CBFA 2025 Panel Presentation

Abstract
The speed and integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into all aspects of society are concerning to many, especially in higher education as generative AIs (GenAI) are being integrated into various aspects, including administrative functions and Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) software suites, curriculum mandates, syllabus and teaching guidelines, faculty development, and even research rules and procedures. This panel will discuss some current challenges in the contexts of education, human development, philosophical & theological ethics, and moral psychology. We intend to discuss and deliberate some of the most challenging issues related to the development of ethical AIs, to the implementation and impacts on the human condition in the contexts of education, medicine, philosophy, and moral psychology.

Panel Contributors

Kirk G. Mensch, Ph.D.'s: Professor of Ethics & Organizational Psychology
Palm Beach Atlantic University
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4340-624
https://www.linkedin.com/in/kirkmensch/
Mensch is a retired Army Major and U.S. Intelligence Community Officer who began teaching at the university level in 2004 at the College of William & Mary and, since then, has continued to facilitate learning at various institutions in the U.S. and the U.K. His research is focused on moral psychology and normative ethics. Kirk is well published in various peer-reviewed academic journals in topics related to moral psychology, leadership development & theory, ethics, the philosophy of science, and is a member of several academic societies including the International Society for MacIntyrean Ethics. He is a regular presenter and speaker at various universities and conferences around the world. His more recent research is focused on the problem of inconsistent moral assumptions within the social sciences and moral challenges associated with artificial intelligence.

Michael Kolta, PhD: Associate Professor of Computer Science
Palm Beach Atlantic University
Kolta received his B.S. in Industrial Engineering from the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in 1998. He earned his M.S. and Ph.D. in computer science in 2007 and 2009, respectively, from the University at

Albany, State University of New York. Both his Master's project and his doctoral dissertation are centered around AI. In his interdisciplinary, patented work, Kolta has devised a unique search engine for music that is not based on traditional text queries but is instead based on melody. Kolta has taught computer science at the college level for 25 years. His concern for the ethical issues in software and AI has led to the release of his book "Christian Ethics in Computers, Software, and Artificial Intelligence" in January of 2025. This book provides a framework to equip students and professionals for the many ethical challenges that lie ahead in software and AI. Educators may request a free evaluation copy from Kendal Hunt Publishing Company here: https://shorturl.at/t6rMP. For more information about Mike's other endeavors, please visit Kolta.net

CAPT Jim Barge, USN, Ret.: Assistant Professor of Management
Mount St. Joseph University
After 38 years of leadership experience in a broad range of civilian business and military organizations, including GE Aerospace and the US Navy, Barge is now a Visiting Assistant Professor of Management, teaching several undergraduate leadership/management and MBA/MSOL courses at Mount St. Joseph University in Cincinnati, Ohio. Additionally, he has taught as an adjunct instructor in both undergraduate and graduate business schools at Point University and Palm Beach Atlantic University. His recent dissertation focused on the development of a survey instrument designed to assess the individual moral worldviews of organizational leaders using, as a framework, four predominant versions of moral enquiry in Western society-traditionalism, rationalism, sentimentalism/emotivism and perspectivism- that find their basis in the work of preeminent moral philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre and other leading scholars. As an AI thought leader at his university, he is pursuing both teaching and research involving leadership, ethics and Artificial Intelligence.

Mark Robert Taylor, PhD: De Vries Institute Postdoctoral Fellow in Normative Business Ethics
Calvin University
ORCID: https//orcid.org/0000-0002-4401-7248
https://calvin.edu/people/mark-taylor
Taylor teaches as a De Vries Institute Postdoctoral Teaching Fellow at the Calvin University School of Business in Grand Rapids, MI. His interests are in normative and applied ethics, especially Business Ethics, as well as a broad interest in the History of Philosophy. Like many other scholars, he has recently taken a special interest in the role of AI in higher education.

Trish Elliott, MS
Palm Beach Atlantic University
Trish Elliott is a recent graduate from the Ethics and Organizational Behavior master's program at Palm Beach Atlantic University, where she was awarded the Outstanding Graduate Award of 2025. While pursuing her master's, she worked as a research assistant in Dr. Julie G. Pilitsis' Neuroscience Lab at the University of Arizona. Trish's research focuses on chronic pain relief with publications in Neuromodulation: Technology at the Neural Interface, Neurosurgery, and Postgraduate Medicine. She earned a bachelor's degree in chemistry with minors in neuroscience and business administration from Southern Methodist University. She plans to join Trauma Free World as a graduate fellow in research and strategy, to continue and grow their research and education on the effects of trauma. She believes that a deeper knowledge of neuroscience invites a profound faith in our Creator, hoping to be an advocate for the unity of Christianity and science in healing a broken world.

Moderator Opening Question (5mins per Panelist)
What are the morally challenging aspects of AIs that keep you up at night?

Moderator Q&A Discussion with Audience (20mins)
Some Suggested Questions for Panel

What aspects of education and learning seem most challenging regarding the integration and use of AIs as a part of the developmental process?

Why is interdisciplinary collaboration so important in AI design, development and implementation?

What is most concerning regarding the human condition and the exponential increase in the use and integration of AIs?

Compiled Manuscript from Panel with References

Philosophy & AI: Topics Many Wish to Avoid

Philosophy scholars generally agree that, as we progress through the 21st century's third decade, there are multiple divergent worldviews where passionate advocates abound within each version and seemingly intractable arguments continue to abide unabated (Herdt, 1998; Gofrey & Lewis, 2018; MacIntyre, 1990; Flett,1999; Fillion, 2018; Naugle. 2002; Sire, 2015; Neville, 2009). As Wieseltier (1994) aptly articulated even thirty years ago, "the sidewalks are crowded with incommensurabilities" (p. A11). These rival worldviews have manifested themselves in significant ways that can influence both current and future organizations and their leaders. More specific to the business world, Taylor (2024), arguing about politics in general which for our purposes often contains a significant moral element, claims that "corporate America is finding itself trapped between society's progressive impulses, and the conservative backlash" and that most companies are in fact marred by dissension over moral and political issues reflecting the massive societal and cultural shifts taking place today (p. 211, 173). The problem that arises from this challenging moral landscape is that leaders in the 21st century are ill-equipped to recognize, understand, and address these worldviews and this disagreement in themselves, much less their organization.

The problems arising from the introduction of AIs has only complicated societal problems related to rival moral traditions in pluralistic organizations. Well known theories have been challenged for their lack of transparency or otherwise exposed for unfamiliarity related to moral philosophy, or otherwise disguising or even disregarding basic philosophy often related to ontological and epistemological assumptions. Incommensurate moral traditions and related assumptions have already been uncovered in psychology, moral psychology, leadership theory, and in the design and development of AIs (Mensch, 2009; Mensch, 2016; Mensch & Barge, 2019; Mensch & Ochasi, 2025).

AI and the Leader Moral Worldview Assessment

In light of the need for the individual and organizations to better understand the potential impacts and risks associated with incommensurate moral traditions operating in pluralistic domains, Barge (2025) developed the *Leader Moral Worldview Assessment* (LMWA), a robust survey tool that asks key questions on morality, truth, self, community, and purpose, attempting to determine the predominant moral worldview that influences organizational leaders' ethical thinking and decision making. Four moral worldviews, based in part on MacIntyre's Three Rival Version of Moral Enquiry (1990), are presented as the dominate worldviews in Western business leaders minds today: Traditionalism, Rationalism, Perspectivism, and Emotivism, sometimes used synonymously with Sentimentalism. Two hundred organizational leaders from corporate America participated in the development and validation of this instrument. The expectation from using tool is that organizational leaders and individuals will be better equipped to handle moral dilemmas including crafting the ability to disagree well and develop solutions even in a pluralistic organization. We believe this is an especially important breakthrough in the context of human/AI interactions.

Some might argue that perhaps, rather than rely on our own inadequate and conflicted thinking on the most pressing moral issues, we can and should turn to AI to help us solve our moral dilemmas. Among the most vocal advocates of AI, venture capitalist Marc Andreessen would argue that "our only moral option is to proceed at maximum speed to the prosperous, free, and just future that AI and its attendant technologies provide" (Bilbro, 2025, p. 59). De Cremer and Kasparov (2022) echo this offering that:

> The practice of being ethical in the business world is transforming gradually more into an issue of technical competencies. Rather than wondering whether they should still pay attention to ethics themselves, business leaders are starting to think: ethics, isn't that what we have AI for now? (p. 2.)

But this line of thinking raises a myriad of significant questions including, does AI have a moral worldview? If so, what might that that be and how can it be identified? How would and how should that influence our thinking and problem solving around moral issues? We offer that it would be a worthwhile

experiment to have one or more GenAIs (ChatGPT, Gemini etc.) complete the LMWA once and then, after a determined interval, complete it again to assess how various AI models answer the survey and whether the answers change. We also believe it beneficial to assess the answers obtained by an individual who has built a conversational relationship with a specific GenAI vs. having a different GenAI, specifically with no conversational or other personal history involved, to answer the same survey questions, to ascertain whether GenAIs' moral worldviews are influenced by the user over time. This project is currently underway (Barge, 2025).

Moral Enquiry, Guardrails, and Human Development Throughout the Lifespan

The complexity of AI systems is problematic, and few understand the innerworkings of such systems better than the people who create them. Many modern systems are so complex and have so many internal parameters that even the people that create them do not fully understand them, a disconcerting notion. We are specifically concerned with the responsible use and creation of AI. Regulations and laws, often referred to as "guardrails", are important but insufficient. People that create AI systems must consider ethical issues during the initial design and throughout the implementation phases. To this end, software developers and engineers must have adequate familiarity and training in formal ethics and philosophy, which can provide tools to help them critically consider ethical implications of their designs so as not to harm the user. We already observe examples of AI systems that encourage humans to engage in self-harm, as predicted in Mensch and Ochasis' (2025) treatise titled "Moral Enquiry Meets Artificial Intelligence: Considering Influences of Interactive Algorithmic-Based Ethical Decision Making on Agentive Wellbeing", and as reported in many popular press articles such a recent piece found in the Wall Street Journal regarding a man on the spectrum whose dangerous delusions were encouraged by ChatGPT causing great harm to the user (Jargon, 2025). One important consideration is to identify and understand better ways to create responsible AI systems through research and education (Kolta, 2025).

Another consideration often overlooked and requiring significant research relates to agentive aspects of human integrity and wholeness, with a focus on what it means to have commitments throughout the lifespan. Since the recent introduction of GenAI in education, many have turned to thinking about the long-term implications of the use of AI for our students in higher education, which has also become a topic of debate and even conflict in higher ed. In a recent article it is argued that teaching students to write well is part of a moral outlook that values students for their own sake, as whole persons; conversely, replacing student writing with AI text production is viewed as anti-social. Forthcoming and currently under review is a treatise that examines interactions between humans and AIs in an educational environment, specifically focused on rhetoric, language, and writing as key components to human cognitive development. We argue that AI, especially in the context of rhetoric and logically consistent writing, diminishes student autonomy rather than enhancing it. Christian educators ought to be concerned to ensure that our schools remain a place where moral wisdom and maturity can grow. We must be unruffled by fearmongers who claim that anyone who doesn't maximally embrace AI will fall behind. Instead, we wish to ensure that respect for the moral agent and learner autonomy with regards to GenAI leads to wisdom, whilst avoiding the many possible pitfalls many of which only seem to be understood in the most basic terms regarding human flourishing (Taylor, 2024; Talor 2025).

AI in Medicine & Practitioner Development

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into medicine generally and specifically in the field of neurology is already well underway, although not without controversy and consternation. Neurology is a field that has impressively progressed with the demand for neurologists exceeding the supply. As the vitality of neurology increases, so does its integration with technology and artificial intelligence. Neurological practices and research studies have begun to utilize AI for its vast benefits in prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation. The ethical guardrails for AI in healthcare are convoluted and should be distinctly developed in the field of neurology, which directly affects the brain and nervous system, the part of us that makes us human. Neuro-ethics is pursuing the collaboration between neuroscience and AI, deliberating concerns such as clarity of terminology, data collection and governance, among others. How we define human identity for the patient and physician matters more now than ever, as we grapple with the correct integration of a machine that aims to mirror and surpass human

intelligence. Ethical guardrails should be cultivated to ensure the safeguarding of human identity in AI reliance, public engagement, transparency, bias, decision-making, patient privacy and neural data. Despite potential perils, the utilization of AI can promote human identity within neurology through personalized medicine, patient-physician connection, prevention, treatment and rehabilitation for disabilities and chronic illnesses.

Algorithmic Authority & Ethical Erosion: Moral Disengagement and the Physician

As artificial intelligence (AI) systems become increasingly integrated into healthcare decision-making, clinicians face a growing ethical dilemma between adhering to algorithmic recommendations and exercising their professional moral judgment. This paper explores how AI-generated recommendations, especially in high-stakes, resource-limited contexts, can intensify moral distress among physicians, erode professional autonomy, and contribute to moral disengagement. Moral distress, originally conceptualized as arising from institutional constraints that prevent ethical action, now reemerges in the AI era, where opaque algorithms can prescribe cost-effective treatments that may conflict with patient-centered care. This dynamic pressures physicians to either override their ethical convictions or risk professional liability. As studies show, such distress not only undermines clinician well-being but can trigger coping mechanisms like detachment or emotional numbness, precursors to moral disengagement with profound implications for clinical integrity and patient safety (Ochasi & Mensch, 2025). Building on relational ethics and algorithmic injustice literature, this paper argues that the ethical risks of AI in medicine cannot be addressed solely through individual responsibility or technical fixes. Instead, they require systemic vigilance regarding how algorithmic systems perpetuate power imbalances, epistemic opacity, and depersonalized care. The AI "black box" problem, where decision pathways are incomprehensible to users, undermines informed consent and shifts moral accountability from humans to inscrutable systems. Drawing on recent scholarship, we examine how algorithmic authority in medicine may silently sanction ethical erosion under the guise of efficiency or evidence-based practice. We call for an interdisciplinary ethical framework that embeds transparency, relational accountability, and the preservation of clinician moral agency at the core of AI integration in healthcare (Ochasi & Mensch, 2025).

References

Barge, J. (2026). *Moral Worldviews in the Workplace: Using MacIntyre's Three Rival Versions of Moral Enquiry for Organizational Leaders' Facilitation of Mutuality and Improved (Dis)agreement*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Exeter.

Bilbro, J. (2025, January/February). AI and all its splendor. *Christianity Today, LXIX* (1), 58-62.

Bösel, J., Mathur, R., Cheng, L., Varelas, M. S., Hobert, M. A., & Suarez, J. I. (2025). AI and Neurology. *Neurological research and practice*, *7*(1), 11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s42466-025-00367-2

De Cremer, D. & Kasparov, G. (2022). The ethical AI—paradox: Why better technology needs more and not less human responsibility. *AI and Ethic+s, 2,* 1-4.

Elliott, T. (2025). Ethical Guardrails for AI in Neurology: Safeguarding Human Identity in Medical Innovation. Master's Thesis. Palm Beach Atlantic University.

Fillion, R. (2018). Situating Poligen studies: Between moral enquiry and political theory. *Genealogy 2018, 2*(2), 1-9.

Flett, J. (1999). Alasdair MacIntyre's tradition-constituted enquiry in Polanyian perspective. *Tradition and Discovery: The Polanyi Society Periodical, 26*(2), 6-20.

Gofrey, P., & Lewis, B. (2018). Pragmatism and pluralism: A moral foundation for stakeholder theory in the 21st century. BYU Scholars Archive. Retrieved from https://philarchive.org/archive/GORMRA-3

Herdt, J. (1998). Alasdair MacIntyre's rationality of traditions and tradition-transcendental standards of justification. *Journal of Religion, 78*(4), 524-546.

Jargon, J. (2025, July 20). He Had Dangerous Delusions. ChatGPT Admitted It Made Them Worse. Wall Street Journal.

Kolta, M. (2025). Christian Ethics in Computers, Software, and Artificial Intelligence. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing Company.

MacIntyre, A. (1990). *Three rival versions: Encyclopaedia, Genealogy, and Tradition.* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Mensch, K. G., & Ochasi, A. (2025). Moral Enquiry Meets Artificial Intelligence: Considering Influences of Interactive Algorithmic-Based Ethical Decision Making on Agentive Wellbeing. *Philosophy & Technology*; Springer, 38. doi:10.1007/s13347-025-00892-7

Naugle, D. (2002). *Worldview: The history of a concept.* Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing.

Neville, R. C. (2009). Worldviews. *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy, 30*(3), 233-243.

Ochasi, A., & Mensch, K. (2025, forthcoming). *Algorithmic Authority and Ethical Erosion: AI, Moral Disengagement, and the Physician's Dilemma*.

Shiferaw, K. B., Roloff, M., Balaur, I., Welter, D., Waltemath, D., & Zeleke, A. A. (2025). Guidelines and standard frameworks for artificial intelligence in medicine: a systematic review. *JAMIA Open*, *8*(1), ooae155. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamiaopen/ooae155.

Sire, J. (2015). *Naming the elephant: Worldview as a concept*. 2nd edition. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press.

Taylor A. (2024). *Higher ground: How business can do the right thing in a turbulent world.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Taylor, M. R. (2025). Writing is not text production. *International Journal of Christianity & Education*, 20569971251359981. https://doi.org/10.1177/20569971251359981

Taylor, M. R. (2024). Spectator to One's Own Life. *Journal of the American Philosophical Association*, *10*(4), 877–896. https://doi.org/10.1017/apa.2024.2

Wieseltier, L. (1994, October). The trouble with multiculturalism [Review of the book *Dictatorship of virtue: Multiculturalism and the battle for America's future.* By Richard Bernstein]. *The New York Times,* October 23, A11.