

ETHICS & ALIA NATURALISM IN ETHICS: REDUCTIONISM

G. E. Moore (19) criticized the term 'naturalistic' when he ought to have used the word reductionistic. That his use of 'naturalistic' was incorrect, is shown by the case of theological moralists, which define 'good' (or 'right') as ~~the~~ 'commanded by God'. According to Moore such moralists would ~~have to be called theological~~ come under the heading 'theological naturalism', a contradiction in terms. Moore's famous expression 'naturalistic fallacy' is to be understood as ~~an~~ 'reductionistic fallacy'. (But of course Moore's criticism of this alleged fallacy was itself fallacious for being dogmatic.)

If moral reductionism ("naturalism") were fallacious, ethics should be an independent discipline; in particular, it should not depend on biol., ψ , or sociology. ~~But then~~ This would place ethics in the same bag with logic, namely as an a priori ~~for~~ discipline. But, ~~and~~ since ethics is about morals, and morals rule ^{in part} human behavior, ~~it would result that~~ ethics would be ~~both~~ synthetic (or informative, or about reality) as well as a priori. Shaker: all ethical propositions would be synthetic a priori. However, this must be false, because we subject ~~more~~ them to the test of practice. Hence non-reductionism ~~is true~~ (in particular intuitionism) is false.

inv 83010
FT 191