and intoxicating qualities arise from specific combinations of ingredients, consciousness emerges from the complex organization of physical elements. Similar to how red color appears from the combination of betel leaf and lime, consciousness manifests through the interaction and arrangement of matter, without being inherent to any single component. To understand this precisely, let's consider an example of cashew, cashew is very rich in magnesium, manganese, phosphorus, zinc, vitamin B6, and vitamin K, and many parents persuade their children to eat them, you should agree with this. But cashew feni is also completely made up of cashew. According to charvaka philosophy, cashew does not have the characteristics of alcohol but after undergoing through a particular procedure it displays the characteristics of alcohol, similarly the consciousness or soul or the existence of entire human body emerged only through a particular processing of all four elements in definite proportion as feni emerges from non-alcoholic cashew nut.

ETHICS

In shat darshan there are 4 aims of life that are called purusharth, Dharma(righteousness) , Arth(wealth), Kama (pleasure) and moksha(liberation). Many of the darshan accepted all the purusharths but charvaka considered only 2 of them just on priority basis, Arth (wealth), Kama (pleasure).they considered kama at the highest pedestal and Arth as supplementary to achieve Kama. There is only one life and nothing beyond, therefore a person should earn money and enjoy life. Wealth should be treated as a secondary aim, because we earn money to enjoy ourselves. Enjoyment is the main aim of life. Beyond enjoyment there should be no aim of life. They considered dharma and moksh as the mental ailments. The concept of dharma and moksha are there just meant for the survival of the persons who are considered as Brahmins. The presence of pain in life should not deter individuals from seeking pleasure. The Charvakas advocate for embracing pleasure despite the inevitability of pain, as illustrated by their sayings: “A wise person doesn’t reject the kernel because of the husk;” “No one stops eating fish due to the bones and scales;” “Roses aren’t discarded for their thorns;” “We don’t abandon crop cultivation because of animal damage;” “We don’t stop cooking because beggars might ask for food.” These sayings encourage people to pursue pleasure persistently. According to the Charvakas, pleasure is the fundamental ethical principle, and one should strive to minimize pain while maximizing pleasure. There are some references from which its clear how they prioritize Kama as a purusharth:-

§ ५७१. अथ ये शान्तरसपूरितस्वान्ता निरुपमं शमसुखं वणयान्त, तानुद्दिश्य यच्चावाक
वृते तदाह—

साध्यवृत्तिनिवृत्तिभ्यां या प्रीतिर्जायते जने ।
निरर्था सा मते तेषां धर्मः कामात्परो न हि ॥८६॥

Saddarsanasamuccaya (shlok 571)

§ ५७१ जो शान्त रससे आप्लावित हृदय होकर तप जप आदि कार्योसे निरुपम शान्ति
सुखको प्राप्ति बताते है उनके प्रति चार्वाकोका यह उपदेश है—
कर्त्तव्यमे प्रवृत्ति तथा अकर्त्तव्यसे निवृत्ति होनेपर जो मनुष्योको आत्म-सन्तोष होता है
उसे चार्वाक लोग निरर्थक बताते है । उनके यहाँ तो कामसे बढ़कर कोई दूसरा धर्म नहीं है ॥८६॥

Vatsayana, in his Kamasutra, references some aphorisms from the Lokyata Sutras. Here is one such aphorism:

1. Religious rites should be avoided,
2. Because their results rely on an uncertain future,
3. Which is unpredictable.
4. Who, except a fool, would give away their own possessions?
5. A pigeon today is preferable to a peacock tomorrow.
6. A guaranteed coin is better than a questionable gold coin.

Controversial sayings and sutras of charvakas

Charvakas' views have been described in various texts such as in Mahabharata (12.211.26-27), Upanishads (e.g. Kaṭha I.20; 2,6 and Maitri 7,8-9), Kamasutra (I.2.25-30). Mostly, the position of Carvakas was described by the philosophers of opposing schools Naiyayikas, Vedantins, Jains and Buddhists. Another major sources are as follows Ṣaḍdarsanasamuccaya by Haribhadra, sarva-darshan sangrah by Madhavacharya and Brihaspati sutra. There are certain sutras and shloks which are controversial to both present and past times. They are as follows:-

**यावज्जीवं सुखं जीवेन्नास्ति मृत्योरगोचरः ।
भस्मीभूतस्य देहस्य पुनरागमनं कुतः ॥**

SarvaDarsana-Sangraha (Pg-13,shlok-1)

**While life is yours, live joyously ;
None can escape Death's searching eye :
When once this frame of ours they burn,
How shall it e'er again return ?**

Sarva-Darsana-Sangraha by E. B. Cowell (1882)

**अग्निहोत्रं त्रयो वेदास्त्रिदण्डं भस्मगुण्ठनम् ।
बुद्धिपौरुषहीनानां जीविका धातृनिर्मिता ॥ २ ॥**

SarvaDarsana-Sangraha (Pg-13,shlok-2)

**The Agnihotra, the three Vedas, the ascetic's three staves, and smear-
ing one's self with ashes,
Were made by Nature as the livelihood of those destitute of know-
ledge and manliness.**

Sarva-Darsana-Sangraha by E. B. Cowell (1882)

**पशुश्चेन्निहतः स्वर्गं ज्योतिष्टोमे गमिष्यति ।
स्वपिता यजमानेन तत्र कस्मान्न हिंस्यते ॥ ३ ॥**

Sarva-Darsana-Sangraha (Pg-13,shlok-3)

If a beast slain in the Jyotishtoma rite will itself go to heaven,
Why then does not the sacrificer forthwith offer his own father ?¹

Sarva-Darsana-Sangraha by E. B. Cowell (1882)

मृतानामपि जन्तूनां श्राद्धं चेतृत्तिकारणम् ।
निर्वाणस्य प्रदीपस्य स्नेहः संवर्धयेच्छिखाम् ॥ ४ ॥

SarvaDarsana-Sangraha (Pg-13,shlok-4)

If the Śrāddha produces gratification to beings who are dead,
Then here, too, in the case of travellers when they start, it is needless
to give provisions for the journey.

Sarva-Darsana-Sangraha by E. B. Cowell (1882)

यावज्जीवेत्सुखं जीवेद्वणं कृत्वा घृतं पिबेत् ।
भस्मीभूतस्य देहस्य पुनरागमनं कुतः ॥ ७ ॥

SarvaDarsana-Sangraha (Pg-14,shlok-7)

While life remains let a man live happily, let him feed on ghee even
though he runs in debt ;
When once the body becomes ashes, how can it ever return again ?

Sarva-Darsana-Sangraha by E. B. Cowell (1882)

यदि गच्छेत्परं लोकं देहादेश विनिर्गतः ।
कस्माद्भूयो न चायाति बन्धुस्नेहसमाकुलः ॥ ८ ॥

SarvaDarsana-Sangraha (Pg-14,shlok-8)

If he who departs from the body goes to another world,
How is it that he comes not back again, restless for love of his
kindred ?

Sarva-Darsana-Sangraha by E. B. Cowell (1882)

ततश्च जीवनोपायो ब्राह्मणैर्विहितस्त्वह ।
मृतानां प्रेतकार्याणि न त्वन्यद्विद्यते क्वचित् ॥ ९ ॥

SarvaDarsana-Sangraha (Pg-14,shlok-9)

Hence it is only as a means of livelihood that Brahmans have established here

All these ceremonies for the dead,—there is no other fruit anywhere.

Sarva-Darsana-Sangraha by E. B. Cowell (1882)

त्रयो वेदस्य कर्तारो भण्डधूर्तनिशाचराः ।
जर्भरीतुर्फरीत्यादि पण्डितानां वचः स्मृतम् ॥ १० ॥

SarvaDarsana-Sangraha (Pg-14,shlok-10)

The three authors of the Vedas were buffoons, knaves, and demons. All the well-known formulæ of the pandits, jarpharí, turpharí, &c.² And all the obscene rites for the queen commanded in the *Aswamedha*,

Sarva-Darsana-Sangraha by E. B. Cowell (1882)

THE END IS THE BEGINNING AND THE BEGINNING IS THE END.

“Yesterday, today and tomorrow are not consecutive, they are connected in a never-ending loop. Everything is connected” now the meaning of this line should be clear to some extent. As this school rejected all the vedic practices and other ethnic rituals of other schools and became extremely materialistic (eat, drink and be merry). As the famous saying “There are only patterns, patterns on top of patterns, patterns that affect other patterns. Patterns hidden by patterns. Patterns within patterns. If you watch close, history does nothing but repeat itself. What we call chaos is just patterns we haven't recognized. What we call random is just patterns we can't decipher. What we can't understand we call nonsense. What we can't read we call gibberish.

There is no free will.

There are no variables.”

— Chuck Palahniuk

Indeed History does repeat itself in the case of charvaka philosophy as well. I am not saying that charvakas only emerged in 6 century BCE, they were present before and after that century but the submit came only in the 6 century BCE (Many of the people got extremely influenced by them). Today's generations is comparable to charvakas. Many people don't know the meaning of the school but following its philosophy unconsciously. People have started (relatively much higher in number) to fall for materialistic world; the money, the luxuries is only the PRAMANA for success today. Indeed it's an admissible purusharth but Arth is becoming only a tool for accomplishing kaam as charvakas considered it to be. According to

me, kaam should be guided by dharma, arth should be guided by dharma and dharma should be guided by moksh. It is really important to include charvakas as a mainstream because it is the Critique of Religious Orthodoxy (which allows other schools to not to be impractical or dominant), provides the first materialistic perspective, and gives an insight of the actual nature of human beings. At last, charvakas make Indian philosophy, the garden of varied thinkings.

Bibliography

- Sarva-Darsana-Sangraha by E. B. Cowell (1882)
- SarvaDarsana-Sangraha by Madhavacharya
- Mahabharata (12.211.26-27)
- Upanishads (Kaṭha I.20; 2,6 and Maitri 7,8-9)
- Śaddarsanasamuccaya by Haribhadra (Translated by M Jain. Asiatic Society, 1989).
- Śaddarsanasamuccaya A Compendium of Six Philosophies by Haribhadra, with Translation and Notes by K. S. Murty, Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers, 1986
- “What the Charvakas Originally Meant. More on the Commentators on the charvakakasutra”, Journal of Indian Philosophy, Vol. 38 (Oct. 2010), pp. 529-542.
- A critical evaluation of the Indian materialistic philosophy of the Carvakas, Agnieszka Rostalska Institute of Middle and Far East Studies, Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

I am Harsh Tomar, residing in New Delhi. I have passed my class 12th from Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Mehta Vidyalaya New Delhi-110055. I secured 100% in Law (Boards-2022-23) and proficiency in Hindi. I was appointed as the President of NASSCOM (Branch: - Techedge and Techbotix). I am currently pursuing Political science (Honours), from Kirori Mal College, University of Delhi.

These manuscripts and scriptures in relation to our culture and heritage ignite the fire of excitement and keenness in me. To attain the elite liquid of knowledge and clearing out the misconceptions motivated me to write this paper.

