



---

# A-level RELIGIOUS STUDIES 7062/2C

Paper 2C Study of Religion and Dialogues: Hinduism

---

Mark scheme

June 2022

---

Version: 1.0 Final



2 2 6 A 7 0 6 2 / 2 C / M S

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

#### **Copyright information**

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2022 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

## Methods of Marking

It is essential that, in fairness to students, all examiners use the same methods of marking. The advice given here may seem very obvious, but it is important that all examiners follow it as exactly as possible.

1. If you have any doubts about the mark to award, consult your Team Leader.
2. Refer constantly to the mark scheme throughout marking. It is extremely important that it is strictly adhered to.
3. Remember, you must **always** credit **accurate, relevant and appropriate** answers which are not given in the mark scheme.
4. Do **not** credit material that is irrelevant to the question or to the stated target, however impressive that material might be.
5. If a one-word answer is required and a list is given, take the first answer (unless this has been crossed out).
6. If you are wavering as to whether or not to award a mark, the criterion should be, 'Is the student nearer those who have given a correct answer or those who have little idea?'
7. Read the information on the following page about using Levels of Response mark schemes.
8. Be prepared to award the full range of marks. Do not hesitate to give full marks when the answer merits full marks or to give no marks where there is nothing creditable in an answer.
9. No half marks or bonus marks are to be used under any circumstances.
10. Remember, the key to good and fair marking is **consistency**. Do **not** change the standard of your marking once you have started.

## Levels of Response Marking

In A-level Religious Studies, differentiation is largely achieved by outcome on the basis of students' responses. To facilitate this, levels of response marking has been devised for many questions.

Levels of response marking requires a quite different approach from the examiner than the traditional 'point for point' marking. It is essential that the **whole response is read** and then **allocated to the level** it best fits.

If a student demonstrates knowledge, understanding and/or evaluation at a certain level, he/she must be credited at that level. **Length** of response or **literary ability** should **not be confused with genuine religious studies skills**. For example, a short answer which shows a high level of conceptual ability must be credited at that level. (If there is a band of marks allocated to a level, discrimination should be made with reference to the development of the answer.)

Levels are tied to specific skills. Examiners should **refer to the stated assessment target** objective of a question (see mark scheme) when there is any doubt as to the relevance of a student's response.

Levels of response mark schemes include either **examples** of possible students' responses or **material** which they might use. These are intended as a **guide** only. It is anticipated that students will produce a wide range of responses to each question.

It is a feature of levels of response mark schemes that examiners are prepared to reward fully, responses which are obviously valid and of high ability but do not conform exactly to the requirements of a particular level. This should only be necessary occasionally and where this occurs examiners must indicate, by a brief written explanation, why their assessment does not conform to the levels of response laid down in the mark scheme. Such scripts should be referred to the Lead Examiner.

## Assessment of Quality of Written Communication

Quality of written communication will be assessed in all components and in relation to all assessment objectives. Where students are required to produce extended written material in English, they will be assessed on the quality of written communication. The quality of written communication skills of the student will be one of the factors influencing the actual mark awarded within the level of response. In reading an extended response, the examiner will therefore consider if it is cogently and coherently written, ie decide whether the answer:

- presents relevant information in a form that suits its purposes
- is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate, so that meaning is clear
- is suitably structured and that the style of writing is appropriate.

<b>Levels of Response: 10 marks A-Level – AO1</b>	
<b>Level 5 9–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and critical understanding is accurate, relevant and fully developed in breadth and depth with very good use of detailed and relevant evidence which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate</li> <li>• Where appropriate, good knowledge and understanding of the diversity of views and/or scholarly opinion is demonstrated</li> <li>• Clear and coherent presentation of ideas with precise use of the appropriate subject vocabulary</li> </ul>
<b>Level 4 7–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and critical understanding is accurate and mostly relevant with good development in breadth and depth shown through good use of relevant evidence which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate</li> <li>• Where appropriate, alternative views and/or scholarly opinion are explained</li> <li>• Mostly clear and coherent presentation of ideas with good use of the appropriate subject vocabulary</li> </ul>
<b>Level 3 5–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and critical understanding is generally accurate and relevant with development in breadth and/or depth shown through some use of evidence and/or examples which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate</li> <li>• Where appropriate, there is some familiarity with the diversity of views and/or scholarly opinion</li> <li>• Some organisation of ideas and coherence with reasonable use of the appropriate subject vocabulary</li> </ul>
<b>Level 2 3–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and critical understanding is limited, with limited development in breadth and/or depth shown through limited use of evidence and/or examples which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate</li> <li>• Where appropriate, limited reference may be made to alternative views and/or scholarly opinion</li> <li>• Limited organisation of ideas and coherence and use of subject vocabulary</li> </ul>
<b>Level 1 1–2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and critical understanding is basic with little or no development</li> <li>• There may be a basic awareness of alternative views and/or scholarly opinion</li> <li>• Isolated elements of accurate and relevant information and basic use of appropriate subject vocabulary</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No accurate or relevant material to credit</li> </ul>

<b>Levels of Response: 15 marks A-Level – AO2</b>	
<b>Level 5 13–15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A very well-focused response to the issue(s) raised</li> <li>• Perceptive discussion of different views, including, where appropriate, those of scholars or schools of thought with critical analysis</li> <li>• There is an appropriate evaluation fully supported by the reasoning</li> <li>• Precise use of the appropriate subject vocabulary</li> </ul>
<b>Level 4 10–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A well-focused response to the issue(s) raised</li> <li>• Different views are discussed, including, where appropriate, those of scholars or schools of thought, with some critical analysis</li> <li>• There is an appropriate evaluation supported by the reasoning</li> <li>• Good use of the appropriate subject vocabulary</li> </ul>
<b>Level 3 7–9</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A general response to the issue(s) raised</li> <li>• Different views are discussed, including, where appropriate, those of scholars or schools of thought</li> <li>• An evaluation is made that is consistent with some of the reasoning</li> <li>• Reasonable use of the appropriate subject vocabulary</li> </ul>
<b>Level 2 4–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited response to the issue(s) raised</li> <li>• Presentation of a point of view relevant to the issue with some supporting evidence and argument</li> <li>• Limited attempt at the appropriate use of subject vocabulary</li> </ul>
<b>Level 1 1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A basic response to the issue(s) raised</li> <li>• A point of view is stated, with some evidence or reason(s) in support</li> <li>• Some attempt at the appropriate use of subject vocabulary</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No accurate or relevant material to credit</li> </ul>

0 1 . 1

**Examine why there are different Hindu views about celibacy and marriage.**

**[10 marks]**

**Target: AO1.3** Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note: 'celibacy and marriage' may be treated as a single idea.

One reason for the difference is that different sources of wisdom and authority lead Hindus to have different views about the issues of celibacy and marriage. Some Hindus may study scripture, for example, the Manusmṛti promotes the celibate lifestyle, suggesting it is a virtuous behaviour. Other Hindus may consult contemporary gurus or follow the example of influential Hindu figures. For example, ISKCON's Swami Prabhupada favoured marriage for devotees. Hindus may also consult their own personal conscience.

A Hindu's stage of life, ashramadharma, may lead to different views regarding celibacy and marriage due to the emphasis placed on each during a Hindu's life-course. For example, celibacy may be encouraged during the student stage of life, as this will allow the Hindu to focus on their guru and acquire knowledge of religious scripture and religious ritual. At the householder stage, marriage may be encouraged and celibacy discouraged. This is to allow the couple to have children, in fulfilment of their dharma.

The increasing westernisation of traditional Hindu societies, and the migration of Hindus to multicultural societies, may lead to different views regarding celibacy and marriage. This is because Hindus may encounter varying attitudes towards the two ideas that may encourage or discourage their practice. For example, the growing divorce rates in the west may lead Hindus to see marriage as unimportant, and not a lifelong commitment. Furthermore, with the growing sexualisation of society, celibacy may no longer be favoured or valued.

Maximum Level 2 for answers that only explain different views.

0 1 . 2

**‘Hindus cannot justify the use of weapons of mass destruction.’**

**Evaluate this claim.**

**[15 marks]**

**Target: AO2:** Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: Ahimsa: the virtue of ahimsa, its application to issues concerning...the use of weapons of mass destruction; different Hindu views...including Gandhi’s views on non-violence.

Answers may present, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments:

Sanatana dharma is underpinned by the value of ahimsa (non-harm). Therefore, due to following their eternal law / religion / duty some Hindus cannot justify using weapons of mass destruction (WMD). This is because the impact of these weapons results in too much harm and suffering, often in the form of collateral damage. However, some Hindus may justify the use of WMD in some circumstances, because it will bring a definitive end to a conflict. This could reduce the prolonged harm and suffering involved with war.

Following the teachings of Gandhi may leave some Hindus unable to justify the use of WMD. This is because Gandhi advocated non-violence. Instead, he favoured and encouraged peaceful methods of conflict resolution, such as non-cooperation and peaceful protests. However, some Hindus may say non-violent action is ineffective and does not lead to long-term solutions; it is only with a show of power, for example, the use of WMD, that the desired outcome can be achieved.

There is no universal agreement regarding the authority and role of scripture, so some Hindus may reject the teachings which appear to legitimise the use of WMD. They may argue that ancient writers could not have accurately referred to WMD or foreseen their destructive power. However, for other Hindus, these texts are accepted sources of authority, and are used as guides to moral decision-making. Some texts are believed to exemplify the use of WMD, therefore their use is accepted and authorised today.

0 2 . 1

**Examine the significant ideas of Ram Mohan Roy and Dayananda Saraswati about the nature of Hinduism.**

**[10 marks]**

**Target: AO1.1:** Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including religious, philosophical and ethical thought and teaching.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

### **Ram Mohan Roy**

Roy saw Hinduism as a universal, pluralistic and global religion.

He founded the Brahmo Samaj, which attempted to reform the nature of Hinduism. Influenced by encounters with Christianity and Islam, Roy attempted to promote an Upanishadic and strictly monotheistic concept of God. For Roy, God was to be understood as the Absolute. By undertaking this reformation, Roy hoped to move Hinduism beyond murti worship into a tradition founded upon reason, not experience.

Roy hoped his reformation would change the nature of Hinduism's religious practices, and to have a more socially engaged nature. He encouraged Hinduism to be more critical of wider Indian society, helping to enact social change. Roy wanted to rid Hinduism of practices such as child marriage and sati because he considered them to be immoral and damaging to Indian society.

### **Dayananda Saraswati**

Saraswati founded the Arya Samaj as an attempt to revitalise Hinduism. For Saraswati, the nature of Hinduism should be Vedic. His movement attempted a restoration of the lost Vedic traditions and the removal of non-Vedic elements. This meant that practices such as murti worship, a belief in avatars and pilgrimage were to be rejected because they were not found in the four Vedas. In his view, they had led to an impure form of Hinduism.

Saraswati wanted Hinduism to become a political force against the growing influence of Christianity and Islam. Therefore, Hinduism's nature should not be one of acceptance and pluralism. It should reject other religious traditions in favour of a Vedic Hindu tradition. Saraswati's concept of Hinduism has been instrumental in the growth of contemporary Hindu nationalism.

0 2 . 2

**‘The smrti (remembered) texts are very important for Hindus.’**

**Evaluate this claim.**

**[15 marks]**

**Target: AO2:** Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: The smrti texts: the status of the smrti (remembered) texts; the importance of the following: the Ramayana; the Bhagavad Gita and the Manusmrti.

Answers may present, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments:

For many Hindus, narrative form of the smrtis make them very important. As many smrti texts recount stories of gods and goddesses, many Hindus find they help them understand the nature and role of the divine. However, some Hindus reject the personal and avataric depiction of God found in these texts, instead preferring the representation of God as an impersonal force found in shruti texts such as the Upanishads, making smrti texts unimportant.

For some Hindus, smrti texts have the highest authority due to their teachings, making them very important. This means that for some Hindus and Hindu traditions, smrti texts such as the Bhagavad Gita contain everything they want and need to know about Hinduism. However, other Hindus challenge the authority of smrti texts, as their origins lack divine authority. These Hindus may prefer to consult shruti texts for religious principles and / or ethical guidance, making smrti texts unimportant in their practice of Hinduism.

Smrti texts are important due to their accessibility. Due to the text’s style, genre and availability in vernacular languages, smrti texts allow everybody access to the sacred wisdom of Hinduism. Furthermore, some may argue they have been instrumental in the growth and development of Hinduism around the world. However, other Hindus may promote the supremacy of the Vedas, suggesting everything a Hindu needs to know is contained within this shruti revelation.

0 3 . 1

**‘Philosophical arguments are irrelevant to Hindu beliefs about life after death.’**

**Critically examine and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Hinduism and philosophy.**

**[25 marks]**

**Target: AO1.4:** Knowledge and understanding of approaches to the study of religion and belief. (10 marks)

**Target: AO2:** Analyse and evaluate aspects and approaches to religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study. (15 marks)

Material related to AO1 and AO2 may be presented discretely or holistically within the answer. Markers must read the whole of the response before either mark is awarded.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

## **AO1**

### **Hinduism**

Life after death may be understood in terms of samsara and / or moksha. Beliefs about samsara centre on reincarnation and the realms of reincarnation. There are differing understandings of moksha based on different views about the relationship between atman and Brahman.

### **Philosophy**

There are different views about the nature of the soul and the body / soul relationship, including Descartes' argument for the existence of the soul. The possibility of continuing personal existence after death is broadly discussed.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not include both Hinduism and philosophy.

**AO2**

Philosophical arguments may be considered irrelevant if they fail to prove their case. For example, the argument that there is no soul / atman to be passed on after death, because no soul / atman can be detected using the five senses, fails if the soul / atman is not regarded as something that can be sensed in this way. However, there are philosophical arguments in favour of life after death, or which at least show it to be a coherent possibility. There may be reference to Hick's idea of eschatological verification and to his replica theory here. Religion may consider philosophy relevant when it works in its favour.

Religious belief can be seen as a perspective, not itself based on evidence or reason, from which all evidence is viewed and all experiences interpreted. This likens belief to a 'Blik'. If belief is not based on reason it may be considered immune to rational argument. However, not all believers accept this understanding of faith and regard their position as reasonable and as supported by evidence. This means that philosophical challenges to the way the evidence has been interpreted are entirely relevant.

Philosophical arguments may be considered irrelevant to religious beliefs if religious claims are understood non-cognitively and / or as part of a religious language game in which those within the game can converse between themselves but have no significance for those outside the game. However, many see religion as making truth claims, such as 'there is a heavenly realm', which can be challenged by philosophy, and the analysis of religious language as non-cognitive may be seen as a philosophical argument.

0 4 . 1

**‘The beliefs of all religions are equally valid.’**

**Critically examine and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Hinduism and philosophy.**

**[25 marks]**

**Target: AO1.4:** Knowledge and understanding of approaches to the study of religion and belief. (10 marks)

**Target: AO2:** Analyse and evaluate aspects and approaches to religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study. (15 marks)

Material related to AO1 and AO2 may be presented discretely or holistically within the answer. Markers must read the whole of the response before either mark is awarded.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

## **AO1**

### **Hinduism**

Some Hindus see all faiths and all traditions within Hinduism as partial expressions of Vedanta, and there is a tolerance of a very wide range of beliefs. In some of its forms, Hindutva distinguishes between religions such as Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism on the one hand, and those such as Islam and Christianity on the other, regarding only the first group as part of Indian, or Hindu, national identity.

### **Philosophy**

This can be approached in a variety of ways. For example, philosophy may challenge the validity of all faiths. It may also point out that arguments used by one faith to support, or attack, belief in miracles or religious experiences must be applied to the claims of all faiths in relation to these topics. Mystical experiences may be seen as the common core of all faiths. Similarly, arguments for God's existence relate to God in general, rather than God as specifically understood by Christians, Muslims or Jews, or to Brahman or the Trikaya.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not include both Hinduism and philosophy.

## **AO2**

All arguments from philosophy in favour of, or against, a religious belief are common to all faiths where the belief is present, for example, beliefs about miracles, religious experiences and life after death. An argument supporting the possibility of personal existence beyond death, for example, supports all those religions that include that belief and arguments against the existence of a metaphysical dimension to life challenge all faiths that believe that such a dimension exists. This suggests that philosophy finds all faiths equally valid / invalid. However, many of the beliefs are contradictory, which seems to show that they cannot all be valid, and certainly some followers of individual religions claim that they alone know the truth.

The view may be supported by those who see all religions / forms of Hinduism as historically and culturally relative expressions of the same underlying awareness or path, or partial expressions of Vedanta. 'Conventional truths' on this view are merely different ways of talking about ultimate reality, which enables individuals to deepen their understanding of it, but the one reality lies beyond these. However, it is very difficult to see some other faiths as expressions of the same underlying reality because of the great differences between them, and some clearly do see their own 'Way' as the only true path.

Tolerance of other faiths and of diversity within Hinduism is a characteristic of much Hindu teaching. However, there are values and practices in other faiths which some Hindus find intolerable. These vary, but include eating beef. There are also divisions on ethical issues such as abortion. Beliefs that operate in the personal realm but are not expressed in practice may be accepted as 'valid' while acting on them is not.

0 5 . 1

**‘Bentham’s way of making moral decisions is compatible with Hindu ethics.’**

**Critically examine and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Hinduism and ethical studies.**

**[25 marks]**

**Target: AO1.4:** Knowledge and understanding of approaches to the study of religion and belief. (10 marks)

**Target: AO2:** Analyse and evaluate aspects and approaches to religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study. (15 marks)

Material related to AO1 and AO2 may be presented discretely or holistically within the answer. Markers must read the whole of the response before either mark is awarded.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

## **AO1**

### **Hinduism**

Hindu ethics may be unpacked with reference to Varnashrama dharma and Sanatana dharma and the principle of ahimsa and its application. There may be reference to the importance of the consequences of actions, both for those who carry them out and more widely, and to the relative importance of consequences and intentions.

### **Ethics**

Bentham's key ideas may be identified as: how consequences of pain or pleasure determine whether an action is right or wrong; the goal of the greatest happiness of the greatest number, the hedonic calculus and the equality of pleasures. Bentham's approach may be identified as act utilitarianism, meaning that each situation is judged on its own merits rather than any moral rules or laws applied.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not include both Hinduism and Bentham's way of making moral decisions.

**AO2**

There are likely to be many issues on which both Bentham and Hinduism would reach the same conclusions, because the pursuit of the greatest good / happiness of the greatest number is consistent with the Hindu emphasis on compassion. However, Bentham's system potentially justifies any action as long as it contributes to that goal, while Hindu ethics do appear to include rules which prohibit certain actions completely, regardless of their consequences. For example, ahimsa would seem to rule out causing pain to a minority even if it increased the pleasure of the majority. Animal welfare would also seem to be a priority in Hinduism, but only justified as a means to an end in Bentham's view.

Bentham's goal of the greatest happiness for the greatest number would appear to be consistent with the Hindu emphasis on ahimsa. However, for Bentham all pleasures are equal while for Hinduism true happiness is moksha, the end of reincarnation, not the fulfilling of desires in this life, which appears to be Bentham's priority.

Both Bentham and Hinduism pay great attention to the consequences of actions, making experience the arbiter of whether the action is 'right' or 'wrong', and requiring those consequences to be considered before the action is carried out. However, for Hinduism the intention behind the action is important, while in Bentham's view it is not, since it has no effect on the outcome of the action.

0 6 . 1

**‘Kant’s way of moral decision making supports Hindu beliefs about lying.’**

**Critically examine and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Hinduism and ethical studies.**

**[25 marks]**

**Target: AO1.4:** Knowledge and understanding of approaches to the study of religion and belief. (10 marks)

**Target: AO2:** Analyse and evaluate aspects and approaches to religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study. (15 marks)

Material related to AO1 and AO2 may be presented discretely or holistically within the answer. Markers must read the whole of the response before either mark is awarded.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

## **AO1**

### **Hinduism**

There is a range of views about lying in Hinduism. Generally truth-telling is the rule and truthfulness a virtue, however it is also recognised that the consequences of lying can justify it. Lying to save a life or self-protection, can be justified. The intention behind the action determines whether the lie can be justified.

### **Ethics**

Kant may be understood to see truth telling as a duty that has to be universalised and one treats all people as ends in themselves rather than means to a secondary end. For example, the individual cannot be treated as a means to increase overall happiness of those around them. There may be reference to the 'mad axe murderer' dilemma or similar and Kant's response that even in this situation, lying cannot be justified. Some may argue that Kant's maxims can be contextualised – meaning that the moral duty depends on the circumstances.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not include both Hinduism and Kant's way of making moral decisions.

## AO2

At first sight, both Hinduism and Kant's system forbid lying as evidenced by the virtue of truthfulness in the dharma and the debate, for example, about telling the murderer where his victim may be found. Kant defended the imperative 'do not lie' even when the consequences would be the death of an innocent person because that rule had to be universalised. However, some Hindu teaching allows exceptions to the rule and permits, for example, lying in order to save a life or to protect wealth from thieves.

Any situation in which lying would save the life of an innocent person would seem to involve a conflict of duties for those using Kant's way of making moral decisions, for example between 'do not be responsible for the death of an innocent person' and 'do not lie'. This is a dilemma comparable to the one faced by Hindus between compassion and the rule of truthfulness. However lying to the murderer would be treating him as a means to an end (protecting lives) rather than an end in himself, so many of those using Kant's system would reject this outright. In Hinduism the intention to deceive for a good purpose may be considered less serious.

If Kant's system allows for the maxim to be formulated in response to a specific situation, then the universalised rule about lying could allow exceptions, such as 'tell the truth unless lives depend on it'. This would bring it more into line with Hindu thinking that prioritises compassion over blind obedience to a law. Also the imperative 'do not lie' is not the same as 'tell the truth' and the option is open of giving a response which does not lead to the death of innocents but does not involve lying, for example 'I will not tell you', and such a response might satisfy both Kantians and Hindus. However, Kant explicitly rejected the consideration of the consequences of lying as an argument in its favour.