

CHAPTER- V

CONCLUDING REMARKS

According to Cārvākas, perception is the valid source of knowledge. As God cannot be perceived, God does not exist. Cārvākas are atheists, and they want to do away with the idea of God as a transcendental reality.

The word 'atheist' is derived from the Greek word 'a'- 'not' and 'theos'-'God' - the view that there are no Gods. A widely used sense denotes (merely) not believing in God and is consistent with agnosticism. Socrates was accused of atheism for not believing in the official Athenian Gods. Some people distinguish between theoretical atheism and practical atheism. A theoretical atheist is one who self -consciously denies the existence of a Supreme Being where as a practical theist may believe that a supreme being exists, but lives as though there is no God. So Cārvākas are theoretical atheists.

Let us say that everything must be created and that was done by an omnipotent God -- A God which stands above time and space. It is a moral existence which is self sustaining in it and has its own cause.

The Cārvākas have rejected inference as a reliable source of knowledge. They believe that there is no

reality beyond the perceptible world. But the idea of God springs from our belief in some transcendental reality, the existence of which is established by inference. But they do not believe in the existence of any such reality i.e. supersensible reality. If there is no omnipotent being, the four kinds of material elements cannot produce the world. The supposition of a creator of this world is necessary. So the question arises: Can the material elements give rise to this wonderful world? Even the production of an object like an earthen pot requires an efficient cause in the form of a potter in addition to the material cause viz, clay. It is the efficient cause that gives rise to the matter the desired form. The four material elements earth, water, fire and air are the material causes of the world.

We require an efficient cause like God as the shaper and designer who turns the material elements into the wonderful and beautiful world.

God is the postulate of existence that keeps the order and harmony of the universe. This reveals us to believe there is a Creator – a Being capable of creating this ordered cosmos. There is a unity behind even contradictory facts. That shows there is a principle of unity viz. a God behind this creation who is ultimately responsible for the unity evident in creation.

God is the object of love, hope and aspirations. He feels that our basic urges require satisfaction and explanation. These urges can have no other explanation than the explanation in terms of the Supreme. Nobody can deny that man at times specially at some crucial moments of his life, feels the need of some super human being and hopes for strength. Religions sprang up to satisfy the human need. This desire for the unknown is a fact. The order, harmony and the law of the universe cannot be explained unless an intelligent law giver is pre-supposed, and that intelligent law giver is a transcendental Being who is God. Sometimes the voice of conscience gives the idea of divinity in man. It has an awareness of the good and the bad. It sanctions the good and condemns the bad. It creates an exalted feeling when the good is done and it pricks whenever a wrong step is taken. There is no other explanation of this call of conscience except the fact that it is a representation of a Being, who is the embodiment of supreme goodness. God reveals himself daily to every human being. But Cārvākas shut their eyes, their heart and soul to feel His existence.

God satisfies a very important aspect of our life. If we survey our life we find that over and above the wants, and needs of everyday existence, we do have an urge of

a different kind which cannot be satisfied with the usual materialistic fulfillments of life and which demands a spiritual satisfaction, we become keenly conscious of such an urge in the moments of anxiety and crisis, when we feel forsaken by all worldly and materialistic ways of life. Then we clearly realize that we are in need of a supreme object of love by having faith in which we can derive strength, solace, peace and happiness. So God's presence can do so by a living faith. God can be felt through actual experiences, that are moral sense and moral experience and that also is not to outline the nature of experience but to provide a way for testing one's religious faith. God not only transcends senses, but is a matter of inner realization and faith.

The whole of nature teaches us that there is a personal being who is the ruler of this universe, who is the architect of this universe. This vastness, harmony and the grandeur of the world leads us to suppose that the architect must be an intelligent designer of the universe.

God's idea is necessary on various grounds. It is necessary because it is the Truth and Truth is necessary. It is necessary because it is freedom. The fact of human freedom presupposes the ideal of

absolute freedom, which is nothing but Divine Freedom. It is necessary because it is inherently present in man. God thus is necessary, because the very condition of existence involves God. In order to explain ourselves, our existence, we have to think of a cause, a creative capacity which could create beings like us. Of course such a cause will not be an ordinary cause, depending upon some prior causes. The divine cause therefore must have a self- dependent cause. The world is not chaos but a cosmos. But man has made it chaotic. The purposive character of the universe cannot be explained unless a divine intelligence is present to explain it. The rational purposive character of the universe gives us enough justification for presuming the reality of a spiritual being, who is God.

Our moral life presupposes a moral governor of the universe. Our sense of morality itself will lose all its effectiveness unless it is backed up by the belief that one is accountable for his good and bad deeds, that is, unless it is believed that the universe is being governed by a moral governor, a God, who keeps an eye on everything good and bad.

The most important evidence of God's existence is the possibility of intuitive experience of divine nature. Everybody is capable of having spiritual experience. We

try to apprehend something that transcends our normal and ordinary capacities which is evidence in favour of the reality of spiritual experiences. These experiences show us the fact that the world is not a chaos which is progressively trying to attend its goal. These experiences show that the reality itself is wholly spiritual, so that it may cause and give sustenance to all kinds of spiritual experiences.

If God is imperceptible, His existence can be inferred from His action through knowledge, desire and volition. Hence the existence of God cannot be denied on the ground of His imperceptibility.

In the Bible in John 1:3, it is written: *“God is the creator of the universe, designer and the Supreme Being. Through Him all things were made, without him nothing was made that has been made.”*¹

So Cārvāka’s attitude towards God is blasphemous attitude. *“You shall not misuse the name of the Lord, your God, for the lord will not hold anyone guiltless who misuses His name.”*² Hence, Cārvāka’s denial of god cannot be accepted. If they deny the existence of God they deny religion also. Morality culminates in religion and religion finds its expression in morality. Hence God exists as a postulate of morality. If there is no God,

people will do whatever they like, because there will be nobody to reward or punish them. Those who deny God's existence are fools and despise wisdom and instruction. God leads man to the path of righteousness, justice, equity and every good path. The fear of god delivers man from the way of evil. The exercise of religion and the practices of ascetism are not the means of livelihood for men as the Cārvākas think. Religion makes man surrender to God's will by subordinating one's body and mind to the call of truth, self sacrifice, renunciation, love and tolerance. If according to the Cārvākas, there is no God, man in a society will be lovers of themselves, lovers of money, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, thankless, unholy, unloving, unforgiving, slanderers, without self control, brutal, despisers, of good, traitors, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God. But the love of God makes man peace-loving, gentle, virtuous and compassionate. Virtuous man avoids excess pleasure and amusements, extreme licentiousness and repression of the senses and accepts the mean between the two. Self -realization is the highest ideal of human life. Real happiness and peace of mind can be obtained only through self determination and faithfully doing one's duty. A real virtuous life is a happy life and life devoid of virtue is not a happy life. The man who enjoys

sensual pleasure for a short time may lose peace of mind in the long run.

The Cārvākas deny vice and virtue, heaven and hell, liberation of the soul and above all the existence of God. So they are '*deniers or negativists.*' They think, there is no world beyond and no retribution of good and bad actions. Guṇaratna in his commentary on the Śaddarśana-samuccaya speaks of the Cārvākas as being nihilistic sect who only eat and do not trust anything other than what can be directly perceived. They drink wine and eat meat and are given to unrestricted sex-indulgence. Each year they gather together on a particular day and have unrestricted intercourse with women. They behave like common people and for this reason they are called Lokāyatas ; they hold views originally framed by Bṛhaspati. Thus, it is difficult to say whether the word Cārvāka is the name of real parsonage or a mere allusive term applied to the adherents of the Lokāyata view.

But both Haribhadra and Mādhava have counted the Lokāyata or Cārvāka philosophy as darśana or system of philosophy. It holds a new logic, a destructive criticism of most of the cherished views of other systems of Indian philosophy, a materialistic philosophy, and it denies morality, moral responsibility, and religion of

every kind. The Cārvāka philosophy is a philosophy of scepticism.

Sceptics are those who doubt the existence of everything. The Greek term 'skeptikos' meant 'inquirers'. Philosophical sceptics have been engaged in inquiry into human achievements in different fields to see if any knowledge has been or could be gained by them. They have questioned whether any necessary or certain information can actually be obtained about the real nature of things. Sceptics have organized their questions into systematic sets of arguments aimed at raising doubts. Extreme scepticism questions all knowledge even immediate experience, except of logic and mathematics. Limited or moderate scepticism questions particular types of knowledge-claims made by the theologians, metaphysicians, scientists or mathematicians which go beyond experience, but it admits some limited probabilistic kinds of knowledge. Some sceptics are of the opinion that no knowledge beyond experience is possible while others have doubted whether even the much could be definitely known. Cārvākas also say, no knowledge is possible beyond experience. Some extreme Cārvākas like Jayarāṣi say that knowledge derived from perception also is not possible.

Ādi Cārvākas do not accept the doctrines of other schools of philosophy. They criticize other philosophical theories. They are known as Vaitandika.. They do not accept the authority of the Vedas, and do not believe in God, immortal soul, life after death and liberation of the soul. They even do not accept perception as a source of valid knowledge. They adopted a method of very subtle and complex criticism and attempted to refute all the other doctrines and methods of valid knowledge proposed by other thinkers.

Jayarāśi Bhatta is one of the defenders of this extreme form of Cārvāka philosophy. He is the author of '*Tattvopaplava-simha*'. He states, "Everything is unreal and we have no valid knowledge of anything". According to him, all sources of valid knowledge, even perception and all views regarding the world, life and God are defective. So they are to be treated as rejected. As all doctrines are rejected, the ultimate reality is regarded as unknown and unknowable. Cārvākas of this group are extreme sceptics, because they are not ready to admit any knowledge in the true sense. To them all knowledge is a guess work, lacking certitude and necessary truths.

Jayarāśi's method is called critical method. He says that system of knowledge depends on the means of

knowledge, which in order to be valid must conform to reality. But he says valid means of knowledge is unfounded. He wants to show the incapacity of knowledge to know anything. His Tattvopaplava-simha is the total destruction of realities.

Hence the doctrine of Tattvopaplava-simha is equal to absolute scepticism. It is against the Naiyāyikas, the Mimāmsakas, the Buddhists, the Jainas and others but in support of Bṛhaspati, the materialist.

Jayarāṣi is a worshipper of ill logic, because he is a materialist. He claims that he has become able to show the philosophical errors, which were not even shown by Bṛhaspati himself who was a very early philosopher, and he comes in the later period. For these Ādi Cārvākas, all knowledge is a mere guess work, lacking certitude and necessary truths.

The Dhūrta Cārvākas are unrefined Cārvākas. Their negative attitude is not helpful for establishing any positive philosophical doctrine. These Dhūrta Cārvākas admitted perception as the source of valid knowledge but rejected inference, testimony, comparison and all other sources of knowledge. Their opinion is that there is no soul apart from the physical body. Soul is nothing but conscious living body, as we perceive life and

consciousness within the body and not apart from it. Four gross elements namely, earth, water, fire and air are perceived as the constituents of the world and its objects. These elements are unconscious. But consciousness is produced from a combination of these elements, known as living body. Soul is destroyed along with the body and therefore we should enjoy pleasure as much as possible. They denied the existence of God, heaven and hell, virtue, vice, rebirth, transmigration of soul, and liberation of the soul. These Cārvākas are *Uccedavādi*, as they reject belief in God, soul and its liberation. They are *Dehātmavādi*, because they identify soul with the body. They are sceptics as they reject the reality of all super sensuous objects like God, heaven, soul and the liberation of the soul.

Suśikṣita Cārvākas do not deny inference totally as a source of knowledge. They accept perception as a *pramāṇa*. They even admit inference as a source of valid knowledge for our practical life. They reject only “such reasoning as was ordinarily thought sufficient by others for establishing the existence of God, of a future life etc.” According to them, pleasure (*Kāma*) and the means of obtaining pleasure is the highest goal of human life. Difference between Dhūrta Cārvākas and Suśikṣita Cārvākas is that while the former take gross and transitory sensual pleasure as the goal of human life,

the latter regard refined and broad based pleasure as the only ideal of life. They regard subjects like economics, sexology, science of medicine, science of cultivation and such other natural sciences as valid and useful for our practical life. These Suśikṣita Cārvākas are also sceptics, for they refute the reality of all super sensuous objects, like God, life after death, etc.

Mādhavāchārya has stated only the view of unrefined Cārvākas (Dhūrtta Cārvākas) in his treatise. In his discussion of Cārvāka philosophy, there is no mention of the view of refined Cārvākas like Purandara and others who accept the validity of inference as far as it relates to perceptible objects. His treatise also does not contain the views of extreme sceptical Cārvākas like Jayarāśi Bhatta, who rejects the validity of all pramānas including perception. Surendranath Dasgupta has pointed out that the Cārvāka's opinion is not negative so far as the validity of inference is concerned. Purandara is a refined Cārvāka who states that in knowing 'the nature of objects of our direct sense experience, we cannot deny the necessity of inference. They are sceptics because they do not admit any knowledge in the true sense. All knowledge is a mere guess work lacking certitude and necessary truth. Like Jayarāśi, another sceptic like Mauthner, a critique of language, also completely denied the possibility of

genuine knowledge. Mauthner called himself “Godless”. So Cārvākas are also godless people for they deny the existence of God and doubt the possibility of genuine knowledge.

Metaphysicians such as the Buddhists take great pains to refute the Cārvāka philosophy. At the latter part of the medieval period, materialism virtually disappeared and all the surviving Indian schools claimed to have a religious goal of some kind.

“Like the philosophy of Democritus, the Cārvāka philosophy is a fanatical effort made to rid the age of the weight of the past that was oppressing it. The removal of dogmatism which it helped to effect was necessary to make room for the great constructive efforts of speculation.”⁴

The importance of this doctrine is that it has given freedom to express thoughts and it has a great importance regarding philosophical activity of ancient India. The Cārvākas do not deny a conscious or spiritual principle but denies regarding it as ultimate or independent. It is a property of the body and disintegrates when the body is destroyed. This view resembles the views of “Modern Behaviourism”.

He Cārvāka is impatient to attain pleasure. He does not try to secure freedom from pain. He makes a compromise with evil instead of overcoming it. The Cārvāka doctrine has denied what is accepted by other schools of philosophy, so it has not made much contribution to Indian thought.

Hedonism of Cārvāka is gross or sensualistic as well as egoistic. Happiness of the self which is counted in the last resort and regard for others with a view of self gratification are the only form of altruism which is rational or proper. If we discriminate between sensual and refined pleasures in view of qualitative superiority it is condemned as foolish.

The Suśiksita or refined Cārvākas and the Dhūrta or astute Cārvākas besides the Lokāyātikas have represented different grades of refined hedonism in their ethical teaching. They have taught materialism, naturalism and scepticism in their metaphysical and psychological doctrines. Pleasure to them is the only end of human life. Their view allows licentiousness to become predominant in society. That is why during Cārvākas' time; India lost its supremacy, freedom of society, freedom of religion and freedom of politics. People became slaves of their senses but pleasure is never free of pain. How then can pleasure be the highest

end of human life? If pleasure is fraught with pain, should we reject our life? Should we fling away sheaves of paddy rich with the finest white grains, because they are covered with husk and dust? We cannot find unmixed happiness in this universe. We become happy when we see our daughter's smiling face and sad seeing her weeping face. So, existence of troubles is natural. The more we have agony of thirst, the more there will be delight in drinking cold water. There is not a single house where there is no sorrow. Nowhere can we escape from misery and pain. So it is foolishness to say, "Enjoy pleasure as much as possible". One should not carry out the commands of Kama as Cārvāka thinks. Man should conquer his senses, observe sex restraint and must be self controlled.

Some Indian philosophers regard the four ends of human life (puruṣārtha) viz. wealth (artha) sensual pleasures (kāma) virtue (dharma) and liberation (mokṣa). Of these four, the Cārvākas regard wealth and enjoyment of sensual pleasure to be the proper ends of human life. Wealth is the means to the enjoyment of sensual pleasures to them. But when wealth is pursued for its own sake, it radiates a degrading effect on the personality of man. Due to the worship of money, he gets depersonalized and dehumanized. He loses the

sense of emotional values of personal affection and aesthetic appreciation.

Goldsmith's warning, "Where wealth accumulates, man decays" comes true. Even Julian Huxley, a great biologist, has given a warning against converting the legitimate pursuit of wealth and material pleasure into the worship of money and the cult of crude hedonism.

The Upaniṣads had clearly given the warning thousands of years ago "*Na Vittena tarpaṇīyo manuṣyah*" *material wealth cannot fully satisfy man*. Hence Huxley rightly asks "*to abandon the pernicious habit of evaluating every human project solely in terms of its material utility or profit.*"⁵ "*For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil, for which some have strayed from the faith in their greediness and pierced themselves through many sorrows.*"⁶

Cārvākas regard, "enjoyment of sensual pleasure as the supreme end of life." But the word Kāma has several meanings. It means desire as well as an object of desire. It means the pleasure one gets from the satisfaction of desire and also affection or love. It is one of the four ends of life. Its connotation ranges from sensual enjoyment to aesthetic joy. In other words, it should not be exclusively identified to sex only. Man's activities are

motivated by various needs and desires. Freud is rightly criticized by some psychoanalysts for his undue insistence on sex and aggressions as the twin motives of human actions. Kāma as a value must be distinguished from lust or desire for carnal gratification. The unrestrained desire or sensual enjoyment or carnal gratification is not accepted as value. It is a value provided and it is pursued in accordance with moral and social norms.

Hence Vātsyāyana, the classical writer in sexology, (Kāmasūtra) advocates the importance of moderation and the significance of reflecting lustful methods of love making.

Modern man has however been too much influenced by technical and mechanical view of man. The result is mechanical and reductionist attitude towards man and sex. This vitalizes sex in man. As a result of this, man is reduced to the level of a machine (Homunculus) in which everything human is refused and rejected. Such type of sex is not only dehumanizing and depersonalizing but also de-eroticizing because it is de-emotionalizing.

Man is a rational being. Without any cause, no rational being thinks of doing injury to others only for his own

pleasure only. If we accept Cārvākas' view, it would misguide us to commit sin, to do immoral actions, to fall into adultery. Injury to others in thought, word and deed, falsehood, cunningness, craftiness, deceit and dishonesty would be the social outcome of Cārvākas theory. This theory does not preach subjective morality, purity of mind, self control and the objective social morality of the pursuit of common good for humanity. By supporting this doctrine children will have no reverence for their parents, affection for children, love for husband and wife, love for brothers, love for fellow human being ---everything will be in vain. In such a society there will be no discipline in children, in grown up, family, in society and in nation.

If “eat, drink and be merry” is the sole aim of human life, and parents spend all their income in a few days for obtaining pleasure, the result will be disastrous. Parents are the prime protectors and nurturers of children. After birth, children need care of parents. Their housing, clothing and feeding all are dependent on parents. The money earned by parents is needed for food, clothes, shelter, education and all other requirements. Through parents, the society's new member first learns the basic values and norms and the cultures of society. In the course of his development, children first learn the normative behavior of their

parents and elders who share the behaviour and the ways of the particular society. It is here that children first learn to distinguish between 'right' and 'wrong', 'good' and 'bad' behaviour. The role behaviour that is learned within the family becomes the model or prototype for behavior in other segments of society. If parents are only after pleasure, they cannot think about the future of their children. In such a family, children become undisciplined and immoral. When they grow up they become social evil. This is evident from the newspapers and television. So parents are wholly responsible for moulding the character of their children. The child's social placement is generally determined by his family members. In him specific habits, traits of character and values commensurate with the role he has to play.

Parents have to do their best to guide, encourage and support their children in giving them education. The extent to which children really benefit from and make full use of their education is determined by the attitudes of their parents and the facilities provided by the family.

The most important duty of the parents is to give children moral and emotional support, provide defence against loneliness as well as satisfying his need for

personal happiness, for love and affection, for warmth and comfort. The family is a “psychological relief station” in which one can safely relax and forget the tension of the outside world. A home thus acts as a powerful agency for mental health. But accepting the Cārvāka doctrine, parents will be irresponsible because they will be engaged in lust, and they want to enjoy as much as possible thinking that once the body dies, it becomes ashes, there is no recurrence.

Being a rational animal, man should give up sexual immorality, impurity, lust, evil desires and greed but should clothe themselves with compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness and patience.

So, true happiness springs from renunciation of desires. Sentient pleasure due to fulfillment of desires is not true abiding happiness. Desires are not pacified by gratification but by renunciation. Attachment is the root cause of misery. It springs from egoism or the sense of ‘I’ and ‘mine’. They can be conquered by destruction of egoism.