

Shared Human Models on Ethics

Abstract. This essay explores a philosophical inquiry into ethics, judgment, power, and the inherent limitations of human perception. Through a reflective conversation, we examine whether any real-time distinction can be made between benevolent guidance and destructive authority, between avataric intervention and tyranny, and between divine order and human ego. The notion of mimicry is explored through the analogy of modern large-scale language models, which imitate human expression convincingly without true grounding of meaning. The essay concludes that stillness rather than judgment may be the only coherent ethical position in the face of uncertainty.

1. Introduction

Ethical reasoning traditionally seeks to differentiate good from evil, legitimate power from tyranny, and divine intention from destructive ambition. Yet when scrutinized deeply, moral evaluation collapses under epistemic limitations: human beings do not possess sufficient information to accurately judge intentions or outcomes while events are still unfolding. What appears violently coercive in the moment may be understood as necessary transformation in hindsight; what appears benevolent may lead to ruin.

This instability challenges the foundations of moral, political, and spiritual certainties. The conversation woven through this essay explores these tensions, touching on suffering, judgment, evolution, and the nature of leadership, culminating in a radical proposition: that real-time moral judgment is fundamentally unreliable, and the only stable stance may be stillness, witnessing, and suspension of premature conclusions.

2. The Collapse of Real-Time Ethical Judgment

Moral evaluation typically assumes that observers can infer intent from action and determine rightness from consequences. Yet intentions are internal and unknowable, and consequences unfold across time horizons beyond immediate perception. Thus, all judgment during unfolding action is provisional and perspective-bound.

A visionary leader may be condemned as a monster by contemporaries who cannot yet comprehend a larger purpose. Conversely, a charismatic destroyer may masquerade as a savior. The problem is not moral ambiguity but epistemic blindness.

This dismantles naïve faith in interventionist ethics. If we cannot reliably distinguish a surgeon from an assailant, then acting forcefully on incomplete knowledge risks compounding harm.

3. The Symmetry with Divine Suffering

A striking parallel arises when comparing human authority with divine creation. If God is credited with benevolence despite creating a world of pandemics, predation, entropy, and death, and if believers excuse suffering by appealing to a hidden cosmic plan beyond human comprehension, then intellectual honesty requires granting similar conceptual space to human actors whose actions also generate suffering.

If a divine plan is unknowable in the moment, why demand immediate transparency from human leaders? Yet applying such reasoning without constraint opens the door to justifying atrocities. The symmetry reveals the instability of our ethical premises rather than endorsing moral relativism.

4. Avatars and the Problem of Omniscience

The idea of an avatar, present in Hindu traditions, reintroduces asymmetry: a divine descent who acts with full knowledge, without ego, and for universal good. Krishna's killing of Kamsa is framed not as domination but restoration of cosmic balance. This template distinguishes divine violence (surgery) from egoic violence (assault).

The distinction rests not upon outward behavior but upon internal consciousness. However, this distinction collapses in practice, because consciousness is invisible to external observers. A tyrant can claim visionary purpose; a true avatar may not claim anything.

5. The Inability to Certify an Avatar in Real Time

Here lies the epistemological dead end: there is no objective, real-time method to determine whether someone is acting from divine wisdom or delusional ambition. Consequences cannot be judged until long after actions complete; intentions cannot be accessed; appearances deceive.

And this is where the analogy to modern AI becomes illuminating and essential.

Analogy to Language Models: Mimicry Without Grounding

Large-scale language models demonstrate convincingly that behavior can be mimicked without underlying understanding. They are trained on vast corpora of human-created text and can generate expressions that appear wise, compassionate, insightful, even spiritually profound. They can imitate tone, emotional cadence, rhetorical structure, and

philosophical depth—yet possess no internal subjective grounding for meaning, no genuine intention, and no lived consciousness. They do not know what they say; they simply reproduce patterned statistical associations.

This parallels the ethical difficulty of distinguishing genuine moral insight from persuasive imitation in human leaders. Just as an AI can convincingly play the role of a sage without possessing wisdom, a charismatic tyrant can imitate the behavioral markers of humility, vision, and altruism without embodying them.

Thus:

Behavior is not proof of truth.

Speech is not evidence of consciousness.

Apparent compassion is not necessarily compassion.

The presence of mimicry at scale—technological or psychological—destroys the assumption that virtue can be observed externally. What appears divine may be engineered. What appears morally clear may be camouflage.

Therefore, moral labeling based on outward traits or rhetoric is fundamentally unreliable.

6. The Argument for Stillness

If judgment is clouded by perceptual limits, mimicry, ego projection, and temporal blindness, then the only coherent ethical stance is to suspend judgment entirely. This does not imply moral collapse or apathy, but radical humility: acknowledging that reactive action under uncertainty often amplifies suffering rather than reducing it.

Stillness becomes a meta-ethical position:

Be still and abandon premature conclusions.

Be still and allow reality to reveal itself in time.

Be still and let action emerge from silence rather than fear or ideology.

This principle resonates with Taoism (*wu-wei*), Buddhist equanimity, Advaitic witnessing, and the Biblical command: *“Be still and know that I am God.”*

7. Conclusion

The conversation leads to a profound reframing of ethics. If:

- Intent cannot be known,
- Consequences cannot be predicted,
- Appearances can be mimicked,

- Judgment is perspective-bound,
- Power cannot be reliably constrained,

then moral certainty dissolves. Intervention becomes morally hazardous; resistance becomes ego-driven; real-time evaluation becomes illusion.

The wise do not judge.

The wise do not intervene prematurely.

The wise are still.

Stillness is not passivity but alignment with the deeper order beyond conceptual thought. In stillness, the evaluator dissolves, and with the evaluator dissolves conflict. What remains is clarity without judgment, action without doership, and peace without victory.

Be still and know that I am God.