



SCIREA Journal of Education

ISSN: 2995-3901

<http://www.scirea.org/journal/Education>

February 22, 2025

Volume 10, Issue 1, February 2025

<https://doi.org/10.54647/education720104>

Research on the Solution of Moral Paradox from the Perspective of Multivalued Logic

Weikang Zhu

School of philosophy, Anhui University, China

Email address: 1263044547@qq.com

Abstract

Moral paradox is a difficult problem perplexing logic, which is often difficult to solve in classical logic. Using many valued logic has become a choice. As a solution to moral paradox, multivalued logic provides a thinking framework of the logic system that is different from the traditional binary logic. It helps us look at the old problems from a new perspective, and provides some inspiration and thinking for improving and optimizing moral education and moral construction.

Key words: moral paradox; multivalued logic; solution path; moral construction

1. Introduction

Moral paradox is a kind of unique problems existing in human real life world. It is the different results people make for the same behavior based on different value judgment and value choice intention in some situations. This result often has the nature of contradiction

between right and wrong, good and evil, beauty and ugliness. The study of moral paradox has become an attractive philosophical topic in the contemporary academic community. Although the existing research results are remarkable, scholars pay more attention to the contradictory nature, phenomenon research, classification, theoretical significance and other philosophical thinking topics of moral paradox, rarely focus on the real life of moral norms and spiritual civilization construction, and are slightly insufficient in proposing the solution to the paradox, so that they can not give an effective solution to the paradox, which makes the theoretical research and practical application of moral paradox disconnected. Therefore, on the basis of combing and integrating the existing research on moral paradox, this paper attempts to put forward some innovative solutions to moral paradox from the perspective of multivalued logic, so as to combine theory with reality, and provide a reference solution to moral problems in reality. We should explore the underlying philosophical issues and theoretical mechanisms, expand the horizon of the study of moral paradox phenomenon, and promote the theoretical research and practical turn of moral paradox.

2. Research on the solution path of multivalued logic and its advantages

2.1 The solution path of multivalued logic

As a branch of non classical logic system, multivalued logic is widely used in translation, ethics, law, probability theory, modal logic, electricity, cryptography and other fields. Because of this, multivalued logic has always been highly valued and studied by scholars at home and abroad. The philosophical thought of multivalued logic can be traced back to the famous ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle's sea battle paradox, in which Aristotle denied the binary principle and affirmed the law of exclusion, which led to the discussion of contingency by many scholars in the future. In the 1920s, the famous Polish philosopher lukaswicz proposed the famous theory of ternary logic in order to solve Aristotle's problem of contingent contingency. Lukasiwitz believes that a proposition can be true, false, or neutral. In this period, the Polish philosopher post also put forward some problems about multivalued logic alone.

The author believes that multivalued logic can provide some enlightenment for us to resolve the moral paradox. Since the proposition can be true, false, or neutral, the result of subject selection in some moral paradox phenomena can also be between morality and immorality. In other words, the result of subject selection in the process of subject behavior selection and

realization, the result of our choice may be absolutely good, or absolutely evil, or not good, or biased toward evil, or biased toward good. We can use the method of paradox degree to characterize the degree of good and evil with a scale of 0 to 1. The scale of 0 represents absolute evil, the scale of 1 represents absolute good, and the scale from 0 to 1 represents the degree of good is constantly increasing, and the degree of evil is constantly decreasing. First, behavior (or action) can be divided into ethical behavior and non ethical behavior. Non ethical behaviors, such as natural behaviors such as eating and sleeping, are not discussed here. Ethical behavior can be divided into four categories according to motivation and results: a. The good motive and the good result, that is, both the motive and the result are good, and this behavior is the best and the most idealized. (according to the multivalued logic paradox solving method, we can assign this behavior a value of 1); b. The good motive is the result of the evil, that is, the motive is good but the result is bad, which is a kind of behavior that is second best (can be assigned as $3/4$); c. The evil motive is the result of the good, that is, the motive is not good but causes good results. This behavior is also OK (according to the multivalued logic paradox solving method, we can assign this behavior as $1/4$); d. The motive of evil is the result of evil, that is, both the motive and the result are bad. This behavior is the worst (according to the multivalued logic paradox solving method, we can assign this behavior a value of 0). This assignment presupposes the theory of motivation. If utilitarianism is taken as the standard, it doesn't matter. Just exchange the assignments of B and C, and the assignments of a and d do not need to be modified. Note that the above four ethical behaviors have at least good causes and good outcomes to choose from. But there are also some behaviors, which are ethical behaviors, but there is no way to choose the cause of good (that is, based on any cause is not good), nor can it lead to the result of good (that is, the result of any choice is not good). This behavior is common in some moral paradoxes. For example, there are many kinds of behavior choices in the tram problem. However, these are not that we do not want to choose the cause of good or do not want to lead to the result of good, but that we have no good cause to choose from, so we cannot act based on the cause of good, and any behavior we make cannot lead to the result of good. Assign a value of $1/2$ to this behavior, that is, good or evil. This kind of good or evil is the internal good or evil of ethical behavior, which is different from the non good or evil of non ethical behavior, because the usual ethical behavior has good or evil, and this kind of ethical behavior is neither good nor evil, which is a special kind of ethical behavior.

2.2 The advantages of solving paradox in multivalued logic

As a solution to the moral paradox, multivalued logic provides a different thinking framework from the traditional binary logic (i.e., the logic system that things are black or white, and whether they are true or false). In the field of philosophy and ethics, the advantages provided by multivalued logic mainly include:

First, accommodate complexity and ambiguity. Multivalued logic allows more than two truth states, such as "true", "false" and "uncertain" or "partially true and partially false". This makes it better able to deal with the complexity and ambiguity in the real world, especially in moral and ethical issues, which are often not black or white.

Second, promote careful analysis and increase resolution. In the framework of multi valued logic, moral problems can be analyzed in more detail. It allows people to distinguish between different levels of moral responsibility, obligation or good deeds, rather than simply categorizing behavior as "right" or "wrong". Multivalued logic increases the resolution of judgment by providing more truth states. This means that it can more finely distinguish the subtle differences between different moral positions.

Third, avoid extremism and improve the flexibility of moral judgment. Multivalued logic helps to avoid moral extremism, which is an oversimplified dichotomy of complex problems. It acknowledges the multidimensional nature of moral decision-making and helps to form a more balanced and flexible moral judgment. In the multi valued logic system, moral judgment can be adjusted according to the specific details of the situation, rather than rigidly following fixed rules or principles.

Fourth, promote the integration of different views. Adapting to dynamic environment multivalued logic allows to find an intermediate zone between seemingly opposing views, which helps to promote dialogue and understanding under different ethical concepts and cultural backgrounds. In the changing social and technological environment, multivalued logic provides a more flexible and adaptable tool to meet the emerging moral and ethical challenges.

Compared with the solutions of other philosophical theories, multivalued logic provides a more flexible, detailed and inclusive perspective in dealing with moral paradoxes and complex ethical issues. However, it should be noted that multivalued logic is not omnipotent. Although it provides richer analysis tools, it may become complex and difficult to operate in practical applications. In addition, it also faces the challenge of how to accurately define and

quantify a variety of truth States, as well as the interpretation and operation difficulties that may occur in practical applications. For some basic moral problems, the solutions of other philosophical theories may still be effective and necessary.

3. Response to some philosophical problems in the process of solving moral paradox

After describing and discussing the specific ways to solve the moral paradox, it is necessary for us to respond to some philosophical problems that often exist in the process of solving the moral paradox: first, is there a boundary for moral obligation? This question actually involves whether people's moral obligations are limited or unlimited. Second, is it possible to adopt the "anti ethics" approach? When solving moral paradoxes, the use of "anti ethics" usually refers to the violation of traditional moral standards or ethical norms. This method can solve practical problems in some extreme cases, but generally we will consider it an immoral choice. Third, can the moral paradox be finally solved?

3.1 Whether moral obligation has boundary

We often encounter the problem of whether moral obligations have boundaries in the process of discussing the solution of moral paradox, which is a complex and controversial topic. Among the difficulties in the experimental tunnel of science and technology ethics we talked about earlier, there are utilitarian algorithm, Rawls algorithm and the setting algorithm of Personality Ethics knob for self driving cars when facing danger. Among them, utilitarian solution is the most controversial. In the investigation and research of appealing to the public's ethical preference, Jean Francois bernifa found that most people agree with utilitarian algorithm, but few self driving cars actually buy utilitarian algorithm. This actually involves the question of whether moral obligations have boundaries.

Moral obligation is the moral code of social conventions, and it is the responsibility and obligation that individuals consciously perform in the process of daily behavior. This moral obligation often requires people to sacrifice their personal interests to achieve the ideal goal of safeguarding social and collective interests. However, in the face of some extreme circumstances, the moral belief of sacrificing personal interests to safeguard social and collective interests will "collapse". The reason for the "collapse" of moral belief is that our understanding of the two concepts of moral obligation and super moral behavior has a very big problem. In the New Testament, the interpretation of super moral behavior is that

everyone has the freedom to choose to marry, but it is a better noble behavior if they choose to remain single to better serve God, which is regarded as a super moral behavior by theologians.

3.2 Is it allowed to adopt anti ethical methods

The possibility and rationality of adopting "anti ethics" in solving moral paradox is a complex and controversial topic. Anti ethical approach usually refers to the behavior that violates the traditional moral norms or ethical principles. This may mean making a choice that is usually considered immoral. The author believes that in solving the moral paradox, the use of anti ethical methods is not allowed. The existence of moral paradox itself shows the complexity and conflict of ethical principles, while the anti ethical approach violates ethical principles and may even aggravate moral conflicts and contradictions. To solve the moral paradox, we should follow the ethical principles, seek reasonable solutions, and balance the interests and values of all aspects as much as possible. The use of anti ethics can not only solve the moral paradox, but also lead to more serious moral problems and social consequences. In the tram problem, from the perspective of anti ethics, it is not allowed to push fat people off the tram. First of all, pushing fat people off the track is immoral in itself, because it violates the basic ethical principle of not harming others. Even in order to save others, we should not take the way of hurting others. Secondly, pushing fat people off the tram can not really solve the tram problem. Even if the fat man is pushed off the electric track, the tram will continue to move forward, and the lives of others are still in danger. This way of solving the problem not only does not reduce the harm, but also causes more harm and pain. Finally, pushing fat people off the rail may lead to more ethical problems. If this kind of behavior is allowed, then under similar circumstances, people may take more extreme and immoral ways to solve the problem, thus undermining the moral order and ethical foundation of the society. Therefore, in the tram problem, we should follow the ethical principles and moral norms and seek more reasonable and moral solutions.

In the face of moral paradox, we should think deeply about the connotation and scope of application of ethical principles, explore reasonable solutions, and promote the development of moral theory and practice.

3.3 Can the moral paradox be finally solved

Moral paradoxes are usually difficult to get a clear and generally accepted "final solution", because they involve deep-seated conflicts between ethical principles and values. The

characteristic of these paradoxes is that different moral concepts and ethical systems may lead to completely different solutions. Here are some key points:

First, ethical diversity. Different cultures, social backgrounds and personal beliefs will affect people's views on moral issues. For example, some people may solve moral paradoxes according to utilitarian principles (maximizing happiness), while others may follow virtue ethics (emphasizing morality and intention) or obligation Ethics (following fixed moral rules). Second, situational complexity. Moral paradox usually involves complex situations, including multiple variables and potential consequences. Therefore, the evaluation of the same moral paradox may vary with the specific situation. Third, moral uncertainty. In some cases, the moral paradox may not have a "correct" answer at all. The essence of these problems may be to show the difficulties and uncertainties of moral decision-making, and urge us to reflect and discuss moral principles and decision-making process. Third, continuous ethical exploration. With the development of society and the deepening of human understanding of complex issues, the understanding and handling of moral paradox may also change. Technological progress, cultural exchanges and the development of philosophical thinking may have an impact on the way we solve these paradoxes.

It is usually impossible for moral paradox to have a fixed and universally applicable solution. They are more to urge us to conduct in-depth moral and ethical discussion than to seek an ultimate answer. Through these discussions and reflections, we can better understand the moral complexity and improve our moral judgment and decision-making ability.

4. Conclusion

As a hot issue, the study of moral paradox has attracted more and more attention in the academic community in recent decades. With the rapid development of the global economy, human material civilization and spiritual civilization have been rapidly improved, but the phenomenon of moral decline, moral anomie and moral dilemma still occur frequently in human society. Therefore, the study of moral paradox and its resolution has reached the point of urgency. The study of moral paradox can not only help people improve their moral wisdom, but also broaden the research vision of related disciplines and promote the construction of related disciplines. In order to solve the problem of moral paradox, scholars have put forward their own solutions. However, as the phenomenon of moral paradox is gradually formed and developed by society and people in the process of moral value and realization, from the

perspective of theory, moral paradox essentially belongs to the scope of moral practice. Due to the intricate background of some moral paradoxes, the reasons for their occurrence are complex, and there are complex situations of different opinions on moral paradox. Moral paradox is a very special kind of paradox. It involves not only logic, but also ethics, law and other disciplines. It is a cross research topic in many fields. So far, there has not been a set of mature moral paradoxes in the academic community. The solution of paradox. Therefore, from the perspective of multi valued logic, the author puts forward the research on the solution path of moral paradox, hoping to further promote the practical turn of moral paradox.

This paper follows the basic model of "discovering problems, analyzing problems, and solving problems". First of all, based on the existing research literature, the author reiterates and clarifies the phenomenon of moral paradox as a special contradiction in the human world. Moral paradox reflects the opposition between good and evil or beauty and ugliness in the result of behavior choice and value realization. Secondly, the author makes an in-depth analysis of the resolution of moral paradox from the perspective of multivalued logic, explores the underlying philosophical issues and theoretical mechanisms, widens the horizon of the study of moral paradox phenomenon, and promotes the theoretical research and practical turn of moral paradox.

Multivalued logic is a way of thinking different from the traditional binary logic (true or false), which introduces more truth states. When dealing with moral paradox, multivalued logic provides us with a more flexible and detailed analysis framework. It requires that people should consider the uniqueness of the situation when facing moral decision-making, make in-depth analysis of each specific situation, and consider multiple conflicting principles under complex moral situations at the same time, so as to understand why there are moral contradictions, and flexibly apply moral principles, instead of relying solely on universal and fixed moral rules, break the Convention, abandon the traditional black-and-white dichotomy thinking mode, and accept the intermediate scheme.

Paradox and its resolution is a fascinating philosophical topic. There are still many important philosophical issues and many virgin lands that have not yet been broken. The academic community has also been working hard to explore. Therefore, to truly resolve the phenomenon of moral paradox, people with lofty ideals still need to continue to follow up, continue to explore and deepen.

References

- [1] Huo Shuquan The ideological origin and production process of multivalued logic [j] Dialectics of nature research, 2008 (11): 17-21
- [2] Wangxisheng The way to eliminate moral paradox -- Thinking from the perspective of logical paradox resolution [j] Journal of Anhui Normal University (HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES), 2008 (03): 266-271
- [3] Zhangjianjun: "the strengthened law of exclusion" and multivalued logic from "the theory of reinforcement""The liar paradox", Jiangsu Social Sciences, 1997, issue 6
- [4] Liuhonglan, Gao Qingshi, yangbingru: two levels of propositional equivalence in probabilistic propositional logic and propositional calculus, philosophical research, 2009, issue 10
- [5] Huoshuquan: Ulam game semantics of multivalued logic, philosophical trends, 2009, issue 12
- [6] Chen Bo Research on deontic logic and ethics [j] Journal of Renmin University of China, 1989. (6): 59-66
- [7] Huo Shuquan The ideological origin and production process of multivalued logic [j] Dialectics of nature research, 2008 (11): 17-21
- [8] R. nibble Moral man and Immoral Society Guiyang: Guizhou people's publishing house, 2007
- [9] Berjaev On human mission: paradoxical ethical experience [m]. Shanghai: Xuelin publishing house, 2000
- [10] Wangxisheng Reflections on the attribute of moral paradox -- from a logical point of view [j] Journal of Anhui Normal University (HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES), 2007 (05): 502-507