

**Imprint:**

Volume: 10

Issue: 1

Year: 2026

Page: 17-43

 Riton MONDAL <sup>a\*</sup> Sajid JAMAL <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Research Scholar (Ph.D.), Department of Education, Aligarh Muslim University, mondalriton.edu@gmail.com

<sup>b</sup> Prof., Aligarh Muslim University, shadansj07@rediffmail.com

\* Riton Mondal

Received: 1/10/2026

Accepted: 4/24/2026

Published: 5/22/2026

**Citation:**

Mondal R. & Jamal S. (2026). Chārvāka philosophy: its educational implications and relevance in the contemporary world.

*Erciyes Eğitim Dergisi*, 10(1), 17-43.

[https://doi.org/10.32433/\[eje\].1860732](https://doi.org/10.32433/[eje].1860732)

## Chārvāka Philosophy: Its Educational Implications and Relevance in the Contemporary World

**Abstract**

Chārvāka philosophy, a significant school of ancient Indian materialism, offers a unique perspective on life, ethics, and knowledge, characterized by its emphasis on empiricism and skepticism of metaphysical concepts. Rooted in a pragmatic worldview, Chārvāka dismisses the existence of an afterlife, the authority of religious texts, and the notion of karma, advocating instead for the pursuit of direct sensory experience and pleasure as the ultimate goals of life. This research explores the educational implications of Chārvāka's critical thinking, rational inquiry, and rejection of dogmatic beliefs. It examines how these principles can foster an education system that encourages independent thought, skepticism, and experiential learning. Furthermore, the study investigates the relevance of Chārvāka's philosophy in the contemporary world, particularly at a time when scientific temper and critical reasoning are increasingly valued, yet societal and educational frameworks often remain influenced by traditional and religious ideologies. This article argues for the inclusion of Chārvāka's materialistic and human-centered approach in modern educational discourse, emphasizing its potential to cultivate free-thinking individuals capable of navigating the complexities of today's globalized, and pluralistic world. The present study adopted qualitative content analysis which includes deductive and inductive approaches to analyze content from multiple sources available in various databases and library resources related to Chārvāka philosophy. This paper focused on the basic doctrines of Chārvāka philosophy, the educational implications of Chārvāka philosophy, and how the concept of Chārvāka philosophy through education can play a major role to make a person's present and immediate future life happy and pleasurable.

**Keywords:** Chārvāka philosophy, Thoughts, Educational Implications, Relevance.



### Chārvāka Felsefesi: Eğitimsel Çıkarımları ve Çağdaş Dünyadaki Önemi

**Öz**

Chārvāka felsefesi, antik Hint materyalizminin önemli bir okulu olarak, deneyciliğe vurgu yapması ve metafizik kavramlara yönelik şüpheciliği ile karakterize edilen, yaşam, etik ve bilgi üzerine özgün bir bakış açısı sunar. Pragmatik bir dünya görüşüne dayanan Chārvāka, ahiret inancını, dinî metinlerin otoritesini ve karma kavramını reddeder. Bunun yerine doğrudan duyuşal deneyim ve haz arayışını yaşamın nihai amaçları olarak savunur. Bu araştırma, Chārvāka'nın eleştirel düşünme, rasyonel sorgulama ve dogmatik inançların reddine ilişkin görüşlerinin eğitimsel çıkarımlarını incelemektedir. Bu ilkelerin bağımsız düşünceyi, şüpheciliği ve deneyimsel öğrenmeyi teşvik eden bir eğitim sistemini nasıl destekleyebileceğini ele alır. Ayrıca çalışma, bilimsel düşüncenin ve eleştirel akıl yürütmenin giderek daha fazla değer

kazandığı ancak toplumsal ve eğitsel yapıların çoğu zaman geleneksel ve dinî ideolojilerden etkilenmeye devam ettiği günümüzde, Chārvāka felsefesinin çağdaş dünyadaki önemini araştırmaktadır. Bu makale, Chārvāka'nın materyalist ve insan merkezli yaklaşımının modern eğitim söylemine dâhil edilmesini savunmakta, bunun günümüzün küreselleşmiş ve çoğulcu dünyasının karmaşıklıklarında yol alabilecek özgür düşünen bireyler yetiştirme potansiyelini vurgulamaktadır. Bu çalışma, Chārvāka felsefesiyle ilgili çeşitli veri tabanları ve kütüphane kaynaklarında bulunan içerikleri analiz etmek amacıyla tümdengelsel ve tümevarımsal yaklaşımları içeren nitel içerik analizi yöntemini benimsemiştir. Bu makale, Chārvāka felsefesinin temel doktrinlerine, eğitimsel çıkarımlarına ve eğitim yoluyla Chārvāka felsefesi anlayışının bireyin mevcut ve yakın gelecekteki yaşamını mutlu ve haz dolu kılmada nasıl önemli bir rol oynayabileceğine odaklanmaktadır.

**Anahtar sözcükler:** Chārvāka felsefesi, Düşünceler, Eğitimsel Çıkarımlar, Uygunluk



## Introduction

CHĀRVĀKA" literally means "*Entertaining Speech*" and is derived from the term "*Charva*" which means to chew or grind with one's teeth (Wernicki, n.d.). Some philosophers claimed that Chārvāka originated from "*Charu Vak*". "*Charu*" means "*Euphonious*" or "*Melodious*" and "*Vak*" means "*Accent*" or "*talk*". Some experts claimed that Chārvāka is the founder of this materialistic school of philosophy. Some philosophers argue that "*Chārvāka*" is not a proper name but a term used to represent Indian materialism, which encourages living happily as long as one lives, eating, drinking, and being merry and sweet-tongued (Sharma, 2000). These types of words become melodious and interested to the common man that's why it is named as "*Chārvāka*" philosophy (Bhattacharya, 1996). Chārvāka philosophy emerged around 600 BCE as a sort of characteristically adverse reaction to the claim of the Vedas (Wernicki, n.d.). They argued that the Vedas were written by clever, greedy, and deceived priests to dominate people by dividing them based on caste (Bhattacharya, 1996). Some people were not allowed to perform religious activities and were isolated by upper caste people of religion, which is considered the central reason for the development of Chārvāka thought (Gokhale, 2015). This philosophy treats every human being as simply physical human being not as spiritual being and gives importance to the thoughts, needs, and interests of common men and dignifies them, that is why Chārvāka philosophy also known as "*Lokayata*" (Bhattacharya, 1996), which means "*Philosophy of the People*" derived from "*lokeṣu āyatam*" and interpreted as "*spread (āyatam) among people (lokeṣu)*" or "*Prevalent among the People*" (Gokhale, 2015) is an Indian school of philosophy solely based on materialistic concepts that reject spirituality or supreme power (Gokhale, 2015; Bhattacharya, 2011; Bhattacharya et al., 1992). This school of philosophy does not believe in any supernatural power. It is a universal fact that most Indian philosophies are spiritualistic in nature, but this philosophy took a different stance by opposing spiritualism and overemphasizing materialism. For them, this physical world is the final destination for human beings. According to this school of philosophy, this world is the result of the aggregation of four gross materials, i.e., air, water, fire, and earth. Other Indian philosophies asserted that this physical world is the product of five materials, i.e., air, fire, water, earth, and ether. But Chārvāka philosophy rejects the "*ether*" because the ether is a non-perceivable object (Gokhale, 2015).

"*Bṛhaspati*" is considered the founder of this school of philosophy, who was always in the view that the exercise of repeatedly orally pronouncing the verses of sacred scripture without proper comprehension is meaningless (Wernicki, n.d.). This view established him as an anti-Vedic and anti-spiritualistic personality. However, there are many disputes among scholars regarding the founder of the Chārvāka School of philosophy.

This study provides a brief view of Chārvāka's thought and how it relates to the present context. This article explores the necessary forms of education and societal structures that need to be developed in accordance with the principles of Chārvāka philosophy, drawing insights from an extensive literature review.

## Methodology

This study adopted a library research approach, also known as a secondary qualitative research, which relies exclusively on existing written materials as the primary data source. This method is particularly suitable for examining philosophical concepts, such as the principles of Chārvāka philosophy, their educational implications, and their relevance to contemporary issues, as it allows for a comprehensive synthesis of historical texts and modern scholarly interpretations without the need for primary data collection.

### Literature Search and Selection

Sources were identified through systematic searches across academic databases including Google Scholar, JSTOR, Springer, Scopus, WOS, Semantic Scholar, ProQuest, and university library catalogs. Key search terms included combinations such as *“Chārvāka OR Carvaka OR Lokayata”* AND *“materialism”* OR *“epistemology”* OR *“education”* OR *“pedagogy”* OR *“implications”* OR *“relevance”* OR *“contemporary”*). Boolean operators and variations (e.g., “Lokayata AND critical thinking”) were used.

**Inclusion criteria:** (1) peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, book chapters, or reputable encyclopedia entries; (2) direct engagement with core Chārvāka principles or their modern interpretations; (3) publication from 1950 onward, with selective inclusion of foundational historical references. Approximately 160 sources were screened; 25 core texts on Chārvāka philosophy and 57 texts related to topic of the study formed the final dataset after excluding non-scholarly, repetitive, or tangential materials opinion pieces without theoretical grounding, and materials lacking substantive discussion of the topic. A balance between Indian scholars and international perspectives was maintained.

### Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using directed qualitative content analysis, which combines deductive (theory-driven) and inductive approaches. This method was chosen for its ability to identify manifest content (explicit principles) and latent content (underlying meanings and implications) while allowing critical synthesis.

The analysis followed a structured, iterative process inspired by established qualitative content analysis frameworks (e.g., Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Elo & Kyngäs, 2008):

The process followed these iterative steps:

1. **Familiarization:** All selected texts were read multiple times to gain immersive understanding. Notes were taken on recurring ideas, and the data was organized into manageable units (e.g., paragraphs or sections discussing core principles, education, or modern applications).
2. **Open Coding:** Initial codes were generated inductively from the text (close to the original wording) to capture key concepts. Examples include codes such as *“perception as sole pramāṇa,” “rejection of afterlife/rituals,” “hedonistic ethics,” “empirical skepticism,” “critique of Vedic authority,”* and *“potential for critical pedagogy.”*
3. **Categorization and Theme Development:** Codes were grouped into broader categories and then refined into overarching themes. Primary themes included: (a) Fundamental principles of Chārvāka philosophy; (b) Educational implications (e.g., emphasis on rational inquiry, sensory experience, and practical knowledge over dogma); and (c) Contemporary significance (e.g., addressing materialism in consumer society, promoting scientific temper, or countering superstition). Axial coding explored relationships between themes, such as how Chārvāka's empiricism could inform critical thinking curricula today.
4. **Synthesis and Interpretation:** Themes were synthesized holistically to develop an integrated narrative. This involved comparing and contrasting perspectives across sources (e.g., traditional interpretations vs. modern reinterpretations), identifying gaps or contradictions in the literature, and linking concepts to the current

educational landscape. Reflexivity was maintained by noting the researcher's positionality as an interpreter of philosophical texts.

5. **Validation and Trustworthiness:** To enhance rigor, triangulation was used through cross-verification across multiple sources. Peer debriefing or member checking (where applicable to draft interpretations) was considered, and an audit trail of coding decisions was documented. Potential biases (e.g., selective emphasis on progressive aspects of Chārvāka) were acknowledged and mitigated through constant comparison.

Findings are presented thematically in a narrative synthesis, supported by theoretical arguments and illustrative quotations. This process ensures conclusions emerge directly from the literature rather than researcher speculation.

### Presentation of Findings

The synthesized insights are presented in a narrative form, supported by direct quotations and paraphrases from the sources (with appropriate citations). Theoretical arguments integrate Chārvāka principles with contemporary educational challenges, yielding actionable recommendations for educators, parents, and policymakers, such as fostering evidence-based learning or promoting skeptical inquiry in curricula.

By employing this rigorous library-based approach with explicit content analysis procedures, the study provides comprehensive theoretical perspectives and practical suggestions aligned with modern educational needs. Limitations include reliance on secondary interpretations (potential translation or contextual biases in ancient texts) and the interpretive nature of philosophical analysis.

## Results and Discussion

### Thoughts of Chārvāka Philosophy

#### Concept of Reality

Chārvāka School of Philosophy is solely based on materialism. For them, the matter, i.e., environment and its components, is the reality. Consciousness, intelligence and the *'self'* emerges from the combination of material elements, much like intoxication arises fermented ingredients, therefore, no separate soul or divine creator is needed. As we all know that all the valid knowledge comes from the sensory experiences, as it is immediate and verifiable. Scriptural knowledge and inferences often lead to error or unprovable claims such as assuming existence of God from world's order. If something cannot be perceived, there is no rational and logical foundation to affirm its existence. In this line, they recognize four elements, namely, air (vayu, mobile and perceivable by touch/movement), fire (tejas, hot and perceivable by sight/heat), water (ap, fluid and perceivable by taste/touch), and earth (prithvi, solid and perceivable by smell/touch), excluding ether/space as it lacks perceptual quality, it cannot be seen, touched, heard, tasted, or smelled independently (Sharma, 2000). These four elements are directly observable by human beings and sufficient to explain these natural phenomena e.g., plant grows from earth and water, warmed by fire, and nourished by air. Combination of these materials yield complex material including human bodies, mind, consciousness (Emergent property like redness from betel nut mixtures). Perception (pratyaksha) is the only valid means of knowledge (pramana) for Chārvākas; inference (anumana) or testimony (shabda) are unreliable if not grounded in direct experience. Other orthodox philosophical thought accepted the five elements namely, air, fire, water, earth, and ether (Bhattacharya et al., 1992; Bhattacharya, 2011; Gokhale, 2015). This physical world is the final destination for the entire human beings. Birth, growth, and death are natural material process, the human body take into form from these elements, functions through them and decomposes into them. There is no single evidence that prove or supports a non-material soul surviving death, claims of afterlife stem from fear, tradition and wishful thinking not through perception. Like afterlife, and soul in human body, this school of philosophy does not believe in spiritual reality. They solely deny the existence of supreme power and the spiritual realm (Hirianna, 1968). As they believe perception is the only way to gain true knowledge, the spiritual

realm is beyond the reach of our perception; i.e., it cannot be perceived by our senses nor through any empirical evidence, accordingly, we cannot believe in any spiritual reality based on inferences, sacred texts, or holy books. Almighty, infinite, merciful, and omniscient God is a superficial imagination, not a perceived reality. They also deny that **“this physical world was created by God”**. God is inferential concept, not empirical which cannot be accepted as valid. Generally, human beings make inferences based on previous knowledge, for example, several times I have seen that a carpenter makes chair, now I am seeing a chair, and make inference that this chair is made by a carpenter- this process of inferences (perception based) cannot be applicable in proving the existence of God, which raise serious question about the existence of God. Therefore, this world is formed through the interaction of four elements air, fire, water, and earth that gave a uniqueness to this world. These four elements are not operated by any supernatural power. Regarding the creation of this physical world, Chārvāka philosophy does not believe in any mysticism or transcendental power; either the creation of the world is accidental or natural. This interpretation supports the Big Bang theory, which states that this universe and all the living, non-living organisms came into existence from a small ball with high density and temperature (Williams, 2015).

Chārvāka denied the fact that **“Vedas are not man-made”**; they doubted the validity of Vedas because different parts of Vedas say different things that are contrary to each other. Chārvāka says that cunning and hypocritical priests are unable to earn money through other productive ways and they try to deceive the simple-minded common people into believing in God and the bondage of **“karma”** to fulfill their personal interest. Vedas were written by these selfish priests but propagated that **“Vedas are not man-made”** (Umashnakar, 1964). Chārvāka claims that the King of the state is the real God; if a person satisfies the King, then the King makes this world heaven for him, if he dissatisfies the King, then the King makes this world hell for him. Chārvāka does not believe in feigned and unperceived hell and heaven; according to them, happiness in this physical world is heaven, and misery in this physical world is hell. A stupid person futilely tries to satisfy an illusory God, but a rational and intellectual one tries to satisfy the King of the state to make his/her life in heaven (Bhattacharya, 1996; Umashnakar, 1964). Therefore, this physical world is the final destination for the entire human being not the life after death. They rejected the existence of illusionary world after death, where human being will suffer the results of their deeds performed by them in this physical world. Various Indian philosophies talked about life after death and another world after death ruled by God, which, according to Chārvāka, cannot be perceived and accordingly cannot be believed in. If I am unable to perceive an object or reality directly, how can I claim that, **“it exist”**. Therefore, it is foolish to hold faith in God and perform religious rituals and practices to enjoy happiness and pleasure in later life or to please God. All the religious scriptures and priests exploit human beings by showing and evidencing the fear of the afterlife, i.e., heaven and hell. Jayarāsi (one of the scholars of Chārvāka philosophy) said that we should only accept worldly practices and discard practices referring to other-worldly existence as Chārvāka opposed dogmatic beliefs of religious philosophy (Gokhale, 2015). Chārvāka also claimed that there is no final liberation, no heaven, and hell, nor any soul in another superficially imagined world. Death is the final liberation from life (Gokhale, 2015; Sharma, 2000) because no one can give any evidence of life after death. This philosophy does not agree with the process of **“Karmas”** as mentioned in the **“Bhagavad Gita”** which states that every person has to enjoy or suffer the results of his/her actions after death through the process of birth and rebirth. If someone does good deeds, then he/she enjoys good results, and if someone does bad deeds, then he/she has to face the bad consequences after death. For consequences in the rebirth period, soul is necessary after death, as this philosophy discarded the concept of soul, therefore, there is no questions of consequences of bad deeds and good deeds.

Most of the Indian philosophies are spiritualistic philosophy that believes in God, life after death, laws of Karma, and the soul beyond the body, and also believe that this physical world is created by a Supernatural power (God). But, among these Indian philosophies, Buddhism and Jainism philosophy does not believe in God and the eternal soul despite these two philosophies being termed as spiritualistic as they keep faith in the **“Laws of Karma”** (the cycle of birth and rebirth). According to the laws of karma, living beings have to enjoy or suffer the consequences of their actions in this life or in the next life after death. Chārvāka philosophers do not believe in God, hell and heaven, the eternal soul,

the cycle of birth and rebirth, and the laws of karma. The reason behind not believing in it, is that these are not perceivable by the human senses, thus, perception is the only means of true and valid knowledge. The things that we can perceive through our senses are air, fire, water, and earth, and through the interaction of these four elements, this world came into existence (Umashnakar, 1964). Therefore, this physical world itself and all other organisms, and material objects are real because these elements have perception qualities (Bhattacharya, 1996). Any supernatural power has not created this world; all entities came into existence in this universe through the amalgamation of four materials, i.e., air, fire, water, and earth (Dasgupta, 1962), and will dissolve with their separation (Wernicki, n.d.). These four elements are operated by internal power and inherent nature that is hidden in these four elements.

Chārvāka's radical materialism offers a bold, this-worldly ontology that reduces reality to the four perceptible elements (earth, water, fire, and air excluding ether) and treats consciousness as an emergent property of matter, akin to intoxication arising from fermented ingredients, it simultaneously exposes significant philosophical vulnerabilities. In contrast, many Indian philosophies include ether as the reality. This school's strict (or sometimes mitigated) empiricism, which privileges direct perception (*pratyakṣa*) as the sole or primary reliable *pramāṇa* and largely dismisses inference (*anumāna*) and testimony (*śabda*) unless firmly grounded in sensory experience, effectively dismantles metaphysical claims such as the existence of God, an immortal soul, afterlife, karma, and Vedic authority, portraying them as products of fear, priestly deception, or wishful thinking (Bhattacharya, 2011; Gokhale, 2015). Scholars highlight internal diversity within the tradition, distinguishing extreme empiricists who reject inference outright from more moderate voices (e.g., Purandara) who accept conditional or "**commonly accepted**" inferences for practical purposes (Gokhale, 2015; Bhattacharya, 2011). This nuanced reading strengthens Chārvāka's alignment with modern scientific temper and naturalistic explanations. However, critics argue that such uncompromising rejection of non-perceptible realities renders the system explanatorily limited: it struggles to account for universal regularities, complex causation, or abstract knowledge without circularity or reductionism, and its materialist account of consciousness remains philosophically thin compared to Nyāya, Buddhist, or Vedāntic alternatives (Chattopadhyaya, 1959/1968; Hiriyanna, 1968). Moreover, reliance on hostile orthodox summaries for reconstruction raises questions of potential distortion, while the dismissal of karma and rebirth, though liberating from dogmatic fear, risks ethical shallowness by undermining long-term moral accountability in favor of immediate sensory pleasure. Thus, Chārvāka's concept of reality serves as a powerful dissenting voice against spiritual orthodoxy but invites critique for its potential epistemological narrowness and practical challenges in addressing the full spectrum of human experience.

### Theory of Causation

Universally, it is an accepted fact that whatever has been produced or made is an effect and without the presence of whom this effect cannot become in its existence, is called Cause. Cause is antecedent to the effect, and the effect is subsequent to the cause (Bhattacharya, 1996), this process is called "**Adulterer**". But in Indian philosophy, causation has been interpreted differently by different philosophies. Whereas Naya philosophy upheld the causation as "**Asatkaryabad**" that refers, effect is not present (non-inherent) in its cause before of its production, effect is a completely new beginning or new existent from the cause (Carr, 2005; Sutradhar, 2018). Another school of philosophies, Sāṅkhya-Yoga and Advaita Vedānta philosophies interpreted causation as "**Satkaryabad**" which refers, the effect is always present (inherent) in its cause in a latent state before its production. However, an effect is merely an outward representation of what its underlying material source holds. "**Satkaryabad**" is further divided into two folds, "**Parinambad**" and "**Bibortobad**". Here, "**Parinambad**" refers to the real transformation of the cause into effect or result, and "**Bibortobad**" refers to the effect or result as only an illusion that has no reality. These interpretations are rejected by Chārvāka Philosophy, and they hold their own theory of causation named "**Svabhāvavāda**" or "**Yadr̥cchāvāda**" (Sutradhar, 2018; Bhattacharya, 1996). Chārvāka philosopher termed their theory of causation as "**Omnivorous**" which means that one effect could be produced from many causes and one cause can produce many effects or things. This interpretation supports the theory of evolution

brought to light by Darwin that states all the living beings in this world belong to one organism i.e., FUCA (First Universal Common Ancestor) (Rathee, 2023). This view support their stance on the origination of this physical world from the four materials namely, air, water, fire and earth. Svabhāvavāda asserted in the *“Sarvadarśanasamgraha”* that the world’s phenomena spontaneously arise from the basic nature of things. It is claimed that the warmth of the fire, coolness of the water, reviving coolness of wind, etc., all result from their inherent nature. These phenomena have no creator. According to Chārvāka, some creatures are immortal, some are not, and some are a combination of both. These specifics about the entities depend on their innate natures (Sutradhar, 2018). As we are evident, that when a fruits rots, bacteria develop there spontaneously, not created by other entity. It further proves their theory of causation. Everything in this world created by the world itself, or natural order, not supernatural or imaginative reality. While this view offers spontaneous creation of this world and every object but failed to give detailed account of their creation.

Chārvāka’s theory of causation, articulated as Svabhāvavāda (inherent nature) or Yadr̥cchāvāda (chance/accident), rejects both the satkāryavāda supported by Sāṃkhya-Yoga and Advaita Vedānta (where the effect pre-exists in the cause) and the asatkāryavāda of Nyāya (where the effect is a novel creation), proposing instead that phenomena arise spontaneously from the intrinsic nature of the four material elements without any external creator or teleological purpose (Bhattacharya, 1996; Sutradhar, 2018). This naturalistic stance of Chārvākas, often described as *“omnivorous”* in allowing multiple causes and effects, provides a powerful anti-theistic and proto-scientific alternative by emphasizing observable regularities (e.g., fire’s warmth or spontaneous fermentation) and aligning with modern evolutionary ideas, such as common ancestry (FUCA) and non-mystical cosmogony. Scholars note that later interpretations increasingly merged svabhāva with deterministic natural order rather than pure chance, strengthening its materialist credentials while distancing it from radical accidentalism (Bhattacharya, 2012). However, this view faces significant philosophical limitations by reducing causation to mere invariable concomitance perceived through the senses and denying deeper explanatory mechanisms, it struggles to account for the ordered regularity and complexity of the universe, risking explanatory shallowness or circularity when compared to more sophisticated systems like Buddhist dependent origination or Nyāya’s detailed causal categories. Furthermore, critics argue that an over-reliance on inherent nature may undermine human agency and moral accountability, echoing historical charges of akriyāvāda (inaction), while its reconstruction largely depends on summaries from hostile orthodox sources, potentially distorting the original position.

Critics also raise questions about the validity of Svabhāvavāda from Chārvāka’s perspective, as they said that only perceived knowledge will be valid, Svabhāva is inherent nature which cannot be perceived by human senses, therefore its validity and trustworthiness remain unproven. Furthermore, Yadr̥cchāvāda has also been criticized for its accidental explanation. Here the strong argument is that everything in this physical world did not came into existence accidentally or all of a sudden. There must be some conditions or system for creation or formation. If we take example of water formation, it required some form of conditions to be fulfilled, it did not come into existence all of a sudden or accidentally. As we all know H<sub>2</sub>O is produced by the combination of two atoms of hydrogen (H<sub>2</sub>) and one atom of oxygen (O), then according to Chārvāka’s own view, if this combination occurs by chance or accidentally, it would not be a correct explanation, because without a required pressure or compressions, H<sub>2</sub>O cannot be formed from the mere combination of H<sub>2</sub> and O. Therefore, from the Chārvāka’s perspectives we must acknowledge that pressure was formed accidentally for the formation of H<sub>2</sub>O. Even then, it is not sufficient to explain the formation of H<sub>2</sub>O, because it needs required temperature. Again, we must acknowledge that required temperature also appears accidentally. In this way, we must accept the presence of *“by chance or accident”* in this systematic formation of water which is irrational or illogical (Bhattacharya, 1996). Thus, Svabhāvavāda (inherent nature) or Yadr̥cchāvāda (chance/accident) alone cannot explain the formation of this physical world. To some extent this might be valid but rational interpretation must be there to support the claim.

## Real Knowledge

Purandara, a renowned Chārvāka thinker, mentioned in *“Tattvasaṅgrahapāñjikā”*, the Chārvāka School of philosophy rejects the inferences as a reliable and valid means of knowledge. In the *sūtras* of Bṛhaspati, it is said: *“The only means of right knowledge is sensual perception,”* and *“the inference is not the means of right knowledge”* (Bhattacharya, 2011; King, 2000). Inference weaves the path to knowledge about an invisible object through the knowledge of an observable object. In the process of inferences, we proceed from a known to an unknown position, where arises the question of certainty and assurance, may be some inferences turn out to be accidentally true (even though some conclusions can end up being unintentionally accurate). Inference is only possible through invariable association, in Indian philosophy, it is termed as *“Vyapti”*. In Vyapti, two events should be present at the same time and place and should be absent at the same time and place together. However, Chārvāka holds that Vyapti is merely guesswork without basing the perception, and through the medium of inferences indubitable and indisputable knowledge is never possible. Furthermore, inference is considered to imply its validity, therefore it cannot be demonstrated by inference. Testimony too cannot prove the validity of Vyapti because testimony itself is not regarded as a valid means of knowledge, and inference would become dependent on testimony, if testimony succeeded in establishing Vyapti, making it impossible for anybody to make their own independent inferences. Therefore, testimony cannot prove it either. According to them, in inferences, conclusion from the proposition may be true based on past perception, but there is no assurance that it will hold true even in circumstances where it is not perceived. As a result, inference is not a reliable means of knowledge (Sharma, 2000).

Extreme empiricism holds that perception is only a valid and reliable means of acquiring knowledge, whereas mitigated-empiricist Chārvākas accept inference; they do it mainly in order to explain and justify the facts of the empirical world. They do accept inferences in an instrumental sense, not in an authoritative sense, but those which are testable by ordinary human experience or necessary for the explanation of such experience (Gokhale, 1993, 2015). Chārvāka philosopher also rejected the deductive inference as it is vitiated by the fallacy of *‘petitio principia’* (begging of the question), is a circular argument, this fallacy arises when the major premises implicitly presuppose the intended conclusion or results need to be proved or whose validity is not established yet (Schagrin et al., 2023). For example, all humans are mortal, Ofijul is human, so, Ofijul is mortal. Here in this example, conclusion *“Ofijul is mortal”* is already implicitly contained in the major (first) premises and needs to be proved. Chārvāka philosophy also asserts that inductive inference makes the effort to establish the veracity of the major premise of deductive reasoning. However, induction is also unsure since it jumps unwarrantedly from the known to the unknown circumstances (Sharma, 2000).

Only those things are real, which have sensible qualities, i.e., touch, sight, smell, and taste, and can be perceived through our senses (Bhattacharya, 2011; Gokhale, 2015). Only through perception one can gain true and valid knowledge. For Chārvāka philosophers, perception is all about to explain all the disputed questions regarding this physical world and spiritual realm. If any object comes into our direct perception and if we can be able to capture information about the same through our five senses then the object exists for us, otherwise not. For example, if we see the car and gain knowledge about the car directly through the eyes, this knowledge is called true knowledge. This philosophy discards all other mediums of acquiring true knowledge such as inferences and words (Shabda) other than perception. Inferred knowledge is based on inferences that cannot have a similar validity to that of perceived knowledge. Perception is of two types: external and internal. External perceptions are those which arise from the direct interaction between the five senses (eyes, ears, nose, skin and tongue) and external worldly objects, and the inner sense i.e., mind. Mind does internal perceptions such as happiness, sadness, depression and anxiety (Bhattacharya, 1996; Kamal, 1998).

While traditional accounts (e.g., Sharma, 2000) portray Chārvāka as rejecting inference outright, more nuanced reconstructions by Gokhale (2015) and Bhattacharya (2011) distinguish between extreme and mitigated empiricism. Mitigated Chārvākas accepted *“lokaprasiddha anumāna”* (commonly accepted inference grounded in perception), allowing practical knowledge without falling into radical skepticism. This internal diversity challenges the popular

caricature of Chārvāka as anti-rational and suggests its epistemology aligns more closely with modern scientific pragmatism than pure sensationalism. However, critics argue that strict reliance on perception limits explanatory power for complex phenomena like causation or consciousness, potentially rendering the system philosophically impoverished compared to Nyāya or Buddhist approaches.

As Chārvākas rejected the inferences as the true and valid means of knowledge on the account of its *“indirectness”* in nature, this stance of Chārvāka also faces criticism by Jain philosophy, stating that from this point of view perception is also invalid knowledge because it depends on senses. If inferences are invalid because of its dependency on perception, on this account perception is also invalid as it dependent on senses of the human being. Further, Chārvākas argues that *“perception is only means of true and valid knowledge”*, internal meaning of this statement is that *“All perceived knowledge are valid”* which is universal in nature. But, if we want to come to this statement, we have to take the help of inference, as we cannot make an universal proposition based on perception (single instance) only (Bhattacharya, 1996). Saying *“in all cases”* includes perceived knowledge of past, present and future which cannot be verified by perception alone. Therefore, it must be admitted that Chārvākas accepted inference as a means of valid knowledge. Chārvāka philosophy also rejected inferences and testimony as the true and valid means of knowledge because both often leads to erroneous knowledge. By the same logic, perception also cannot be accepted as a means of valid knowledge, because perceptual knowledge sometimes proven wrong, for example, the illusion of seeing a snake in a rope (famous example from Indian philosophy) (Bhattacharya, 1996). Thus, taking the account of Chārvāka philosophy with other Indian philosophy, perception, inferences, analogy and testimony can be used to acquire knowledge but its trustworthiness and validity must be verified with rationality.

### Concept of Soul

Chārvāka philosophy rejects the concept of an immaterial and immortal soul apart from the body because it cannot be perceived; they posited that soul will be alongside the body as long as the body lives and will be perished with the death of the physical body (Umashnakar, 1964) and this soul which is the product of the aggregation of four materials, can be perceived through internal perception (mind). Even a single part of the human body will not exist in this world after the death of the physical body to enjoy the consequences of his/her good or bad deeds in later birth, heaven, or hell (Bhattacharya, 2011). Chārvāka philosophy accepts the view of consciousness and soul and, asserts that consciousness and soul are the eventual and emergent quality of aggregation of four materials, and consciousness and soul cannot exist independently of matter (Umashnakar, 1964). Consciousness and soul are not the quality of any one of the four materials, rather the aggregation of four materials in a particular way gives birth to another quality, i.e., consciousness and soul in the physical human body like intoxicating power arises from the fermentation of molasses or red color arises from chewing the leaves of the piper-betel with other ingredients (Bhattacharya, 2011; Gokhale, 2015; Umashnakar, 1964). The physical body (brain, mind, soul, or all these organisms together) can only represent a person’s self when it is qualified by the consciousness, as consciousness is considered the essence of the self (Chattopadhyay, 1992; Bhattacharya, 2011; Gokhale, 2015).

Chārvāka’s rejection of an immaterial, immortal soul independent of the body, coupled with its emergentist view that consciousness and the *“soul”* arise as a temporary quality from the specific aggregation of the four material elements, analogous to intoxication emerging from fermented molasses or redness from betel leaves, represents a radical materialist reductionism that effectively eliminates any basis for afterlife, karma, rebirth, or post-mortem moral retribution (Bhattacharya, 2011; Gokhale, 2015; Umashnakar, 1964). This position, which treats consciousness as perceptible only through internal perception while the body lives and perishes with it, offers a powerful critique of spiritualist philosophies and aligns with modern physicalist or emergentist theories of mind, providing a consistent this-worldly framework that prioritizes empirical verifiability over metaphysical speculation (Chattopadhyaya, 1959). Many philosophical communities criticize the stance taken by Chārvāka on existence of soul. Critics raise the

counterargument that how Chārvāka prove the existence of temporary bodily soul, as it cannot be perceived by senses, even if they said that it can be proved through internal perception by mind, but it is only possible for person's himself, how one can prove other person's soul by his/her internal perception. Another important argument is, "*dēhātmavāda*" (materialism) cannot justify the existence of memory, as it is changeable. Therefore, if we accept this view, remembrance of previous experiences cannot be possible. Previous day's body does not remain the same the next day. The body of youth does not remain the same in old age. Therefore, a changeable body cannot remember the previous experiences. To bring into present the previous experiences, one must acknowledge the existence of some eternal entity in addition to changeable body, which existed in past and still exists in present. Thus, in order to explain the memory, besides changeable body, one must acknowledge the existence of some eternal entity i.e., soul (Bhattacharya, 1996). Now, we can say that the Chārvāka's explanation on existence of soul is questionable and against the religious and spiritualistic philosophy, but in modern scientific era, this view has become much popular among the atheistic society.

### **Pleasure**

As discussed before, this physical world is the final destination for an entire human being; therefore, every human being should strive for the greatest amount of pleasure (King, 2000), and happiness from every part of this worldly life and try to avoid the chances of pain as far as possible (Gokhale, 2015; Panchal, 2024), just like a person who wants to eat fish, catches fish with skin and thorns, and then he/she only takes that much which he/she needs to fulfill his/her gratification, in the same way, the person who wants rice, brings paddy along with the straw, takes as much as he should take from it and leaves. A person does not start driving due to fear of an accident, a person does not start cooking because he/she is a beggar. Chārvāka calls these people as stupid as animals who do not go forward to achieve happiness and pleasure because of some obstacles. It is a foolish judgment of ignoring happiness and pleasurable life because these are illusions, full of misery, and born from worldly matters (Umashnkar, 1964). In reality, such people are rarely found who don't drive in fear of accidents.

While Chārvāka philosophy prioritizes pleasurable life, other Indian philosophy like buddhism posited that there is no pleasure without sorrow, both are intertwined. Buddhism philosophy goes further and says that sorrow or grief is not an isolated emotion or personal failing but a fundamental aspect of existence (Bhattacharya, 1996). A similar stance was taken by one of the famous Western philosophies, "*Existentialism*". It says there was nothing before birth and will be nothing after death. In between, we have been thrown into social life which is characterized by full of misery, sorrow, anguish, and uncertainty, and human beings must be prepared to face and learn to live with (Seetharamu, 1978). Kierkegaard's famous work "*Either/or*" focused on a similar philosophical stance. Therefore, it is impossible to lead only a pleasurable life without grief and misery. To some extent, human beings can adopt the Chārvāka's thought of pleasurable life and avoid miserable life wherever possible but entirely adopting this principle will be unrealistic from a rational perspective.

### **Pleasure as only Value**

Most of the Indian philosophy (Orthodox, Buddhist, and Jainists) derived their value system from sacred books which regulate their overall conduct and behavior. While this philosophy criticizes the value system derived from Vedas and other holy texts, which include vulgar and brutal practices. It condemned the priesthood to earn money for a livelihood by deceiving people. They criticized numerous customs and rituals for being blatantly superstitious and nonsensical. Because Vedic sacrificial ceremonies frequently involved killing animals under the pretense of delivering them to paradise, they were very suspicious of their duplicity. They were also against asceticism because it entailed harming oneself in order to survive. The Vedic value system's criticism by Chārvāka has another crucial effect. According to the value system promoted by the Vedas and Smritis, men and women are treated unequally under patriarchy and are primarily ruled by the Caste and Varna hierarchy (Pathak, 2019; Joshi & Fawcett, 2001). Humans' obligations were mostly based on their caste and gender status, with their status as humans only coming in second. Vedic morality was not egalitarian in this sense. Chārvāka philosophers were against this caste-based system of values. They believed that

human beings are liberated from the hierarchical structure that this tradition imposes. Various Indian philosophies focused on the individual's salvation of the soul, but Chārvāka withholds this interpretation by saying that individual salvation of the soul has no social and moral perspective. They advocated that humans are social creatures seeking happiness and prosperity (Kama and Artha) within a social context (Gokhale, 2015).

This school does not provide any specific framework about the values. Sensual pleasure is life's highest value and "*summum bonum*" (Sharma, 2000), and everybody should try to get it even by immoral means (Gokhale, 2015). They also talked about justice, social order, and their critical attitude toward untruth, hypocrisy, and sacrificial violence is evident in Chārvāka literature (Gokhale, 2015). Chārvāka regards "*Artha*" and "*Kama*" as the central or only "*Puruṣārtha*" (Gokhale, 1993). Value system in Chārvāka philosophy is completely based on Hedonistic principles.

Chārvāka rejected the need for ethics or morals and suggested that while life remains, let a man live happily, let him drink ghee even though he runs in debt (Bhattacharya, 2011). For them, morality means carnal pleasures. Chārvāka does not deny the opinion of salvationists that pleasure is temporary and intertwined with sadness, but at the same time, they argued, that it is not necessary that whatever is temporary in this world, should be worthless and fallacious. Rangoon Creeper lasts a little longer than bastard teak, but no one disrespects Rangoon Creeper by calling it fictitious. Although garden saffron is more short-lived than artificial flowers, still we value it more. In this way, the rainbow, sunset, and sunrise are temporary but not fictitious. Likewise, physical happiness should not be abandoned and despised, even if it is temporary. Even though pleasure is temporary, that temporary happiness is the ultimate goal of human life (Bhattacharya, 1996). Chārvāka philosophy asserted that there is nothing wrong with sensual pleasure. Since happiness and sorrow are intertwined, Chārvāka posited that wisdom lay in enjoying pleasure and avoiding grief and misery as far as possible. Pleasure is the only goal of Chārvāka philosophy that could be achieved even by immoral means (Gokhale, 2015). Unlike many Indian philosophies of the time, Chārvāka philosophy did not believe in austerities or rejecting pleasurable life out of fear of pain and held such reasoning to be foolish (Paone, 2022).

Chārvāka's ethical framework sharply criticizes the Vedic and Smṛti-based value systems for promoting caste and gender hierarchies, priestly exploitation, animal sacrifice, and ascetic self-harm, while advocating an egalitarian, this-worldly pursuit of '*artha*' (prosperity) and '*kāma*' (pleasure) as the only legitimate "*puruṣārthas*"; rejecting individual soul-salvation in favor of social happiness (Gokhale, 2015; Bhattacharya, 2011). Its hedonistic stance encapsulated in the famous verse urging one to live happily and "*drink ghee even if in debt*" celebrates sensual pleasure as the summum bonum and defends the enjoyment of temporary happiness through vivid analogies (rainbow, sunset), arguing that impermanence does not render pleasure worthless (Bhattacharya, 1996; Sharma, 2000). Recent comparative studies further nuance this by portraying Chārvāka hedonism as more refined and socially contextual than crude egoism, often contrasting it favorably with Epicurean moderation (Paone, 2022). However, this radical rejection of transcendent morality and endorsement of pleasure "*even by immoral means*" has often been criticized, it risks ethical relativism or short-termism, potentially undermining long-term social order, justice, raises ethical concern in pluralistic democracies and moral accountability in the absence of karma or afterlife considerations. Moreover, while Chārvāka's anti-hierarchical and anti-ascetic critique offers a liberating dissent against orthodox oppression, its apparent tolerance for immoral means and lack of a systematic ethical framework leave it vulnerable to charges of promoting unrestrained individualism or failing to provide robust guidance for complex social dilemmas. Thus, although Chārvāka's value system delivers a powerful materialist and egalitarian alternative to spiritualist moralities, it remains philosophically provocative yet limited in its capacity to sustain enduring ethical structures beyond immediate sensory gratification.

### Educational Implications Of Chārvāka Philosophy

Chārvāka does not articulate an explicit educational theory, as its surviving fragments focus on metaphysics and epistemology rather than pedagogy. The implications below are derived through reasoned extension of its core

principles (strict empiricism, anti-dogmatism, present-life focus, pleasurable life and sensory reality). While consistent with its materialist outlook, these extensions remain interpretive and open to debate.

### ***Meaning of Education***

Chārvāka philosophy consider this physical world is the real world, there is nothing behind and other than this physical world, from this perspective, education should be fundamentally centered on understanding human beings as physical entities, comprehending the physical world, and pursuing maximum pleasure while avoiding pain, concurrently serving as a “*man-making process*,” (Miller, 2000; Guo-rong, 2011). It should be the process of developing the physical human being and this material world for living a healthy, happy, and pleasurable life. The process of education should be to teach the learners about various aspects of this world and their protection and preservation (Chuan et al., 2013).

### ***Aims of Education***

School is mandated to foster kids' physical and mental growth through a variety of physical activities, as well as their capacity for reasoning, logical and critical thinking, sound comprehension, and the ability to adapt to new situations. As is rightly stated, a sound body is a prerequisite for a sound mind (Cook & Kohl III, 2013). Chārvāka philosophers were strictly against painful experiences and always in favor of the pleasurable principles (Kandpal, 2017). Therefore, school curriculum should be designed in such a way that it gives training to the students to make their lives healthy and pleasurable. In order for pupils to have a healthy and pleasurable existence in the company of other social beings, it is also the job of the school to develop them as social beings. Without a community question arises about identity, name, and sense of belongingness, without which a man cannot exist (Saldanha, 2023). Educational practices must also provide knowledge about this physical world and four materials i.e., air, fire, water, and earth. According Chārvāka philosophy, this physical world comes into existence through the interaction of air, fire, water, and earth (Macauley, 2010), therefore it is necessary for the students to gain some basic knowledge about the same.

As discussed Chārvāka philosophy preferred perception based knowledge, therefore, rigorous training of the senses are required to improve psycho-motor skills, which is also mentioned in Jean Piaget's theory of cognitive development. This will widen the learning and earning abilities of the students. Students with strong psycho-motor skills will be able to carry out a variety of tasks inconspicuously, expanding their earning potential and allowing them to meet their fundamental needs for a living and becoming self-dependent (Freedman, 2008; Cheatum & Hammond, 2000). Every student's requirements, interests, and abilities should be taken into account while designing the curriculum and educational environment so that it can fulfill their expectation and dream of what they want to be. A wide range of alternatives should be made available for students to select from and pursue in line with their interests, requirements, and talents (Tomlinson, 2014; Dewey, 1938). Furthermore, to prepare students for a healthy and pleasurable life, students should be made aware of their health and hygiene to make them physically healthy. Various types of physical exercise should be incorporated as an inescapable part of the school curriculum, which would help the students to lead a pleasurable life (LIU & Fernando, 2024; Joseph, 2020). Schools should also provide variety of opportunities for self-expression (Benjamin, 1992). Every student is unique and has unique interests, abilities, dreams, aptitudes, and personality characteristics (Biesta, 2020). Therefore, students should be allowed to express themselves as they wish. They should not be restricted from expressing themselves and voicing their opinions by external authority (Easton, 2005; Edes, 2020). Authoritarian exercise would limit the expression of the true personality of the students (Schrag, 1972; Morrison, 2008).

Additionally, school should provide provide an opportunity for the preservation of life. Given that the body is just as vital as the mind, a child must be able to maintain and defend it (Stadtmuller, 1926). He/she must understand how to maintain a clean, healthy, and safe environment for himself/herself as well as for others.

Finally, Chārvāka-oriented education will aim at the exaltation of human personality through self-expression and self-actualization. Students should be given enormous opportunities for the exaltation of personality and self-actualization. Basic needs should be fulfilled before they step up towards self-actualization (Ball, 2017; Mustofa, 2022). As Carl Rogers said, self-actualization is the highest level of psychological development where an individual realizes his/her full potential but does not mark the end of life's journey, rather it will constantly vary at different points over time depending on the circumstances (Rogers, 1951, 1995).

### ***Curriculum***

According to the thoughts of Chārvāka, curriculum need to be framed to maintain pleasurable environment in the school, as educational environment is a critical determinant of curriculum effectiveness and student outcomes fostering intellectual activities and positive interactions, with a proven connection to student achievement, satisfaction, and success (Jamaiah, 2008). In this line, happiness curriculum was implemented in the schools of New Delhi since 2018 monitored by SCERT from nursery to grade 8 students to promote emotional well-being, mindfulness, and self-awareness. Class span is 40-45 minutes daily, including non-academic classes focused on storytelling, activities and meditation with no formal examinations aimed at fostering a positive, compassionate, and stress-free learning environment (Ajmani & Kaur, 2024).

To maintain pleasurable environment in the school, similar types of curriculum could be framed including collaborative project work, play based activities, yoga, gamification and meditation. To acquaint students with the physical world, study of scientific subjects, tour, educational visits and excursion can be organized by the school authorities. Gamification can enhance student engagement and create a more stimulating learning environment, addressing the need for a pleasurable school curriculum (Rishipal et al., 2019). Ample opportunities should be there in schools to make the students innovative and creative in diverse fields. Music and dance need to be incorporated in the curriculum, as sound and movement are the best expressive way of students' personality, as Rabindranath Tagore, one of the prominent Indian philosopher of twentieth (20<sup>th</sup>) century profoundly emphasized in his educational philosophy (Taneja & Taneja, 2006; Nasev, 2013). For healthy and sound physique, physiology and physical activities should form an important part of the school curriculum. To lead a pleasurable life, it is necessary to be economically sufficient, addressing this, training on craft work for the students is essential in school curriculum as it enables students to connect theoretical knowledge with practical life skills, contributing to economic sufficiency and independent living (Lind et al., 2009). Craft education is evolving to make it more relevant and meaningful, with teachers using pedagogical models to provide authentic contexts for successful living, which can contribute to economic sufficiency and a pleasurable life (Pöllänen, 2009). Additionally, reasoning, philosophy, and mathematics can be included for mental development. Furthermore, History can also be included because it provides valuable guidance to lead an informed and wiser life. By studying the past, we gain deep insights into human behavior, decisions, successes, and mistakes. This knowledge helps us avoid repeating the same errors and make better choices in the present (Lamb, 2021). History acts like a mirror that shows us what worked and what failed in different situations. For example, the economic crisis of 2008 taught governments and banks the dangers of excessive risk-taking and poor regulation. Because of this lesson from history, many countries introduced stricter banking rules and financial safeguards to prevent a similar collapse in the future. Thus, history does not just tell us what happened, it actively guides us to live more thoughtfully and responsibly today.

### ***Methods of Teaching***

Chārvāka philosophy gave much importance to perception; therefore teaching-learning method should be based on the perception (Mukherjee & Goswami, 2018). From this viewpoint, firstly learning by doing method can be proved an effective method where students are given enormous opportunities to learn by doing to acquire in-depth first-hand knowledge and experiences (Raj, 2020). Students retain the subject matter better when their own senses are involved in

the teaching-learning process (Itagi, 2019; Zhana, 2024). Secondly, experimentation can be used by the teachers, as experiments help the students to know worthy facts of life through the process of verification as it also involves the senses which contribute to the better retention of the facts (Kotsis, 2024). Chārvāka philosophy said that this physical world is the final destination for all, there is nothing after death and we should know this world of objects (Gokhale, 2015), therefore, observation method is suitable method of learning, which allow students to observe this world of objects for the betterment of human living (Campos & Martínez, 2012). Let the students observe the nature critically as famous Indian Poet and Philosopher Rabindranath Tagore said, “child are the offspring of nature” (Taneja & Taneja, 2006). Additionally, teachers can also use demonstration method where teacher plays the key role in the teaching-learning process.

Chārvāka philosophy highlighted the importance of freedom, this world belongs to human being not from hidden eternal reality or truth (Sharma, 2020; Dehghanzadeh et al., 2020), everyone has the right to experiences life as they wish without restrictions from external authority that establishes the principle of freedom enabling students to experience the physical world through their senses and acquire in-depth knowledge of their surroundings. Other practical-based methods can be used which directly involve the five senses. Conditional inferences can be used, but they should be supported by perception or real-life experiences.

Chārvāka's elevation of *pratyakṣa* logically supports experiential, sensory, and *'learning by doing'* methods over rote memorization or scriptural authority. This resonates with constructivist approaches and could counter authoritarian tendencies in some Indian educational traditions. Critically, however, an overemphasis on immediate sensory experience might undervalue abstract or theoretical knowledge that cannot be directly perceived, limiting depth in subjects like advanced mathematics or ethics. Moreover, granting full freedom without structured guidance risks disciplinary issues, as noted in critiques of child-centered education.

As stated Chārvāka (also known as Lokāyata), an ancient Indian materialist and heterodox philosophical school, emerged as a significant revolt against the dominant Vedic and Smṛti socio-cultural systems. It rejected the authority of the Vedas, the concepts of an afterlife, karma, mokṣa (liberation), and the ritualistic practices upheld by the priestly class, which were often seen as tools for maintaining social hierarchy and exploiting the masses. Chārvākas emphasized direct perception (*pratyakṣa*) as the primary, often sole valid means of acquiring true knowledge, promoting empiricism, skepticism toward scriptural authority, and a this-worldly focus on pleasure and rational inquiry over metaphysical speculation and blind ritualism.

In the context of education, this philosophical stance implies that teachers should actively cultivate critical and analytical abilities in students, encouraging them to question established dogmas, challenge oppressive socio-cultural structures, and rely on evidence and reason rather than unexamined tradition. This approach resonates strongly with Paulo Freire's framework of critical pedagogy. In his seminal work *“Pedagogy of the Oppressed”* (1970), Freire critiqued the *“banking model”* of education, where teachers deposit knowledge into passive students, as a mechanism of oppression that maintains the status quo.

Instead, Freire advocated for a problem-posing, dialogical education in reponse to anti-dialogical practices that fosters *“critical consciousness”* (*conscientização*) among oppressed. This empowers the oppressed to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, recognize their own dehumanization, and engage in transformative action to challenge power structures and authority (the oppressors). Through praxis, reflection and action, learners attain liberation and reclaim their lost humanity, moving from objects of history to subjects who can transform their reality (Freire, 2005).

Thus, drawing parallels between Chārvāka's rejection of Vedic orthodoxy and Freire's emphasis on conscientization, educators can design pedagogies that equip students not merely with information but with the tools to interrogate dominant ideologies, dismantle systems of oppression, and pursue genuine freedom and humanization. This synthesis highlights a universal thread in liberatory education, fostering skepticism toward unjust authority while grounding inquiry in lived experience and critical reflection.

### *E. Role of the Teacher*

An ideal teacher should guide the students in their every activity and help them by giving the required information (Abdulla-Hel-Baqui, 1999). Teacher should help the children in taking advantage of every opportunity available in the school setting to the fullest extent (Vladimirov et al., 2022). Teachers also need to encourage every student to participate in every activity organized by the school, promoting mutual understanding and cultivating shared responsibility among the masses of the students (Hu, 2023). Teacher should keep an eye on every movement of the students and track their progress to provide support if required. Teachers must understand the perceived needs of the students and provide opportunities accordingly (Modupe, 2010). Teachers should give them space to explore their self-interest as dominating teachers would limit the student's exploration of self-interest. Teachers should have sufficient expertise that will facilitate the identification and maximization of the student's creativity (Afshari et al., 2013).

### *Discipline*

As mentioned above, they rejected painful experiences by advocating pleasurable life; accordingly, corporal punishment should be strictly prohibited (Gokhale, 2015; Panchal, 2024). School life should be pleasurable and full of happiness for the students. Therefore, students should be given full freedom to enjoy their life and provide little guidance and help them to avoid sorrow and painful experiences. To invoke self-discipline among the students, schools should take due care of the child's self-interests. If school activities and the curriculum are rooted in the child's natural interests, the problem of discipline will largely disappear, a principle strongly emphasized by the renowned Western philosopher, John Dewey, in his pragmatism philosophy (Seetharamu, 1978; MacAllister, 2013).

As Chārvāka's stance against painful experiences and only pursuing pleasure even by immoral mean sometimes raise the issue of social order, social justice, moral accountability and bringing unity in deversity. Spiritualistic valuse helps to maintain a helthy environment and social order in the society (Gray & Coates, 2013). Therefore, utterly pursuing of pleasure would not be beneficial for the whole society. Although, Chārvāka philosophy stances should be mixed with values system advocated by other Indian as well as western philosophies.

### **Education**

Education and philosophy are considered two sides of the same coin; the former is the means, and the latter is the goal (Seetharamu, 1978). Hence, education needs to play a significant role in inculcating the thoughts of Chārvāka philosophy among the students through the advanced teaching-learning process.

This philosophy emphasized empirical validation, perception, and material things leading to constitute the scientific basis of modern education (Raja, 1974). Every branch of education must be related and focused on the present life to make it more pleasurable for the human beings without too much considering the distant future and life after death, as Rousseau pleads, ***“what is to be thought of, therefore, of that cruel education which sacrifices the present to an uncertain future, that burdens a child with all sorts of restrictions and begins by making him miserable, in order to prepare him for some far-off happiness which he may never enjoy”*** (Seetharamu, 1978). The education process in the school and colleges needs to be interesting and engaging for the students such as game-based education, colorful tools, toys, and didactics must be used to aid the teaching-learning process, so that they come to school and pursue their education with full of motivation, energy and enjoyment. The curriculum of education should be framed in such a way that it incorporates real-life experiences and knowledge. Nature study needs to be an indispensable part of today's education system to acquaint students with the various components of the environment, their inevitable contribution, and the functioning process. This helps prepare our future generation to play a significant role in preserving the environment and achieving seventeen (17) goals under SDGs.

### **Relevance In The Contemporary World**

This fast-growing world gives an enormous responsibility to the human population to make the distant future happy and brighter, for which they are losing their present and have no time to share their feelings, problems, and needs and spend their happiest moment with members of the family and society. In addition, some people are so pious in religious activities that they give up every happiest and most peaceful moment in life for the sake of happiness and peaceful moments in later life (life after death) that are unknown to them or might be a world of imagination to them. Further, people in many religions are so busy with religious activities that they don't have time to spend with others. People of one religion don't want to be associated with the people of other religions. They think people of other religions are sinful and ungodly according to their own religion. Even though their every action is in accordance with the rules of their religion, they do not do any ungodly acts by violating the rules of religion. They do everything according to their religion, whether it provides them with sorrow or happiness. They don't know for what they are sacrificing their entire life, is actually exists or not, but they do it blindly based on inferences that have not been proved through perception or shreds of evidence.

This leads to intra-religious and inter-religious conflict, casteism, and communalism. Intra-religious conflict means one asking himself/herself whatever he/she is doing, whether it is right or wrong, from the religious perspective, internal depth of one's faith. Every experience, adventure, challenge, and action of this continuously changing world is viewed from a religious perspective to lead to a deeper conversion toward God (Hall, 2010). Every moment one's deepening of the religious commitment and purification of one's faith sometimes leads to a conflicting situation within oneself. Inter-religious conflicts lead one to think that his/her religion is supreme compared to other religions and this type of thought gives the opportunity to political leaders to play divisive politics to come into power which further leads to communalism throughout the world, breaks social harmony, and creates hurdles to forming unity among the people belonging to different faiths (Upadhyay & Robinson, 2012). In recent years, there is growing evidence that some filmmakers are producing movies based on past religious conflicts and violence primarily to maximize commercial profit, often inciting hatred and division among people, leading people to look at each other with hatred (Nazini & Kumar, 2020).

Chārvāka philosophy prioritizes the present life and immediate future and discards the karmic reparation, birth, death, and rebirth cycle. Therefore, this philosophy denies the concept of religion as it leads to communalism, casteism, disharmony, and makes division among the people of the society. Every individual should make a continuous effort to become happy and make their life pleasurable and successful without considering the consequences. Famous Sanskrit verses say-

*"jāvaj jīvet sukhaṃ jīved ṛṇaṃ kṛtvā gṛtaṃ pibet |*

*bhasmībhūtasya dehasya punar āgamaṇaṃ kutaḥ. ||"* (Bhattacharya, 2011)

*Trayo vedasya kartāro bhaṇḍa-dhūrta-nisācarāḥ||* (Joshi, 2010)

As long as man lives, lives happily. Drink ghee even after taking debt. That is, whatever measures have to be taken for happiness and enjoyment, do them. Don't hesitate to get material comforts by borrowing from others. As it is a well-known fact that the time of human life constantly decreasing, the time that is passing away cannot be reversed again, Heraclitus has said *"One cannot step twice into the same river"* (Seetharamu, 1978). Do not care about things like the afterlife, rebirth, and Soul-Paramatma. According to the Lokyatikas, one should not follow dharma because its benefits will only be realized in the future and are also uncertain. Who else besides a fool would give what is in his hand to someone else? Today's pigeon is preferable than tomorrow's peacock. Better than a questionable golden coin is a guaranteed copper coin (Gokhale, 2015). If any action gives you pleasure, just do it without much considering and caring about what will be the future consequences of that action. Where does the question of reincarnation arise, if the body which is burnt to ashes after death, that is, the body which has been burnt to ashes in the cremation. Whatever is there, is only till the safety of this body and after that nothing is left, after understanding this fact, it is okay to enjoy life by

taking a loan. The creators of the three Vedas have been nocturnal pranksters of cunning nature, who have spread the illusion of things like Soul-Parmatma, heaven-hell, and sin-virtue to fool people (Gokhale, 2015). As they said, materials are the sources of everything, so every member of society should make an effort to advance the material things around them, such as every component of the environment. If all human beings strive to improve the environment in terms of quality and quantity, then the whole nation will have a happy, safe, and healthy life.

We all also need to take some precautionary steps to create awareness among the people about environmental degradation which will help us to survive better. Therefore, the responsibility falls on the people to protect the environment from hazardous pollution, protect the wildlife from hunting, and the hostile attitude of human beings to maintain the ecological balance for healthy and safe living of the entire world.

### Chārvāka's Dream Of Society

Chārvāka philosophy does not talk about human beings in utter isolation; instead, it emphasizes human beings in society and the pursuit of pleasure and wealth in the social setup. Chārvāka philosopher is always in favor of the pursuit of pleasure and wealth in the company of all the social members, which enhances belongingness among them. The viewpoint of Chārvāka is intended for all living things, not only the egoistic goals of a few isolated people. Without society, an isolated individual can't create his/her identity; therefore, surviving is impossible. The fact that Chārvāka accepted are polity and jurisprudence as acceptable means of subsistence shows their preference for a just and stable social structure. The fact that Lokyata is included under *Ānvikṣikī* by Kautilya suggests that Lokyata seeks to rationally control the spheres of religion, economy, and polity. This opens the door for a moral-social strategy based on logic. As said before, Chārvāka always criticized blatant dishonesty, deceit, and sacrificial brutality in Chārvāka literature. Chārvāka strongly opposes dishonest and deceitful ways of life, such as ritualistic practices, and instead support straightforward practical livelihoods like cultivation, cattle-keeping, and commerce. Thus, it appears that Chārvākas are devotees of frankness, reason, sincerity, and non-harm (Gokhale, 2015). Every individual should respect each other as responsible members of the society. Healthy and happy co-living of all creatures in this world without harming anyone is necessary to form a perfect and just society. Instead of thinking about the imaginary world (God, Heaven, and Hell) too much, people should strive collectively for the betterment of society to transfer this world into *"Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam"* (The world is one family). In the real sense, this philosophy dreamt of such a society that will be free from religious extremism.

### Conclusion

Chārvāka philosophy, often marginalized among Indian philosophies, emerges as a powerful reminder in this study that valued rational inquiry, critical outlook, scientific understanding, intellectual freedom, and empirical validation. This philosophy rejected the so called traditional metaphysical and spiritual speculation, and by emphasizing that perception is the only source of true and valid knowledge, it positioned itself in the world of philosophy a counterbalance to dogmatic and unquestioned tradition and superstitions prevalent in the society. Therefore, this philosophy fosters critical thinking, autonomy, and skepticism, which facilitate meaningful learning for the students of modern generation. In this contemporary world, it is evident that societies are characterized by rapid scientific advancement, technological advancement, ideological polarization, and information overload; in this scenario, the relevance of Chārvāka philosophy becomes more pronounced. An education system based on the principles of Chārvāka philosophy encourages questioning, evidence-based reasoning, and a pragmatic and scientific understanding of life, aligning closely with the modern scientific temperament and democratic outlooks. These types of educational approaches truly empower learners to engage themselves actively with knowledge, challenge assumptions, and make informed decisions in their lived experiences. Thus, the education system based on the principles of Chārvāka philosophy would be a dynamic, rational, real-world experience-based, and student-centered process that will contribute to the production of rational, logical, scientific, reflective, and socially responsible individuals capable of

navigating and solving the problems and complexities of the modern world with reason, confidence, and clarity for a greater sustainable world.

As stated, this philosophy holds that whatever we perceive is real and that non-perceived objects are unreal, which it presents as counter to spiritualistic and religious philosophies. But to maintain social order, we need a religious perspective among the members of society. Many things are not perceivable, such as an atom, but we still believe that an atom is the source of creation of this physical world. Therefore, completely denying the non-perceived objects is unreal and will distort the world knowledge base. Many concepts in mathematics and other scientific subjects are also abstract in nature, and we believe in those abstract concepts in this scientific era. Thus, we have to strike a balance between these two propositions and need to put effort into making this world more scientific in temperament. In the same manner, Chārvāka stated that perception is the only means of true and valid knowledge, whereas other Indian philosophy incorporated shabda (testimony), analogy, and inference as also the means of true and valid knowledge. This is a subjective stance that whatever a man perceives is true and valid for him, but it is also evident that much of the valid and true knowledge we acquire comes from previous studies, books, and inferences. If a man did not see *"Japan"*, according to the Chārvāka stance, *"Japan"* does not exist for him, but in reality, it exists. Sometimes perceptions also failed to provide true and valid knowledge, for example, *"a mirage in the desert"*. Therefore, we can use perception as a means of true and valid knowledge on a circumstantial basis, but it is not always true and valid. Thus, other means of acquiring knowledge would be used, but their authenticity should be judged with an analytical perspective before reaching a valid conclusion. Additionally, Chārvākas deny the existence of an eternal soul as it could not be perceived; this view has also been criticized by many spiritualistic philosophies. For this view, people began to accept Chārvāka philosophy as a guiding principle for conducting their lives, those who do not believe in supernatural power or revolt against religious extremism. Another important principle of Chārvāka philosophy is that pleasure is the core value to be followed throughout life. Many critics raise an argument against this proposition, saying that if human being only strives for his/her own pleasure without considering its effects on society or other human beings, then there will be no difference between animals and human beings who are considered wise, intelligent, and supreme creations in this world. Still, this principle gained acceptance in society for its revolting nature against the priesthood and the religious society.

While Chārvāka offers a valuable counter-narrative to dominant spiritualist traditions and supports rational, student-centered education, its limitations, particularly in ethics and long-term reasoning suggest it functions best as a complementary voice rather than a standalone framework. Future research could empirically test these inferred implications in classroom settings.



**Peer-review:** External, Independent.

**Acknowledgements:**

-

**Declarations:**

**1. Statement of Originality:**

This work is original.

**2. Author Contributions:**

**Concept:** RM,SJ; **Conceptualization:** RM,SJ; **Literature Search:** RM; **Data Collection:** RM; **Data Processing:** RM; **Analysis:** RM; **Writing– original draft:** RM; **Writing– review & editing:** RM,SJ.

**3. Ethics approval:**

Not applicable.

**4. Funding/Support:**

This work has not received any funding or support.

### 5. Competing Interests:

The authors declare no competing interests.

### 6. GenAI Usage Statement:

The authors made very limited use of ChatGPT and Grok to assist with language editing, translation, grammar and text refinement. The authors reviewed, edited, and verified all outputs and take full responsibility for the content of this publication

### 7. Sustainable Development Goals:



## REFERENCES

- Abdulla-Hel-Baqi, G. (1999). The profile of a good teacher. *Khulna University Studies*, 1–4.
- Afshari, M., Ghavifekr, S., Siraj, S. B., & Razak, A. Z. (2013). Developing students' creativity.
- Ajmani, T., & Kaur, T. (2024). Happiness curriculum: A project-based learning approach. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 646–650. <https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i1.5115>
- Ball, H. (2017). Concept of self-actualization of personality in humanistic psychology. *Psychology & Society*, 2, 16–32.
- Benjamin, E. (1992). Freedom in the classroom. *New Directions for Student Services*, 1992, 37–48.
- Bhattacharya, R. (2011). *Studies on the Cārvāka/Lokāyata*. Anthem Press.
- Bhattacharya, S. (2018). *Bhartiya darshan*. Book Syndicate. (Original work published 1996)
- Bhattacharya, S., Chattopadhyaya, D. P., Embree, L. E., & Mohanty, J. N. (1992). Phenomenology and Indian philosophy (pp. 44–76).
- Biesta, G. (2020). Regaining the democratic heart of education. In *Flip the system US* (pp. 32–38). Routledge.
- Campos, G., & Martínez, N. E. L. (2012). La observación, un método para el estudio de la realidad. *Xihmai*, 7(13), 45–60.
- Carr, B. (2005). Causation in Indian philosophy. In *Encyclopedia of philosophy*. Encyclopedia.com. <https://www.encyclopedia.com/humanities/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/causation-indian-philosophy>
- Chatterjee, S., & Datta, D. (2016). *An introduction to Indian philosophy*. Motilal Banarsidass.
- Chattopadhyaya, D. (1959). *Lokayata: A study in ancient materialism*. People's Publishing House.
- Chattopadhyaya, D. (1968). *Lokayata: A study in ancient materialism*. People's Publishing House.

- Cheatum, B. A., & Hammond, A. A. (2000). *Physical activities for improving children's learning and behavior: A guide to sensory motor development*. Human Kinetics.
- Chuan, X., Zhuan, C., & Liming, C. (2013). Life education: For a happy life. *Journal of Tianjin Normal University (Elementary Education Edition)*.
- Cook, H. D., & Kohl, H. W., III (Eds.). (2013). *Educating the student body: Taking physical activity and physical education to school*.
- Dasgupta, S. (1962). *A history of Indian philosophy* (Vol. 5). Cambridge University Press.
- De Pisón, R. M. (2018). Stages of moral (human) development and images of God. *Roczniki Teologiczne*, 65(5), 157–172. <https://doi.org/10.18290/rt.2018.65.5-11>
- Dehghanzadeh, S., Ahmadian, F., & Mirhosseini, Z. (2020). The criterion of truth in Epicureanism and Cārvāka philosophy. *Philosophical Investigations*, 14(32).
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. Macmillan.
- Easton, L. B. (2005). Democracy in schools: Truly a matter of voice. *English Journal*.
- Edes, I. (2020). Listening to student voice. *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education*, 19(2), 7.
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>
- Freedman, D. H. (2008). *Improving skills and productivity of disadvantaged youth*. International Labour Organization.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Herder and Herder.
- Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
- Georgieva, Z. (2024). Multisensory approach in education.
- Gokhale, P. P. (1993). The Chārvāka theory of pramāṇas: A restatement. *Philosophy East and West*, 675–682. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1399208>
- Gokhale, P. P. (2015). *Lokāyata/Cārvāka: A philosophical inquiry*.
- Gray, M., & Coates, J. (2013). Changing values and valuing change: Toward an ecospiritual perspective in social work. *International Social Work*, 56(3), 356–368. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002087281247400>
- Guo-rong, Y. (2011). Man's completion and multi-dimensions: Education in the perspective of philosophy. *Hebei Academic Journal*.
- Hall, G. (2010). Inter- or intra-religious dialogue? *Australian eJournal of Theology*, 1–13.
- Hiriyanna, M. (1968). *Outlines of Indian philosophy*. George Allen & Unwin.
- Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687>
- Hu, Q. (2023). How can the full participation of all students including those with additional learning needs be facilitated in educational activities? *The Educational Review, USA*, 7(7).
- Itagi, G., & D'Mello, L. (2019). Academic excellence through multi-sensory approach: A model for classroom teaching. *International Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 74–86. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3544137>
- Jamaiah, I. (2008). Review of research in learning environment. *Journal of Health and Translational Medicine (JUMMEC)*, 11(1), 7–11.

- Joseph, S. (2020). Need and importance of physical education and sports: A way to develop fitness and life skills among children.
- Joshi, D., & Fawcett, B. N. (2001). Hindu mythology and an unequal social order in India.
- Joshi, Y. (2010, January 12). यावत् जीवेत् सुखं जीवेत् ...: चार्वाक दर्शन (लोकायत). *Vichaar Sankalan*. <https://vichaarsankalan.wordpress.com/>
- Kamal, M. M. (1998). The epistemology of the Cārvāka philosophy. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu)*, 46(2), 1048–1045.
- Kandpal, M. (2017). A comparative study of the philosophical and educational thought of Jain and Chārvāka philosophy. *Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies*, 4(35), 5896–5900.
- Kátai, Z., Juhász, K., & Adorjáni, A. K. (2008). On the role of senses in education. *Computers & Education*, 51, 1707–1717.
- King, R. (2000). *Indian philosophy: An introduction to Hindu and Buddhist thought*. Maya Publishers.
- Kotsis, K. T. (2024). The significance of experiments in inquiry-based science teaching. *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 5(2), 86–92.
- Lamb, G. (2021). History. *Sexual Grounding Therapy*.
- Lind, E., Pappel, K., & Paas, K. (2009). Handicraft and home economics as designers of citizens who are able to cope in society. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*, 8(1), 54–62.
- Liu, G., & Fernando, Y. (2024). Health education in the parameter of physical in primary and secondary schools. *International Journal of Innovation Research in Education, Technology and Management*, 1(1), 17–22.
- MacAllister, J. (2013). School discipline, educational interest and pupil wisdom. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 45(1), 20–35.
- Macauley, D. (Ed.). (2010). *Elemental philosophy: Earth, air, fire, and water as environmental ideas*. SUNY Press.
- Miller, R. (2000). Beyond reductionism: The emerging holistic paradigm in education. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 28(1–3), 382–393. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08873267.2000.9977003>
- Modupe, H. (2010). Developing positive self-concept and self-esteem as panacea for industrial development and harmony in a work-race. *Academic Leadership: The Online Journal*, 8(3), 14.
- Morrison, K. (2008). Democratic classrooms: Promises and challenges of student voice and choice, part one. *Educational Horizons*, 87, 50–60.
- Mukherjee, S., & Goswami, G. (2018). Cārvāka or Lokāyata philosophy as a theory of materialism. *Lokāyata*, 8(1), 34.
- Mustafa, A. Z. (2022). Hierarchy of human needs: A humanistic psychology approach of Abraham Maslow. *Kawanua International Journal of Multicultural Studies*, 3(2), 30–35.
- Nasev, L. (2013). Integrating music and dance into school curriculum. *Activities in Physical Education and Sport*, 3(1), 95–97.
- Nazini, N., & Kumar, V. V. (2020). Fabricated cinema: A study on the representation of Muslims in selected Tamil films featuring Kamal Haasan. *Global Media Journal: Indian Edition*, 12(2).
- Panchal, R. (2024). Cārvāka philosophy and the pursuit of pleasure: A hedonistic perspective. *Gurukul International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*.
- Paone, C. (2022). Lives of pleasure: A comparative essay on Cārvāka and Epicurean ethics. *Philosophy East and*

- West*, 72(4), 1023–1044.
- Pathak, H. P. (2019, June). Hinduism and women religious beliefs and practices. In *Proceedings of the 13th International RAIS Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities* (pp. 228–235). Scientia Moralitas Research Institute.
- Pöllänen, S. (2009). Contextualising craft: Pedagogical models for craft education. *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, 28(3), 249–260.
- Raj, B. J. (2020). Relevance and impact of Cārvāka philosophy in modern age.
- Raja, C. K. (1974). *Some fundamental problems in Indian philosophy*. Motilal Banarsidass.
- Rathee, D. (2023, May 6). *Theory of evolution: Fact vs fiction / How life originated on Earth?* [Video]. YouTube. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fla6Xvslalo&ab\\_channel=DhruvRathee](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fla6Xvslalo&ab_channel=DhruvRathee)
- Rishipal, Saraff, S., & Kumar, R. (2019). A gamification framework for redesigning the learning environment. In *Recent advances in computational intelligence* (pp. 93–105). Springer International Publishing.
- Rogers, C. R. (1951). *Client-centered therapy: Its current practice, implications, and theory*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, C. R. (1995). *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Saldanha, S. E. (2023). *Cārvāka philosophy, the first philosophy of dissent*. PhilArchive. <https://philarchive.org/archive/SALCPT>
- Sarade, M. (2021). Chārvāka: The materialist and empiricist philosophy of Hinduism. *Exotic India Art*. <https://www.exoticindiaart.com/article/Chārvākas-the-materialist-and-empiricist-philosophy-of-hinduism/>
- Schagrin, M. L., & Rescher, N. (2023, May 14). Fallacy. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/argument-logic>
- Schrag, F. (1972). Freedom and authority in the educative process. *The School Review*, 80, 551–571.
- Seetharamu, A. S. (1978). *Philosophies of education*. APH Publishing.
- Sharma, C. (2000). *A critical survey of Indian philosophy*. Motilal Banarsidass.
- Sharma, V. (2020). Cārvāka darśana in view of environmental harmony. *Philotheos*, 20(1), 129–133.
- Stadtmuller, E. (1926). Examination of the child before entering school. *American Journal of Public Health*, 16(6), 586–589.
- Sutradhar, A. (2018). Causation in Indian philosophy. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 23(9), 35–39.
- Taneja, V. R., & Taneja, S. (2006). *Educational thinkers*. Atlantic Publishers & Dist.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners*. ASCD.
- Umashnakar. (1964). *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*. Choukhamba Vidya Bhavan.
- Upadhyay, S. P., & Robinson, R. (2012). Revisiting communalism and fundamentalism in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 35–57.
- Vladimirov, I., Volynets, G., Karganov, M. Y., & Pozdnyakov, S. (2022). School and teacher. *Vestnik RFFI*.
- Wernicki, A. T. (n.d.). Lokāyata/Cārvāka: Indian materialism. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://iep.utm.edu/indmat/>
- Williams, M. (2015, December 18). What is the Big Bang theory? *Phys.org*. <https://phys.org/news/2015-12-big-theory.html>



**Künye:**Cilt: 10  
Sayı: 1  
Yıl: 2026  
Sayfa: 17-43Riton MONDAL<sup>a</sup>Sajid JAMAL<sup>b</sup><sup>a</sup> Araştırmacı/Doktora, Eğitim Bölümü,  
Aligarh Muslim Üniversitesi,  
mondalriton.edu@gmail.com<sup>b</sup> Prof. Dr., Aligarh Muslim Üniversitesi,  
shadansj07@rediffmail.com

\* Riton MONDAL

Geliş Tarihi: 10.01.2026

Kabul Tarihi: 24.04.2026

Yayın Tarihi: 22.05.2026

**Atf:**Mondal, R. & Jamal, S. (2026). Chārvāka  
philosophy: its educational implications  
and relevance in the contemporary world.  
*Erciyes Journal of Education*, 10(1), 17-43  
<https://doi.org/10.32433/eje.1860732>

## Chārvāka Felsefesi: Eğitimsel Çıkarımları ve Çağdaş Dünyadaki Önemi

### Öz

#### Giriş

Chārvāka (Lokāyata olarak da bilinir.), antik Hint materyalizminin önemli ve heterodoks bir felsefe okulu olup M.Ö. 6. yüzyılda Vedik ortodoksiye radikal bir eleştiri olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Kelime anlamı olarak “eğlenceli konuşma” veya “halkın felsefesi” anlamına gelen Chārvāka, deneyciliği (empirizmi), metafizik iddialara yönelik şüpheciliği ve bu dünyaya odaklı hedonizmi vurgular. Çoğu Hint felsefesinin spiritüalist nitelikte olup Tanrı, ruh, karma, ahiret ve Vedik otorite gibi kavramları kabul etmesine karşın Chārvāka, bunları algılamaz oldukları için geçersiz sayar ve reddeder. Gerçekliğin yalnızca dört algılanabilir maddi unsurdan oluştuğunu savunur: toprak, su, ateş ve hava. Eter (akasha) ise algılanamaz olduğu için bu unsurlar arasında yer almaz (Gokhale, 2015; Bhattacharya, 2011; Sharma, 2000). Bilinç ise maddi unsurların bir araya gelmesinden ortaya çıkan türevi bir özellik olarak görülür; tıpkı mayalanmış maddelerden kaynaklanan sarhoşluk gibi...

Bu okulun epistemolojisi, pratyakṣa'yı (doğrudan duyuşsal algı) bilginin tek veya birincil geçerli aracı (pramāṇa) olarak ön plana çıkarır; deneyimle temellendirilmiş ılımlı biçimlerde çıkarım (anumāna) kabulünü ise sınırlı ölçüde benimser. Etiği, mevcut hayatta haz (kāma) ve refah (artha) arayışına odaklanır. Bu anlayış, ünlü dizede şöyle özetlenir: “Yaşam devam ettiği sürece insan mutlu yaşasın; borca girse bile ghee içsin.” (Bhattacharya, 2011). Chārvāka, rahiplerin sömürsünü, kast hiyerarşisini ve ritüalizmi eleştirerek pragmatik ve insan merkezli bir dünya görüşünü savunur. Bilimsel düşüncenin, ideolojik kutuplaşmanın ve hâlâ dogmalardan etkilenen eğitim sistemlerinin hâkim olduğu bir çağda Chārvāka, eleştirel sorgulamayı ve deneyimsel öğrenmeyi vurgulayan güçlü bir karşı-anlatı sunmaktadır.

#### Amaç

Bu çalışma, Chārvāka felsefesinin temel doktrinlerini incelemeyi, bunların eğitimsel çıkarımlarını türetmeyi ve çağdaş dünyadaki relevansını değerlendirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Özellikle Chārvāka'nın deneycilik, şüphecilik, rasyonel sorgulama ve şimdiki hayata odaklı haz vurgusunun bağımsız düşünmeyi, duyuşsal temelli öğrenmeyi ve dogmatik inançlara karşı direnci teşvik ederek modern eğitimi nasıl şekillendirebileceğini araştırmaktadır. Araştırma ayrıca bu ilkelerin, küreselleşme, çoğulculuk, bilimsel ilerleme ve sosyo-dinî çatışmalarla başa çıkabilecek özgür düşünen

bireyler yetiştirmede nasıl rol oynayabileceğini incelemektedir. Bu çalışma, Chārvāka'nın materyalist ve insan merkezli yaklaşımını eğitim söylemine dâhil ederek öte-dünyasal spekülasyonlar yerine kanıt dayalı akıl yürütmeyi, kişisel tatmini ve toplumsal uyumu ön plana çıkaran bir eğitim sistemini savunmaktadır (Gokhale, 2015; Bhattacharya, 1996). Sonuç olarak, Chārvāka felsefesinin öğrenci merkezli, pragmatik ve bilimsel odaklı pedagoji için güçlü bir felsefi temel olma potansiyelini ortaya koymayı hedeflemektedir.

### Yöntem

Bu çalışma, tümdengelsel (teori odaklı) ve tümevarımsal yöntemleri birleştiren yönlendirilmiş (directed) içerik analizi kullanan nitel kütüphane araştırması yaklaşımını benimsemiştir. Veriler, Google Scholar, JSTOR, Scopus gibi akademik veri tabanları ve üniversite kütüphanelerinde yapılan sistematik aramalar yoluyla elde edilen hakemli makaleler, bilimsel kitaplar ve tarihsel metinlerden derlenmiştir. Anahtar arama terimleri arasında "Chārvāka OR Carvaka OR Lokayata" ile "materyalizm", "epistemoloji", "eğitim" ve "çağdaş önem/relevans" gibi terimler birleştirilmiştir. Yaklaşık 160 kaynak taranmış, dâhil etme kriterleri (hakemli, 1950 sonrası yayınlar, seçici temel referanslar ve ilkelerle substantive bir etkileşim) uygulandıktan sonra Chārvāka üzerine 25 temel metin ve konuyla ilgili 57 metin nihai veri setini oluşturmuştur.

Analiz, yinelemeli bir süreç izlemiştir: metinlerle aşınalaşma, açık kodlama, temalara kategorizasyon (temel ilkeler, eğitimsel çıkarımlar, çağdaş önem), eksenel kodlama ve bütüncül sentez. Güvenilirlik, triangülasyon, denetim izleri ve yansıtıcılık (reflexivity) yoluyla artırılmıştır (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Elo & Kyngäs, 2008). Çalışmanın sınırlılıkları arasında ikincil yorumlara dayalı olması ve Chārvāka düşüncesine dair düşmanca ortodoks özetlerdeki potansiyel önyargılar yer almaktadır.

### Bulgular

Chārvāka'nın ontolojisi, gerçekliği algılanabilir maddeye ve ortaya çıkan (emergent) bilince indirger. Tanrı, ölümsüz ruh, ahiret, karma ve Vedik otoriteyi korku ürünü veya rahiplerin aldatmacası olarak reddeder. Nedensellik teorisi (Svabhāvavāda veya Yadṛcchāvāda), dört maddi unsurun kendi içsel doğalarından kendiliğinden ortaya çıkışı savlar. Bu yaklaşım, doğalcı ve evrimsel fikirlere uyum gösterirken açıklayıcı sıklık eleştirileriyle karşılaşmaktadır. Epistemolojik açıdan algıyı (pratyakṣa) önceliklendirir, deneyimle temellendirilmiş çıkarımları (anumāna) ılımlı bir şekilde kabul ederken, test edilemez tanıklığı (testimony) ve saf tümdengelsel çıkarımları reddeder. "Ruh" geçici ve maddeye bağımlıdır. Haz ise geçiciliğe rağmen pragmatik bir şekilde takip edilmesi gereken summum bonum'dur (en yüksek amaçtır) (Bhattacharya, 2011; Gokhale, 2015; Sharma, 2000).

Eğitimsel çıkarımlar bu ilkelerin yorumlayıcı uzantıdır. Eğitim; fiziksel/zihinsel gelişim, duyuşsal eğitim, bireysel ilgi ve haz dolu, sağlıklı bir hayata hazırlık üzerine odaklanmalıdır. Müfredat önerileri arasında fen bilimleri, beden eğitimi, el sanatları, sanatlar, tarih, gamification (oyunlaştırma) ve mutluluk odaklı etkinlikler (örneğin Delhi Mutluluk Müfredatı'ndan esinlenerek) yer almaktadır. Öğretim yöntemleri "yaparak öğrenme", deney, gözlem, gösteri ve algıyla uyumlu deneysel yaklaşımları vurgular. Öğretmenler özgürlüğü, yaratıcılığı ve eleştirel düşünmeyi teşvik eden facilitator (kolaylaştırıcı) rolü üstlenirken disiplin anlayışı, cezadan kaçınarak ilgi odaklı öz-düzenlemeyi ön plana çıkarır. Bu yaklaşım, yapılandırmacı, pragmatik (Dewey) ve eleştirel pedagojilerle (Freire) uyum gösterir ve baskıcı yapılara karşı bilinçlenme (conscientization) sürecini destekler.

Çağdaş bağlamlarda Chārvāka, dinî aşırılığa, cemaatçiliğe ve geleceği uğruna bugünü feda eden dindarlığa karşı çıkarak şimdiye odaklı, kanıt dayalı bir yaşamı savunur. Bilimsel düşüncüyü, çevresel farkındalığı ve eşitlikçi toplumsal uyumu ("Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam" – Dünya tek bir ailedir) desteklerken materyalizmin etik görecelik risklerini de vurgular.

### Tartışma ve Sonuç

Chārvāka felsefesi, eleştirel düşünmeyi, deneyciliği ve öğrenci özerkliğini dogmatik geleneklere karşı savunarak modern eğitim için güçlü bir çerçeve sunmaktadır. Algılanamaz gerçeklikleri reddetmesi ve duyuşsal deneyime verdiği önem, bilimsel metodoloji ve ilerici pedagojilerle uyum göstermekte, batıl inançları azaltma ve yeniliği teşvik etme potansiyeli

taşımaktadır. Şimdiki zamandaki mutluluğu ve maddi refahı ön plana çıkararak rekabetçi sistemlerdeki stres, ezberci öğrenme ve yabancılaşıma gibi sorunlara çözüm getirmektedir. Freire'nin eleştirel pedagojisiyle kurduğu paralellikler, sosyo-kültürel hiyerarşilere karşı özgürleştirici potansiyelini vurgulamaktadır (Freire, 1970/ 2005).

Ancak, bu felsefe önemli eleştirilerle karşı karşıyadır. Katı deneycilik, soyut kavramlar (örneğin atomlar, ileri düzey matematik) ve evrensel iddialarla başa çıkmakta zorlanmakta ve epistemolojik darlık riski taşımaktadır. Hedonizmi, gökkuşağı ve gün batımı gibi benzetmelerle geçici hazzı savunurken, etik görecilik, kısa vadecilik ve karma veya aşkın değerler olmadığında zayıflayan ahlaki sorumluluk konusunda ciddi endişeler doğurmaktadır. Eleştirmenler, uzun vadeli toplumsal düzeni potansiyel olarak zayıflatabileceğini ve diğer etik çerçevelerle entegrasyon ihtiyacını vurgulamaktadır. Yeniden inşalar sıklıkla düşmanca kaynaklara dayanmakta olup iç çeşitlilik (aşırı deneycilik ile ılımlı deneycilik arasındaki fark) tek biçimli bir uygulamanın önünü tıkamaktadır.

Sonuç olarak, bu sınırlılıklar nedeniyle tek başına bir çerçeve olmasa da Chārvāka, rasyonel, deneyimsel ve insan merkezli eğitimi teşvik eden önemli ve vazgeçilmez bir tamamlayıcı ses olarak hizmet etmektedir. Yansıtıcı, bilimsel okuryazarlığa sahip ve toplumsal olarak sorumlu bireyler yetiştiren, çağdaş karmaşıklıklarla başa çıkma yeteneğine sahip müfredat ve uygulamaları teşvik eder. Gelecekteki araştırmalar bu çıkarımları sınıf ortamında test eden ampirik çalışmalar içermelidir. Algıyı titiz bir şekilde kullanırken doğrulanmış durumlarda çıkarım ve tanıklığı da kabul ederek bir denge kurmak suretiyle eğitim, Chārvāka'nın muhalif ruhunu harekete geçirerek çoğulcu ve küreselleşmiş bir dünyada özerk düşünürler yetiştirebilir. Bu materyalist miras, nihayetinde felsefe ve eğitimin, insan yaşamının burada ve şimdi somut biçimde gelişmesine ve serpilmesine hizmet etmesi gerektiğini vurgulamaktadır.

**Anahtar sözcükler:** Chārvāka felsefesi, Düşünceler, Eğitimsel Çıkarımlar, Uygunluk



**Hakem:** Dış, Bağımsız.

**Teşekkür:**

-

**Beyanname:**

**1. Özgünlük Beyanı:**

Bu çalışma özgündür.

**2. Yazar Katkıları:**

**Düşünce:** RM,SJ; **Kavramsallaştırma:** RM,SJ; **Alan Yazın Taraması:** RM; **Veri Toplama:** RM; **Veri İşleme:** RM; **Çözümleme:** RM; **Yazma – Özgün Taslak:** RM; **Yazma – İnceleme ve Düzenleme:** RM,SJ.

**3. Etik Kurul İzni:**

Etik kurul izni gerekmemektedir.

**4. Destek:**

Bu çalışma, herhangi bir destek almamıştır.

**5. Çıkar Çatışması:**

Yazarlar, herhangi bir çıkar çatışması olmadığını beyan etmektedirler.

**6. Üretken Yapay Zekâ Beyanı:**

Yazarlar, dil düzenleme, çeviri, dilbilgisi ve metin iyileştirme konularında ChatGPT ve Grok'u çok sınırlı ölçüde kullanmışlardır. Yazarlar tüm çıktılarını gözden geçirmiş, düzenlemiş ve doğrulamışlardır ve bu yayının içeriğinden tamamen sorumludurlar.

**7. Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma Amaçları:**

