TILBURG UNIVERSITY

Is Morality Innate?

A Consideration of the Evidence from Two Perspectives

S. Sommer

774107

Supervisor: M. Colombo

Second Reader: A. Archer

"*You will see what you have done, and you will know the difference between right and wrong, just as God does*." (Gen 3:5)

Is Morality Innate?

A Consideration of the Evidence from Two Perspectives

ABSTRACT

This paper fuels the debate on the innateness of morality by testing four prominent notions on the moral domain: i) the morality versus convention nexus (c.f. Turiel, 1979), ii) the theory of the four moral domains (c.f. Haidt and Joseph, 2004), iii) the 'big three' ethics (c.f. Shweder, 2008) and iv) the theory of the 'five tastebuds' (c.f. Haidt, 2012) on two perceptions of innateness. The first of these, the nativist, hardwired tenet, is that the innate cognitive architecture includes domain-specific bodies of knowledge and/or dedicated psychological mechanisms. The second, empiricist, prewired notion rebukes the rigidity of the nativist view and claims that solely domain-general mechanisms are included into the innate cognitive architecture.

In projecting- and theoretically testing the former definition on the four moral accounts, this paper finds no evidence for the existence of a nativist kind of moral innateness. Turning to the empirical evidence and adopting the empiricist definition of innateness, this paper finds that some of the four accounts on morality may be innate or entail innate components. These findings support the empiricist belief that the mind contains innate domain-general moral mechanisms. There is, however, no evidence presented that the innate aspects are strictly human nor essentially moral.

Introduction

Morality. A notion transpiring as prominently throughout history as it does in contemporary events. Addressed in ideologies, religions and legal frameworks. Present in our behavior towards one-another and ourselves. A notion present *within* ourself perhaps?

One evening, doing groceries, I was suddenly confronted with this very question. On a shelf, amidst needly ordered, bundled 'fresh guacamole-packages', lay a torn-up package, the plastic slit and its contents scattered around in the container. Until my surprise, the avocados were missing. Standing in revulsion, I wondered about the motives behind this unconventional -and so I deemed immoral- scenery. Most likely, the violator had noticed the superior quality of the avocados in the container compared to those sold in single quantity, after which he or she had taken out the respective products, apparently without feeling morally distressed. Reason suggests the goods were payed for; it is more convenient to steal a complete bundle than solely some of its containing. This puzzled me. Why did I feel morally vexed whereas the violator did not? Perhaps the person did not regard the tearing up of a package as a moral breach, but as a breach of the convention of bundling goods. Or maybe the violator felt equally apathetic to vandalizing and stealing, but thought the latter had grave legal consequences when caught. On the other hand, maybe the agent thought both acts defied morality, but simply did not act accordingly or thought stealing was more wrong than vandalizing was.

Anyhow, the guacamole debacle suggests that morality is not likely to be a homogeneous notion that manifests itself in a clear-cut, similar way for everyone. Some people feel morally distressed in situations where others do not. On a global scale, some events can be appalling in a particular culture, while being a common practice in another. For the Ilongot, a Philippine tribe, there is honor in cutting of heads of random strangers (Rosaldo 1980). For Westerners, there is no such honor: there is horror and disgust.

At the zenith of the manifold manifestations of morality, the question arises whether there is a *common factor* in play, or whether morality is merely the produce of numerous social, environmental, cultural and religious influences. And if there is a common factor; is it a shared value, e.g. 'harm is wrong', or is it a shared ability to make judgements, alike to the ability to see or to speak? Moreover, if there is such a common moral factor present in mankind, has it been there from the start, i.e. *is morality innate*?

If everyone on earth shared the belief that harm was wrong, it is cumbersome explaining traditions like those of the Ilongot. An innate ability to moralize, however, may better explain the

tremendous diversity in moral judgements. Alike to the ability to taste; some people crave things others find repulsive. Also in similarity to 'taste', where flavor is essentially composed of sweet, sour, salty, bitter or umami[1]; a shared moral ability has to stem from biological components, making the variation of judgments limited, albeit plenty still.

At this point, one may argue that taste is innate because the mind is endowed with the hardwired comprehension of the elemental, quintuple tastes, originating directly from tastebuds which are solely dedicated to the domain of taste. This will be referred to as the 'nativist' perception of innateness. Others may argue that taste is innate because the mind is endowed with several prewired domain-general mechanisms, together enabling the acquirement of taste through interaction and experience. This will be referred to as the empiricists perception of innateness.

Although the question of moral innateness is of importance for understanding morality and ourselves, it is not novel. Over time, many philosophers and scientists have asked themselves the very same question. Biologists have tried to find answers in the search for a moral faculty in the brain (see e.g. Dwyer, 1999; Mikhail, 2000), moral psychologists have targeted (out of many) conventions (Turiel 1979, 1983), emotions (see e.g. Greene, 2002; Nichols, 2005), intuition (see Haidt, 2012) and reason (see e.g. Kohlberg 1984; Piaget 1932/1965) and anthropologists have focussed on certain ethics (see e.g. Shweder, 2012). Whereas the majority of the research focussed one particular moral theory, some studies took a more global approach by taking into consideration several accounts on morality. An example of such a study is that of Prinz (2008), who presented a framework of requirements for the innate moral domain and used them in testing several accounts on hardwired innateness. This paper extends on Prinz's research by 1) evaluating and improving the requirements for the innate moral domain, 2) approaching innateness from both a nativist and an empiricist perspective and 3) expanding the test to recently presented theories of the moral domain.

Before turning to the question of the innateness of morality, I will first lay the foundation by illustrating different beliefs about how morality enters the stage. Throughout history, various views on the moral domain have been developed, each attributing certain properties to the domain. The presentation of four of the most prominent notions and the introduction to the concept of innateness are the focal point of part I. At the end of this section, the reader will have a comprehensive though concise understanding of what counts as a moral norm and of why these norms tend to vary across persons and cultures. Furthermore, the understanding of how different people can appeal to different aspects of morality in a common moral-hard-case will be extended.

[1] Savory

Part II starts by evaluating a prior test of the hardwired innateness of morality conducted by Prinz's (2008) after which the proposed requirements for the nativist innate moral domain are evaluated, improved and eventually used in testing the innateness of the four theories of the moral domain presented in part I.

Part III takes the theory to the practice by evaluating the empirical evidence for the existence of an innate moral domain. Instead of approaching innateness from a nativist perspective, part III will adopt the prewired, empiricist definition. Main focus in this part is on cases of feral-children and psychological experiments involving babies. Both babies and feral-children are suiting candidates for research on innateness as both have enjoyed little or no moral training (Prinz, 2008).

Finally, I conclude by evaluating whether the presented evidence argues in favor of innate moral domains. In considering the theoretical evidence presented in part II, approaching innateness from a nativist perspective and the empirical evidence presented in part III, adopting the empiricist stance, I find support for the empiricist belief that the mind is endowed with innate domain-general moral mechanisms.

Part I

Norms

Not everything that guides one's behavior beyond the requirements of the law needs to be of moral nature. An employee at a big accountancy agency in the U.S. is not legally obliged to wear a suit to work, yet arriving one morning in pajamas will definitely render some disturbed looks. Recurrent occurrence of such *peculiar* behavior is likely to endanger this employee's position. One might wonder on what grounds such an eventual dismissal would be based. Well, it is all in the word 'peculiar'. There is no article in the law forbidding the wear of pajamas, nor is there any evident moral transgression made. Instead, wearing pajamas in a corporate environment relates to a social norm of conduct: a *convention*. The employee's manager will claim that the behavior is weird, not in line with the agency's idea of proper conduct and therefore is simply unacceptable. He might just as well have said it is unconventional. So far, morality has not entered the stage. If the employee, however, would spit in his bosses face upon hearing news of his dismissal, it would. Such an act does not appeal to any social convention or law, but still it *seems wrong* in some morally salient way.

Instead of finding its origin in convention, this *wrong* act find its origin in morality. Most researchers agree that besides *conventional* and *moral* norms, there also are *decency* norms, stemming from the concept of disgust (Lisciandra, Postman & Colombo, 2013). Which norm is relevant in a particular situation depends, inter alia, on the seriousness of the violation. The employee spitting in his boss's face (moral) is more serious than wearing pajamas to work (convention), which in turn *may be* more serious than farting on his way out of the office (decency).

One may argue that the third violation is more serious then the second. More troublesome, one may argue that the latter norm appeals to morality (Lisciandra, Postman & Colombo, 2013). In the scope of this paper, preference goes to a clear distinction between moral and nonmoral (let it be conventional) norms. Fortunately, such an account is proposed by Elliot Turiel.

The Morality versus Convention Nexus

Turiel (1983) solely accounted for moral- and conventional norm and used their definitions in designing moral psychological experiments. These definitions were as following (Nado, Kelly & Stich, 2006):

i Moral [conventional] rules are [not] held to have an objective, prescriptive force; they are not [they are] dependent on the authority of any individual or institution.

ii Moral [conventional] rules are [not] taken to hold generally, not just [just] locally; they not [they do] only proscribe behavior here and now, but also [not] in other countries and at other times in history.

iii Violations of moral [conventional] rules [does not] involve a victim who has been harmed, whose rights have been violated, or who has been subject to an injustice.

iv Violations of moral rules are typically more serious than violations of conventional rules.

Turiel's framework appears intuitive. In our previous example, the employee wearing pajamas transgressed a rule that had (i) no objective, prescriptive force, was dependent on an institution, (ii) does not hold generally, (iii) involved no victim and (iv) was not 'serious'; hence a violation of convention. Things do however get iffy when we change perspective. Suppose, for example, that the agency would not be located in the U.S. but in Japan instead. According to Turiel (1983), the violation of wearing pajamas would be of conventional nature still. Those of us who have been to Japan might start feeling slightly uncomfortable. In the Japanese culture, respect plays a prominent role and business environments are formal. Wearing pajamas in such a setting may be deemed profane, instead of merely unconventional.

The reason that Turiel's framework fails to capture this immorality arises in point (i), (ii) and (iii). Certain violations, involving harm or not, e.g. disrespect to one's boss, may not hold generally, nor be independent of authority, but do appeal to morality (Haidt & Joseph, 2004). Moreover, Japanese morality may be (and is) very different from American morality. Because the moral frameworks are different, some situations can occur morally distressing according to one party while rendering apathy in another. Additionally, the degree in which people moralize varies not only geographically (across cultures) but also over time. Kelly and Stich (2007) illustrated the latter by probing (asking very short, tale-like questions in an experimental environment) about whiplashes as a sanction for bad behavior aboard a ship in a 200-years-ago-scenario versus the same sanction in contemporary situations. Whereas 52% of the questioned thought it ok in the historical example, only 6% thought it would be ok today (Kelly, Nado & Stich, 2006).

Apparently, the distinction between convention and morality is not as straightforward and homogeneous in practice as Turiel supposed it to be. More so, when morality enters the stage, it is

not some lone ballerina we can observe in ease, as many moral value-monists[2] (e.g. Mill, Bentham, Kohlberg and Prinz in some sense) may think. Instead, the theatre is suddenly filled by numerous puppets, jumping around, pulling our hair and punching us in the face. Indeed, there is more to morality. Much more.

The 'Four Domains'

Acknowledgement of this 'much more' -and the intention to grasp it- led to the development of several accounts, all realizing morality cannot be addressed as a homogenous, single entity. At this point, the moral domains come into picture. Just like any other domain, for example in mathematics, a moral domain is a sphere including values from a certain order and excluding all other values (Prinz, 2008). These domains may have various definitions, but there are four domains which appear to enjoy wide-scale consensus (Haidt & Joseph, 2004).

The first of these is the domain of suffering, which is the most obvious of all and is represented in Turiel's framework. This domain involves rules that stop us from inflicting harm to others (Prinz, 2008). It is not surprising that Turiel's focus was solely on this account; 'Western' morality is majorly involved with concepts regarding the domain of harm in peer to peer conflicts. As Haidt (2012) puts it; "[…] The WEIRDer (western, educated, industrial, rich, democratic) you are, the more you perceive a world full of separate objects, rather than relationships […]."

The second domain, is the domain of hierarchy, which is comprised of rules regarding dominance and submission. The third domain is that of reciprocity and involves the principle of fairness. The fourth and final domain is the domain of purity and revolves around the concept of disgust (Haidt, 2012).

Note that the four domains are a theoretical categorization, making the notion of morality more comprehendible. One might argue that many 'subdomains', such as gratitude, respect, sanctity

Four moral modules and the emotions and virtues associated with them

	Suffering	Hierarchy	Reciprocity	Purity
Proper domain (original triggers)	*Suffering and vulnerability of one's children*	*Physical size and strength, domination, and protection*	*Cheating vs. cooperation in joint ventures, food sharing*	*People with diseases or parasites, waste products*
Actual domain (modern examples)	*Baby seals, cartoon characters*	*Bosses, gods*	*Marital fidelity, broken vending machines*	*Taboo ideas (communism, racism)*
Characteristic emotions	*Compassion*	*Resentment vs. respect/awe*	*Anger/guilt vs. gratitude*	*Disgust*
Relevant virtues	*Kindness, compassion*	*Obedience, deference, loyalty*	*Fairness, justice, trustworthiness*	*Cleanliness, purity, chastity*

Table 1
The four domains as presented in Haidt and Joseph, 2004
Source: Haidt and Joseph (2004), page 59

[2] Proponents of the belief that morality is captured in a single value, e.g. that of utility or harm.

and more, are ignored by the framework. Such an argument would be invalid as in fact these subdomains are captured by the four prevailing domains (Shweder, 2012). Gratitude is a characteristic emotion related to reciprocity, respect is in the same way related to hierarchy and sanctity is related to purity.

The four domains provide insight into the manifold, diverse demonstration of morality as previously encountered. A situation may occur in which one party feels morally distressed based on a particular domain, whereas another party appeals to another domain and yet another party may consider the whole situation as a matter of convention. Reconsider the Ilongot in the Philippines. Someone from the Western world may feel distressed based on the domain of suffering, while another may think the killings defy the domain of purity. Yet for the Ilongot, head-hunting is actually convention.

In the domain-theory, suffering is almost automatically assumed to be related to another (tangible) party, but it may also be related to oneself or some spiritual entity. Consider biblical Cain; "[…] but on Cain and his offering He (The Lord) did not look with favor. So Cain was very angry, and his face was downcast. Then the Lord said to Cain, "Why are you angry? Why is your face downcast? If you do what is *right*, will you not be accepted? But if you do not do what is right, *sin* is crouching at your door […]" (Gen 4:5-7). Apparently, offerings could be conducted in a right way and in a wrong way, indicating that there is some kind of norm in play. Successively, a wrong offering causes "sin crouching at your door", which suggest suffering.

The 'Big Three' Ethics

Someone who did place emphasis on the relationship between the violator and the authority is Richard Shweder. Shweder, Much, Mahapatra, Manmohan and Park (2003) propose that 'moral goods' can be categorized into the 'big three' ethics, namely that of autonomy, community and divinity. In the first of these, a person is represented as an autonomous entity, seeking satisfaction for its own desires (Shweder, 2012). In the second, a person is part of a community, characterized by duties, roles and responsibilities. In the third and final ethic, one is a spirit, related to something 'higher' and divine. According to Shweder, every ethic favors it's own moral properties. Examples of these are harm and equality for the first, duty and hierarchy in the second and sanctity and purity in the third (Shweder, 2012).

Some of the 'moral properties', e.g. harm, can emerge from serval types of relationships between the violator and the authority. Obviously, one can physically harm another party, but, as we

saw with biblical Cain, one can also mentally harm oneself by violating 'divine' (or self) imposed rules.

In this paper, I will view Shweder's 'Big Three' as a framework based on the relationship between the violator (the self) and the authority of either the self, the community, or the transcendental.

The 'Five Tastebuds'

The final account on morality presented in this section is the theory of the 'five tastebuds' Haidt (2012). The theory behind the 'tastebuds' was lent from the idea of *modularity* (Sperber & Hirschfeld, 2004). There are several views on what should qualify as a module and what not (see Colombo, 2013), but general consensus is that a module is a cognitive mechanism with a specialized function, implying that "[…] it carries out a restricted range of types of processes that successfully apply to certain problem domains—where domains are individuated by the formal properties of input representations to the mechanism […]" (Colombo, 2013: Page 7).

Haidt (2012) illustrates modularity by arguing that a module is like a switch in the brain which is automatically triggered in the occurrence of some threatening event, e.g. the detection of a snake. When triggered, the module sends a signal that affects the behavior of the organism in an adaptive way (Haidt, 2012). These modules have 'original' triggers, i.e. those for which the module was intended, e.g. the detection of a snake, and 'current' triggers, i.e. all contemporary events that provoke the same mechanism, e.g. a piece of robe (Sperber & Hirschfeld, 2004).

Haidt (2012) argues that whereas an alteration in the design of the original triggers would require a lengthy generic evolution, the current triggers can change in a single generation. The sensitivity to relatively short-notice changes of the current triggers partially explains the diversity in the manifestations of morality across cultures, but also within particular environments.

Haidt tried to identify the most common universal cognitive modules (on which people base their moral frameworks) by examining the most prominent adaptive social challenges across cultures. He finds that there are five prominent challenges and compares them to the five tastebuds. According to Haidt, these five 'moral tastebuds' are *care*, *fairness*, *loyalty*, *authority* and *sanctity*.

Overview of Accounts

Thus far, the reader has been presented a broad, but concise scope of moral accounts and domains from moral psychology. Admitted, a lot of details have been left out of consideration in

order to keep the focus on the sole aim of this part; explaining the existence and nature of moral domains and presenting the most prominent cases. These have been;

1. The morality versus convention nexus proposed by Turiel. The sole aim of this account is on the division between norms classifying either as moral or conventional.
2. The theory of the 'four domains' proposed by Haidt steers focus towards the possible divisions between moral violations. Instead of classifying morality as a notion necessarily related to harm, authority and global validity as Turiel proposed, Haidt recognizes that some moral violations do not involve harm and may be dependent of authority and location. Sequentially, Haidt organizes moral violations into the four domains of suffering, hierarchy, reciprocity and purity.
3. The 'big three' ethics proposed by Shweder classify different moral goods according to the environment to which they appeal, namely the (self) autonomy, the community, or the divinity. Some of the 'four domains' have strong affiliations with one particular ethic, but need not restrict themselves to that. Hierarchy, for example, is a notion strongly present in communal relationships, but also may occur as a loyalty to a deity. Note that with his approach, Shweder agrees with Haidt that Turiel was wrong in restricting morality to harm and independence of space and authority.
4. Whereas his 'four domain' theory observed moral violations and captured them in a comprehensive, four-category framework, Haidt's (2012) 'five-tastebuds' model approaches morality from the theory of modularity. In unison with (2) and (3), the theory of the 'tastebuds' defies Turiel's 'narrow' perception of morality. In contrast to all other accounts, this theory has its origin in the innateness of morality and its 'modules'.

The primary challenge of the next part is establishing the requisitions of an 'innate moral account'. Before I will discuss this notion, the final section of this part addresses the concept of innateness itself.

Innateness

The concept of innateness emerges when one tries to answer the question; "where does morality come from?" One of the most popular answers to this questions is that morality is learned (c.f. empiricists). Humans start off as a tabula rasa and learn about morality from their caretakers and through experience, i.e. morality is nurtured. Human minds are equipped with general learning

mechanisms enabling the acquirement of e.g. the ability to speak. The actual acquirement is what is being nurtured.

At the opposite side of the empiricist account, one finds the 'nativist' explanation. We start off with an inborn moral awareness, disregarding whether it came to us through the means of a deity (Christianity) or through evolution (Darwin). The nativist account claims that the mind is equipped with domain specific mechanisms -and bodies of knowledge- similar to the modules presented in the prior section. To nativists, morality is not like the ability to learn how to taste (c.f. nurture); instead its like the ability to distinguish sweet from sour.

When it comes to the actual specification of innate traits, there are various definitions, varying in strength and testability (Prinz, 2008). Two general definitions close in line to the scope of this paper are that a trait is innate if it is: 1) unlearned and/or 2) 'psychologically primitive', i.e. acquired at the biological level (Samuels, 2004). Yet, within these general approaches towards innateness, there are several more specified (sub)definitions. One of these definitions is based on the idea that something innate must be *hardwired* and immutable (the nativist account) (Haidt & Joseph, 2004). A good, yet relatively testable nativist definition is offered by Prinz (2008: page 3); "[…] a psychological phenotype (writers note; observable trait) P is innate if it is acquired by means of psychological mechanisms that are dedicated to P, as opposed to psychological mechanisms that evolved for some other purpose of for no purpose at all […]" (Prinz, 2008). A suiting example of such an innate trait would be the experience of sweetness (phenotype), stemming directly and solely from the 'sweet tastebuds' (dedicated mechanism).

There is, however, also a more giving definitions of innateness which does not require something innate to be hardwired, but merely *prewired* (Haidt & Joseph 2004). According to this definition, a first draft is provided by nature (innate). Next, our experience can alter and revise the draft. Innateness does not imply that something is unchangeable. Instead, it means […]"organized in advance of experience[…]" (c.f. empiricism) (Haidt & Joseph 2004; Marcus, 2004).

In attempt to reformulate Prinz's (2008) definition of innateness with respect to 'prewiredness': a psychological phenotype P (e.g. taste) is innate if it is acquired by means of one, *or more* psychological mechanisms (e.g. the five tastebuds).

In contrast to the nativist definition, the empiricist definition does not require the innate trait to have an universal manifestation, nor is it required to have a directly traceable dedicated mechanism. Successively, testing traits for 'prewired' innateness is not as straightforward as testing traits for 'hardwired' innateness is. A proponent of the first might argue that language is innate,

whereas a proponent of the latter will argue that only ‘making sounds’ is. Whereas ‘making sounds’ is easily verified for nearly whole humanity, languages are manifold and practical complications, e.g. whether a baby’s babbling qualifies as a language or not, are profuse.

Part II tests the innateness of the moral accounts presented in part I by making use of the nativist, hardwired definition of innateness. If morality is innate in this sense, at least one of the four approaches of the moral domain is/are required to satisfy the requirements of hardwired innateness (as further specified in part II) without leaving room for theoretical implausibilities.

Part III adopts the empiricist, prewired definition of innateness in empirically testing the moral accounts on innateness. If morality is innate in this sense, at least one of the four accounts is/ are required to satisfy the requirements of prewired innateness (as further specified in part III) without leaving room for empirical -theoretical and implausibilities.

Part II

Review of Prior Innateness Tests

Before presenting the requirements of what it takes for a moral account or domain to be essentially classified as innate and before examining whether there is evidence for the existence of such accounts, this section considers a prior attempt with the same objective. As mentioned in the introduction, the question about moral innateness is not novel. Moreover, its opponents may have been as fierce as its advocates. One of these opponents, Prinz (2008), argues against the case of nativist moral innateness by targeting universal moral rules and by targeting moral domains. By taking this approach, Prinz puts pressure on both the first account on morality as presented in the prior section; the morality versus convention nexus which assumes the universality of harm, and on the second account; the theory of the 'four domains'. The 'big three' ethics and the 'five tastebuds' were not yet put forth at the time of Prinz's writing and as a result they were not considered

Prinz on Universal Rules

Prinz lays out requirements for a 'moral' rule to satisfy innateness as following. For starters, there must be an universal rule, e.g. harm is wrong. Secondly, the universal rule may not be explained in a non-nativist way, i.e. it may not be learned. Finally, the innate 'machinery' at work must be specific to the moral rule (Prinz, 2008). Note how these requirements approach innateness as 1) unlearned and 2) 'psychologically primitive' and 3) domain-specific. By incorporating universality in his first requirement, Prinz enables the framework to be tested in practice.

With these requirements at hand, Prinz targets the rule against harm, which some people deem innate (see e.g. Turiel, 2002). After considering cases of e.g. cannibalism, war and torture, Prinz concludes that there are a lot of overriding factors in play and that an universal prohibition of harm comes down to "[…] harm when and only when the pros outweigh the cons […]" (Prinz, 2008: page 6), which he claims to be "an empty mandate". And at first sight it is. It gets more involved when one considers the rationales behind the pros. If a soldier participates in a war out of patriotic sentiment, he or she may allegedly do so out of moral duty; out of loyalty for the country or community. Note that such a motivation could be classified in (ii) the domain of hierarchy, (iii) the ethic of community and (iv) the 'tastebud' of loyalty. In this situation, the soldier may feel morally vexed when harming others in general, but may not experience this moral distress in the event of a war, as his or her morals relating to loyalty trump over those relating to harm. In Prinz's mandate, taking into account the diversity of morality, both the pro and the con can be of moral

nature. If one adheres to a moral value trumping over the universal moral rule against harm, this needs not say that the universal moral law against harm is absent.

If a pro would not be of moral nature, the case for an innate moral rule against harm would be seriously endangered. In practice, such pros do exist. As an army general said; "[…] It's fun to shoot some people […]" (Schmitt, 2005). In contrast to the loyalty of a soldier, which appeals to morality, the general's experience of 'fun' is not easily moralized.

Prinz on Domains

After attacking universal moral values, Prinz turns towards the 'classical' four domains as put forth by Haidt and Joseph (2004). As with universal rules, he lays groundwork specifications of what would make these moral domains innate domains. Alike to the prior requirements, the moral domains are required to be universally present and unlearned. Remarkably, instead of requiring the domains to be stemming from dedicated psychological mechanisms, Prinz requires them to be *essentially moral*.

In contrast to the claims about universal values, Prinz acknowledges the potential universal presence of the four domains, although they are realized not to be equally appealed to in every culture (Haidt, 2012). There may even be cultures in which some particular domain, e.g. that of purity, is strongly conventionalized. In liberal (WEIRD, c.f. Haidt, 2012) societies, 'impurities' like having sex with an animal carcass, are often not even moralized at all (Prinz, 2008; Haidt, 2012).

Concerning the 'learning' aspect of the moral domains, Prinz (2008) argues that the respective domains may have fully emerged from our nonmoral sentiment. When discussing the morality of, for example, dietary laws, Prinz (2008) argues that our body possesses an innate negative sentiment towards eating particular animals, e.g. bugs. A moral domain, stemming from that 'natural disgust', would be merely a (nonmoral) learned extension from our innate emotions (Prinz, 2008). The crucial point in this attack is the link between 'natural disgust' and its moral sequel, but this link, at least with respect to dietary laws, is outright mistaken. Rozin (1987) found that 2-year-old children do not posses a 'natural disgust' towards food whatsoever. Instead, in an experimental environment, when kids are presented a grasshopper, or food that looked like animal feces, they experience no hesitation in eating it (Bloom, 2013).

Leaving aside the natural disgust involved in dietary laws, so far Prinz and proponents of the theory of the 'four domains' are not in severe conflict. Both parties agree that the domains are universal and stem from innate sentiments. The point where Prinz takes a stance against the

innateness of the domain theory is in his third and final requirement which is emphasized earlier in this section: the domain must be essentially moral. Although the separate domains may be universal and unlearned, they are likely to be the mere produce of our nonmoral emotional faculties. These sentiments may be nonmoral in essence, as all the emotions that are related to the 'moral' domains have nonmoral applications; e.g. […] We feel sympathy for the sick, but we do not make moral judgments about them; […]"(Prinz, 2008: page 12), i.e. the psychological mechanisms behind the 'moral' trait are not dedicated to the moral domain, hence not essentially moral.

The Innate Moral Domain

Although the evidence presented by Prinz (2008) against the 'hardwired' innateness of moral values and domains is not convincing in our quest, the procedure he presented in examining innateness is usable. Prinz offers a total of four requirements; the domain must be (i) universal, (ii) unlearned and (iii) stem from a dedicated psychological mechanism. Additionally, the domain must be (iv) essentially moral. The latter requirement is not really a requirement for innateness, as a phenotype is already innate when the first three conditions are satisfied. Instead, the fourth requirement aims at the *morality* of the innate trait. This *moral essence* is satisfied if the dedicated psychological mechanisms behind the innate trait are specialized to the moral domain.

The nativist perception of innateness as presented in the previous part required an innate phenotype to be 1) unlearned, 2) 'psychologically primitive' and 3) domain-specific, which coincides with requirement (ii), (iii) and (iv) when we turn to the moral domain. The first requirement (i) must necessarily hold according to Prinz, but below I will argue why universality is not a prerequisite of the innate moral domain.

(i) According to Prinz, the domain must be universal. Considering the guacamole-debacle from the introduction: it cannot possibly be that the I was endowed with an innate moral domain condemning the violator's behavior, whereas the violator was not. Either we both 'share' an innate moral domain or it was not innate in the first place. Of course, it may be possible that the violator is an exception to the moral domain, i.e. nearly everyone may feel x (e.g. bad) towards y (e.g. killing), but the violator does not, making the domain not strictly universal. This issue, the issue of psychopathy, is both interesting and puzzling for moral philosophers, but for the sake of brevity, I will leave this case by turning to Haidt and Joseph (2004), who argues that psychopaths reason but do not feel. Arguing that the case of psychopaths eliminates the

possibility of universal moral domains is like saying that whenever a person with five legs is born, having four limbs is not universal -nor innate- anymore. Here, a drawback of the first requirement (i) appears; the domain can be universal in essence, but need not be universally *observable*. Because of this bias, the first requirement (i) is used in testing domains for innateness, but is *not taken to be a necessary requirement* of the innate moral domain.

(ii) The domain must be unlearned. Universality alone is not enough to satisfy innateness. People all over the world wear clothes, yet clothes are not innate. In order to vouch for innateness, (ii) the domain we are testing must not be possibly explained in a non-nativist way, e.g. by learning to wear cloths (Prinz, 2008).

(iii) There must be a psychological machinery solely dedicated to the particular moral domain. In the presence of (i) and (ii), the moral domain need not be innate. Consider the sense of taste. Taste is universal and not learned, but it is comprised as a combination of sweet, sour, bitter, salty and umami (savory), thus it does not satisfy 'hardwired' innateness (although its components might be).

Recall the definition of 'hardwired' innateness as presented in part I; "[…] a psychological phenotype P is innate if it is acquired by means of psychological mechanisms that are dedicated to P, as opposed to psychological mechanisms that evolved for some other purpose of for no purpose at all […]"(Prinz, 2008: page 3). We can adjust this definition with respect to the four accounts presented in part one by replacing the 'phenotype P' for the 'divide', 'domain', 'ethic' or 'tastebud' in consideration[3].

(iv) The domain is required to be *essentially* moral. Although this requirement is the kernel of Prinz's attack on innate moral domains, he fails to specify the exact definition of an essentially moral domain. The reason he suspected the 'four domains' not to be moral is because they stem from sentiments that also have non-moral applications. One can conclude that a 'moral' sentiment may not have non-moral applications.

Just like requirement (i), requirement (iv) need not strictly hold for the respective phenotype to be classified as innate. Still, (iv) is used in addressing the actual morality of the potential innate traits.

[3] E.g. for the morality versus convention nexus, the 'phenotype P' would be replaced for 'divide between moral and conventional norms D' and for the domain of hierarchy, the 'phenotype P' would be replaced for 'domain of hierarchy Dm'.

The Theoretical Implications of Innateness on the Proposed Moral Domains

Before one can turn to the empirical evidence for the existence of innate moral domains in part III, its is important to establish how the four prominent moral domains presented in part I would behave with respect to the innateness of moral domains as presented in the previous section. In this section, I consecutively test the four domains on the theoretical plausibility of hardwired, nativist innateness. If morality is innate with respect to this definition, no theoretical implausibilities may occur in at least one of the four accounts under consideration.

(1) The morality versus conventionality nexus

The kernel of this account is the *division* between norms that are moral and norms that are conventional. Advocates of the innateness of this nexus predict that the divide is fixed and with that, they conclude the innateness (and absoluteness) of moral rules. The moral rule under consideration in this account is that involving harm. In prior sections, I have argued that this rule need not be absolute (c.f. the Ilongot), nor innate (c.f. the army general).

A thing that may be innate in the context of this account is the *existence* of a division between moral and conventional norms. For the divide to be classified as innate, it must be (ii) unlearned and (iii) have a dedicate psychological machinery. Moreover, the divide is likely to appear as (i) universal trait. Finally, regarding morality; the divide must be (iv) essentially moral.

The theoretical 'hardwired innateness of this account would imply the existence of a 'morality-module' which is triggered in some vexing event. With such a singular moral module, the content must be preloaded and hence, absolute. If the 'morality-module' is triggered for the employee at the Japanese agency when arriving at the office in pajamas, the module is necessarily required to be triggered in the same way for the employee at the U.S. agency when making the same violation. Observations on the manifestations of morality suggest that such a module cannot exist.

(2) The 'four classical domains'

The core of this account is the *categorization* of moral values into several, comprehensive domains. This account also assumes a division between moral and nonmoral norms, but claims the moral norms can be categorized as appealing either to the domain of suffering, hierarchy, reciprocity or purity. For this account to be innate, the domains must be (ii) unlearned and (iii) linked to a psychological mechanism solely dedicated to the particular domain. Moreover, the domain is likely to appear as (i) universally observable. Finally, for the innate domains to be moral, they must be (iv) essentially moral.

Note that there may occur some theoretical implausibilities at this point (iii). A situation may occur in which multiple domains are addressed. Consider, for example, the employee at the Japanese accounting agency wearing pajamas to work. His moral breach can appeal to hierarchy (disrespect), reciprocity (failing to cooperate in the common interest of the firm) and purity (social taboo, disgust from fellow employees) all at the same time. Consequentially, either the domains cannot have strictly dedicated psychological mechanisms at their origin but just one single module, which would disqualify them as 'hardwired' innate domains according to requirement (iii), or the transgression must be the produce of a combination of innate domains (like taste from tastebuds).

One may wonder how such a combination is computed. Either it is learned (ii), or it is innate as well. If this were to be the case, however, the manifestations of 'the combination' should be homogenous. Let us consider the employee at the U.S. agency. In the light of an innate morality, this person's cognitive architecture is required to contain the same domain-specific psychological mechanisms and the same domain-specific bodies of knowledge as the employee at the Japanese agency. Sequentially, both employees must be equally vexed in all domains by the particular situation, which they are not.

(3) The 'big three' ethics

The kernel of this account is the *socio-relational nature* between the self and the self (in the ethic of autonomy), the self and the community (in the ethic of community) and the self and the transcendental (in the ethic of divinity). For this categorization to be qualified as innate, the ethics must be (ii) unlearned and (iii) originating from three separate dedicated psychological mechanisms. Moreover, the ethics are likely to be (i) universally observable. Finally, attributing moral innateness, the ethics (iv) must be moral in essence.

Theoretical conflicts in this account are not as superficial as those previously emerged with 'the four domains' as situations in which inconsistencies or conflicts between the three ethics occurs are not easily thought of. Given, someone might be disloyal to the self, the community and a deity at the same time, e.g. a muslim woman not wearing a burka in public. In this case, however, one can examine from which ethic the distress ultimately originates. Perhaps the woman is no strong adherent to the Islamic doctrine, but is majorly wearing the burka because of her community. If the ethics would be innate (hardwired) however, the content of the dedicated mechanisms of the muslim woman (iv) must be similar to that of other women, suggesting that all women solely wear burkas based on eventual communal motives, which appears ludicrous.

Another theoretical complication occurs in requirement (ii). If one is born, disregarding prenatal learning for a moment, it is cumbersome imagining this being possessing modules solely dedicated to things outside the self, namely community and divinity. On the other hand in plenty cultures and societies all over the world, people tend to have a sense of both community and 'something beyond'. Even though these senses may be learned (c.f. (ii)), they even occur in completely isolated environments.

(4) The 'five tastebuds'

The kernel of this account may appear to be categorization, but actually is cognitive *modularity*. Morality is divided at its source; the 'universal' cognitive modules. Morality comes into play when cognitive modules are triggered by some morally vexing event. There are five of these moral modules, namely care, fairness, loyalty, authority and sanctity. For these modules to be innate they must be (ii) unlearned and (iii) have distinguishable, dedicated psychological mechanisms. Moreover, the modules are likely to be (i) universally observable. Finally, in order to be morally innate, the modules must be (iv) essentially moral.

In contrast to its predecessor, the theory of the 'four domains', the components of this account are deliberately claimed to be directly linked to specific cognitive modules. Although this quintuple distinction sounds promising regarding innateness, the same theoretical problems as encountered with the 'four domains' appear to arise. Let us return to the employee wearing pajamas at the Japanese accountancy agency. His behavior infringes loyalty to the firm, but is also a sign of disrespect to his superior and co-employees and thus relates to two modules at the same time. As mentioned in (2), such a conflict of modules suggests that either the mechanisms are not strictly dedicated (iii), or that the sequel (the combination of modules) is not strictly unlearned (ii) nor essentially moral (iv).

Even more troublesome is that the employee at the American agency does not feel morally distressed at all, which should be impossible in the light of nativist innateness, i.e. if the modules of both employees contain similar 'preloaded bodies of knowledge'.

This section illustrates that when the requirements for hardwired moral innateness are projected on the four accounts on morality, theoretical complications arise in every single notion. In every account at least one vital problem is identified, conflicting with either one or more of the requirements of the innate moral domain. The existence of these imminent problems suggests that neither of the four accounts satisfy the requirements of 'hardwired' innateness. In the absence of

such a theoretical achievement, the accounts are considered insurmountable to satisfy the requirements when turning to practical cases in the next part. Therefore, instead of focussing solely on hardwired innateness, part III will adopt a more giving definition of innateness, namely the 'prewired', empiricist definition.

Part III

In this part, I adopt the, prewired, empiricist definition of innateness and I examine the evidence provided by real-life cases. Main focus is on cases in which the subjects have had minimal experience with any form of morality, as this limits the degree in which they have had the chance to learn. Furthermore, this aim increases the likelihood of finding similar 'innate' manifestations. This part considers two scenarios that suit this condition well. The first involves feral-children and the second shifts focus towards psychological experiments involving babies. Before turning to the practical evidence, I will redefine the concept of prewired innateness in the light of this study.

Prewired Innateness in Practice

The main difference between hardwired- and prewired innateness is that whereas the former requires psychological mechanisms to be fully dedicated and specialized to one particular domain, the latter merely requires the trait to have one or more psychological mechanisms, disregarding wether they are domain-specific Another difference concerns learning. Whereas nativist innateness requires an innate trait to be strictly unlearned, the empiricist definition grants that after the 'first draft' is provided by nature, alterations can be made through learning, i.e. the innate trait is "[…]organized in advance of experience[…]"(Haidt & Joseph, 2004; Marcus, 2004).

Turning to the four accounts presented in part I; prewired innateness requires the divide between morality and convention, the domains, the ethics or the 'tastebuds' to find their (a) origin in one or more unlearned psychological mechanisms which are organized in advance of experience. Moreover, (b) these 'psychologically primitive' origins are likely to be universally observable in the manifold manifestations of morality. In practice, this implies that in considering several isolated cases, the same core mechanisms are likely to occur. Finally, as with the prior definitions of innate morality: (c) the prewired innate trait must be essentially moral. This requirement, however, needs to be altered as the hardwired definition of moral essence requires the psychological mechanisms included in the cognitive architecture to be dedicated to the domain of morality. According to the prewired definition of innateness, the psychological mechanisms are not dedicated, but domain-general instead. Therefore, in this part, I replace the requirement for moral essence with the requirement that the innate trait must be empirically essentially moral *to humans.*

Note that all three requirements include significant ambiguities. First, (a) it may be hard to define the various original psychological mechanisms behind a presumably innate trait, second (b) I have already argued that universality need not be a strict requirement of innateness and thirdly (c)

moral *essence* may be controversial. Consequentially, the evidence provided by making use of these requirements is not definitive, but merely suggestive. Nonetheless, the findings presented in the second section of this part illustrate the respective plausibility for the four accounts presented in part I to be innate (prewired).

Empirical Evidence

Both feral-child cases and psychological experiments concerning babies may appear as suitable candidates for experiments on moral innateness, but both should be treated with caution. First, feral-child cases typically involve significant data ambiguities about the period before isolation and the isolation itself. During those moments, the children may have had unrecorded encounters with society, possibly biassing the degree in which they actually exhibit 'unlearned' traits. Secondly, in baby-experiments, the infants have lived months, or even years, in the presence of their up bringers and their environment, which also weakens the case for observable 'unlearned' innate traits. Nonetheless (and disregarding data ambiguities) both type of cases may reveal traits of the feral-children or babies, suggesting the presence of an empiricist innate morality.

In this section I will consecutively 'test' the four accounts on morality on practical 'prewired' innateness by placing focus on one particular feral-child case and one particular sequel of baby-experiments. The feral-child under consideration is 'Victor', a.k.a. 'The wild boy of Averyon', who emerged from the woods in southern France after having lived in the woods for an estimated period of 7 years. The boy was placed under care of a physician named Jean-Marc-Gaspard Izard who was interested in Victor's ability to learn and civilize and famously recorded on his findings (see Itard, 1801/1962). The sequel of baby-experiments is obtained from a research put forth by Paul Bloom (2010) who examines the innateness of morality by analyzing the reactions of babies in, inter alia, puppet-show-experiments in which one puppet hinders another puppet in achieving its goal.

If morality is innate is an empiricist, prewired kind of fashion, at least one of the four accounts presented in part 1 is required to satisfy the requirements of prewired innateness without leaving room for empirical-, or theoretical implausibilities

1) The morality versus convention nexus.

   In order to proof the innate presence of this nexus, one is required to find traits appealing to morality as prescribed by Turiel (1983), i.e. resolving around the concepts of, inter alia, harm

and authority. When Victor was found, he had strong inclinations to steal things, for which he was subsequently punished by Itard. Stealing would be classified as an immoral act as it is independent of authority, generally holds and involves a victim who is being harmed. Yet Victor appears unaware of any rule against stealing. By punishing him, Itard tries to *learn* Victor that stealing is morally wrong. If the divide between moral- and conventional norms is innate, however, Victor's cognitive architecture should be organized in such a way that he could already recognize harmful acts as wrong before he was being taught they were. Of course, here one may argue that Victor may have know harm was wrong, but was naively unaware of the harm involved in stealing.

Turning (1983) to the baby-experiments, Bloom (2013) finds that when toddlers watch a puppet show in which one puppet hinders (i.e. harms) another puppet, the babies prefer the former puppet, while sometimes punishing the latter. One toddler even hammered the naughty puppet in the head. This behavior supports the belief that an innate dislike of harm is imbedded in the baby's minds, but one must not be hasty in drawing this conclusion.

Turiel (1983) also tested his nexus by probing children on stories involving conventional- and moral violations. In examining what children think of a rule to wear a school uniform, Turiel finds that five-year-olds understand that such a rule may restrict itself to the school or to the authority of the teacher. When he probes what the children think of a girl who pushes (harms) a boy of a swing because she wants to use it, the majority of children think its wrong, independent of the respective school or the teachers authority (Haidt, 2012). Based on this, inter alia, Turiel concludes young children grasp the special, universal nature of rules preventing harm. Moreover, in extending the research to other places, Turiel concludes that children from various cultures make the distinction between conventional and moral norms (Haidt, 2012).

Two notes can be placed with this conclusion. The first is that, recall the Ilongot, not whole humanity suggests to have a dislike of harm. Given, babies and young children may dislike harm, but if this dislike were to stem from domain-general psychological mechanisms, the same mechanisms should be at work with the adult Ilongot. The second is that the children who distinguished between moral and conventional norms had already spend five years in the presence of adults and may have fully learned the divide through observation.

2) The theory of the 'four domains'

For this theory to be innate, one is required to find the presence of one or more domains reflected in the behavior of feral children and babies. In Itard's recordings, there are situations described appealing to justice and obedience, which are related to the domains of reciprocity

and hierarchy. Itard reports that sometimes he behaved deliberately 'odd' to examine Victor's sense of justice. Where Itard had developed a systematical reward to Victor's behavior, he would suddenly deny the reward an punish Victor instead. This provoked anger, which Itard took as Victor's awareness of justice (Itard, 1801/1962; Prinz, 2008). One might argue that this is evidence for the existence of a moral mechanism dedicated to fairness, but one must be cautioned. The tendency to react angrily when being denied reward is also common with various animals, e.g. rodents (Prinz, 2008).

The reporting of obedience is introduced in (1). Through punishing Victor for bad behavior, Itard learned the boy to obey. Which may well suggest that Itard successfully revised Victor's prewired domain of hierarchy. Of course, it may also be that the boy had no innate moral domain of hierarchy, but was introduced to the concept of obedience by Itard's teaching.

Both the domain of hierarchy and reciprocity may have been present and originating from unlearned psychological mechanisms, but there is no proof that the resulting traits are essentially moral (c). Certainty is that they are not strictly *humanly* moral.

Returning to the baby-experiments, in examining the behavior of babies across different cultures, Bloom (2013) finds that the desire to punish wrongdoers and the notion of vicarious suffering is universally observable. Note that the former is related to the domain of reciprocity and the latter to that of suffering. As in the Victor case, these findings may suggest the existence of domains potentially originating at unlearned psychological mechanisms, but do not attribute human morality (c). Vicarious suffering is also observable with rats who get distressed by hearing screams of other rats (see Bloom, 2013) and a dog may attack his boss's assaulter.

Skies turn grim when one turns to the undiscussed domain of purity. The domain of purity is strongly affiliated with the sense of disgust. Rozin (1987) finds that babies, in contrast to adults, are not disgusted by eating things adults would deem morally distressing (e.g. animal droppings). If the domain of purity would be prewired innate, something morally vexing at adulthood cannot have been common practice during infancy as this would imply that original domain-general psychological mechanisms behind the trait are required to have switched in nature during the upbringing.

The knowledge of disgust and the understanding of purity is not inborn. In contrast; it is an understanding that is developed between the 1st and the 8th year of life (Rozin, 1987).

3) The 'big three' ethics

The 'big three' ethics evolve around the self, the community and the divine. If this divide were to be prewired innate, it must be present in the behavior of feral-children and babies. Of course,

in the absence of ties with the outside world, the existence of a communal- or transcendental awareness may seem unlikely. Yet there are some examples in which the ethic of community appeared in the absence of humanity. In the year 1937, a girl, a.k.a. 'the bear-girl', was found after having spent most of her days being part of a family of bears. She was discovered when hunters had shot a bear, after which they were attacked by a "wood spirit". This creature turned out to be a girl (Michell and Rickard, 2007).

The reason the 'bear-girl' makes an interesting case is that she attacked the attackers of one of her fellows. This behavior is related to moral properties captured in the ethic of community such as loyalty and self-sacrifice. Of course, at this point, one might argue that this altruistic behavior is also observed in e.g. wolf packs and hordes of elephants and therefore need not be related to human morality (c).

Regarding the ethic of divinity, isolated societies all over the world show to have some awareness of the divine. Such an awareness, however, is unlikely present in individually isolated cases like the of the bear-girl or Victor (or babies altogether). Note that the same may hold for the concept self-awareness, required for the ethic of authority.

Turning to baby-experiments, toddlers seem to have communal awareness. Bloom (2013) finds that 3-month-olds have a preference for faces of their own race to others. In a same way, 11-month-olds have a reference for people who share their own taste of food. This, however, need not involve any morality. Moreover, recordings on self-awareness and especially a 'divine awareness' are absent.

4) The 'five tastebuds'

For this account to proof innate one is required to find evidence for the existence of the five modules, i.e. care, fairness, loyalty, authority and sanctity in the feral-child and baby-cases. Note that the concept of fairness has received attention in the aforementioned evaluation of Victor's response to 'unjust rewards'. Bloom (2013) tested the same thing on babies by denying them a treat and the response is universal; the infant gets mad. In the prior section we saw that Victor got mad too. As did rats.

Returning to the Victor-case, there are some recording on the module of care. Itard (1801/1962): "[…] as a great proof of intelligence, his having been able to *learn*, at the end of six weeks residence in society, to prepare his food, with all the *care* and attention […]". Of course, the care of food may be moral (e.g. on religious grounds), but it may also be simply practical.

There are also recording of emotions related to the modules, e.g. fear, which is related to authority. Findings from the situations in which Victor showed fear, however, are eventually

similar to those in which he showed anger after being denied his reward; the reaction is not exclusively human and cannot be proven to be essentially moral (c).

Finally, similar to the issues involved in proving the domain of purity; the module of sanctity is nearly impossibly proven in a feral-child-and baby cases. It is, for example, difficult to think of a feral-child or baby having to deal with contaminations (of diseases among people) or sanctity in dealing with the dead (again of other people). Moreover, returning to the lack of disgust recorded with babies once more, the 'tastebud' of sanctity appears to be fully learned, instead of stemming from unlearned, innate psychological mechanisms.

This section illustrates that whereas (2), (3) and (4) may entail aspects that are prewired innate, the evidence for the innateness of the (1) is lacking. Although toddlers and young children seem to dislike harm, which is of core importance in this approach of the moral domain, the same dislike may disappear over childhood (if it was there in the first place), which is impossible if the dislike is captured by innate domain-general psychological mechanisms.

Even though (2), (3) and (4), or some aspects of them, may be innate, there is no evidence that they are strictly human nor essentially moral. Finally, where all three accounts encounter some difficulties in explaining the innateness of domains, ethics and 'tastebuds' relating to the transcendental, especially (2) and (4) encounter implausibilities revolving around the concept of disgust. Disgust is a core ingredient of the domain of purity and the 'tastebud' of sanctity, but is prominently absent in the behavior of babies.

The findings presented in this sections support the belief that the human cognitive architecture includes domain-general psychological mechanisms in line with Shweder's, 'big three' ethics approach of the moral domain. Note that no evidence presented whether these domain-general psychological mechanisms are essentially moral. According to the hardwired definition of moral essence (c.f. Prinz) they are not, as the ethics include nonmoral applications. Moreover, all presumably innate domains are not proven strictly human.

Discussion and Conclusion

Is morality innate? This paper illustrates that when innateness is approached from a nativist, 'hardwired' perspective (i.e. a phenotype is innate if it is unlearned and linked to a psychological mechanism solely dedicated to the respective phenotype (c.f Prinz)), none of the four prominent approaches of the moral domain taken into consideration pass the test. When the empiricist, 'prewired' perspective (as in "organized in advance of experience") is adopted and when focus is shifted from the theory to the empirical evidence, the first account; the morality versus convention nexus (c.f. Turiel), encountered implausibilities in the innate presence of a universal rule against harm. Two other accounts; the theory of the 'four domains' (c.f Haidt) and the 'five tastebuds' (c.f Haidt & Joseph) appear to entail innate components, but encounter insolvable problems in respectively the domain of purity and the 'tastebud' of sanctity, both stemming from the implausible presence of their core component in the practical cases; disgust. The sole account passing the bar without encountering such problems is Shweder's 'big three' ethics approach.

Although evidence is presented that some domains or ethics may be innate in a empiricist sense, they are not proven to be strictly human, nor essentially moral. Moral essence has been the focal point of Prinz's argument against the innateness of the theory of the 'four domains' (c.f. Haidt). Even if the domains stem from hardwired, innate emotions, these emotions need not be moral as they do not restrict themselves to the moral domain. The former has appeared when the 'four domains' and the 'five tastebuds' were evaluated with respect to the empiricist reception of innateness. Some 'domains' and some 'tastebuds' may be innate, but they are not be strictly human. Shweder's 'big three' ethics may not be exclusively human either as, e.g. the ethic of community is also observed in the wild. The combination of the ethic of authority, the ethic of community and the ethic of divinity, however, may likely be strictly human. Although no empirical evidence is presented for the existence of the latter ethic, its in-existence is not proven either. Moreover, thinking of isolated societies and cultures all over the world, the idea that a 'divine ethic' component is innate (as in prewired) to human beings, seems plausible. Yet, the ethic is likely to be not utilized in the absence of society as it is in feral-child-cases. The same holds for the ethic of community; it cannot have manifested in the absence of any kind of communal life. This reasoning boils down to a well-known belief about morality; […] "as sociality goes, so goes morality"[…] (Doris & Nichols, 2012: page 434).

The observed 'prewired' innateness of Shweder's ethics succeeds in explaining the observed manifold manifestations of morality. If the ethics are merely preloaded, respective societies may fill

in the blanks and revise them towards the common belief. Nonetheless, whatever these beliefs may be, some aspect of self awareness (authority), a communal awareness and a transcendental awareness will be present.

A remaining question, one in the spirit of Prinz's critique on the moral innateness of the 'four domains', is whether the ethics are essentially moral or merely social. Future research might provide the answer.

This paper fuels the discussion on the innateness of morality by presenting evidence that four of the contemporarily most prominent views on morality fail to satisfy 'hardwired' innateness. Regarding the nurture vs. nature debate, this paper places pressure on the 'nature explanation' by disputing the existence of nativist moral innate traits.

Future research can built on this paper by improving the requirements for the innate moral domain and by applying them on various other accounts of morality.

References

Bentham, J. (1789) An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.

Bloom, P. (2013) Just Babies; the Origins of Good and Evil. *Crown*.

Colombo, M. (2013). Moving forward (and beyond) the modularity debate: A network perspective. *Philosophy of Science.* Vol. *80*(3). Pp. 356-377.

Cowie, F. (1999). What's within? Nativism reconsidered. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Doris, J.M. and Nichols, S. (2012) Broad-Minded: Sociality and the Cognitive Science of Morality. *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Cognitive Science*

Dwyer, S. J. (1999). Moral competence. *Philosophy and* linguistics. Pp. 169-190

Gowans, Chris (2006) Moral Relativism. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.)

Greene, J. D. and Haidt, J. (2002). How (and where) does moral judgment work? *Trends* in Cognitive Sciences. Vol. 6. Pp. 517-523.

Gottlieb, G. (1997) Synthesizing Nature–Nurture: Prenatal Roots of Instinctive Behavior, Erlbaum

Haidt, J. and Joseph, C. (2004) Intuitive ethics: how innately prepared intuitions generate culturally variable virtues. *American Academy of Arts & Sciences*

Haidt, J. (2012) The Righteous Mind; Why Good People are Divided by Politics and Religion. *Pantheon books.* New York.

Itard, J.M.G. (1962). *The wild boy of Aveyron*. (G. Humphrey & M. Humphrey, Trans.). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Lecanuet, J. P., Granier−Deferre, C., Jacquet, A. Y., Capponi, I., & Ledru, L. (1993). Prenatal discrimination of a male and a female voice uttering the same sentence. *Early development and parenting.* Vol. 2(4), Pp. 217-228.

Kelly, D. and Stich, S. (2007) Two Theories about the Cognitive Architecture Underlying Morality *The innate mind.* Vol. 3

Kohlberg, L. (1984). The psychology of moral development: Moral stages and the life cycle. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.

Lisciandra, C., Postma-Nilsenová, M. and Colombo, M. (2013) Conformorality. A Study on Group Conditioning of Normative Judgment. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology. Vol 4(4).*

Marcus, G. (2004) The Birth of the Mind. New York: Basic Books.

Michell, J. and Rickard, B. (2007) The Rough Guide to Unexplained Phenomena. *Rough Guides.* P. 309

Mikhail, J. (2000). Rawls' linguistic analogy: A study of the 'generative grammar' model of moral theory described by John Rawls in 'A Theory of Justice.' Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Philosophy, Cornell University.

Mill. J.S. (1861) Utilitarianism

Nado, J., Kelly, D. and Stich,S. (2006) Moral Judgement. *Routledge Companion to the Philosophy of Psychology*

Nichols, S. (2005). Innateness and moral psychology. *The innate mind: Structure and content*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Piaget, J. (1932/1965). The Moral Judgement of the Child. Trans. M. Gabain. New York: Free Press.

Prinz, J.J. (2008) Is Morality Innate? *Moral Psychology*. Oxford University Press

Rosaldo, M. Z. (1980). Knowledge and passion: Ilongot notions of self and social life. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rozin, P. and Fallon, A.E. (1987) A perspective on disgust. *Psychological Review, Vol 94(1)*. Pp. 23-41.

Samuels, R. (2004) Innateness in cognitive science. *Trend in Cognitive Science. Vol 8(3).* Pp. 136-141

Schmitt, E. (2005). General Is scolded for saying, "It's fun to shoot some people," *New York Times*.

Shweder, R. A., Much, N. C., Mahapatra, M. and Park, L. (2003) The "Big Three" of Morality (Autonomy, Community, Divinity) and the Big Three Explanations of Suffering. *Why Do Men Barbecue? Recipes for Cultural Psychology.* Richard A. Shweder, ed., Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shweder, R.A. (2012) Relativism and Universalism. *A companion to moral anthropology,* 85.

Sperber, D. and L. A. Hirschfeld. (2004) The Cognitive Foundations of Cultural Stability and Diversity. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences.* Vol. 8. Pp. 40–46.

The Bible

Turiel, E. (1983) The Development of Social Knowledge: Morality and Convention. Cambridge University Press.

Turiel, E. (1998). Moral development. *Social, emotional, and* personality development. Pp. 863-932

Turiel, E. (2002). The culture of morality: Social development, context, and conflict. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.