

Candidate Marks Report

Series : 6 2018

This candidate's script has been assessed using On-Screen Marking. The marks are therefore not shown on the script itself, but are summarised in the table below.

Centre No :	Assessment Code :	H573
Candidate No :	Component Code :	07
Candidate Name :		

Total Marks :

In the table below 'Total Mark' records the mark scored by this candidate.
'Max Mark' records the Maximum Mark available for the question.

Question Part

1.	<p>Hinduism is the third largest religion in the world after Christianity and Islam, although the majority are located in India and Nepal. Whilst Hinduism is not as popular in the west as other religions, it certainly can be practised outside of India as can be shown by the existence of ISKCON (International Society for Krishna Consciousness) and other new religious movements such as the Brahma Kumaris.</p> <p>Also that India is not the only country to have a majority Hindu population, Nepal does also and other countries such as Fiji have significant Hindu populations, showing how it is certainly possible to practice Hinduism outside India.</p>
	<p>It could be argued that it is indeed possible to practice Hinduism outside of India as there are significant populations of Hindus who have either moved from India or converted to the religion. After Christianity, Islam and Islam, Hinduism is the largest religion in the UK and also the location of hundreds of temples or places such as Leicester and London showing how it is possible to practice Hinduism outside of India. Hindus believe that all 5 religions lead back to Brahman and are all ways of discovering the truth which would suggest that there is no reason why anyone would not be able to practice Hinduism outside of India. The movement of important holy people from India to spread their message in</p>



Question Part

The west also romanticizes this. Vivekananda introduced Hinduism to the west at the 1893 Chicago Conference of World Religions, which has, according to Klostermaier, led to the common misconception that the "west is materialistic, whilst the east is spiritual". He went on to found the Ramakrishna Mission which set out to spread the message and enable people to attain spiritual fulfillment.

Other important people within Hinduism such as Gandhi and Swami Bhaktivedanta (founder of ISKCON) travelled to the west in order to spread the message of Hinduism, something that would not have been done had they not believed that Hinduism was a viable option outside of India. Gandhi himself ~~was~~ ^{often} travelled around England to explain certain aspects of Hinduism or his beliefs - for example his trip to workers in Lancashire where he explained ahimsa (non-violence) and that his policy of only using Indian spun-silk was in order to make India self-sufficient from the British government not out of any personal malice towards the workers, who may have lost their jobs over the issue. Both Gandhi and Ambedkar (writer of the Indian constitution) completed their studies in the UK, which would indicate that Hinduism can be practiced outside India as they would not have given up on their beliefs just because they



Question Part

were not physically located in India at the time. Some people may argue that ~~India~~ Hinduism cannot be practiced outside India as the proximity to nearby temples can often be much further than within India, although I would argue that this criticism does not stand up as many people have shrines located in their homes dedicated to their personal deities (Ishtwara) and so do not need to visit a temple as regularly as one would go to church as they can circumambulate (walk around (clockwise)) their deity and complete puja from the home. Hinduism can often be adapted for practicing outside of India, Flood created the 'Pizza theory' which states that like Pizza originated in Italy, Hinduism originated in India, was popularised around the world, adopted by people who chose the most appealing sections (e.g. a colorful pantheon or yoga) and then ~~it~~ these changes reached back to India where Western influence began to have an influence upon Hinduism. I would broadly agree with Flood as it can be seen that certain parts of Hinduism are more well known outside of India, such as Yoga, Mohaha, Karma than others such as Vedanta or the Atman and cycle of Samsara. Finally, I would argue that it is certainly possible to practice Hinduism outside of India as Nepal, the only country where a majority of the



Question Part

Populations are Shaivites (follow Shiva) rather than Vaishnavites (followers of Vishnu), and until 2006 the only Hindu Rashtra (nation) on earth (as they had a Hindu (Kshatriya - warrior) king which shows that although Nepal may only be on the border with India, Hinduism is still practiced outside the country and it is indeed possible to do so, India is certainly NOT the only place Hinduism can be practiced.

On the other hand, some people would argue that India is the only place Hinduism can be practiced, nationalist groups such as the RSS as well as political parties such as the BJP follow the doctrine of Hindutva (Hindu-ness) proclaimed by Savarkar. They see India as the homeland of the Hindus (similar to Israel for the Jews) and call India "Mother India". This, combined with the fact that the holy works - Shanti literature - such as the Vedas rely heavily on landscape, suggests that Hinduism can only be practiced within India as the religion is too connected to the land and overall setting. Each individual village has its own deity to protect it, something not found in other places and certain aspects of Hindu doctrine simply do not translate for use outside of India - for instance the Varna (caste)



Question Part

and job (job) system cannot easily be implemented outside of India as if people convert it would be incredibly hard to work out their caste and caste distinctions simply do not apply outside of India. Other common practices like Vajira (sacrifices) and cremation cannot often be performed outside of India as there are many laws and regulations that would (especially in the UK) forbid this. Another way in which Hinduism is not able to be practiced outside of India is that it was often seen as unclean for a Brahmin (priest) to travel across bodies of water as they would become polluted and lose their purity which could explain why Hinduism has successfully moved to Nepal (bordering) but is (e) popular in the west. It is the highest caste and priests who are supposed to carry out sacred ceremonies (such as the sacred thread to high-born caste members as they grow up) then it makes it extremely hard to truly follow the Vedas and attain Moksha if the path, e.g. Jnana - knowledge or bhakti - devotion only really work within India.

To conclude, I would argue that, as shown by the existence of vibrant Hindu communities in the USA, UK and Nepal Hinduism can be practiced outside of India but it sometimes needs certain



Question Part

		adaptations from original 'vanilla' Hinduism - although as such a wide and diverse reception forces adopting this is certainly possible.
2		<p>Building good karma is one of the key ways in which a person can achieve liberation (ie. Moksha), an escape from the cycle of Samsara (rebirth).</p> <p>Although building good karma (punya) is better than going against karma and producing bad fruit (punya), and is one of the ways to liberation, it is certainly not the only way a person can achieve liberation and, perhaps more importantly, building good karma does not always help a person achieve liberation as argued by Madhvacharya in his Dvaitavedanta.</p> <p>Some people would argue that building good karma helps a person to achieve liberation as it is clearly mentioned in the vedic texts as one of the ways one can escape the cycle of Samsara. In order to build up good karma (Kriyamani Karma - good works in this life), one needs to follow their dharma (duty) as well as their varnashramadharmas (duty based upon your varna (caste) and ashrama (life stage - e.g. grihastha - householder) as well as your sadhana dharma (everyone's duty). This is clearly mentioned in scripture when in the Bhagavad Gita, Krishna tells Arjuna that it is better</p>



Question Part

to do your duty (dharma) badly than ~~someone~~ someone else's well. Karma builds up and is stored in an ethereal 'bank' of karma (Sancita Karma) which will ~~be~~ ~~to~~ and ~~with~~ the cycle of Samsara (reincarnation and rebirth) will continue until your Karma has worked itself out. If the net karma from your life is good then you will move up the chain (either higher caste or becoming a god until your karma has worked itself out) or if your net karma is bad then you will be reborn as what is deemed a lower life form. This shows that ~~Karma's~~ building good karma is quite clearly a way of helping a person & achieve liberation.

Whilst it has clearly been seen that for some people, building good karma helps a person achieve liberation - this is not true for all, especially Sudras and Dalits. Karma is also by no means the only or ever preferred way to achieve liberation. ~~Karma~~ Building good karma ~~does not~~ only helps a person achieve liberation if they happen to be a twice-born (Vaishya, Kshatriya or Brahmin), for the lowest servant ~~or~~ (Sudras) or the untouchables (Dalits - entirely outside the caste system), karma does not help them achieve liberation and so they must seek other methods of attaining Moksha, if they wish to do it in their current life, rather than



Question Part

await the time their karmic balance is in a good enough position to enable them to do so. Madhvacarya, the founder of Dvaita Vedanta (believes that the Atman and Brahman are completely distinct) believed that not everyone will ever escape the cycle of Samsara, a belief having similarities with Calvin's view of predestination — not everyone will reach Heaven, Madhvacarya believes that not everyone will reach Moksha. This would suggest that there is very little point in some people building good karma as the person will never achieve liberation — I believe that this view is not particularly helpful as it is impossible to realise whether you personally will be able to obtain Moksha and Hindu scripture makes it clear that that is the end goal for all — Sannyasin (renounce) is one of the accepted Ashramas (life stages) ~~open to~~ (but not necessarily achieved) by all. People who are either Sudras and Dalits and so have no hope of achieving liberation through good karma must find other methods of doing so. Shankara, the founder of Advaita Vedanta (the Atman and Brahman are the same) personally believes that Bhakti (or devotion) is the best path to achieving liberation (Moksha). This, again, has scriptural basis and can be traced back to Bhagavad Gita 18:66 which states that all should put their trust in Brahman and that liberation will come to all. This has been



Question Part

		<p> interpreted by some scholars, such as Kabir, to mean that those who are twice-born should follow the karma (action) or jñana (knowledge) path whilst those who are unable to shall rely on Bhakti (devotion) to achieve anugraha (god's grace). </p> <p> Relating to the path of Bhakti (devotion) as a way of achieving liberation it is much more inclusive than karma and can be attempted by anyone wishing to reach Moksha. There are two schools of thought surrounding Bhakti; the 'cat' school and 'monkey' school. These are two different ways posited as a means of reaching Moksha. </p> <p> The 'cat' school states that we should act similar to a parent kitten and its mother in the sense that the kitten does not do anything and is simply licked up by the cat (Brahman) suggesting that we need do nothing for Brahman to help us. </p> <p> Whereas, on the contrary, the 'Monkey' school of thought suggests that we should act like a monkey and its child where it is the child doing all the work and holding on to its mother rather than the other way around - suggesting that, although Brahman may allow us to reach Moksha through Bhakti, we need to do something to get it. I would argue that achieving Moksha through Bhakti is more useful as the karma simply does not work for everyone - the final way in which someone can achieve liberation which shows that good karma </p>
--	--	--



Question Part

is not the only way to achieve liberation and is in fact not that useful to everyone is the path of jñāna (knowledge). That is, realising that Brahman "as small as a grain of rice" is in everything and that (in Sankara's view) the world is māyā (illusion) or in Ramana's view (Vishishtadvaita - qualified non-dualism) the world is Brahman's body. Sankara believes that the only reason we are stuck in the cycle of Samsara is because of our Avidya (ignorance) and that once we realise this we shall be freed. Jñāna can be shown to be a viable route as it is highly regarded for one to have used the jñāna path in order to become a jīvanmukhi (someone who has achieved Moksha in this world) and this can only be completed through the realisation brought about by jñāna.

In conclusion, I would argue that building good Karma does indeed lead to liberation and is one of the most popular and useful ways to bring about Moksha. However it is simply a too broad view to claim that good karma is the only thing that leads to liberation and it is also simply not accessible to all, ie those who may not know their dharmas and duties of Śūdra (not twice born). Karma is a way of achieving liberation but it is certainly not the only nor



Question Part

		The best way that would apply to all
4.		Hinduism is a very diverse religion containing many (sampradayas) sects. ^{for example} I argue that Hinduism is a "common abbreviation" of a group of religious traditions. I would argue that Hinduism would be better described as a single religion as it all shares a common nucleus — however there is a severe disparity between the beliefs of Sankara and D Madhva relating to Purva Mimamsa as well as the core theistic traditions of Vaishnavism, Shaivism and Shaktism.
		It could be argued that different forms of Hinduism would be better described as separate religions due to the fact that there is such a wide range of beliefs that traditionally fall within the purview of Hinduism. Originally, the term Hindu was coined by the Persians to refer to those that lived beyond the Indus River and the designation had no religious connotation. Over time, especially with the arrival of the British in the 1800s and who added the 'ism' and turned the cacophony of beliefs held by most Indians into one clear religion. Perhaps unaware of how much difference they were effectively shoe-horning into one designation. This would suggest that Hinduism would be better described



Candidate forename	Daniel	Candidate surname	Baker
--------------------	--------	-------------------	-------

Centre number	2	6	3	2	4
---------------	---	---	---	---	---

Candidate number	1	1	2	1
------------------	---	---	---	---

Unit code	H	5	7	3	/	0	7
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Write here how many booklets you have used in total.	2
--	---

4 PAGE CONTINUATION BOOKLET

Write the information required clearly in the boxes above using capital letters.

Question Part

4		<p>as separate religions because the designation of Hinduism is an entirely human (often colonial) construct. Many Hindus themselves prefer to refer to their religion as <i>Sanatana Dharma</i> (eternal law) as that is more consistent with the beliefs and aims of the religion. It could be argued that it would be better to describe different forms of Hinduism as separate religions simply because there is so much diversity between them. Christianity, Judaism Judaism and Islam all share a common core and yet are quite clearly acknowledged to be separate religions, so why does this not apply to Hinduism? Buddhism and Sikhism split off from Hinduism and are regarded as completely separate religions. Guru Granth Sahib (the founder of</p>
---	--	---

This document consists of 4 pages



* 2796206475 *

Question Part

Sikhism is often quoted as saying "There is neither Hindu nor Muslim, so whose path shall I follow? I will follow God's path" indicating that he believed that it was all about following the path of God rather than any clear-cut desirable scheme within the religion. Different forms of Hinduism would make more sense to be called different religions as there is simply so much diversity that it would be ridiculously pluralistic to fit them all under one umbrella of 'Hinduism'. Upanishads and Purva Mimamsa disagree upon whether the Vedas, the most central text within Hinduism, is a mere book of philosophies to be followed. Advaita, Visishtadvaita and Dvaita disagree upon what the relationship between the 'atman' and Brahman is. The different Sampradayas such as Shaivism, Shakism and Vaishnavism all have different key beliefs and texts, although Smriti (remembered) texts can be added by almost any Swami or holy person if people are willing to follow - there is simply too much diversity for Hinduism to only be one religion.

On the other hand, I would argue that Hinduism is better described as one religion despite the overwhelming multiplicity shown within the religion. It may not fit into the simplistic Judeo-Christian western view of how religions should work and how uniformly



Question Part

They should act but that does not mean that it doesn't
 share an 'essence' of what Hinduism is. The atman,
 Brahman as well as notions such as karma, moksha
 and dharma are all found throughout the religion
 suggesting that it is perfectly coherent to call it a
 single religion. Christianity has numerous denominations and
 a similar concept can be applied to Hinduism even if
 the sampradayas are less clear-cut and flow into
 each other more than they might do in the Western
 world. A key reason why the question of
 Hinduism being more than one religion ever
 arises is due to the centuries-old scholarship
 by Indologists who saw the world through a
 Christian Western viewpoint as something that was
 fact - Abbé Dubois, a Frenchman who was
 one of the world's first Indologists and also was
 a heavy influence upon Max Müller (a big influence
 today) was looking for evidence that the
 Indus valley civilisation had grown up following the
 deluge in the Bible. ~~and~~ Scholarship from his
 era is highly questionable and although the
 word Hinduism may have originated from this
 scholarship, their ideas of religion are
 severely misguided and outmoded today when
 a much more neutral viewpoint is required. This
 can be shown by the fact that modern day
 scholars such as Flood, Uppstad and
 Zuesenig all see Hinduism as one coherent religion
 that often takes on many, possibly conflicting, strands.



Question Part

The Vedas and the all-important Shakti literature ^{are} ~~are~~ accepted by all Hindus. ~~or~~ Even those who may worship Shiva (Saivites) ^{who} ~~and~~ find that the Brahmasutras are their most important texts, still respect the divinity of Vishnu and the goddess (Shakti) even if they may take the view that Shiva is of the utmost importance. The differences between Advaita (non-dualism), Visistadvaita (Qualified non-dualism) and Dvaita (dualism) are not something to be seen as different religions - rather different ways of trying to explain a concept - similar to ~~the~~ denominations that have split ~~off~~ in Christianity as they believe that their concept is more accurate than the one they were formerly a part of.

In conclusion, the different forms of Hinduism would be better to be described as one single religion.

Hinduism is and always has been a complicated religion that goes in many directions and strands. Although the different forms of Hinduism contain many differences they still ~~put~~ ^{revolve} around the same concepts (Brahman, Atman etc) upon which they can all agree upon. Hinduism has gone through many changes from ~~the~~ ^{its} ~~past~~ beginning through to the post-vedic period and as such is an incredibly complex religion but this does not mean that it has become more than one, rather it is a single religion that operates broadly taking in many, often differing, opinions whilst accepting they may agree about only select core facts.

