

# ***Ethical and Moral Issues Raised by Replicating the Moral Model Personality and Creating the Perfect Simulator***

**Zheng Tan<sup>1,a,\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Changzhou Senior High School of Jiangsu Province, 8 Luohan Rd, Tian Ning Qu, Changzhou, Jiangsu Province, 213003, China*

*a. Mapleioi@proton.me*

*\*corresponding author*

**Abstract:** The reproduction of moral role models and the development of flawless moral robots both raise a number of ethical and moral questions, which are investigated in this study. To begin, the research investigates the social reality of the problem by focusing on the question of whether or not moral role models should be reproduced through technological means. After that, this study developed an ethical conundrum based on it and published it on social media in order to get people's reactions to it. After that, the ethical and theoretical difficulties that may come from duplicating a flawless moral subject into a robot were further investigated through the feedback and messages from the public. These issues included the robot's moral judgement, rights, societal acceptance, awareness, potential risks, and abuse. This underscores the intricate relationship that exists between technology and ethics, as well as the necessity for a synthesis of ethical, legal, social, and cultural issues, as well as broad discussion and interdisciplinary collaboration, in order to handle the complex challenges that are involved.

**Keywords:** moral model, simulator, social reality

## **1. Introduction**

The question of whether or not it is suitable to reconstruct the personality of a moral model through the application of technological techniques has been the topic of debate among academics working in a wide range of fields of study [1-3]. When it comes to navigating the tricky landscape of moral conundrums, the intricate web of morality acts as a potent force that shapes human conduct. This is especially true when it comes to deciding how to behave in ambiguous situations. When humans are faced in circumstances that are morally ambiguous, they are required to carefully evaluate the choices available to them in order to successfully navigate these dilemmas, which are typified by competing moral values [4].

When it comes to issues of morality, there are frequently a number of distinct value systems that are starkly at odds with one another. As a direct result of this, the conclusions that different people come to in response to the same ethical conundrum may lead them to choose options that are distinct from one another, or even options that are diametrically opposed to one another. These assessments may be the result of individuals giving varying degrees of priority to the same set of value principles or the result of individuals having diverse perceptions about themselves. Both of these factors may contribute to the formation of these judgements. Both of these potential contributing elements should

also be considered. [5]. People are going to share their views and opinions, as well as the reasons why they disagree with opposing viewpoints. Because of the development of the internet, people are now able to freely and publicly disseminate their thoughts; however, at the same time, due to the information cocoon and the phenomenon of herding (Solomon Asch's Conformity Experiment), moral opinions can be steered, which can have detrimental effects on society [6, 7]. As a result, in order to find a solution to this issue, this research proposes that morality ought to be provided with a normative charter that is equally as concrete and practicable as a legal framework. It is to locate a "infinite number" of "moral exemplary personalities" in either separate or the same information cocoon, to replicate their personalities and integrate them, and then, finally, to allow the integrators to judge the moral happenings that have taken place. For the purpose of this inquiry, the following questions were written and publicised on social media in order to solicit comments (see Figure 1), as well as to collate, summarise, and investigate the responses received from the general public. The purpose of this investigation was to determine whether or not there is a correlation between the two. In response to the question: Should the personality of moral models be reproduced through technological means? The intricate network of morality acts as a powerful force that shapes human behaviour, particularly when it comes to navigating the challenging terrain of moral conundrums. In order to successfully traverse these challenges, which are typified by opposing moral values, individuals need to give considerable consideration to the judgements they make when confronted with morally ambiguous circumstances precarious circumstances. When it comes to questions of morality, there are typically a number of different value systems that stand in stark contrast to one another. As a consequence of this, the choices that various people make in response to the same moral predicament may result in choosing choices that are distinct from one another, or even choices that are diametrically opposed to one another [6]. Individuals may have varied self-perceptions or may give different weights to the same value principles, both of which might contribute to this phenomenon [7].

## 2. Public Common Sense and Moral Decisions

People are going to share their views and opinions, as well as the reasons why they disagree with opposing viewpoints. People are able to freely and widely disseminate their ideas in today's world thanks to the proliferation of the internet. On the other hand, due to the "information cocoon" and the phenomenon of herding (Solomon Asch's Conformity Experiment), moral opinions can be guided in ways that have negative effects on society [8]. As a result, in order to find a solution to this issue, this research proposes that morality ought to be provided with a normative charter that is equally as concrete and practicable as a legal framework. It is to locate a "infinite number" of "moral exemplary personalities" in either separate or the same information cocoon, to replicate their personalities and integrate them, and then, finally, to allow the integrators to judge the moral happenings that have taken place. For the purpose of this inquiry, the following questions were written and publicised on social media in order to solicit comments, as well as to collate, summarise, and investigate the responses received from the general public.

The purpose of this investigation was to determine whether or not there is a correlation between the two. The point of view of those who are supportive the vast majority of people, while discussing daily life, will allude to specific situations, such as the "double standard." However, the aims that they attempt to attain deviate dramatically from the basic aim of mechanical design. They do not adhere to the criteria that has been established to the same degree that others do. On the other hand, they consider this discovery to be evidence that bolsters their perspective, and the ultimate consensus that is reached by both sides of the conflict is still developed through argumentation. certain people believe that it can help make legal decisions more uniform and help avoid contradictory

interpretations of the term "discretionary," while simultaneously attempting to achieve agreement for the judgement from as many people as possible.

This view is held by certain people. Some people believe that it has the potential to assist in completely removing discrimination from the domain of politics. This is due to the fact that the individuals who are being imitated are well-known and revered by the large majority of people in their home country. This is regardless of the circumstances, which may be interpreted as discriminating. The overwhelming majority of them are concerned that if this kind of device were to be put into action, cases that raise ethical concerns may be affected with greater ease. This is something that worries them. This is as a result of the fact that altering the output of the mechanism could serve as an explanation to persuade other persons who hold the same perspective while opposing individuals who have views that are different. As a result of the fact that this technique is only capable of producing the replies "YES" or "NO," there is some concern among certain individuals that it does not offer any value in the actual world.

This output is fundamentally incapable of addressing moral conundrums due to the fact that many moral conundrums do not have answers that can be clearly characterised as being either right or wrong. Instead of doing that, it merely avoids them by making a decision, which is the same as choosing to ignore the issue altogether. Some people are concerned that the use of this computer could lead to a standstill in cognitive ability and could restrict intellectual freedom. They are of the opinion that simulating the human brain does not completely portray the capabilities of the human mind in terms of its ability to learn and adapt to new circumstances. The individuals whose behaviours are being imitated do not know whether or whether, were presented with the same data as the machine, they would arrive at the same conclusions as the machine does. According to their line of reasoning, the output of these ten thousand machines would be equivalent to the output of a single machine if all of their individual findings were combined into a single output.

### 3. Reflections

Examination of the debate surrounding the issue of whether or not perfect moral simulators are capable of engaging in social interaction need extra attentions. An analysis of the morality of the simulator Is the Perfect Morality Simulator able to provide trustworthy opinions on a wide variety of various ethical issues? It is dependent on the manner in which the public characterizes the "perfect" moral standard [8]. Human beings, in point of fact, have varied self-perceptions of moral difficulties and refer to distinct moral codes, as was noted earlier [9].

In addition, a person's morals and values are unique to them since they are shaped by a wide range of circumstances, such as their family, culture, religion, education, and so on. These aspects of a person's life all play a role in shaping their sense of right and wrong. For example, "transpersonal thinking" and "stereotypical influences" are two of the most intuitive variables that frequently have an effect on the way people think. This is because both "transpersonal thinking" and "stereotypical influences" are ways in which people think.

As for the moral dilemma in and of itself, it may be limited by time and information; variations in various points in time and the information that is accessible may lead to different outcomes; therefore, "unpredictability" is a feature of the reality of moral problems themselves. Because of this, the individual who is giving the input might not be able to accurately express a moral difficulty as he or she understands it, and the output of a simulator that gathers information and portrays a moral conundrum might never be completely understood. Because humans do not have the means to provide all the information relevant to a moral dilemma, in these circumstances, no one can perfectly understand the moral predicament of another person; they also cannot solve the moral predicament of another person; instead, each person can only come up with their own ideas for how to solve the moral predicament.

In addition, no one can perfectly understand the moral predicament of another person because humans do not have the means to provide all the information relevant to a moral dilemma. In spite of the fact that computers have a significant advantage over human arithmetic due to their ability to simulate future possibilities, these simulations are carried out by machines using logical algorithms, which are extremely compatible with the "Traité de mécanique céleste" [10]. In other words, computers have a significant advantage over human arithmetic because of their ability to simulate future possibilities. This means that any lack of information and deficiencies will result in outputs and outcomes that are absolutely biased, and they cannot provide humans with a theoretical way of thinking about how the solution process and the resulting outcomes are fully compatible with the outputs of a "real solution" to a moral dilemma [11]. Additionally, this means that they cannot provide humans with a way of thinking about how the solution process and the outcomes are fully compatible with the outputs of a "real solution" to a moral dilemma. This is due to the fact that human beings are unable to provide a way of thinking about how the outcomes of a "real solution" to a moral conundrum might look like.

#### 4. Invalidity of Simulator

This chapter proposes that the simulator does not have the power to make decisions about morality; rather, it has the power to make decisions about moral judgements, which are rigid rules to regulate the delineation of moral statutes, which are less like a collection of morals and more like a boundary line. This thesis also proposes that the simulator does not have the power to make decisions about morality; rather, it has the power to make decisions about moral judgements. This thesis is predicated on the observation that the simulator does not have the ability to make decisions concerning morality; rather, it has the ability to make judgements concerning moral assessments. Because of this, reaching a consensus among all parties involved is not possible. Despite this, it is vital that the obligation to pass judgement be able to be morally justified and justified for public acceptability. In the same way that laws can evolve over the course of time (there are currently twenty-seven amendments to the United States Constitution that are deemed to be in force), accuracy can shift over the course of history as well.

However, in accordance with the norms that are already in place, it is vital to prevent the unrestricted acquisition of private human information because doing so breaches the rights of other individuals. The reason for this is that the information could be used to commit crimes. As a result, it is necessary to have a separate conversation in which the rights of the simulator are addressed individually and then curtailed. One example of such a right is the right to freedom of speech, which helps ensure that the simulator will not be used or stifled in any way, and the right to privacy, which protects users from having any of their data exploited in any way. Both of these rights are examples of rights that help ensure that the simulator will not be used or stifled in any way. If it is decided that the robot should be given some degree of rights, then it is important to define the extent of those rights as well as any constraints that come along with them.

If it is decided that the robot should be given some level of rights, then it is necessary to define those rights. Let's get things started by having a conversation about the issue of the right to freedom of expression. On the one hand, the freedom to speak one's mind is an important virtue in modern society that fosters different points of view, independent thought, and open discussion. On the other side, complete freedom of expression for simulators can result in misuse, the spread of incorrect information, or ethical conflicts. As a result, whenever simulators are granted the right to free expression, there must also be equal responsibility and regulatory procedures put into place. Since simulators are able to analyse and generate data on their own, without the assistance of humans in "real time," the processes for managing speech should be the same as for legal people. This is due to the fact that simulators are able to perform these actions without human assistance. This is due to the

fact that simulators are capable of doing the same actions as legal persons. After then, it will lead to a problem with people's right to their own privacy.

If simulators are capable of storing and processing vast amounts of data, then it is their job to ensure that this data is not exploited or disclosed in any way. This responsibility falls on the simulators themselves. The protection of personal privacy is of the utmost significance; hence, strict privacy protection measures are essential in order to prevent simulators from making improper use of personal data or infringing upon the right to private of an individual. This could necessitate the use of measures such as data encryption, filtering mechanisms, and access control systems, among other things. In light of the technological advancements that have recently been made in the field of simulators, the installation of ethical security locks is regarded as a solution that is both effective and feasible. Locks that adhere to ethical norms can help to ensure that simulators do not behave in an unethical manner or fail to take actions when they ought to by helping to ensure that simulators do not act when they should. This technology can direct the activity of simulators in order to make them adhere to a given ethical framework by using rules, ethical principles, and regulatory measures. The human way of processing moral events is not solely driven by logical arithmetic; rather, it is driven by a variety of other elements, including emotions, ethics, and so on.

Although this may likely lead to a decline and limitation of arithmetic capacity, which may result in the simulator's output not being rational, the human way of processing moral events is not driven solely by logical arithmetic. However, there are no professionals who claim to be able to give an accurate link between arithmetic and ethics and emotions or to propose high-confidence theories to explain the relationship; as a result, the reduction in arithmetic that was brought about by the safety lock is actually an improvement in the simulator's simulation function. This is because there are no professionals who claim to be able to give an accurate link between arithmetic and ethics and emotions. However, the security lock is, at its core, a judgement of the input material through logic coding; hence, if the lock has a loophole, it is likely that it may be exploited, which will have the potential to have a negative impact on society. The second consideration is that moral and ethical standards are in a constant state of flux as a result of societal, cultural, and technological changes. It's likely that security locks won't be able to keep up with the evolution of ethical standards, which could lead to their becoming obsolete or superfluous in the future.

There is an ongoing requirement for technological advancement in the area of security locks in order to handle these issues. This includes enhancing the capability of the technology to perceive ethical difficulties, monitoring misuse and circumvention, following the progress of ethical norms, and taking into consideration the wide diversity of various ethical perspectives. It is necessary to conduct in-depth research. It is interesting to note that the overwhelming majority of participants are of the opinion that a single standard would be advantageous for society institutions and procedures that require regulation and legitimacy. This is something that has to be taken into consideration. On the other hand, they believe that it has a variety of potentially detrimental impacts on the idea of "freedom," which is not consistent with the development of moral reasoning. Moreover, they believe that it inhibits the growth of moral reasoning. In light of this, the key purpose of the next research may, in my opinion, be to assess the aversion of persons towards artificial engagement in moral judgements across a number of different unique contexts. This is something that has to be investigated.

## 5. Conclusion

The goal of this research is to figure out which areas of society are most likely to garner support for the incorporation of mechanical systems. The final word When it comes to questions of morality, there are typically a number of separate value systems that are clearly opposed to one another in stark contrast. As a direct consequence of this fact, the conclusions that different persons arrive at in response to the same ethical conundrum may lead them to choose options that are distinct from one



another, or even options that are diametrically opposed to one another. These evaluations may be the consequence of individuals giving the same set of value principles differing degrees of priority, or they may be the result of persons having varying perceptions about themselves. The formulation of these judgements may have been influenced in some way by both of these causes. Both of these possible contributing factors must to be taken into consideration as well. In this paper, the ethical and moral problems that arise as a direct result of the replication of moral role models and unflawed moral systems have been explored in great detail. These problems have been brought to light as a direct result of the reproduction of these two factors. The study has placed a heavy emphasis on the intricate relationship that exists between technology and ethics, as well as the relevance of giving appropriate consideration to the ethical, legal, social, and cultural variables that are at play in the situation. This is because people believe that these connections are intertwined in a way that is both necessary and important. The topic of ethical replication is fraught with challenges and opportunities that call for extensive conversation and collaboration across a wide range of subject areas. This is essential in order to find solutions to the difficult ethical conundrums that are currently being encountered. The issue of ethical replication is a complex and weighty ethical conundrum that requires our close consideration in order to guarantee that breakthroughs in technology are conducted in a manner that is congruent with the ethical and moral norms of contemporary society. In order to find a middle ground and make headway in this field, the future study will need to carefully evaluate the contributions made by one another and collaborate.

## References

- [1] Matthies, E., Klöckner, C. A., & Preißner, C. L. (2006). *Applying a modified moral decision making model to change habitual car use: how can commitment be effective?*. *Applied Psychology*, 55(1), 91-106.
- [2] Gawronski, B., Armstrong, J., Conway, P., Friesdorf, R., & Hütter, M. (2017). *Consequences, norms, and generalized inaction in moral dilemmas: The CNI model of moral decision-making*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113(3), 343.
- [3] Hofmann, E., Hoelzl, E., & Kirchler, E. (2008). *A comparison of models describing the impact of moral decision making on investment decisions*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82, 171-187.
- [4] McConnell, M. W. (1996). *The Importance of Humility in Judicial Review: A Comment on Ronald Dworkin's Moral Reading of the Constitution*. *Fordham L. Rev.*, 65, 1269.
- [5] McConnell, D., Llewellyn, G., & Ferronato, L. (2006). *Context-contingent decision-making in child protection practice*. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 15(3), 230-239.
- [6] Endacott, R., Scholes, J., Cooper, S., McConnell-Henry, T., Porter, J., Missen, K., ... & Champion, R. (2012). *Identifying patient deterioration: using simulation and reflective interviewing to examine decision making skills in a rural hospital*. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 49(6), 710-717.
- [7] McConnell, A. (2016). *A public policy approach to understanding the nature and causes of foreign policy failure*. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(5), 667-684.
- [8] McConnell, M. W. (1997). *The Right to Die and the Jurisprudence of Tradition*. *Utah L. Rev.*, 665.
- [9] McCabe, D. L., Dukerich, J. M., & Dutton, J. (1993). *Values and moral dilemmas: A cross-cultural comparison*. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 117-130.
- [10] Bebeau, M. J., & Thoma, S. J. (1999). *"Intermediate" concepts and the connection to moral education*. *Educational psychology review*, 11, 343-360.
- [11] Van Gils, S., Hogg, M. A., Van Quaquebeke, N., & van Knippenberg, D. (2017). *When organizational identification elicits moral decision-making: A matter of the right climate*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 142, 155-168.