

UNITED WISDOM

Conscience: an inner orientation and the voice of learned rules

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P07 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Conscience: an inner orientation and the voice of learned rules

Epigraph

> *“The first is the judge; the second the pannel.”*

— Adam Smith, The Theory of Moral Sentiments, III.II in this edition, p.183. The first is the examining self; the second is the acting self. Original English, including the edition’s spelling pannel.

What this article is about

After declining an optional request, someone may feel they acted wrongly; after concealing an error, another may experience little inner objection. How should conscience be understood when emotional volume does not determine responsibility? This article distinguishes moral attention, learned rules, others' condemnation and particular commitments. We examine what an inner voice demands, which grounds it assumes and how it relates to actual circumstances. Kant, Adam Smith and Rousseau offer different philosophical comparisons, keeping the question open rather than forming a common theory. Invented family and workplace scenes show when promises need clarification, actions need repair or an overly broad prohibition needs revision. The material diagnoses no experience and guarantees no relief. It proposes more specific responsibility while retaining respect for oneself, another person and information still missing.

I. An inner voice still needs understanding

Imagine someone declining an optional request and subsequently thinking they acted wrongly. They neither deceived nor broke a promise, nor withheld necessary help known to them. Yet a familiar rule returns: a good person never refuses. In another invented scene, an employee conceals a substantial error with little internal objection because their circle treats this as normal. These are not psychological observations. They pose a philosophical question: is the strength of an inner experience sufficient to determine an action's moral quality? Must a loud voice be obeyed immediately? Does a quiet one remove responsibility for consequences?

Conscience can mean a capacity to address one's own action with a moral question. Everyday speech also uses the word for shame before others, fear of condemnation, fidelity to a habitual rule and concern for someone harmed. These meanings can coexist without becoming identical. The article does not diagnose the origin of each experience. It considers the grounds

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

of an internal demand: what it condemns, which rule it assumes and how that rule relates to the actual situation. This respects moral unease without making all its content an infallible instruction or dismissing an inconvenient objection as an empty obstacle to freedom.

Both possibilities matter. An inner voice can recall what someone would prefer to hide: a broken promise, a convenient lie or another's cost. It can also repeat a demand needing revision because it forbids any refusal or independence. Distinguishing them requires more than selecting “follow your heart” or “ignore it.” We return to action, relationships and grounds of judgement. This slower route guarantees no immediate relief. Its purpose is specific responsibility: seeing not only how difficult the present feels, but what actually happened between ourselves and other people.

II. A learned rule is not necessarily a meaningless rule

Learning that a moral rule was acquired in a family or social setting does not refute it. Rules against deception or humiliation and for recognising promises also arrive through language and relationships. Origins alone do not determine quality. Equally, a rule is not correct merely because it is longstanding and provokes strong internal objections when breached. In both cases, history replaces examination of grounds. Our question is what the rule protects and whether its application here can be explained. It may sustain an important relationship, or preserve an arrangement convenient to some while imposing unlimited obligations on others without asking about resources or agreement.

Consider an invented family formula: “You cannot refuse your own.” It may preserve a valuable commitment to mutual support. Without clarification, however, it can treat unavailable money, time, consent to danger or willingness to conceal an error as refusal. Someone receives an obligation nobody has bounded. Revision need not abandon closeness: help through available means, avoid impossible promises and do not participate in harm. This editorial example is no study of family relationships. It distinguishes a familiar rule from the value it once attempted to protect, allowing a different expression without necessarily breaking with an entire relational history.

Internal confidence after revision is not sufficient proof either. A new formula can become a convenient excuse if existing commitments disappear from it. What changed and what remains should be named. I can reject the idea that every refusal is wrong while remaining responsible for a particular promise. I can disagree with a family demand while considering its consequences for someone dependent on me. The distinction releases an overly general command, not every relationship. Conscience becomes a capacity to revisit grounds rather than merely choose between old and new slogans. Respect for history can coexist with reflection on it and precision towards those affected.

III. Conscience as attention to the grounds of duty

In The Metaphysical Elements of Ethics, Kant connects conscience with examining one's action before practical reason. He distinguishes judgement about what counts as duty, where error is possible, from the act of internal examination itself. His claim about conscience must not become a promise that every internal demand accurately describes the world. This is a philosophical distinction, not a way to assess someone through emotional intensity. For our purpose, understanding what ought to be done requires clarification. Reading the historical passage involves distinguishing attention to duty from fidelity to every initial judgement.

In the optional-request scene, someone can ask both “Why do I feel bad?” and “Which obligation do I regard as breached?” Was there a promise, known necessity, agreed role or available opportunity to prevent substantial harm? If the only answer is never refusing, that rule's limits need examination. A particular promise creates a different question: how was it accepted, what prevents fulfilment and who needs to hear about change? Clarification provides no automatic justification. It makes the objection's object more intelligible. Someone can discover specific responsibility where only indefinite accusation existed, or recognise an old demand extending obligation without adequate grounds.

Philosophical language should not exclude another's voice. “I acted according to conscience” can close discussion of consequences another person understands better. Explaining internal grounds establishes no completeness of information. An unrecognised cost reported by someone relying on a promise deserves attention without necessarily validating every complaint. Conscience should not become a private, unchallengeable stamp applied to any convenient decision. Our editorial application retains facts, other participants and revised rules. “I thought it right” can continue with “On what grounds, what was unknown, and what must now be considered?” rather than making previous confidence inviolable.

IV. Seeing oneself from another position

In The Theory of Moral Sentiments, Adam Smith considers evaluating one's conduct from an imagined observer's position. The edition read distinguishes the agent from the examiner of action. This is no instruction to agree with every actual audience: others may lack information, pursue advantage or make mistakes. The comparison concerns leaving the convenient position where intention is vivid and another's cost nearly absent. Here this remains an editorial application rather than an empirically validated impartiality technique. An imagined observer acquires no omniscience and cannot replace conversation with someone possessing accessible information.

In an invented workplace scene, an employee conceals an error to avoid letting the team down. From their position, it protects the shared task. A colleague later repairing the

consequences may describe it differently: essential information was unavailable in time. Hearing that position does not predetermine acceptance of every accusation. It brings into consideration the time, burden and choice transferred to someone else. If the error affected nobody and was repaired through available means, judgement would differ. Imagination poses a question; facts are needed to answer it. Asking what changed for the participant is better than declaring their feelings or hidden motives on their behalf.

Changing position can also concern oneself. Someone forbidding themselves any refusal may ask whether they would demand the same of a friend in identical circumstances. If not, the difference requires explanation. Perhaps there is a special obligation; perhaps the rule applied asymmetrically without sufficient grounds. Neither conclusion is automatic. The observer should not merely repeat the harshest familiar judgement. Examination should consider information and relationships instead of increasing accusation's volume. Conscience gains substance by seeing action from several sides and returning to reality, rather than demanding an increasingly severe internal voice.

V. Trusting an inner orientation and its limits

In Book IV of Emile, Rousseau's Savoyard vicar defends conscience as an inner moral orientation and distinguishes natural feeling from acquired ideas. Trust here has strong grounds connected with a conception of human nature. The article does not adopt this as an established fact about every contemporary experience. It offers another perspective beside Kant and Smith: moral life need not be exhausted by others' ready-made opinions. Someone may object internally to conduct approved by their surroundings. Calling something “inner,” however, does not make three philosophical explanations one theory or remove the question of which content now deserves trust.

Imagine a group routinely mocking an absent participant. Someone joins in, then notices they do not want to sustain that relationship. Their objection can arise before a complete rule is formulated. It deserves attention as the beginning of a moral question. Further clarification can ask whom the action affects, how it differs from permissible criticism and how disagreement can be expressed. Feeling initiates consideration rather than replacing every subsequent ground. Lacking a philosophical vocabulary does not require continuing humiliation until research is complete. We can end our participation and explain the boundary more precisely later without immediately solving every relationship in the group.

The opposite danger is trusting only the voice that permits what we want. If inconvenient objections are labelled learned rules and pleasant confidence the authentic self, the distinction has become convenient protection for desire. Permission and prohibition therefore deserve equal scrutiny: why is the action permissible or not, what could change the judgement, and whose information is missing? The article offers no instant method for separating a true

conscience from every other experience. Its narrower route respects an internal signal, articulates its content and examines its relation to action. Trust acquires substance when it allows understanding and correction rather than demanding either complete obedience or complete abandonment of moral attention.

VI. Others’ condemnation and our responsibility

An actual audience can reveal something overlooked. Someone may name a broken promise, report consequences or recall an agreed rule. Condemnation is not correct merely because many voices share it, however. A group can protect a familiar arrangement in which one person always yields. Its content matters alongside its social force. What happened, which relationship was breached, and who bears the cost? These questions allow justified criticism to be heard without accepting an indefinite accusation of bad character as sufficient proof. The article advocates neither ignoring others nor calling every unwelcome message pressure; it distinguishes information, grounds and the manner of presenting them.

In one invented scene, someone postpones a longstanding arrangement at the last moment without explanation. Another is dissatisfied because they spent time and relied on the promise. There is a particular object of responsibility. In another scene, no meeting was promised and a new invitation was declined beforehand. Dissatisfaction exists there too, but does not itself create an earlier obligation. The difference looks small while discussion remains at “you upset me.” It becomes substantial once the agreement's history appears. Feelings can be recognised respectfully in both cases without accepting every conclusion about guilt or a duty to reverse the decision immediately.

Conscience is not opposed to relationships here. It prevents responsibility from dissolving into approval or hiding behind independence. We can bear disagreement while repairing a breached promise, recognise consequences while rejecting humiliating conversation, or explain refusal without demanding instant delight. These combinations retain complexity. Complete obedience to an audience and complete insensitivity are not our only possibilities. Moral attention distinguishes an important fact reported, an arguable ground offered, and unsupported demands for submission. Responses can differ even when the volume of condemnation is identical.

VII. A feeling is not a judgement on the whole person

Moral unease easily becomes “I am bad,” “something is wrong with me,” or “I have no right to want this.” Such formulas do not identify the judgement's object. A particular harm can require repair, which declaring an entire identity wrong cannot accomplish. A difficult feeling can exist without an established breach, and a breach cannot be inferred solely from its intensity. This is a logical distinction, not a diagnosis of origins. The article establishes no reason why a particular person feels bad. It avoids replacing action with a total verdict on self, because responsibility requires conduct, grounds, consequences and available change.

Once the object is found, language becomes more precise: “I promised to communicate a change and did not.” We can then ask who was affected, what remains repairable and how the method can change. If no object has yet been found, uncertainty can be recorded: “I feel an objection but do not understand which rule I regard as breached.” This does not call the feeling false. It leaves the question open without requiring immediate obedience to every demand for the sake of relief. Specificity retains moral meaning without turning life into an endless trial of someone's existence. Discussion concerns what they do and answer for, rather than their right to be among others.

Sometimes retaining this distinction alone is difficult, particularly when an experience interferes with everyday life. An essay should not promise that a few questions solve this. Appropriate support can be sought, with its form depending on circumstances and personal choice. We diagnose no clinical condition, prescribe no treatment and derive no medical recommendation from historical quotations. The material's boundary matters: reflection on conscience is no health assessment and requires no endurance of every internal accusation without help. Moral responsibility and attention to one's condition can coexist. Seeking support means neither abandoning conscience nor receiving exemption from every accepted commitment.

VIII. When an action needs repair

Suppose examination reveals a particular breach rather than only a difficult feeling. Someone concealed information another relied on, or made a promise they already intended not to keep. Conscience then involves more than explaining an experience. Available repair deserves consideration: stating facts, acknowledging participation, clarifying consequences and changing subsequent methods. This is no legal procedure and promises no restored relationship. Some losses cannot be fully recovered; another need not immediately accept an explanation. Yet an uncomfortable conversation alone does not justify leaving consequences invisible where they can be responsibly named and considered.

In the workplace scene, the employee reports the concealed error. Stating what happened and who needs the information is more useful than beginning with lengthy proof of kindly motives. Intention can explain part of the history without replacing necessary facts. Repair requiring others' participation cannot be promised on their behalf. Safety and professional competence require appropriate procedures. Moral acknowledgement grants no right to improvise with others' risks for quick relief. Our discussion remains at the grounds of responsibility: who is affected, what was promised, which consequences concern my action, and which change actually lies within my power?

Repair should not become indefinite punishment unrelated to the act either. Acknowledging a breach does not mean accepting every subsequent demand. Justified costs, available restoration and a new request requiring separate agreement differ. The internal orientation can become specific: not simply “I must feel bad,” but “I must examine this responsibility and do what is available.” Feeling bad does not itself repair another's loss; an absence of strong feeling does not itself cancel obligation. The next step is measured through its relation to action, facts and people rather than a competition to demonstrate moral distress convincingly.

IX. When the rule needs revision

Another result is that no breach is established while the internal demand proves overly broad. Someone might forbid every independent plan because another person could be upset. The rule makes freedom depend on an absence of all dissatisfaction, which cannot be guaranteed. Revision needs more precision than “I owe nobody anything now.” We can consider someone, communicate significant changes and keep promises without making their satisfaction the sole measure of a permissible life. This editorial formulation solves no universal case; it identifies the part needing examination so an important relationship can survive without unlimited transfer of authority over our actions.

In an invented family scene, someone announces a new plan beforehand and offers to agree on connected duties. Another remains dissatisfied. The response matters but does not establish that the decision was wrong. Perhaps the plan breaches an actual promise; perhaps the expectation was never agreed. History is needed rather than an obligation inferred from one conversational outcome. Revision becomes more convincing when retained responsibility is named: what will be done, what needs separate agreement, and what was never promised. Change then need not erase the relationship. It clarifies independence within it and leaves room for disagreement without an automatic right to prohibit a decision.

A new rule can also become excessive. “I always choose myself” may conceal the same rigidity as “I always choose others.” Both versions avoid circumstances through “always,” at the expense of accuracy. Relations between grounds are more useful: freedom, existing promises, resources, particular needs and permissible methods. Their positions can change

but need explanation. Conscience keeps the question open rather than permanently selecting a convenient extreme. Revision need not deliver instant calm; an old demand can continue to sound. Change concerns no guaranteed new feeling, but a clearer account of action and which obligations actually apply.

X. An inner orientation that allows conversation

Conscience can mean refusing to close a moral question where an answer is especially convenient for oneself. It recalls another's cost, an obscured promise and the method of action. Its content nevertheless needs language, information and an understanding of relationships. Rousseau, Kant and Smith reveal different aspects: trust in moral feeling, examination of duty and viewing oneself from another position. They form no single theory of conscience's origins. This article does not determine which account exhausts human nature. Its narrower task preserves moral attention without granting every internal demand absolute authority or dismissing every inconvenient objection as an obsolete habit.

Return to the opening scenes. The person declining an optional request needs to understand whether an obligation existed and how the rule was formulated. The employee concealing an error needs to consider consequences even with little inner objection. Both require facts and grounds, but not identical decisions. The first may call for revising a prohibition on refusal; the second for recognising specific responsibility. A general recommendation to strengthen or weaken conscience cannot replace the distinction. Its object matters more. Changed information can require changed judgement—not proof of inconsistency, but accountability to actual circumstances rather than retaining an old conclusion solely to feel confident.

The result might be a clear, small commitment: communicating an essential fact, clarifying a promise, refusing to treat refusal as proof of a bad identity, or examining the grounds of an objection heard. These actions neither complete moral life nor remove every difficult experience. They connect inner orientation with relationships. Conscience becomes more mature neither through constant punishment nor through an absence of doubt. In our editorial perspective, its substance appears in naming conduct, seeing consequences, explaining rules and allowing conversation. Someone remains an accountable participant in shared life, capable of error, repair and revision without depriving themselves or another of dignity for a final verdict.

What this means in practice

If you wish to continue, choose a small situation involving an internal objection. Do not begin with the hardest experience. Record the action, known consequences and the demand's content separately. For example: “I declined a new invitation” and “I think refusal is forbidden.” This proves neither that refusal was right nor that the feeling is false. It shows which question needs considering without immediately assessing an entire identity.

Next, clarify the grounds: was there a promise, agreed role, known necessity or available opportunity to prevent substantial harm? Whose information is missing? What does the rule protect, and would you apply it to another person in identical circumstances? If particular responsibility emerges, name available repair. If the rule proves overly broad, formulate a more precise limit while retaining actual commitments. With insufficient information, the question can remain open; no invented answer is needed to finish the exercise.

Finally, choose just one possible action: checking a fact, communicating change, asking about consequences or describing a promise more precisely. This is voluntary editorial reflection, not diagnosis or a proven calming technique. It determines no legal culpability, replaces no professional assistance and requires no endurance of danger. If the experience interferes with life, an essay does not require solitary examination. The purpose is to connect an internal question with actual action and grounds, rather than obtain freedom from every doubt at any cost.

Key quotation

> *“Unconscientiousness is not want of conscience, but the propensity not to heed its judgement.”*

— Immanuel Kant, The Metaphysical Elements of Ethics, Introduction XII, B. Thomas Kingsmill Abbott English translation. The surrounding argument admits error in judging what counts as duty.

Connections between traditions

Question	Comparison	Boundary
Where does orientation arise?	Rousseau defends a natural moral principle; Smith examines an observer's position.	These are different accounts, not one empirical theory.
How do we examine ourselves?	Smith distinguishes agent and examiner; Kant addresses examination of duty.	An imagined observer and practical reason are not identical.
Can judgement be mistaken?	Kant admits error about duty's content; our scene calls for factual scrutiny.	An internal signal is not infallible knowledge of the world.
What is trust?	Rousseau gives conscience strong authority; our analysis retains attention and clarification.	Contemporary application does not call a historical claim a study.
What follows an objection?	Each perspective allows discussion of moral self-relation.	Repairing a particular act remains editorial examination of circumstances.

Primary sources

1. Adam Smith. The Theory of Moral Sentiments, Part III, chapter II in this edition, pp.183–184: the acting and examining selves.

2. Immanuel Kant. The Metaphysical Elements of Ethics, Introduction XII, B, Of Conscience. Thomas Kingsmill Abbott translation: attention to judgement of duty.

3. Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Emile, Book IV, the Savoyard vicar’s discourse on conscience. Barbara Foxley English translation.

Only the passages identified in the research notes were read. Russian quotations are United Wisdom translations from Smith’s original English text and Thomas Kingsmill Abbott’s English translation of Kant; the German original was not collated. All contemporary scenes are hypothetical editorial examples.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Tags

conscience, inner orientation, morality, rule, learned rules, duty, responsibility, feeling, judgement, shame, guilt, condemnation, promise, refusal, boundaries, independence, consequences, repair, revision, moral attention, Kant, Adam Smith, Rousseau, Emile, spectator, practical reason, relationships, consent, uncertainty, philosophy of life

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.