Frontiers in Research
Volume 1, Number 1, 2025, 20-35

Article

Artificial intelligence and space exploration: A philosophical analysis of their intersection and implications

Hüseyin Can Coşkun [1]

[1] Pak-Turk Maarif International Schools and Colleges, Model Town Campus, Multan, Pakistan

Abstract

This article examines the philosophical intersections between artificial intelligence (AI), space exploration, and their conceptual frameworks. As AI systems become increasingly integrated into nearly all domains of human life, and space exploration advances toward potential habitable environments beyond Earth, philosophy becomes essential for interpreting these transformative developments. The paper investigates definitions, boundaries, and applications of AI while addressing philosophical discussions around habitable space environments and potential space societies. The research employs qualitative document analysis to examine the theoretical foundations of AI, from algorithmic processes to complex learning systems. It explores AI's fundamental limitations, particularly regarding consciousness and self-awareness, while reviewing existing space agreements and international legal frameworks. The analysis demonstrates that despite these important initiatives, no definitive conclusions have been reached regarding governance structures for habitable space. The study argues that political philosophy, which has historically provided robust frameworks for conceptualizing societies, will be crucial for developing ethical and just structures for potential space communities. As AI and space exploration converge, philosophical inquiry becomes indispensable for addressing fundamental questions about governance, ethics, consciousness, and human experience in these new domains. The implications extend to technology development, policy formation, education, and interdisciplinary research.

Article History
Received 19.01.2025
Accepted 04.05.2025

Keywords
Artificial intelligence, space exploration, philosophy of technology, space governance, political philosophy

Introduction

AI has established itself as a technological system with profound historical significance (Bostrom, 2014; McCarthy et al., 2006). The pervasive integration of AI systems into virtually all domains of human life necessitates a clear delineation of the roles and boundaries of these sophisticated systems—described by Edward Fredkin as one of the three most significant developments in human history (Brooks, 2002; Floridi, 2019). Furthermore, AI research, whose scope, capacity, and domain remain incompletely defined, intersects with a wide range of debates concerning habitable space, space governance, and emerging space societies, making its relevance to space exploration unavoidable (Dickens & Ormrod, 2016; Lin et al., 2018).

Corresponding Author Hüseyin Can Coşkun ✉ Pak-Turk Maarif International Schools and Colleges, Model Town Campus, MPS Road, Multan, Pakistan

The notion that such a profound, valuable, and nuanced technological development could progress without critical examination is unacceptable (Bostrom & Yudkowsky, 2014; Russell et al., 2015). This transitional process—both challenging and transformative—must be interpreted through the lens of philosophy, which has historically accompanied humanity wherever life has existed or was conceived to exist (Blackburn, 2016; Gabriel, 2018). In this context, philosophy serves as an essential framework for comprehending and interrogating AI (Dreyfus, 1992; Searle, 2010). Indeed, few fields generate as many philosophical questions as AI. Particularly, issues surrounding mind, consciousness, free will, and ethics position AI at the center of contemporary philosophical discourse (Chalmers, 2010; Dennett, 2017; Yeşilkaya, 2022).

A review of the literature reveals a need for more comprehensive academic inquiry connecting these topics with philosophical perspectives (Mainzer, 2020; Schwitzgebel & Garza, 2020). Accordingly, this article investigates the definitions, boundaries, and domains of AI, while simultaneously addressing philosophical discussions surrounding space, habitable environments, and potential space societies. These subjects are examined in depth and contextualized to provide a thorough analysis. Ultimately, this study aims to contribute meaningfully to ongoing academic discourse and offer guidance for researchers working at this interdisciplinary intersection (Cockell, 2016; Milligan, 2015). The article concludes with evaluations and proposals on how AI, space, and philosophy might be conceptually integrated on common ground (Dick, 2018; Marsiske, 2019).

Method

This research employs qualitative methodology, specifically document analysis. Document analysis involves the systematic examination of written materials containing information about the phenomena under investigation. In qualitative research, document analysis can function as a standalone data collection method or complement other techniques (Bowen, 2009; Creswell, 2017; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). During the data collection process, we utilized academic articles, reports, official documents, and online sources relevant to the intersection of artificial intelligence, space exploration, and philosophy (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018; Patton, 2015). Regarding the Pakistani education system, expert opinions were obtained from officials at the Ministry of Education in Pakistan, and relevant documents were examined (Khan, 2019; Shah & Ishfaq, 2018). The gathered data were analyzed under the thematic categories presented in the findings section, following established protocols for qualitative content analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2012; Krippendorff, 2018).

What is Artificial Intelligence?

To establish a comprehensive definition of AI, we must first examine its two foundational elements: algorithms and intelligence itself (Legg & Hutter, 2007; Russell & Norvig, 2020). In fundamental terms, an algorithm is defined as a structured set of procedures designed to solve a problem (Köroğlu, 2017). Problem-solving capabilities have been essential to human evolution and largely responsible for humanity's advancement beyond other species. Algorithms enable us to systematically address complex questions by breaking them down into manageable components through analysis, which, when executed sequentially, lead to resolution (Köroğlu, 2017).

Defining intelligence proves considerably more complex than defining algorithms (Bayık, 2019). In the study "A Collection of Definitions of Intelligence," nearly seventy distinct definitions are presented, categorized into three main groups: general definitions, definitions by psychologists, and definitions by AI researchers. The general category alone includes eighteen definitions, which broadly characterize intelligence as comprising understanding, memory, experience, reasoning, knowledge, imagination, and general cognitive abilities. Definitions provided by psychologists—thirty-four entries—emphasize cognitive processes such as sensation, perception, association, memory, imagination, discrimination, judgment, and reasoning. These definitions often frame intelligence as a process involving the retrieval, acquisition, storage, integration, and comparison of information (Bayık, 2019).

From another perspective, intelligence can be defined as the ability to effectively generate solutions to complex problems within our world. In essence, intelligence represents the capacity to produce algorithms (Köroğlu, 2017). AI is directly associated with this capacity. In AI research, intelligence is approached from various angles. One such angle—computational intelligence—focuses on the ability to achieve tangible, worldly goals through data processing. From this perspective, any entity's ability to attain targeted outcomes in a specific environment is directly related to its capacity to process information (Bayık, 2019). AI systems are capable of recognizing problem definitions and reaching conclusions using methods derived from human-developed systems. Accordingly, systems that can learn, explore, and generate solutions are classified as artificial intelligence. In summary, AI comprises automated systems capable of producing algorithms (Köroğlu, 2017).

The term "artificial intelligence" was first introduced by John McCarthy and his colleagues during a summer research project in 1955 (İşler & Kılıç, 2021; McCarthy et al., 2006). Since then, the concept has evolved into various sub-disciplines depending on the nature of the problems being addressed. These include artificial neural networks (ANNs), fuzzy logic, simulated annealing, expert systems, computer vision, genetic algorithms, speech recognition, chaotic modeling, and robotics (Civalek, 2003; Goodfellow et al., 2016; Nilsson, 2010).

What are the Limits of Artificial Intelligence?

Since its inception, AI has continuously expanded its boundaries (Boden, 2018; Müller, 2016). Given its structured problem-solving nature, predicting its future capacity is particularly challenging (Bostrom, 2014; Kurzweil, 2012). Initially, AI was conceptualized as computer-based systems designed to operate under rules mimicking human cognition and behavior. However, more recent developments have also been inspired by natural phenomena, introducing both theoretical and practical constraints to the field's growth (Dilek, 2019; Mitchell, 2019).

The first known theoretical exploration of AI's potential dates back to the 18th century, specifically Julien Offray de La Mettrie's 1748 work *L'homme Machine* (Man a Machine). In this work, he argued that humans are complex machines, and that mental processes stem from such complexity (Bennet, 2017; Vartanian, 1999). This mechanistic view suggests that the cognitive limits of humans indirectly constrain the systems they create, as AI development remains fundamentally shaped by human understanding (Hawkins, 2021; Minsky, 2007). Nevertheless, in specific operational domains, AI demonstrates capabilities that surpass human performance, particularly in tasks requiring error-free computation and symbolic reasoning (Haugeland, 1989; Russell & Norvig, 2020).

AI's capacity for understanding, while seemingly limited by human cognition, differs significantly in terms of learning and information acquisition (Floridi & Chiriatti, 2020; Marcus & Davis, 2019). Alan Turing, in his 1950 article *Computing Machinery and Intelligence*, was the first to address the concept of AI at a theoretical level. Turing proposed that computers could be taught to think like humans and designed similarly to a child's mind—developing through education and experience (Adaş & Erbay, 2021; Copeland, 2004). This learning-centered approach has evolved into contemporary AI systems that acquire knowledge through data accumulation and processing, forming the foundation for modern machine learning (Domingos, 2015; Jordan & Mitchell, 2015). Perhaps the most significant aspect of AI is machine learning, which occurs through artificial neural networks (Goodfellow et al., 2016; Kelleher, 2019). These networks imitate the structure of the human brain, learning through sensors, generating new information based on classified data, and making decisions accordingly (Keskenler & Keskenler, 2017; LeCun et al., 2015). The current prominence of AI is largely due to these machine learning capabilities, whose boundaries are directly proportional to the size and quality of available data (Agrawal et al., 2018; Sejnowski, 2018). With millions of data points now accessible, AI systems continue to demonstrate increasingly sophisticated behaviors across diverse domains (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2017; Silver et al., 2018).

One of the most critical thresholds of AI remains consciousness, which is intrinsically tied to its operational context and capabilities (Chalmers, 2010; Dehaene et al., 2017). The environments in which AI functions, the evolutionary traits it might simulate through selection, and its learning mechanisms are all externally defined by humans. For AI to determine these elements autonomously, it would need to form dialectical relationships with its surroundings—essentially requiring self-awareness (Koch, 2019; Zeki, 2007). This presents a fundamental limitation for machines learning through algorithms, as true consciousness remains elusive even in our understanding of human cognition (Graziano, 2019; Searle, 2014; Tononi & Koch, 2015). Scientific inquiry into the nature and function of consciousness continues to occupy researchers across disciplines, leaving artificial consciousness as a concept that has yet to be fully modeled or realized (Gamez, 2018; Zeki, 2007).

Application Areas of Artificial Intelligence and Space Studies

AI is an interdisciplinary field that operates in close connection with multiple disciplines simultaneously (Poole & Mackworth, 2017; Russell & Norvig, 2020). Depending on the area of study, AI frequently intersects with statistics, logic, cognitive psychology, neuroscience, linguistics, cybernetics, and computer engineering (Ince et al., 2021; Mainzer, 2020). This cross-disciplinary nature has enabled AI applications to permeate nearly every aspect of business operations, contributing significantly to efficiency and performance across sectors from healthcare to finance to manufacturing (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2017; Kaplan, 2016).

Interest, awareness, and recognition of AI have grown in parallel with the development of computer and information technologies over recent decades (Nilsson, 2010; Tegmark, 2017). From a functional perspective, AI can be defined as the capacity of machines to perform intelligent behaviors typically associated with human cognition—adapting to emerging situations, solving problems, overcoming challenges, and answering complex questions (Mitchell, 2019). In essence, AI provides computers with the ability to replicate human-like functions, continuously expanding its domain of application as computational capabilities advance (Koçyiğit & Darı, 2023; Russell & Norvig, 2020; McCarthy et al., 2006). Similarly, space has historically represented a domain of mystery and uncertainty, serving as a symbol of the unknown for humankind (Dick, 2018; Milligan, 2015). Since the 1950s, efforts to explore, comprehend, and explain space have intensified, transforming it from a theoretical frontier into an active field of scientific engagement and technological development (Erdem, 2018; Marsiske, 2019). From the second half of the 20th century onward, nations have invested substantially in space exploration, leading to numerous discoveries despite most of space remaining largely uncharted (Dickens & Ormrod, 2016). These explorations have yielded technologies with wide-ranging terrestrial applications, creating a virtuous cycle of innovation and discovery (Cockell, 2016; Dick, 2018).

Today, space technologies permeate various aspects of modern life in ways often unrecognized by the general public (Lin et al., 2018; Milligan, 2015). Both military and civilian satellites are employed in communication, surveillance, navigation, intelligence, and early warning systems that form critical infrastructure for global operations (Erdem & Orki, 2019; Sökmen, 2016). Beyond general broadcasting applications such as radio and television, satellite technologies have become integral to banking, healthcare, internet connectivity, and logistics sectors (Bozkurt, 2011; Karakulak, 2019). The umbrella of space utilization now encompasses diverse activities including satellite communication systems for global connectivity, scientific exploration of the universe, data acquisition for weather forecasting and climate monitoring, geographic identification, maritime navigation, geodesy, and remote sensing—all supported through sophisticated navigation and satellite systems (Kaşıkara, 2017; Sevim, 2022).

The convergence of space exploration and AI represents one of the most promising technological frontiers of the 21st century (Dickens & Ormrod, 2016; Marsiske, 2019). Scientific studies related to space have resulted in significant technological advancements across multiple fields, while developments in AI have transformed space into a viable field of study for virtually all disciplines (Cockell, 2016; Dick, 2018). Nations, international organizations, and scientific institutions have accelerated their research efforts in space, aiming not only to understand and explore it but also to establish influence within this increasingly strategic domain (Erdem & Orki, 2019; Sökmen, 2016). These rapid technological, social, scientific, and political developments have inevitably led to new debates about humanity's relationship with space. Among these, discourse surrounding "Habitable Space" has emerged as particularly significant, raising questions about human settlement beyond Earth and the governance structures that might accompany such expansion (Milligan, 2015). These considerations necessitate approaching the conceptual and philosophical inquiry into "Habitable Space" within the comprehensive framework of "Space Philosophy," where AI will inevitably play a central role in enabling sustainable human presence beyond our home planet (Cockell, 2016; Dick, 2018).

Space and Philosophy

The space explorations that began and expanded during the second half of the 20th century—so influential that they lent their name to the era—have not only served humanity across various domains through the information gathered and technological advancements achieved but have also given rise to new debates (Cockell, 2016; Dick, 2018). Discussions on the notion of "Habitable Space" naturally influence and are influenced by a wide range of disciplines (Dönmez, 2020; Milligan, 2015). Ultimately, these debates prompt consideration of potential political structures, international formations, and societies that may be established in space (Dickens & Ormrod, 2016; Schwitzgebel & Garza, 2020). From this perspective, concepts such as "Habitable Space," "Space States," and "Space Societies" can be closely associated with philosophy (Cockell, 2016; Gabriel, 2018). This connection raises essential questions: Is a philosophy of space possible? Or alternatively, is it possible to practice philosophy in space? (Dick, 2018; Milligan, 2015).

If such concepts are to be meaningfully discussed in the near future, then a structured life in space must be envisioned (Cockell, 2016; Marsiske, 2019). Such a structured society would require a system of governance, constitutional rights, and basic moral frameworks (Dickens & Ormrod, 2016; Milligan, 2015). Hence, notions surrounding potential space states and societies inherently relate to philosophy, which, as a discipline of inquiry, questioning, and knowledge production, becomes indispensable—and indeed, necessary for support (Blackburn, 2016; Topdemir, 2009). Historically, philosophy has concerned itself with the universe, nature, and humanity (Gabriel, 2018; Schwitzgebel & Garza, 2020). Human life and existence, both individually and socially, have always been core subjects of philosophical inquiry (Cevizci, 2005; Işıldak, 2006). As Işıldak (2006) states, philosophy grants us the opportunity to bear witness to ways of life that have existed across historical epochs. Accordingly, philosophy appears throughout history as a practice of reflecting, knowing, recognizing, learning, understanding, interpreting, and explaining all forms of existence (Blackburn, 2016; Topdemir, 2009). In brief, the love of wisdom is, in essence, the pursuit of genuine knowledge and understanding (Gabriel, 2018; Topdemir, 2009).

How, then, might philosophy contribute to the potential formation of space states and societies? One of the foundational branches of philosophy—political philosophy—deals with the state, society, and the individual, and produces thought within this framework (Cevizci, 2005; Macit et al., 2018). Thus, it becomes necessary to employ political philosophy in this context. Understanding political philosophy requires first grasping what it is, and then distinguishing it from political science, political theology, political thought, and political sociology (Macit et al., 2018; Yeşilkaya, 2022). Political philosophy not only interprets current political conditions but also explores how ideal political conditions might be achieved, what forms of governance are most desirable, which values political systems should be built upon, and how societal peace and welfare can be realized (Cevizci, 2005; Milligan, 2015). Consequently, to determine the ideal governance structures for potential space societies, to evaluate political conditions, and to ensure social well-being, political philosophy is essential (Cockell, 2016; Dickens & Ormrod, 2016). In short, political philosophy is the discipline that investigates the nature, aims, and scope of the art of politics as a whole. It approaches problems and topics from a philosophical perspective, compares actions based on their outcomes and underlying justifications, and reconstructs the state's structure using philosophical methods through proposals for an ideal order (Aybek, 2013; Cevizci, 2005).

Space Agreements

Since the first half of the 20th century, technological and scientific advancements concerning outer space have expanded the scope of relevant debates and international cooperation frameworks (Dickens & Ormrod, 2016; Marsiske, 2019). These developments have necessitated the creation of foundational legal instruments including what might be considered the first "space constitution," formal space agreements, and ongoing diplomatic negotiations regarding space governance (Erdem, 2019; Kaşıkara, 2017). As human activities in space increase, new complexities emerge that require careful legal consideration (Milligan, 2015; Sevim, 2022). Particularly, if the concept of habitable space is to become reality, establishing clear definitions of boundaries, resource rights, and regulatory frameworks becomes a fundamental necessity rather than a theoretical exercise (Cockell, 2016; Dick, 2018).

The current operational landscape of space presents a multilayered challenge: certain regions are already actively utilized, others are projected for access in the medium-term future, while vast areas remain largely unexplored but hold potentially limitless resources and opportunities (Dickens & Ormrod, 2016; Lin et al., 2018). This stratification makes defining the legal boundaries and scope of space critically important for both establishing resource ownership and determining jurisdictional authority for their utilization (Kaşıkara, 2017; Sevim, 2022). The stakes of these definitions extend beyond mere academic interest to core matters of national security and global power dynamics.

Existing theoretical frameworks consistently emphasize that mastering space and its resources would confer immense strategic advantages to nation-states capable of establishing dominance in this domain (Dickens & Ormrod, 2016; Erdem, 2018). Analysis suggests that a state or political entity achieving comprehensive control over space could potentially gain unprecedented influence over all Earth-based states—politically, militarily, and economically—altering the fundamental balance of global power (Erdem & Orki, 2019; Sökmen, 2016). Despite the obvious significance and increasingly contentious nature of space governance, the international community has yet to establish a universally accepted legal definition of space itself, though numerous legal studies have examined these questions in depth (Kaşıkara, 2017; Sevim, 2022). The first substantial and organized international discussion of outer space legal dimensions occurred during the 13th session of the United Nations General Assembly in 1958, marking the beginning of formal space law development (Erdem, 2019; Kaşıkara, 2017).

In response to the growing importance of space activities, the United Nations established the Office for Outer Space Affairs, a specialized unit dedicated to developing comprehensive international space law frameworks (Erdem, 2018; Sevim, 2022). This effort has resulted in five major binding international agreements that form the core legal regime governing space activities, each addressing distinct aspects of space exploration and utilization (Kaşıkara, 2017; UNOOSA, 2022):

- The Outer Space Treaty (October 10, 1967), formally titled the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, which establishes space as a domain for peaceful use by all nations and prohibits claims of sovereignty (Kaşıkara, 2017; UNOOSA, 2022).
- The Rescue Agreement (December 3, 1968), officially known as the Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts and the Return of Objects Launched into Outer Space, which mandates assistance to astronauts in distress and establishes protocols for returning space objects to their countries of origin (Erdem, 2019; UNOOSA, 2022).
- The Liability Convention (September 1, 1972), titled the Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects, which creates a liability framework

for damage caused by space objects, whether on Earth, in air space, or in outer space (Kaşıkara, 2017; UNOOSA, 2022).

- The Registration Convention (September 15, 1976), officially called the Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space, which requires states to maintain registries of objects launched into space and provide information to the UN (Erdem, 2019; UNOOSA, 2022).
- The Moon Agreement (July 11, 1984), formally named the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, which attempts to establish the Moon and other celestial bodies as the "common heritage of mankind" and proposes an international regime to govern resource exploitation (Kaşıkara, 2017; UNOOSA, 2022).

Complementing these binding agreements, the international community has also adopted five non-binding but influential declarations and principles that further shape the governance framework for space activities (Erdem, 2018; UNOOSA, 2022):

- The Declaration of Legal Principles (December 13, 1963), which established early foundational concepts for space governance before the major treaties were formalized (Erdem, 2018; UNOOSA, 2022).
- The Broadcasting Principles (December 10, 1982), addressing the use of satellites for international television broadcasting and respecting state sovereignty in information flow (Kaşıkara, 2017; UNOOSA, 2022).
- The Remote Sensing Principles (December 3, 1986), governing Earth observation from space and establishing guidelines for data sharing and rights (Erdem, 2019; UNOOSA, 2022).
- The Nuclear Power Sources Principles (December 14, 1992), providing safety frameworks for the use of nuclear power in space missions (Kaşıkara, 2017; UNOOSA, 2022).
- The Declaration on International Cooperation (December 13, 1996), promoting collaborative approaches to space exploration with particular attention to developing nations' needs and interests (Erdem, 2018; UNOOSA, 2022).

Together, these agreements and principles constitute the evolving legal architecture for humanity's expanding activities in space, though many experts argue that significant gaps remain as technological capabilities advance more rapidly than corresponding legal frameworks (Cockell, 2016; Milligan, 2015).

Artificial Intelligence, Space, and Philosophy

Despite numerous international agreements, negotiations, and initiatives, the global community has yet to reach definitive or universally accepted conclusions regarding the governance structures for habitable space (Cockell, 2016; Milligan, 2015). This ongoing uncertainty largely stems from the continuing nature of space exploration and our still-developing accumulation of knowledge about cosmic environments (Dick, 2018; Marsiske, 2019). In this context of uncertainty, philosophy emerges as an essential framework for addressing complex questions about potential human futures beyond Earth (Gabriel, 2018;

Schwitzgebel & Garza, 2020). Throughout human history, philosophy—particularly political philosophy—has provided conceptual frameworks for understanding and organizing societies during periods of profound transformation (Cevizci, 2005; Macit et al., 2018). From Plato to Aristotle, and from Spinoza to Locke, philosophers have extensively examined core concepts such as state formation, constitutional structures, and individual rights that will inevitably become relevant to space settlement (Blackburn, 2016; Gabriel, 2018). This historical precedent suggests that the establishment of potential space societies and governance systems must necessarily draw from philosophical thought to address unprecedented challenges (Cockell, 2016; Milligan, 2015).

Simultaneously, AI has evolved into sophisticated systems capable of performing predefined tasks according to programmed instructions—mimicking human cognitive functions—while progressively improving themselves through information acquisition and processing (Bostrom, 2014; Russell & Norvig, 2020). Beyond technical capabilities, AI represents a form of technology equipped with enhanced reasoning and data analysis capacities that increasingly influence human decision-making (Dönmez, 2020; Mitchell, 2019). The philosophical examination of AI requires conceptual clarification of frequently interchanged terms: "reason" typically refers to the expression of inherently human qualities, while "intelligence" denotes the capacity to perform specific tasks effectively within defined domains (Bayık, 2019; Legg & Hutter, 2007). These distinctions become critically important when considering how AI might function in extraterrestrial environments with different constraints than those found on Earth.

When space exploration and AI are considered individually, they each represent influential fields with transformative potential across numerous domains (Dickens & Ormrod, 2016; Nilsson, 2010). However, the introduction of human beings into these contexts fundamentally changes the nature of relevant discussions: definitions require refinement, concepts evolve in unexpected ways, and philosophical inquiry becomes indispensable—either directly or indirectly—to address emergent ethical and existential questions (Chalmers, 2010; Gabriel, 2018). Wherever human life ventures, philosophical reflection becomes not merely relevant but imperative for ensuring that technological systems serve human flourishing rather than undermining it (Blackburn, 2016; Topdemir, 2009). Without such reflection, even the most advanced systems and structures eventually encounter limitations or inconsistencies that may prove difficult to resolve in isolated environments far from Earth (Bostrom, 2014; Dreyfus, 1992).

As technological progress accelerates, AI increasingly exerts direct influence over human life while simultaneously raising novel philosophical questions that traditional frameworks struggle to address adequately (Floridi, 2019; Tegmark, 2017). Recent years have witnessed growing discussion under the umbrella of the "philosophy of AI," often situated within the broader field of philosophy of science (Schwitzgebel & Garza, 2020; Yeşilkaya, 2022). These discussions initially focused on understanding the fundamental nature of intelligence before evolving toward establishing the philosophy of AI as a legitimate subdiscipline with its own methodologies and concerns (Mainzer, 2020; Yeşilkaya, 2022). This emerging field centers its inquiries on scientific assumptions, foundational principles, methodological approaches, and conceptual frameworks that structure our understanding of AI and its implications (Çevik, 2020; Floridi, 2019).

The revolutionary developments in both AI and space exploration—and their inevitable convergence in future human activities—directly engage with fundamental questions across philosophy's subfields, particularly philosophy of science, epistemology, ethics, and political philosophy (Bostrom, 2014; Cockell, 2016). Contemporary philosophers of mind now grapple with questions about whether true artificial consciousness or artificial personhood might eventually emerge, especially in the unique conditions of space environments (Chalmers, 2010; Searle, 2010). Philosophy, as a discipline founded on critical questioning, will be responsible for addressing essential questions about space societies: What constitutes an ideal governance system beyond Earth? What forms of sovereignty might exist in habitable space? How should justice, freedom, and equality be conceptualized in extraterrestrial communities? Is a space constitution fundamentally different from terrestrial equivalents? (Cockell, 2016; Milligan, 2015). While these political and social questions unfold, epistemologists simultaneously explore how AI systems "know" or understand the world, particularly in environments with different physical laws or constraints (Floridi & Chiriatti, 2020; Marcus & Davis, 2019). In parallel, ethicists investigate AI's impact on human life, examining concepts such as responsibility, moral agency, and social norms in unprecedented contexts (Bostrom & Yudkowsky, 2014; Yeşilkaya, 2022).

The transformation of technology necessarily reshapes the fields of philosophical inquiry that seek to understand its implications (Dennett, 2017; Floridi, 2019). Since its earliest beginnings, philosophy has engaged—either directly or indirectly—with questions about knowledge, being, and right action that remain relevant to contemporary debates about AI and space exploration (Blackburn, 2016; Gabriel, 2018). Many core methodological questions now surrounding AI have historical antecedents in philosophical thought dating back to antiquity (Dreyfus, 1992; Searle, 2010). Philosophers including Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, William of Ockham, René Descartes, Thomas Hobbes, and Gottfried W. Leibniz posed foundational inquiries that resonate with current challenges: What constitutes the basic operations of cognition? Under what conditions can formal language adequately represent reality? Can reasoning processes be automated? Is logic itself amenable to mechanization? (Russell & Norvig, 2020; Yeşilkaya, 2022). This historical continuity demonstrates that current questions about AI and space exploration extend intellectual traditions that have developed over millennia, providing valuable frameworks for addressing unprecedented technological and social changes (Blackburn, 2016; Gabriel, 2018). As scientific knowledge evolves and social structures transform in response to space exploration, these philosophical inquiries gain renewed relevance and urgency (Bostrom, 2014; Floridi, 2019). This connection between past and present is exemplified by Turkish mathematician and scientist Cahit Arf's prescient question: Can a machine be constructed that adapts—that is, solves problems unforeseen by its designers—and if so, through what mechanisms? (Arf, 1959; Yeşilkaya, 2022). As humanity contemplates permanent settlement beyond Earth, such questions move from theoretical interest to practical necessity.

Conclusion and Implications

Today, AI is increasingly recognized as a technological system with significant historical depth, and its influence has become evident in nearly every aspect of human life (Bostrom, 2014; Russell & Norvig, 2020). This pervasive integration raises fundamental questions about the role and limitations of AI—described by Edward Fredkin as one of the three most significant developments in human history—that inevitably occupy scientific and public discourse (Brooks, 2002; Tegmark, 2017). Despite ongoing debates about AI's boundaries, capabilities, methodologies, and even its core definition, this technology is already being connected—both implicitly and explicitly—with the frontier of space exploration, including concepts of habitable space environments, potential space states, and emergent space societies (Cockell, 2016; Dickens & Ormrod, 2016). The profound implications of both domains necessitate that these transformative technologies develop with comprehensive philosophical scrutiny rather than in isolation from critical ethical and social examination (Bostrom & Yudkowsky, 2014; Gabriel, 2018). This transitional process, characterized by both challenges and revolutionary possibilities, requires the guiding framework of philosophy, which has historically accompanied humanity's intellectual and social development wherever human life exists or might potentially exist (Blackburn, 2016; Topdemir, 2009). The responsibility to philosophically examine and guide this process must be acknowledged and embraced without further delay, particularly as technological development accelerates and space exploration advances (Floridi, 2019; Schwitzgebel & Garza, 2020).

Philosophy will therefore play an essential role in helping humanity comprehend and critically evaluate AI as it extends into the space domain (Boden, 2018; Chalmers, 2010). Few technological fields generate as many profound philosophical questions as AI, with issues of mind, consciousness, free will, and ethics dominating contemporary debates in this area (Dennett, 2017; Searle, 2010). The current vaguely defined nature of AI systems—with their still-unclear boundaries, capacities, operational languages, and methodological approaches—demands philosophical illumination, which has historically transformed ambiguity into clearer understanding through systematic questioning (Dreyfus, 1992; Floridi, 2019). Scientists, engineers, policymakers, and the broader public must approach this momentous technological convergence with the philosophical tools that have guided human thought for centuries (Gabriel, 2018; Russell et al., 2015).

As philosophy engages with these questions, it will systematically investigate concepts fundamental to both AI and space governance: reason, intelligence, comprehension, knowledge, learning, and consciousness (Blackburn, 2016; Mainzer, 2020). This investigation builds upon a rich tradition of philosophical inquiry dating back to antiquity, when thinkers first examined the nature of cognition and the possibility of mechanized reasoning (Dreyfus, 1992; Searle, 2010). From Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas to Descartes, Hobbes, and Leibniz, philosophers have long asked questions directly relevant to contemporary AI challenges: What constitutes fundamental cognitive operations? What conditions must language fulfill to accurately represent reality? Can reasoning processes be automated? Is logic itself amenable to mechanization? (Floridi, 2019; Russell & Norvig, 2020). Beyond these theoretical concerns, philosophy has historically addressed social and political dimensions of human organization that will become increasingly relevant as space exploration advances (Blackburn, 2016; Gabriel, 2018). Political philosophy—investigating the state, society, and individual rights—offers crucial insights for developing governance models, ethical frameworks, and legitimate authority structures for potential space communities (Cevizci, 2005; Macit et al., 2018). As AI systems with seemingly boundless capabilities intersect with the expanding domain of space exploration, the humanization of these technological developments will only be possible through rigorous philosophical examination of their implications (Cockell, 2016; Dick, 2018).

Looking forward, humanity will likely confront novel concepts that currently appear speculative or distant—AI-governed systems, permanent habitation beyond Earth, political organizations in space, and societies developing under fundamentally different conditions than those on Earth. When these possibilities materialize, philosophical inquiry will prove invaluable for addressing unprecedented ethical and social challenges (Milligan, 2015; Schwitzgebel & Garza, 2020). Without question, political philosophy will need to interpret emerging conditions while providing frameworks for achieving optimal governance structures, identifying appropriate political arrangements, establishing foundational values, and ensuring social welfare in entirely new environments (Cockell, 2016; Dickens & Ormrod, 2016).

The implications of this analysis extend to multiple domains: for technology developers, it suggests that philosophical considerations should be integrated early in the design process rather than added retrospectively; for policymakers, it indicates that space governance frameworks should anticipate AI integration rather than react to it; for educators, it emphasizes the continued relevance of philosophical training alongside technical education; and for researchers, it highlights the need for genuinely interdisciplinary approaches to these complex challenges (Bostrom, 2014; Cockell, 2016; Floridi, 2019; Milligan, 2015). In summary, if the convergence of AI and space exploration continues to transform our established narratives, inaugurate a new era of human development, and potentially seed the emergence of novel states or societies—whether on Earth or beyond—then humanity must entrust this noble responsibility to philosophical inquiry that can illuminate the path forward with wisdom, ethical insight, and historical perspective (Bostrom, 2014; Cockell, 2016; Gabriel, 2018; Milligan, 2015).

Declarations

Competing interests: The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Publisher's note: Frontiers in Research remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Orcid ID

Hüseyin Can Coşkun https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4099-333X

References

Adaş, E., & Erbay, B. (2021). Yapay zekâ sosyolojisi üzerine bir değerlendirme. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 21(1), 326-337.

Agrawal, A., Gans, J., & Goldfarb, A. (2018). *Prediction machines: The simple economics of artificial intelligence*. Harvard Business Press.

Arf, C. (1959). Makine düşünebilir mi ve nasıl düşünebilir. *Atatürk Üniversitesi-Üniversite Çalışmalarını Muhite Yayma ve Halk Eğitimi Yayınları Konferanslar Serisi*, (1), 91-103.

Aybek, H. S. (2013). *Siyaset felsefesi ve toplumsal düzen*. Gazi Kitabevi.

Bayık, F. (2019). Aristoteles ve Descartes bağlamında akıl ve zekâ kavramlarının farkları. *Kaygı. Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Felsefe Dergisi*, 18(1), 172-187.

Bennet, M. R. (2017). Development of the concept of mind. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, *41*(12), 943-956.

Blackburn, S. (2016). *The Oxford dictionary of philosophy* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Boden, M. A. (2018). *Artificial intelligence: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. Oxford University Press.

Bostrom, N., & Yudkowsky, E. (2014). The ethics of artificial intelligence. In K. Frankish & W. M. Ramsey (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of artificial intelligence* (pp. 316-334). Cambridge University Press.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *9*(2), 27-40.

Bozkurt, G. (2011). *Uzay teknolojileri ve Türkiye*. İmge Kitabevi.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In H. Cooper (Ed.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 57-71). American Psychological Association.

Brooks, R. (2002). *Flesh and machines: How robots will change us*. Pantheon Books.

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2017). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies* (2nd ed.). W.W. Norton & Company.

Cevizci, A. (2005). *Paradigma felsefe sözlüğü* (5th ed.). Paradigma Yayıncılık.

Chalmers, D. J. (2010). The singularity: A philosophical analysis. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, *17*(9-10), 7-65.

Civalek, Ö. (2003). Yapay zekâ- Ömer Civalek'le söyleşi. *TMH - Türkiye Mühendislik Haberleri*, 423(1), 40-50.

Cockell, C. S. (2016). *Extraterrestrial liberty: An inquiry into the nature and causes of tyrannical government beyond the Earth*. Edinburgh University Press.

Copeland, B. J. (2004). *The essential Turing*. Oxford University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2017). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Çevik, A. D. (2020). Bilim felsefesi bilim pratiğinden ne öğrenebilir?. *Kilikya Felsefe Dergisi*, (2), 110-132.

Dehaene, S., Lau, H., & Kouider, S. (2017). What is consciousness, and could machines have it? *Science*, *358*(6362), 486-492.

Dennett, D. C. (2017). *From bacteria to Bach and back: The evolution of minds*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2018). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Dick, S. J. (2018). *Astrobiology, discovery, and societal impact*. Cambridge University Press.

Dickens, P., & Ormrod, J. S. (2016). *The Palgrave handbook of society, culture and outer space*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Dilek, G. Ö. (2019). *Yapay zekânın etik gerçekliği* (Doctoral dissertation, Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Programları Değerlendirme ve Akreditasyon Derneği).

Domingos, P. (2015). *The master algorithm: How the quest for the ultimate learning machine will remake our world*. Basic Books.

Dönmez, S. (2020). Felsefi bağlamda yapay zekâ ve 2025 sendromu. *Çukurova Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(2), 748-760.

Dreyfus, H. L. (1992). *What computers still can't do: A critique of artificial reason*. MIT Press.

Erdem, T. (2018). Uluslararası ilişkilerde yeni perspektif: Astropolitiğe giriş. *Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 20(1), 431-446.

Erdem, T. (2019). Uzay hukukunda güncel gelişmeler. *Marmara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Hukuk Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 25(2), 1160-1178.

Erdem, T., & Orki, A. (2019). Uluslararası ilişkilerde klasik askeri güç anlayışının evrimi: Dış uzay sahası. *İzmir Kâtip Çelebi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(1), 12-28.

Floridi, L. (2019). *The logic of information: A theory of philosophy as conceptual design*. Oxford University Press.

Floridi, L., & Chiriatti, M. (2020). GPT-3: Its nature, scope, limits, and consequences. *Minds and Machines*, *30*(4), 681-694.

Gabriel, M. (2018). *I am not a brain: Philosophy of mind for the 21st century*. Polity Press.

Gamez, D. (2018). *Human and machine consciousness*. Open Book Publishers.

Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., & Courville, A. (2016). *Deep learning*. MIT Press.

Graziano, M. S. A. (2019). *Rethinking consciousness: A scientific theory of subjective experience*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Haugeland, J. (1989). *Artificial intelligence: The very idea*. MIT Press.

Hawkins, J. (2021). *A thousand brains: A new theory of intelligence*. Basic Books.

Ince, H., Imamoğlu, S. E., & Imamoğlu, S. Z. (2021). Yapay zekâ uygulamalarının karar verme üzerine etkileri: Kavramsal bir çalışma. *International Review of Economics and Management*, 9(1), 50-63.

Işıldak, M. (2006). Felsefe nedir?. *FLSF Felsefe ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (1), 45-58.

İşler, B., & Kılıç, M. (2021). Eğitimde yapay zekâ kullanımı ve gelişimi. *Yeni Medya Elektronik Dergisi*, 5(1), 1-11.

Jordan, M. I., & Mitchell, T. M. (2015). Machine learning: Trends, perspectives, and prospects. *Science*, *349*(6245), 255-260.

Kaplan, J. (2016). *Artificial intelligence: What everyone needs to know*. Oxford University Press.

Karakulak, B. (2019). *Devletlerin uzay çalışmaları ve Türkiye'nin uzay politikası* (Master's thesis, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).

Kaşıkara, M. S. (2017). *Devletlerin uzay faaliyetlerinden doğan sorumluluğu*. Adalet Yayınevi.

Kelleher, J. D. (2019). *Deep learning*. MIT Press.

Keskenler, M. F., & Keskenler, E. F. (2017). Geçmişten günümüze yapay sinir ağları ve tarihçesi. *Takvim-i Vekayi*, 5(2), 8-18.

Khan, T. M. (2019). *Education policy reforms in Pakistan*. Oxford University Press.

Koch, C. (2019). *The feeling of life itself: Why consciousness is widespread but can't be computed*. MIT Press.

Koçyiğit, A., & Darı, A. B. (2023). Yapay zekâ iletişiminde ChatGPT: İnsanlaşan dijitalleşmenin geleceği. *Stratejik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 7(2), 427-438.

Köroğlu, Y. (2017). *Yapay zekâ'nın teorik ve pratik sınırları*. Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi.

Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Kurzweil, R. (2012). *How to create a mind: The secret of human thought revealed*. Viking Books.

LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. *Nature*, *521*(7553), 436-444.

Legg, S., & Hutter, M. (2007). A collection of definitions of intelligence. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, *157*, 17-24.

Lin, J., Singer, P. W., & Ding, D. (2018). *China's influence on the global Middle Class*. The Brookings Institution Press.

Macit, M., İplikçi, N., & Bingöl, O. (2018). *Siyaset felsefesi*. Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Mainzer, K. (2020). *Artificial intelligence - When do machines take over?* Springer.

Marcus, G., & Davis, E. (2019). *Rebooting AI: Building artificial intelligence we can trust*. Pantheon Books.

Marsiske, H. (2019). *Mission to Earth: Understanding our planet from space*. Springer.

McCarthy, J., Minsky, M. L., Rochester, N., & Shannon, C. E. (2006). A proposal for the Dartmouth summer research project on artificial intelligence, August 31, 1955. *AI Magazine*, *27*(4), 12-14.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Milligan, T. (2015). *Nobody owns the Moon: The ethics of space exploitation*. McFarland & Company.

Minsky, M. (2007). *The emotion machine: Commonsense thinking, artificial intelligence, and the future of the human mind*. Simon & Schuster.

Mitchell, M. (2019). *Artificial intelligence: A guide for thinking humans*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Müller, V. C. (Ed.). (2016). *Risks of artificial intelligence*. CRC Press.

Nilsson, N. J. (2010). *The quest for artificial intelligence: A history of ideas and achievements*. Cambridge University Press.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Poole, D. L., & Mackworth, A. K. (2017). *Artificial intelligence: Foundations of computational agents* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2020). *Artificial intelligence: A modern approach* (4th ed.). Pearson.

Russell, S., Dewey, D., & Tegmark, M. (2015). Research priorities for robust and beneficial artificial intelligence. *AI Magazine*, *36*(4), 105-114.

Schwitzgebel, E., & Garza, M. (2020). Designing AI with rights, consciousness, self-respect, and freedom. In S. Matthew Liao (Ed.), *Ethics of artificial intelligence* (pp. 291-332). Oxford University Press.

Searle, J. R. (2010). *Making the social world: The structure of human civilization*. Oxford University Press.

Searle, J. R. (2014). *Consciousness and language*. Cambridge University Press.

Sejnowski, T. J. (2018). *The deep learning revolution*. MIT Press.

Sevim, O. U. (2022). Uzay kaynaklarının kullanımına ilişkin BM perspektifi. *Adalet Dergisi*, (69), 351-372.

Shah, M., & Ishfaq, S. (2018). Educational policy reforms in Pakistan: Critical analysis. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 5(2), 158-175.

Silver, D., Hubert, T., Schrittwieser, J., Antonoglou, I., Lai, M., Guez, A., Lanctot, M., Sifre, L., Kumaran, D., Graepel, T., Lillicrap, T., Simonyan, K., & Hassabis, D. (2018). A general reinforcement learning algorithm that masters chess, shogi, and Go through self-play. *Science*, *362*(6419), 1140-1144.

Sökmen, A. İ. (2016). Uzay jeopolitiği: Güç dengesinde önemli avantaj alanı. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 71(1), 133-156.

Tegmark, M. (2017). *Life 3.0: Being human in the age of artificial intelligence*. Alfred A. Knopf.

Tononi, G., & Koch, C. (2015). Consciousness: Here, there and everywhere? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *370*(1668), 20140167.

Topdemir, H. G. (2009). Felsefe nedir? Bilgi nedir? *Türk Kütüphaneciliği*, 23(1), 119-133.

United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs. (2022). *Treaties and principles on outer space*. https://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties.html

Vartanian, A. (1999). *La Mettrie's L'homme machine: A study in the origins of an idea*. Princeton University Press.

Yeşilkaya, N. (2022). Felsefi bir sorun olarak yapay zekâ. *Bozok Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, *22*(22), 97-126.

Zeki, S. (2007). The disunity of consciousness. *Progress in Brain Research*, 168, 11-268.