Section B

3.　　(a)　　**Explain the meta-ethical approach of Naturalism.**　　　　**[AO1 20]**

Candidates could include some or all of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.

- Naturalism is meta-ethical theory. It explores the status, foundations, and scope of moral values and words. Naturalism concentrates on what morality itself is.
- Naturalism states that objective moral laws exist independently of human beings. Morality is not the result of human rational thought but is an independent reality.
- As morality is independent of reality, moral terms can be understood by analysing the natural world in the same way that scientific terms can be understood from analysis.
- Both ethical and non-ethical statements can both be regarded as cognitivist.
- Cognitivism is the meta-ethical view that ethical sentences express propositions and can therefore can be verified or falsified.
- Verified moral statements can then be accepted as objective truths in the same way that scientific statements are accepted as objective truths.
- As moral statements are objective truths they must also be universal i.e. apply to all in the same way.
- Candidates can refer to the work of F.H. Bradley on Naturalism. Bradley developed naturalism by arguing that ethical sentences express propositions. These propositions can be seen as true or false by considering objective features of the world. Therefore, meta-ethical statements can be seen in the same way as scientific terms.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

3.   (b)   'The Naturalistic Fallacy illustrates that ethical language can never be objective'.
Evaluate this view.   **[AO2 30]**

Candidates could include some or all of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.

- The Naturalistic Fallacy is commonly associated with G. E. Moore. He argued ethical terms like 'good' and 'bad' cannot be used in objective statements. This is because you cannot define ethical words like 'good' and 'bad'. Any attempt to find a definition will reduce / limit the idea of these terms. Therefore, ethical terms like 'good' and 'bad' cannot be used in objective statements because ethical terms are themselves are undefinable.

- Ethical statements cannot be objective because the terms used to express them are not themselves objective. Naturalism cannot illustrate ethical language as being objective because the words used in ethical statements cannot express ethical facts.

- The view that ethical language can never be objective is also supported by the meta-ethical theory of Emotivism. Emotivism states objective moral laws do not exist. Moral terms express personal emotional attitudes and not propositions that can be verified or falsified. Instead, ethical terms are just expressions of personal approval or disapproval.

- However, Naturalism states that objective moral laws do exist that are independent of human beings. Moral terms can be understood by analysing the natural world. Ethical words like 'good', 'bad', 'right' or 'wrong' are defined in the same way we define scientific terms, through observation of the natural world. Ethical statements are verified or falsified using scientific criteria.

- Ethical statements are cognitivist, and as a result, morality can be defined in factual terms. This would mean that ethical statements have an absolute nature that can be applied to all moral agents equally. The idea is supported by F.H. Bradley, he stated that ethical sentences express moral propositions. It is the objective features of the world around us that can be used to decide if these propositions are true or false.

- Intuitionism would also argue that objective ethical statements exist. However, objective moral laws can be discovered by using our minds in an intuitive way. Intuitive ability is a universal innate ability and therefore allows for objective moral values.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.