

### Key concepts:

- **Meta-ethics** is a discipline in ethics that attempts to understand the nature of ethical statements, attitudes, properties and judgements.
- **Naturalism** is a meta-ethical theory stating that we can learn the meaning of ethical terms like 'good' or 'bad' by looking at knowledge gained through the senses - **empirical** data.
- Naturalism takes a **realist** view that the world around us exists and can be known.
- Naturalism is a **cognitivist** meta-ethical theory that says ethical statements or **propositions** are meaningful and can be **verified** (proven to be true) or **falsified** (proven to be false) by looking at how they affect the world.
- A **normative** use of Naturalism makes judgements about good or bad behaviour by observing behaviour and its positive or negative effects in the world e.g., Utilitarianism is a normative application of ethical Naturalism.
- Verified moral statements are **objectively** true so moral laws exist independently of human beings and are part of the nature of the world.
- Moral laws are **universal**, meaning they can always be applied to all people.

- F. H. Bradley's essay 'My Station and its Duties' appears in his book *Ethical Studies* as part of his ethical thought process and is not his final position.
- Bradley presented a new kind of Naturalism in this essay that combined meta-ethical ideas found in the contrasting approaches in Utilitarianism and Kant. He ultimately rejected this.
- The individual 'self' is a part of the wider 'whole' of society from which it cannot be separated.
- To understand one's own identity or 'self' is a journey of **self-realisation**.
- Moral behaviour involves understanding one's own position or **station** in society and following the **duties** or responsibilities that belong to that station.
- Moral statements are cognitive as they relate to the **concrete universal** or the world that the individual is part of.

- Naturalism makes a false link between 'is' statements about the world and 'ought' statements about morality. **Hume's Law / Hume's Guillotine** cuts this link. A moral **imperative** or 'ought' is a different type of statement than a descriptive one and so you cannot derive an 'ought' from an 'is'.
- The **Naturalistic Fallacy** says that it is false to try and define moral terms by relating them to other states, like happiness or fulfilling a duty. G.E. Moore compared this to defining the colour yellow. Goodness, like yellow, cannot be defined as a natural property.
- Moore says that when a naturalist tries to define goodness like a natural property, they raise an **open question** that cannot be answered with a simple yes or no e.g., if good is defined as 'doing my duty within my station' we can still ask, 'but is that good?'

### Key quotes:

**'In my station my particular duties are prescribed to me, and I have them whether I wish to or not.'**  
- F.H. Bradley

**'For as this ought, or ought not, expresses some new relation or affirmation, it is necessary that it should be observed and explained...'** - Hume

**'If I am asked, "What is good?" my answer is that good is good, and that is the end of the matter.'** - G.E. Moore

### Issues for analysis and evaluation:

#### **Key arguments/debates**

Whether ethical language is meaningful or relates in any way to the real world.

Whether ethical language is objective.

Whether naturalism is a useful theory in ethical philosophy.

#### **Key questions**

Can ethical language be understood in the same way as non-ethical language?

Can we test or check the meaning of ethical terms using empirical evidence?

### Key words:

meta-ethics

cognitivist

normative

station

imperative

Naturalism

propositions

objectively

duties

naturalistic fallacy

empirical

verified

universal

concrete universal

open question

realist

falsified

self-realisation

Hume's Law / Hume's Guillotine