

A-level  
**RELIGIOUS STUDIES**  
**7062/2A**

Paper 2A Study of Religion and Dialogues: Buddhism

---

Mark scheme

June 2022

---

Version: 1.0 Final



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 Buddhist views about celibacy and marriage.**  
**[10 marks]**

**Target: AO1.3:** Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including causes 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 in Theravada Buddhism the code of discipline for monks requires celibacy but the code of conduct for lay Buddhists does not. For monks, all sexual activity is forbidden. It is seen as feeding desire and attachment which they are working to overcome. Lay Buddhists, however, may marry and have children. For them sex is a normal part of life, but they have to avoid adultery and ensure that they are not harming their partner in any way.

Another reason is that many believe, based on the teaching of the Buddha, that all Buddhist teaching should be tested through experience and not taken as absolute. One should follow the Middle Way between self-indulgence and harmful self-denial, so it is up to each person to decide what is right for them in terms of sexual expression. For some people celibacy could be harmful, for others it may come naturally. Some may need the security of a marriage relationship to achieve any degree of mental peace, others may not.

Buddhist attitudes may be affected by the society in which Buddhism is being practised. For example, Buddhism in a secular western society may accept sex before marriage, and see it as a natural part of growing up for many people, but in another context it may be seen as harmful and wrong. Marriage has a different significance in different countries, so it may be a positive step, giving legal rights and protection to children, but there may be valid alternatives. It may be judged simply according to how harmful or positive it could be.

Maximum Level 2 for answers that only explain the different views.

0 1 . 2

**‘Buddhists 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 concept of ahimsa and its application to issues concerning...the use of weapons of mass destruction; different Buddhist views.

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

The first precept, ahimsa, requires Buddhists to refrain from harming any living thing. This would seem to rule out the use of any weapons of mass destruction (WMD) since they cause negative Karma and suffering to humans, animals and the environment. However, there could be times when a refusal to use such weapons could cause greater suffering. In such a case, their use could be tolerated in order to minimise harm. This would apply first to their use as a deterrent, and then, as a last resort, in combat.

Compassion is a key Buddhist virtue, and it would appear to be incompatible with the use of weapons which can cause suffering to future generations who are not even involved in the conflict. However, governments have a duty to protect society as a whole, and may be faced with an enemy armed with nuclear weapons. In this case, Buddhists might support the possession of nuclear weapons as a deterrent, and be prepared to sanction their use if necessary, as the best way to preserve peace.

The precepts do advocate non-violence, and an ideal society of perfect people would be pacifist, and no-one would harm themselves or others. However, Buddhism recognises that this is not an ideal world and that, in reality, violence is part of life and requires a response. The precepts are taken as guidelines and emphasis is placed on the motive behind the action. For that reason, Buddhists may support the use of WMD if the motive is peacemaking and the destruction regretted.



0 2 . 1

**Examine the significant ideas of Stephen Batchelor and David Brazier about the nature of Buddhism.**

**[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.

### **Stephen Batchelor**

Batchelor's approach rejects all of the aspects of traditional Buddhist teachings that make scientific thinkers sceptical. For example, he denies rebirth, miracles, and the transcendent. This is appealing to those looking for a spiritual community that does not challenge the scientific theories to which they are already committed.

Batchelor claims that he has revealed the true Buddhism by stripping away the various layers of the many different cultures that have built up since the Buddha's death and been labelled Buddhism. This, he claims, enables it to be incorporated into western liberalism since conflicts of culture have been removed.

### **David Brazier**

For David Brazier, Buddhism is a religion. He accepts metaphysical elements of the Buddha's teaching, such as dependent origination, and emphasises the importance of faith. He does not expect Buddhists to compromise with the values and attitudes of their day, but to rise above their context and act for what is right.

David Brazier argues that Buddhism should be socially active and that this is based in the example of Gautama Buddha himself. He argues that individuals should not focus on their own pursuit of enlightenment at the expense of helping others, because the duty of good people is to make society good. Buddhism should be transforming society, not removing itself into solitude in order to practise meditation.

0	2	.	2
---	---	---	---

**‘Gautama Buddha is very important as a role model for Buddhists.’**

**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 Buddha: the significance the life of Gautama Buddha for Theravada Buddhists with reference to his relevance as a role model and his authority as ‘the enlightened one’; the Mahayana view that the life and teaching of Gautama Buddha was ‘skilful means’, with reference to the parable of the burning house in the Lotus Sutra.

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

Theravada Buddhists believe Gautama Buddha was an ordinary man who showed, by example, the way to achieve enlightenment. He can therefore be a role model, and monks follow his example in leaving their families and renouncing possessions, and by adopting his meditation practices. However, lay Buddhists do not follow his example in this way, so it may be of less importance to them. Life has changed so much since Gautama’s time that much of his example may be of limited relevance today, and provide little help for Buddhists facing modern dilemmas.

The example of Gautama, which allows him to be used as a role model, appears in scripture such as the Pali Canon. Some see this as an accurate record of how he achieved enlightenment, and so an illustration of the path to be followed. However, the accuracy of the record is widely challenged because it was compiled from oral tradition long after his death, and scriptures vary greatly between different traditions. Also, Gautama is recorded as saying that each individual should find their own path, which suggests that a single example cannot apply to all.

Theravada Buddhism regards Gautama as unique. He is the human Buddha who is to be followed, which makes his example very important. However, for Mahayana Buddhists he is only one example of Buddha-nature, an example suited to his time and place, and matched by many other examples of different ways in which the goal can be reached. This reduces his importance as a role model. In some forms of Buddhism there is much more emphasis on sharing the merit of heavenly Bodhisattvas rather than on earning good karma for yourself by doing what Gautama did.

0 3 . 1

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

**Critically examine and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Buddhism 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**

### **Buddhism**

Beliefs about life after death may include beliefs about samsara and rebirth, and / or those about Nirvana. Rebirth is seen as a continuing process of change on the cycle of Samsara in which karma may express itself in different forms described in the realms of becoming. The doctrine of anatta (no-self) shows that the person reborn is not the same as the person who dies but there is some continuity between the two states. There is a variant of this belief in Tibetan Buddhism. Nirvana is variously described but may be seen as the release from the cycle of rebirth.

### **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 Buddhism 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, or karmic energy, to be passed on after death, because nothing can be detected using the five senses, fails if the soul / karma 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 philosophical 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 Buddhism 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**

### **Buddhism**

There is a range of Buddhist attitudes to different faiths. These include those found in Edict 12 of Ashoka, such as the ideas that glorifying one's own religion harms that religion, and that one should listen to and respect the doctrines of others. Buddhism is very tolerant of diversity, with most traditions recognising that the Buddhist Way needs to be, and has been, expressed in a way relevant to the cultural and historical context in which it is practised. Nichiren Buddhism, however, teaches that it is the only true tradition.

### **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 Buddhism 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. Buddhist views about right understanding are relevant here.

The view may be supported by those who see all religions / forms of Buddhism as historically and culturally relative expressions of the same underlying awareness or path. '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, a branch of Nichiren Buddhism claims to be the only true religion, and it is very difficult to see some other faiths as expressions of the same underlying reality because of the great differences between them.

Tolerance of other faiths is a characteristic of much Buddhist teaching, such as that found in Ashoka's Edict 12. Some Buddhists believe that possessing and defending 'their' point of view reflects an unhealthy attachment that is an obstacle to enlightenment and that ideas should only be accepted if they are supported by experience, and promote healthy mindedness. However, there are values and practices in other faiths which some Buddhists find intolerable. These vary but include, for example, the use of drugs and animal sacrifice. 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 Buddhist ethics.’**

**Critically examine and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Buddhism 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**

### **Buddhism**

Buddhist ethics may be unpacked in terms of the five precepts and the six perfections, including reference to the principle of ahimsa and to intention. There may be reference to the importance of the consequences of the action, both for the individual carrying it out and more widely.

### **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 Buddhism and Bentham's way of making moral decisions.

**AO2**

There are likely to be many issues on which both Bentham and Buddhism would reach the same conclusions, because the pursuit of the greatest good / happiness of the greatest number is consistent with the Buddhist emphasis on compassion. However, Bentham's system potentially justifies any action as long as it contributes to that goal while the precepts and perfections of Buddhism do appear to some to be 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.

Bentham's goal of the greatest happiness for the greatest number would appear to be consistent with the Buddhist emphasis on ahimsa and the ending of Dukkha. However, for Bentham all pleasures are equal while for Buddhism true happiness is the end of all desires, not the fulfilling of them in this life, which appears to be Bentham's priority. The focus of Buddhism could be seen as the mental adjustment needed to cope with suffering rather than practical steps to end it.

Both Bentham and Buddhism 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 Buddhism 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 Buddhist beliefs about lying.’**

**Critically examine and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Buddhism 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**

### **Buddhism**

The five precepts commit Buddhists to follow the rule of training to 'refrain from falsehood / false speech' so lying would appear to be forbidden. Lying maintains illusion for the person lied to, where Buddhism aims at overcoming illusion. The motive for lying may also be self-interest. There may be tension between compassion and keeping strictly to this rule. This may be considered on a case by case basis, and Buddhists may have different views on what, if anything, could justify lying.

### **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 Buddhism and Kant's way of making moral decisions.

**AO2**

At first sight, both Buddhism and Kant's system forbid lying as evidenced by the five precepts 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 consequence would be the death of an innocent person, because that rule had to be universalised. However, Buddhism does not treat the 'no falsehood' rule as a law but as a guide to training. This means that compassion may require that the truth is not told if innocent lives are at stake.

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 Buddhists between compassion and the 'rules' of the five precepts. 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 Buddhism 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 Buddhist thinking which prioritises compassion over blind obedience to a law. Also the imperative 'do not lie' is not the same as 'tell the truth'. It is possible to give 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 Buddhists. However, Kant explicitly rejected the consideration of the consequences of lying as an argument in its favour.