


<p>Aquinas <i>NOT an innate knowledge of right and wrong, but:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☛ <i>God-given ability to reason</i> ☛ <i>Synderesis – inclination to do good and avoid evil</i> ☛ <i>Conscientia – where the two come together: reason helps us determine right from wrong, and synderesis inclines us to do what is right</i> 	<p>Paul <i>The requirements of the Law are written on their hearts, their consciences also bearing witness ...</i></p> <p>Paul said that all people know God and can determine what is right and wrong. However, in the case of non-believers: <i>their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened.</i></p>	<p>Piaget </p> <p>Piaget observed cognitive development in children. He said:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ★ <i>Morality is developmental and progressive.</i> ★ <i>Younger children think in terms of consequences rather than intentions</i> ★ <i>By the age of 10, a child has a fully developed conscience</i>
<p>Newman Conscience is God-given and innate, “... a principle planted within us, before we have had any training, although training and experience are necessary for its strength, growth and due formation.”</p> <p>Newman talks of a ‘fake’ conscience, one influenced by society. Our ‘true’ conscience is the voice of God.</p> 	<p>Butler Conscience is God-given and fully reliable. - ‘Had it strength as it has right; had it power as it had manifest authority, it would absolutely govern the world.’</p> <p>Two principles guide humanity:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Self Love 2. Benevolence <p>Conscience balances these two. It is our natural guide, ‘assigned to us by the Author of nature.’</p>	<p>Freud </p> <p>Conscience is developed. Described the self as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Id – primal instincts 2. Ego – Outward personality 3. Super-ego – unconscious mind <p>The super-ego contains the ego-ideal which praises good action, and the conscience, which makes you feel guilty for bad actions.</p>

<p>Hard Determinism</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All our actions are causally determined 2. Because of this we are not free 	<p>Soft Determinism</p> <p>They agree with the philosophical claim that all events have a cause. However, there is a difference between being physically forced to do something, and choosing to do it.</p>	<p>Libertarianism</p> <p>Libertarians agree with Hard Determinists that free will and determinism are incompatible. However, they argue that none of the factors listed entirely determines what happens next:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☛ biological determinism - genes ☛ scientific determinism - physics La Place’s demon (theoretically knows about every atom and can predict the future) ☛ theological determinism - God Calvin – predestination (God has predetermined what will happen) and pre-lection (God decides who will choose salvation – irresistible grace) ☛ philosophical determinism Theory of Universal Causation (everything has a cause) – freedom is an illusion. Locke’s man in a locked room; Spinoza ☛ psychological determinism Skinner – operant conditioning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☛ Some causes are external, and compel us. For example, you are not free to resist gravity. ☛ Some causes are internal, a result of our wishes and desires. For example, I freely choose to eat a banana because I am not externally compelled to do so, even though my wanting a banana is a result of things outside my control. <p>The Soft Determinist believes in moral responsibility, (which the hard determinist is compelled to reject). Our wishes and desires are the cause of our actions, so we can be held accountable for our actions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☛ genes – these produce inclinations or tendencies. Twins who share genes can make very different moral choices ☛ physics – Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle (quantum mechanics claims the world is not totally knowable); Chaos Theory (the butterfly effect) ☛ God – Arminius believes God doesn’t determine or know the future; Open Theology ☛ philosophy – existentialists (e.g. Sartre) say we are a blank sheet ☛ psychology – criticised as very bad science; psychologists can predict but not know what people will do.