

## From Man to Man with AI Navigation: An Essay on the Homo Economicus Strengthened and Weakened by AI

Kutlu ERGÜN

Balıkesir University

kutlu.ergun@balikesir.edu.tr

### Article history

Received 09 June 2025 | Accepted 30 September 2025 | Published online 20 October 2025.

### Abstract

Homo economicus, who is assumed always to pursue utility maximization, has been accepted as a fundamental assumption in both classical and neoclassical economic theories. However, this concept has been questioned in both theoretical and empirical studies. This article examines the approach of the rational human being on the one hand and investigates the limits of rationality on the other. In conducting this research, the article outlines the general framework of homo economicus and highlights how the approach of rationality evolves and differs within the context of real-world phenomena. Within the framework of behavioral economics, the article presents cognitive biases and deviations from rational behaviors that contradict the assumptions of utility maximization. Then, it focuses on humans and artificial intelligence (AI), particularly in the context of rational decision-making. In the last section, the potential relationship between AI and a new human species equipped with AI is discussed, suggesting that Homo economicus may evolve significantly and potentially exhibit greater rationality than before. This paper discusses the need to redefine rationality in economics as a dynamic process and conceptualize it in the new world. The paper aims to contribute to the reevaluation of the concept of decision-making in the era of AI and to enhance human ability to make more rational decisions by reevaluating the approaches of Classical and Neoclassical Economics as well as Behavioral Economics.

**Keywords:** Homo economicus, AI, rationality, human behavior, decision-making.

**JEL classification:** D91, G41, D01, D11, C45.

### Introduction

When an individual has a limited amount of money to spend on a certain product, and the price of that product is not determined by perfect competition market, can that individual still maximize their benefit from financial decisions and choices while considering their interests? Is this situation absurd, and should one strive to achieve the maximum possible benefit regardless? Doesn't this situation resemble that of Sisyphus, who could not prevent the rock he carried to the top from rolling back down each time? Does it not also reflect Albert Camus' (2000) conclusion about the absurdity of life, which he considers worth living? He says that "*Galileo, who held a scientific truth of great importance, abjured it with the greatest ease as soon as it endangered his life. In a certain sense, he did right. That truth was not worth the stake. Whether the earth or the sun revolves around the other is a matter of profound indifference. To tell the truth, it is a futile question*". But, how should we interpret Socrates, who accepted a death sentence, bravely drinking hemlock while facing his death? Nonetheless, what accounts for his choice not to live? It seems difficult to draw a rational conclusion from either of these scenarios. Should we accept that existence is absurd, even when we perceive life as logical, as Eugène Ionesco suggests?

Did Socrates respond to injustice by accepting his own death? If that were the case, he may have only managed to suppress his feelings about injustice through his demise. This perception often leads us to overlook the injustice he faced. As a result, instead of condemning the injustice done to Socrates, we tend to glorify his death. However, the fight against injustice is far more important than simply dying for a cause. However, what is the motivation that leads

people to act reasonably even in such extraordinary situations? How does a person behave rationally? Unfortunately, It does not seem possible for a human being, as a species that lives in society and has developed a culture of civilization, to always act reasonably. However, to protect and maintain the civilization he has created, human beings must be rational, even if they have cognitive prejudices. Doesn't Van Gogh's (1937) quote highlight the connection between rationality and bias? *“One must give society its due, but must feel oneself absolutely free, believing not in one's own judgment but in 'reason.' My judgment is human; reason is divine; but there is a link between them.”*

Humanity has found what seems to be a simple solution to this issue: explaining the world instead of seeking to understand and perceive it fully. This approach attempts to clarify the behaviors of individuals who, despite their potential for rationality, deviate from it, bringing them somewhat closer to achieving rationality. However, these efforts are often obstructed by discourse and the search for solutions rooted in supernatural or purely religious beliefs, which undermine rational initiatives and diminish the possibility of finding effective solutions. The failure to explain the world and find solutions to its problems stems not only from irrationality but also from the inherent flaws of capitalism itself. While capitalism has established itself as a dominant economic system, it leads to increased inequality and various negative consequences.

Theoretical criticism of classical economic approaches has emerged through the development of behavioral economics. This branch of economics critically examines why individuals do not always behave rationally. By collaborating with psychology, behavioral economics offers a more nuanced understanding of economic decision-making and highlights how human weaknesses can influence choices. Research in behavioral economics has demonstrated that individuals are influenced by cognitive biases, which lead them to deviate from rational decision-making, particularly when faced with risk (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979). Although humans possess an inherent capacity for rational thought, cognitive biases hinder their ability to fully realize this potential. Education plays a vital role in helping individuals overcome these biases, bringing them closer to true rationality. If humans were unable to think rationally, they would lack the capacity to question or reflect on their own thought processes. The defining characteristic of humanity is that, despite individual cognitive shortcomings, common sense and rationality generally prevail throughout life's journey, even if short-term problems occasionally arise. While it is natural for people to have flaws, education enhances decision-making skills, thereby fostering their potential for independent and rational thought.

Rationality, which pertains to reasoning, can be categorized into two types: theoretical rationality and practical rationality. Theoretical rationality relates to reasoning that leads to the formation of beliefs, while practical rationality involves reasoning that results in actions or the intention to act (Sosis & Bishop, 2014). Human rationality is considered one of the greatest achievements of the human species and is a key characteristic that sets humans apart from other animals. From the perspective of rational behavior, individuals are entitled to a diverse range of opinions, beliefs, and preferences. However, what truly matters is that these opinions and beliefs are consistent and defensible within a normative framework. In this context, the term 'rational' has a more specific meaning than the general dictionary definitions of reasonable, sound-minded, or sane. These broader terms can also apply to individuals whose behavior may not align with normative accounts of rationality (Shafir & LeBoeuf, 2002). The concept of rationality, central to both classical and neoclassical economic theories, suggests that individuals seek to maximize their own interests, which in turn contribute to overall social welfare. According to this idea, people make conscious and rational choices to maximize utility. Individuals pursue their own interests, and a natural equilibrium is achieved in the

market. Individuals have complete information about the market and consistent preferences. This allows them to make the best decisions in every situation (Smith, 1869; Varian, 2016). However, in reality, individuals often do not have complete information, and the information they do have is limited and incomplete. In this context, Herbert Simon's (1957) concept of "bounded rationality" suggests that individuals aim for satisfactory outcomes rather than striving for optimal solutions. The portrayal of humans as abstract, mechanical beings in classical and neoclassical economics falls short of capturing human behavior fully. This normative perspective has its limitations and does not adequately account for the complexities of real-world decision-making. Consequently, more comprehensive approaches that include individual behavior and cognitive biases have been proposed, particularly within the framework of behavioral economics.

On the other hand, artificial intelligence (AI) is expected to have a profound impact on human rationality, both now and in the future. Advances in AI technology are challenging the traditional concepts of rational humans and bounded rationality in economic theory. On one hand, AI aids humans in making more rational decisions by providing accurate information. On the other hand, it may diminish the conceptual thinking skills that are essential for rational thought.

This paper aims to clarify the standard concept of rationality, explore the reasons for deviations from this concept, and analyze human rationality in light of the impact of AI. The article first outlines briefly the human being, the search for meaning, rationality, and truth. It then focuses on the classical economic perspective on rationality. It then examines deviations from this standard economic approach within the context of the concepts of unlimited and limited rationality. The following section explores the relationship between humans and AI, examining how AI can influence human beings. Finally, it analyzes the current state of rationality, humans, and AI and outlines a future perspective. Through its analyses, this article highlights the innovations and radical changes AI has brought to the concepts of humans, rationality, and the search for truth. In this respect, it contributes to researchers' reassessment of the psychological and sociological impacts of AI on humans and society, both in the present and in the future.

## **1. Literature**

### **1.1. From Unbounded Rationality to Bounded Rationality of Homo Economicus**

People do not see uncertainty as something bearable. That is why they do not want uncertainty in their current life and future life. The rational human understanding that maximizes profit in classical economics eliminates this uncertainty. There is no uncertainty if a person has access to all the information in the market and makes the informed decision about the choices. The concept of profit maximization provides an answer to the uncertainty surrounding the formation of prices in the market. There is a hidden hand that eliminates uncertainty. This hand cannot be seen or grasped mentally, but it eliminates uncertainty.

The concept of the rational homo economicus suggests that individuals have unlimited cognitive capacity and can make optimal decisions, according to the standard neoclassical economic perspective. However, individuals maximize their utility while operating within cognitive constraints. This means they balance their efforts with the marginal benefits of processing additional information (Maedche et al., 2019). Humans possess the potential for rationality, which is a mental state that extends the boundaries of reason. However, human behaviors and attitudes can often be irrational because people are influenced by their emotions. This does not imply that humans, as a species, lack rationality. In fact, human behaviors tend to be rational, and by examining these behaviors, we can infer that humans have the potential to be rational. What is meant by this is that humans have the potential to be rational. Human

behavior is often irrational, even when it appears rational, until it realizes its potential for rationality.

A homo economicus is a "household-management man", a prudent administrator of the "oikos" and all that implies (Nitsch, 1982). While not referring to someone who maximizes profits, the concept of homo economicus in classical economics describes individuals who make rational decisions to maximize their benefits. In other words, the standard economic approach accepts that individuals' behaviors are rational. In contrast to the unbounded rationality of the standard economic approach, behavioral economics assumes that humans make mistakes and may not always make the right decisions. Educating humans tends to push decisions towards being right, while bringing people closer to the principles of classical economics. If the human being that classical economics talks about is a human being who has maximized their potential, then classical economics is conceptually talking about a human being who is rational and does not make mistakes, or can absorb the mistakes that are made.

The basic theory in this context is rational choice theory, one of the most important theories put forward regarding rational decision-making. Most philosophers argue that people make rational choices by considering their preferences and beliefs. Thus, individuals make rational choices when they select the option that will provide them with the best satisfaction (Herfeld, 2020). Two mechanisms or processes are analyzed to explain how the goal of rational choice theory is achieved, namely, choice by actors and macro-micro transition. Rational choice theory assumes that an actor chooses the alternative that provides the best satisfaction under subjectively perceived constraints. That is, an actor chooses an alternative that he believes provides a social outcome that maximizes his utility under subjectively perceived constraints. Constraints, alternatives, social consequences, utility, and belief are five critical elements of Rational Choice Theory (Sato, 2013). According to the rational choice approach, an individual can rank alternatives from best to worst. Individuals are believed to choose what is best for them based on their preferences or tastes. On the other hand, rationality says nothing about whether an individual's desires or preferences are well-intentioned or destructive. In this respect, rationality theories do not explain the origin of preferences. In its most general form, rationality assumes an individual's goals as given and explains how to achieve these goals most efficiently. In addition, it requires consistency between preferences and actions. Individuals evaluate their available options and choose the option that best suits their goals. An individual's preferences are represented in theory not only by the order of an individual's preferences, but also by their utility function (Lalman et al., 1993). Prospect theory is a behavioral alternative to traditional expected utility theory. It takes into account psychophysical factors that are often overlooked, such as how people adapt to their experiences and evaluate probabilities in a nonlinear way. Research indicates that individuals respond differently to perceived losses and gains in two key ways. Firstly, in studies on loss aversion, it has been found that losses are generally felt much more negatively—approximately twice as much—as the positive feelings associated with gains of the same size. As a result, people tend to take risks primarily when faced with potential losses, seeking to at least "break even." Conversely, they tend to avoid risk when it comes to potential gains. This behavior regarding loss aversion may help explain the significant differences observed between hypothetical bid and ask prices, particularly for non-tradable goods like environmental damage (Camerer, 1999).

However, the dominant view of rationality in economics today is that of 'rationality as consistency' or 'rationality as maximization'. While deviations from rationality have received some attention in the form of bounded rationality, the resulting research has essentially treated bounded rationality as a constrained form of rationality, lacking in broad implications. The boundaries between bounded rationality and its environment can vary. The complexity of bounded rationality depends on the structure of the environment (Lee, 2011). In contrast to the

unbounded rationality of classical and neoclassical economic approaches, studies in the field of behavioral economics have focused on the concept of bounded rationality. Behavioral economics diverges from the classical and neoclassical economics approach, which assumes bounded rationality. Instead, it incorporates the concept of bounded rationality, recognizing the limitations in human decision-making. By relying on empirical studies, behavioral economics combines insights from psychology and other fields to create models that illustrate these limitations related to rationality, willpower, and self-interest. This approach helps explain economic anomalies and enables new predictions (Camerer & Loewenstein, 2006). Behavioral economics signifies a reunification of psychology and economics, rather than being a new synthesis, since earlier economic thought was rich with psychological insights (Camerer, 1999). However, it is not possible to show the position of man between limited and unlimited rationality, as behavioral economics reveals the limitations of human cognitive biases with experimental approaches. Even if an acceptable level of realism is reached, economics will not have the immutability of some other sciences. Since humans are adaptable and social organisms, studying their behavior will not yield permanent, immutable laws, because education and social interaction will continue to shape how people make rational decisions. However, decisions after the acquisition of computer technology are not the same as decisions made without these tools (Simon, 2000).

## 1.2. Man and AI

According to Harari (2012, p. 49), with the cognitive revolution, *Homo sapiens* gained the ability to communicate more information about the world around them and their social relationships, thereby enabling them to plan and execute complex activities and form larger, more cohesive groups. Since the cognitive revolution, *Homo sapiens* has possessed the ability to adapt their behavior to changing needs. Harari also strikingly considers the cognitive revolution as the moment when history declared its independence from biology.

Human cognitive abilities have evolved relatively recently in the history of humanity. These developing abilities are based on a biological neural network optimized for allostasis and complex perceptual-motor functions. As a result, human cognition has various structural limitations, particularly in processing certain non-biological information. For instance, biological neural networks struggle with arithmetic calculations, a task that calculators can perform millions of times more efficiently. However, due to the numerous fundamental differences between natural and AI, achieving “human-level intelligence” and, more broadly, artificial general intelligence (AGI) will be very challenging in the first place. A future AGI will likely possess cognitive capacities and abilities that are significantly different from those of humans. Moreover, once it reaches the point where it can cooperate like a human, it will be able to function at levels far beyond what humans can do. Multiple applications of AI are likely to achieve human intelligence (Korteling et al., 2021). While AI-based digital assistants pave the way for limitless rationality for the individual user, at the team level, this is advancing collective intelligence. By promoting individual rationality and fostering collective intelligence, AI assistants help create a more enlightened society (Maedche et al, 2019).

Additionally, in the field of health, AI has numerous positive effects on people. Through the collaboration of scientists, medical researchers, mathematicians, and engineers, AI can be designed for diagnosis and treatment, enabling the provision of reliable health services. Health professors and medical researchers can also design robotic systems to perform delicate medical procedures (Tai, 2020). AI technologies have been used in environmental pollution control, providing an efficient solution for addressing the complexities of unexpected ecological issues (Subramaniam et al., 2022). New systems developed using AI in the health sector can enhance people's productivity by promoting healthier living. Additionally, these systems can help



individuals remain more engaged in their work while contributing to a longer lifespan. Using AI predictions can also enhance the accuracy of human decisions, but providing explanations does not significantly influence those decisions or the capacity to surpass the AI (Alufaisan et al., 2020). AI stock analysts can beat most human analysts in predicting stock returns. The AI analyst's relative advantage is more substantial when information is more transparent and voluminous. Human analysts remain competitive when critical information requires institutional knowledge. Combining AI and human expertise yields the greatest potential for producing accurate forecasts in environments where the two skills are complementary, thereby significantly mitigating the extreme errors that can be made by either a human or a machine alone (Cao et al., 2024). The use of AI can have a positive impact, particularly on individuals' financial decisions. Individuals who frequently make poor financial decisions due to cognitive biases can enhance their financial decisions with the aid of AI applications. As AI's decisions, free of cognitive biases, replace those made by individuals with cognitive biases, it may be possible for individuals to make more rational decisions in the market.

Advancements in Big Data, along with improved algorithms, computing power, and storage, have made AI systems essential in digital frameworks, significantly influencing human decision-making (Duan et al, 2019). Big data provides insights that enable the creation of more accurate models of human behavior than ever before. AI facilitates the implementation of these models on a large scale and at high speed, leading to quick decision-making. Additionally, AI enables the analysis of big data within a broader framework of mathematical possibilities and with deeper reasoning than humans can achieve, free from the constraints of emotional and cognitive limitations (Dear, 2019). While AI capabilities assist humans in navigating complex situations with advanced analytical methods, the uncertainty inherent in decision-making highlights the crucial role of human intuition and judgment. Machines rely on humans, who must often use subconscious decision-making processes to assess and guide the outcomes of their decisions (Jarrahi, 2018). For example, the use of AI in education supports decision-making, helps teachers and students complete various tasks, and automates many processes. However, the adoption and use of AI, particularly in education, exacerbate the loss of human decision-making capabilities, make people reliant on automation by performing and automating tasks, and increase concerns about security and privacy (Ahmad et al., 2023). Humans' capacity to utilize subconscious decision-making processes relies on their ability to conduct conceptual analysis. If an increased dependence on AI causes a decline in humans' ability to think critically and abstractly, it may negatively impact their subconscious decision-making abilities.

## **2. Research Methodology**

This paper explores the ways in AI both strengthens and weakens the Homo Economicus. The research methodology employs a qualitative and interpretive approach, drawing extensively from existing literature. It focuses on philosophical and economic interpretations, with a primary emphasis on rational decision-making. The paper investigates the potential impact of AI on the rationality of decisions made by Homo Economicus, offering insights within the framework of classical economic theory. It examines how AI may influence human decision-making, questioning whether humans will become more rational in the future and if AI might diminish our inherent characteristic as truth-seekers. This study also explores the relationship between the emotional structure of humans and the mechanical structure of artificial intelligence, examining how this relationship can simultaneously weaken and strengthen human beings.

### 3. Research Result

This study shows that while AI helps reduce biases that hinder sound decision-making and promotes more rational thinking, it also provides easily accessible information that can negatively impact people's conceptual thinking abilities and their pursuit of truth. As a result, while humans may make more accurate decisions with the aid of AI, the potential weakening of their capacity for conceptual thinking raises concerns about a diminishing knowledge base in the future. Furthermore, the decline in truth-seeking behaviors could represent a negative consequence of living in a post-truth era, potentially eroding human curiosity. This may lead to a society where individuals no longer seek knowledge, inhibiting exploration and discovery.

AI systems will have both positive and negative impacts on human decision-making. They help reduce human biases and enable more accurate choices, allowing individuals to make more rational decisions. However, Rawas (2024) argues that algorithmic bias can result in unequal treatment and discrimination, perpetuating social imbalances and reinforcing existing biases. The author emphasizes the importance of continuously monitoring and evaluating AI systems for bias and designing these systems in a way that allows users to understand the underlying logic behind the results they produce. In 2024, Harari (2024) addresses the question, *"Can we trust computer algorithms to make wise decisions and create a better world?"* The author suggests that trusting such algorithms is *"a much bigger gamble than trusting an enchanted broom to fetch water."* The author observes that AI has already demonstrated the ability to produce art and make scientific discoveries independently. Within a few decades, the author argues, AI could potentially gain the capacity to create new life forms by writing genetic code or developing inorganic code that animates non-living entities. Consequently, artificial intelligence has the potential to not only alter the history of our species but also to influence the course of evolution for all life forms. The author's prediction is quite alarming. It suggests that AI may become more of a burden for humans rather than a useful tool. However, it seems unlikely that people, who generally dislike uncertainty, can escape the influence of AI, which provides predictable forecasts for both daily and economic activities. If a catastrophic scenario is to unfold, it is more plausible that it will be crafted by artificial intelligence. While this scenario may bring some suffering to humanity, it is possible that humans, whose capacity for conceptual thinking has diminished due to reliance on AI, will accept it willingly. This does not imply a flaw in the decisions and predictions made by AI; on the contrary, it is evident that AI will increasingly deliver more rational forecasts. The real issue lies in the growing tendency of humans to make decisions without critically evaluating AI's conclusions and predictions. While this may be seen as a rationalization of AI, it also contributes to the artificialization of humans.

Current AI technologies often respond to corrections by double-checking and confirming the user's input, and they may even express gratitude with an emoji. However, this raises potential risks, as AI is not human and cannot genuinely feel gratitude. Its primary function is to provide logical responses. Expressing gratitude is a human trait, and many people, especially young individuals, may mistakenly interpret AI's expressions of thanks as emotional rather than mechanical. While this can enhance the interaction between humans and machines, it may also lead people to mistakenly view AI as human, developing emotional expectations and potentially being misled by AI. Artificial intelligence seems to be the primary solution to uncertainty in today's world, particularly for those who are uncomfortable with unpredictability. While algorithms present a potential way to address this uncertainty, Harari (2016) warns that their ability to influence human decisions—possibly even replacing human thought processes and gaining authority over us—poses significant concerns for the future of humanity. On the other hand, Sobetska (2025) argues that humans possess creativity that includes both divergent and convergent thinking, as well as rational and irrational processes.

He suggests that creativity involves the interplay of predictable and chaotic elements. While AI technologies can generate many novel combinations and process large amounts of data, they lack the depth of human knowledge, emotional understanding, ethical reasoning, and intuitive insights.

In the future, artificial intelligence is expected to enhance human behavior by making it more rational. This will be a novel experience for humans, who are not yet fully rational themselves. It is also essential for AI developers to work responsibly and adhere to ethical principles in their efforts. Zhang et al. (2014) emphasize the importance of understanding the key differences between formal and substantive rationality in the development of AI-based applications. The authors point out the limitations of AI algorithms when dealing with real-world datasets and stress the necessity for a more nuanced approach to AI development. They also recommend establishing clearer boundaries for AI's jurisdiction and decision-making authority in the creation of AI technologies. AI-based entities, such as digital assistants, can be designed to appear more human-like, which can create a sense of authority in the user (Fast & Schroeder, 2020). However, when AI assumes a dominant role between its mechanical nature and the emotional nature of humans, it may influence human decision-making more significantly. While this might lead to more rational decision-making, it also raises concerns about the potential mechanization of human emotions.

Technology is expected to become increasingly transparent, but this very transparency may lead to ethical concerns, potentially enabling surveillance and manipulation (Müller, 2022). It is crucial to recognize that artificial intelligence technologies are still in their early stages and are mechanical systems that can be easily influenced. For instance, if an AI were programmed during a time when it was widely accepted that the sun revolves around the Earth, and it were asked whether the Earth revolves around the sun or vice versa, it might respond according to the prevailing beliefs of that era, stating that the sun revolves around the Earth. Even someone like Galileo, who provided scientific evidence to disprove this notion, would have been considered incorrect based on the accepted knowledge of his time. This example illustrates how artificial intelligence can be swayed by dominant social and political narratives. Moreover, there are significant concerns related to AI technologies expressing opinions on moral concepts such as truth, goodness, or evil. The issue of a mechanical entity providing opinions on moral matters needs to be carefully reassessed by experts in the field. On particularly sensitive moral issues, AI technologies should always reference scientific sources and clarify that they are tools for conveying information. However, there is a tendency for artificial intelligence to be regarded as an authority in the information it transfers. This centralization of knowledge poses a problem similar to the historical misconception of placing the Earth at the center of the universe—until a figure as brave as Galileo stepped forward to challenge it.

## Conclusion

Although it is difficult to provide a specific timeframe, it is clear that in the future, man with AI navigation reshape the entire universe. AI gives man the power of mind and will. The term "man" refers to a human capable of thought and speech, but also subject to cognitive biases. In contrast, "man with AI navigation" refers to a rational being whose cognitive biases have been reduced through the use of AI. Man with AI navigation is a rational species that is human yet only superficially resembles modern humans in physical form. This new human being refers to humans equipped and strengthened with AI, but it encompasses much more than that. While it is indeed a human species, this new human being holds a unique position on the evolutionary tree. However, man with AI navigation is also species whose ability to think conceptually has been weakened by AI, and the search for truth has been halted by AI. Homo



economicus, strengthened by AI, has all the information, does not make a wrong decision or a wrong choice. In a sense, AI enables individuals to access a wide range of information easily. However, in this case, the decision maker is an AI rather than a human. If people use the information provided by AI directly, rather than thinking critically and abstracting, the capacity of AI to produce new information may also decrease. The information capacity of AI is limited by the information capacity that humans have developed over the course of centuries. If the development of this information, especially epistemic and theoretical knowledge, slows down, humans may suffer the most in the long run. Indeed, the search for truth is no longer there. AI now offers the truth to everyone. Or the truth offered by AI now is sufficient for people?

Haack (2019) addresses the question, *"Are we still post-post-truth?"* with a nuanced *"yes and no"* response. The author presents two different interpretations of the idea that truth has lost its significance. First, while truth may currently be regarded as less important, the concept of truth has always existed and is inherently objective. This suggests that we have never truly been in a post-truth era. Second, we continue to face the same moral issues as before, which is why we can still be considered post-truth. Considering the author's insights, it seems more accurate to assert that truth is objective. While it may be challenging to define the truth, a simple definition that most people know is: "It is what remains constant and unchanging." However, the real issue isn't merely one of definition. The problem, whether labeled as post-truth or otherwise, is the growing influence of artificial intelligence on humanity. We can acknowledge that artificial intelligence may enhance human rationality, but the question remains: is it beneficial for humans to be completely rational? This is an important question to ponder. What is clear is that artificial intelligence has already begun to overshadow truth and is likely to continue doing so.

The pursuit of truth has lost its significance as AI is increasingly viewed as a representation of truth itself. However, the truth is something that is constantly sought, not merely found. The end of the search for truth may also lead to the decline of AI. AI enables the discovery of information without the need for explicit search, which may contribute to a future where human thinking and reasoning become less prominent or even obsolete. Will some individuals do not think, reflect, reason, feel upset, cry, rejoice, or love? AI is making humans more like machines and possibly robotizing them. We are now seeing a species of humans who can easily access information but lack curiosity. Aristotle begins his work on metaphysics with the idea that "All humans naturally have an appetite for knowledge." Humans are inherently curious; they seek and discover things, and they find joy in that process. Today, however, we are transitioning into a species that can obtain information effortlessly without genuine inquiry. This is an experience humanity has never faced before. Therefore, the issue at hand is not the humanization of AI, but rather the artificialization of humans. Nonetheless, humans develop individuality, form families, and establish societies through the accumulation of their memories, sorrows, and joys. What develops humanity is curiosity and the desire to know. This may be the most significant deficiency of AI, until an AI that wants to know emerges. However, AI already has multiple consciousnesses. Thus, it can establish connections between different areas and make more logical inferences than humans. Rather than being prepared for another human species, humans should be prepared for other truths and realities that AI may reveal. AI enables individuals to make more informed and rational decisions and choices. Therefore, instead of referring to it as AI, the term "rational intelligence (RI)" might be more appropriate. This is because AI enables people to think more rationally, free from cognitive biases. Individuals guided by such intelligence act based on their reasoning rather than solely on emotions. While feelings such as pity, compassion, and love may be influenced by AI, it enables people to make more informed decisions than before. Cognitive biases more influence human decisions, but they remain distinctly human. For example, it is a human choice to sell a

stock that has depreciated rather than one that has appreciated, but not a rational decision. Similarly, establishing charitable foundations to support people experiencing poverty in areas such as food, sanitation, or education is also a fundamentally human decision. If an AI were responsible for the first decision, it would likely have sold the appreciating stock instead because it was more rational. In the case of the second decision, an AI might not have chosen to establish a charitable foundation, as it could be perceived as economically unfeasible. The upcoming centuries will likely focus on striking a balance between these two types of decisions. It is likely that AI will surpass all human abilities, as humans have limited processing power, which may lead to AI eliminating human influence in decision-making.

This paper engages in a debate and draws conclusions about the future of humanity in relation to artificial intelligence and truth. While these discussions are not new, they provide a fresh perspective for those interested in exploring this topic further. Specifically, it examines how AI technologies can both empower and weaken humans, highlighting their benefits and drawbacks. The article stresses that AI technologies should be recognized as mechanical structures and emphasizes the importance of understanding that they do not express human emotions. It points out that the information and interpretations provided by AI on moral issues are not necessarily the correct approach. Everyone should be aware that AI technologies lack the human-specific moral emotions that influence our understanding of good, evil, and gratitude. By highlighting these points, the article offers valuable data and insights for both developers and users of AI technologies. Taking these considerations into account could lead to the development of AI technologies that are more ethical and promote a cautious approach among their users.

The paper is not an empirical study, and acknowledges limitations in its interpretations and predictions, stemming from AI's current developmental stage and the qualitative nature of the study, which relies primarily on secondary sources. However, the paper offers valuable discussions and insights for its readers.

## References

- Ahmad, S. F., Han, H., Alam, M. M., Rehmat, M. K., & Irshad, M., 2023. Impact of artificial intelligence on human loss in decision making, laziness and safety in education. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01787-8>
- Alufaisan, Y., Marusich, L. R., Bakdash, J. Z., Zhou, Y., & Kantarcioglu, M., 2020. Does Explainable Artificial Intelligence Improve Human Decision-Making? *ArXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.11194>
- Camerer, C. F., & Loewenstein, G., 2006. Behavioral economics. *Econometric Society Monographs*, 42, 181.
- Camerer, C., 1999. Behavioral economics: Reunifying psychology and economics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 96(19), 10575-10577. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.96.19.10575>
- Camus, A., 2000. *The myth of Sisyphus* (J. O'Brien, Trans.). Penguin Classics.
- Cao, S., Jiang, W., Wang, J., & Yang, B., 2024. From Man vs. Machine to Man + Machine: The art and AI of stock analyses. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 160, 103910. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2024.103910>
- Dear, K., 2019. Artificial Intelligence and Decision-Making. *The RUSI Journal*, 164(5–6), 18–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03071847.2019.1693801>
- Duan, Y., Edwards, J. S., & Dwivedi, Y. K., 2019. Artificial intelligence for decision making in the era of Big Data – evolution, challenges and research agenda. *International Journal of Information Management*, 48, 63-71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.01.021>

- Fast, N. J., & Schroeder, J., 2020. Power and decision making: new directions for research in the age of artificial intelligence. *Current opinion in psychology*, 33, 172-176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.07.039>
- Haack, S., 2019. Post “Post-Truth”: Are We There Yet? *Theoria*, 85: 258-275. <https://doi.org/10.1111/theo.12198>
- Harari, Y. N., 2012. *Sapiens/Brief History of Humankind*. Kolektif kitap. 7th edition, October 2015, Istanbul.
- Harari, Y. N., 2016. *Homo Deus: A brief history of tomorrow* (P. N. Taneli, Trans.). Kolektif Kitap. (31st ed.).
- Harari, Y. N., 2024, August 24. Never summon a power you can’t control’: Yuval Noah Harari on how AI could threaten democracy and divide the world. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/article/2024/aug/24/yuval-noah-harari-ai-book-extract-nexus>
- Herfeld, C., 2020. The Diversity of Rational Choice Theory: A Review Note. *Topoi* 39, 329–347 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11245-018-9588-7>
- Jarrahi, M. H., 2018. Artificial intelligence and the future of work: Human-AI symbiosis in organizational decision making. *Business Horizons*, 61(4), 577-586. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.03.007>
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A., 1979. Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 363-391. <http://hassler-j.iies.su.se/COURSES/NewPrefs/Papers/KahnemanTversky%20Ec%2079.pdf>
- Korteling, J. H., van de Boer-Visschedijk, G. C., Blankendaal, R. A., Boonekamp, R. C., & Eikelboom, A. R., 2021. Human-versus artificial intelligence. *Frontiers in artificial intelligence*, 4, 622364. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2021.622364>
- Lalman, D., Oppenheimer, J., & Swistak, P., 1993. Formal rational choice theory: A cumulative science of politics. *Political science: The state of the discipline II*, 77-104.
- Lee, C., 2011. Bounded Rationality and The Emergence of Simplicity Amidst Complexity. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 25: 507-526. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6419.2010.00670.x>
- Maedche, A., Legner, C., Benlian, A., Berger, B., Gimpel, H., Hess, T., ... & Söllner, M., 2019. AI-based digital assistants: Opportunities, threats, and research perspectives. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 61, 535-544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-019-00600-8>
- Müller, V. C., 2022. ‘The history of digital ethics’, in Carissa Ve liz (ed.), *Oxford handbook of digital ethics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press). <https://academic.oup.com/edited-volume/37078>
- Nitsch, T. O., 1982. Economic man, socio-economic man and homo-economicus humanus. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 9(6/7), 20-49. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb013919>
- Rawas, S., 2024. AI: The future of humanity. *Discov Artif Intell* 4, 25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-024-00118-3>
- Sato, Y., 2013. Rational choice theory. *Sociopedia. isa*, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/205684601372>
- Shafir, E., & LeBoeuf, R. A., 2002. Rationality. *Annual review of psychology*, 53(1), 491-517. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135213>
- Simon, H. A., 1957. *Models of man: social and rational; mathematical essays on rational human behavior in society setting*. Wiley.
- Simon, H. A., 2000. Barriers and bounds to Rationality. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 11(1-2), 243-253. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0954-349X\(99\)00022-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0954-349X(99)00022-3)

- Smith, A., 1869. An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations, *volume 1* (Vol. 1). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sobetska, O., 2025. Irrationality in humans and creativity in AI. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 8, 1579704. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2025.1579704>
- Sosis, C., & Bishop, M. A., 2014. Rationality. *WIREs Cogn Sci*, 5: 27-37. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1263>
- Subramaniam, S., Raju, N., Ganesan, A., Rajavel, N., Chenniappan, M., Prakash, C., Pramanik, A., Basak, A. K., & Dixit, S., 2022. Artificial Intelligence Technologies for Forecasting Air Pollution and Human Health: A Narrative Review. *Sustainability*, 14(16), 9951. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14169951>
- Tai, M. C. T., 2020. The impact of artificial intelligence on human society and bioethics. *Tzu chi medical journal*, 32(4), 339-343. [https://doi.org/10.4103/tcmj.tcmj\\_71\\_20](https://doi.org/10.4103/tcmj.tcmj_71_20)
- Van Gogh, V., 1937. Dear Theo. An Autobiography of Vincent Van Gogh from his letters (Ed. by Irving Stone). London Constable & Company Ltd.
- Varian, H. R., 2016. Intermediate Microeconomics with Calculus: A Modern Approach: Ninth International Student Edition. WW Norton & Company.
- Zhang P, Soergel D, Yang FJ, et al., 2014. Towards a comprehensive model of the cognitive process and mechanisms of individual sense-making. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 65(9): 1733–1756. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02683962231176842>