

Research Article

Artificial Intelligence and the Crisis of Human Agency: Rethinking Freedom in the Algorithmic Age

Banoth Sampath

Department of Political Science, Jawaharlal Nehru University, Delhi, India.

Corresponding Author: Banoth Sampath.

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is transforming the relationship between individuals, institutions, and society by influencing how people think, communicate, work, learn, and make decisions. Although AI offers opportunities for innovation, efficiency, and human development, its growing role in everyday life raises fundamental questions about freedom, autonomy, responsibility, and democratic participation. This paper examines the crisis of human agency in the algorithmic age, focusing on the ways algorithmic systems shape individual choices, distribute opportunities, influence public opinion, and exercise power through data-driven decision-making. Drawing on political philosophy, theories of liberty, critical theories of technology, and contemporary debates on AI governance, the paper distinguishes between formal freedom and meaningful agency. It argues that individuals may retain the legal right to choose while their preferences and opportunities are increasingly influenced by recommendation systems, predictive algorithms, automated decision-making, and digital surveillance. The study adopts a qualitative, conceptual, and interdisciplinary methodology based on the critical analysis of scholarly literature and international policy frameworks. Particular attention is given to the implications of AI for political autonomy, privacy, employment, education, social equality, and democratic governance, including the challenges facing developing societies such as India. The paper further argues that human agency should not be understood as complete independence from technology but as the capacity to understand, question, and meaningfully influence technological systems. It proposes a human-centred framework based on transparency, accountability, digital literacy, democratic oversight, privacy protection, and accessible mechanisms of appeal. The paper concludes that AI need not inevitably undermine human freedom. Its consequences depend on the institutional arrangements, economic interests, ethical principles, and political choices governing its development and deployment. Preserving human agency requires ensuring that technology remains accountable to human beings and democratic values.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Human Agency, Freedom, Algorithmic Governance, Autonomy, Democracy, Digital Surveillance, AI Ethics, Human Rights, Political Philosophy.

1. Introduction

Artificial Intelligence has emerged as one of the most influential technological developments of the twenty-first century. From social media platforms and digital assistants to automated recruitment, educational technologies, financial services, healthcare, and public administration, AI systems increasingly participate in decisions that shape individual and collective life. These systems analyse large volumes of data, identify patterns, generate predictions, recommend actions, and, in some circumstances, make or implement decisions with limited direct human involvement.

The expansion of AI creates an important political and philosophical question: what happens to human freedom when technological systems increasingly influence the choices available to individuals? Traditionally, freedom has been associated with the ability to think independently, make decisions, express opinions, pursue personal goals, and participate in collective political life. However, algorithmic systems introduce a more complex situation in which choices may remain formally voluntary while being influenced by invisible processes of data collection, behavioural prediction, automated classification, and personalised persuasion.

For example, a person using a social media platform may believe that their news consumption reflects independent preferences. Yet the information displayed to that person may be selected by algorithms designed to maximise engagement. Similarly, an employer may use an automated recruitment system to rank applicants, a financial institution may use predictive models to evaluate creditworthiness, and a public authority may use digital systems to allocate services or identify potential risks. In each situation, technological systems can influence opportunities without making the grounds of their decisions fully visible.

The central concern is not simply whether machines can replace human intelligence. It is whether people retain meaningful control over the decisions that affect their lives. Human agency involves more than performing an action. It includes the capacity to form preferences, reflect on reasons, revise beliefs, act according to considered judgments, and accept responsibility for one's conduct.

AI can strengthen these capacities by expanding access to information, supporting scientific research, improving accessibility, and reducing repetitive work. Nevertheless, excessive dependence on automated systems can weaken independent judgment, narrow opportunities, and make it difficult to identify who is responsible when decisions cause harm.

This paper approaches the issue from the perspective of political science and political philosophy. It examines the relationship between technological power and human freedom, drawing on the distinction between negative liberty, positive liberty, republican non-domination, and contemporary theories of surveillance and algorithmic governance.

The paper argues that the crisis of human agency is not an unavoidable consequence of technological advancement. Rather, it arises when AI systems operate within institutional arrangements that prioritise efficiency, profit, control, or administrative convenience over human autonomy, equality, and accountability.

1.1 Background of the Study

Earlier technological transformations changed the relationship between human beings and their social environments. Industrial machinery transformed labour, mass communication changed political mobilisation, and the internet expanded the speed and scale of information exchange. AI represents a further transformation because it can participate in activities associated with prediction, classification, language, reasoning, and decision support.

Unlike conventional tools that generally perform clearly specified physical tasks, contemporary AI systems can influence the informational and cognitive environments in which individuals make decisions. They can recommend what people should read, suggest whom they should contact, rank which candidates deserve consideration, and generate persuasive or misleading content.

This development makes it necessary to reconsider freedom not merely as the absence of direct interference but also as the ability to exercise informed, independent, and effective judgment.

UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence emphasises human dignity, human rights, transparency, accountability, privacy, and human oversight. These principles reflect the recognition that AI systems can affect individual autonomy and social relationships in ways that require public scrutiny.

The challenge, therefore, is to ensure that technological progress strengthens human capabilities rather than turning individuals into passive subjects of automated decisions.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The principal problem addressed in this study is the growing gap between formal individual choice and meaningful human agency in algorithmically mediated environments.

Individuals may possess legal rights and access to digital services while lacking sufficient information about how their choices are influenced, how their data are used, or how automated decisions affect their opportunities. The concentration of technological infrastructure and data in powerful private and public institutions can further intensify this problem.

When decisions become difficult to understand, challenge, or reverse, human beings may lose practical control even when they retain formal freedom.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The study has the following objectives:

1. To examine the relationship between Artificial Intelligence and human agency.
2. To analyse the meaning of freedom in algorithmically mediated societies.
3. To explain how algorithmic systems influence individual autonomy and decision-making.
4. To investigate the implications of AI for democracy, political participation, privacy, and social equality.
5. To examine the opportunities and challenges associated with AI in developing societies, particularly India.
6. To propose institutional and ethical measures for protecting human freedom in the algorithmic age.

1.4 Research Questions

The paper addresses five principal questions:

1. How does AI influence the capacity of individuals to make independent decisions?
2. Does algorithmic mediation undermine freedom, or can it expand human capabilities?
3. How do surveillance, automated classification, and predictive systems affect democratic citizenship?
4. What are the implications of AI-driven decision-making for equality and accountability?
5. What institutional arrangements can preserve meaningful human agency while enabling technological innovation?

1.5 Central Argument

The central argument is that AI creates a crisis of human agency when technological systems shape decisions and opportunities without sufficient transparency, meaningful consent, democratic oversight, or effective opportunities for appeal.

The appropriate response is neither the complete rejection of AI nor unquestioning acceptance of automation. Instead, societies must develop institutions that combine technological innovation with human-centered governance.

2. Conceptualizing Artificial Intelligence and Human Agency

Artificial Intelligence refers broadly to computational systems capable of performing tasks that ordinarily require human cognitive abilities, including pattern recognition, prediction, language processing, classification, planning, and decision support. AI is not a single technology. It includes machine learning, deep learning, natural language processing, computer vision, generative AI, and other computational techniques.

Machine learning systems identify patterns in data and use those patterns to produce classifications, predictions, or recommendations. Generative AI systems can produce new text, images, audio, video, and computer code in response to prompts. These technologies differ in their capabilities, limitations, and potential consequences.

Human agency is the capacity of individuals to act intentionally, make meaningful choices, reflect on their circumstances, and influence the conditions of their lives. It includes cognitive agency, practical agency, moral agency, political agency, and social agency. AI can support these dimensions by providing information, translating languages, improving accessibility, and assisting with complex tasks. However, it can also constrain them when individuals become dependent on systems they cannot adequately understand or challenge.

Agency should not be confused with complete independence from external influences. Human beings always act within social, economic, cultural, and institutional contexts. The relevant question is whether those influences permit reflection, meaningful choice, and the possibility of contestation.

The relationship between AI and agency is complex because the same technology can simultaneously empower and constrain individuals. An AI-powered educational assistant may help a student understand a difficult concept, thereby expanding learning opportunities. Yet an educational institution that relies exclusively on automated assessment may prevent students from questioning

inaccurate evaluations. AI-assisted healthcare may improve diagnosis, but an opaque system that clinicians cannot adequately evaluate may introduce new risks.

Agency is also relational. A person may be formally free to challenge an automated decision but lack the technical knowledge, financial resources, or legal assistance necessary to do so. Meaningful agency therefore requires both individual capacities and supportive social conditions. Education, accessible information, legal protection, and institutional accountability are essential for turning formal rights into practical freedoms.

3. Theoretical Framework: Freedom in Political Philosophy

The crisis of human agency can be understood more clearly by examining established theories of freedom. Classical and contemporary political philosophy provide different ways of identifying the conditions under which technological systems may support or undermine liberty.

3.1 Negative Liberty: Freedom from Interference

Isaiah Berlin's distinction between negative and positive liberty remains influential in contemporary political theory. Negative liberty refers broadly to the area within which individuals can act without interference from other people or institutions.

From this perspective, AI becomes a threat to freedom when it enables intrusive surveillance, restricts access to information, manipulates choices, or permits institutions to interfere in individual lives without sufficient justification. Extensive digital monitoring can discourage people from expressing controversial political opinions. Automated censorship may restrict lawful expression, while algorithmic profiling can expose individuals to differential treatment.

However, negative liberty alone may not fully explain the problem. An algorithm can influence a person's behaviour without issuing a direct command or formally preventing an action. A platform may shape the information available to a user while leaving that user legally free to select another option. The absence of direct coercion does not necessarily mean that the informational environment is neutral.

3.2 Positive Liberty: The Capacity for Self-Determination

Positive liberty concerns the capacity to direct one's own life and act according to considered purposes. Freedom requires more than the absence of external interference; individuals must possess the knowledge, resources, and capabilities needed to make meaningful choices.

AI can enhance positive liberty by supporting education, translating information, improving access for persons with disabilities, and providing analytical assistance. At the same time, automated recommendations can encourage intellectual passivity if users accept outputs without evaluating their accuracy or underlying assumptions.

The distinction is not simply between using and avoiding AI. It concerns whether the use of technology expands or diminishes a person's capacity to understand and direct their own actions.

3.3 Republican Freedom: Non-Domination

Republican political theory provides a particularly useful framework for analysing algorithmic power. In contemporary republican thought, associated especially with Philip Pettit, freedom involves protection against domination: being subject to another agent's uncontrolled or arbitrary power.

A person may not experience direct interference at every moment yet remain unfree if another actor possesses the unchecked capacity to interfere in their choices. A company may possess extensive information about users, predict their behaviour, and alter the information they encounter. A public authority may rely on automated risk assessments that individuals cannot meaningfully challenge.

Republican freedom therefore requires contestability, institutional checks, transparency appropriate to the context, and mechanisms through which affected people can challenge decisions.

4. The Algorithmic Age: From Human Choice to Computational Mediation

Algorithmic mediation occurs when computational systems influence how information, opportunities, resources, and decisions are presented to individuals. Search engines rank information, social media platforms recommend content, online marketplaces organise products, recruitment systems classify applicants, and financial institutions use predictive models.

These systems can improve efficiency and help individuals navigate complex environments. However, they also shape the conditions under which choices are made. The options presented to a person may be determined by data, design decisions, commercial incentives, or institutional priorities that remain invisible to the user.

Choice architecture refers to the way options are arranged and presented. Digital systems use ranking, recommendations, notifications, default settings, and personalised prompts to guide user behaviour. Problems arise when systems exploit behavioural vulnerabilities, conceal relevant alternatives, or prioritise the objectives of the system operator over the interests of the user.

Predictive AI systems use historical data to estimate future behaviour or outcomes. Such predictions can be useful, but when applied to people they can influence the opportunities they receive. If institutions treat estimates as definitive judgments, predictions can become self-reinforcing. An individual who is denied an opportunity may lose the chance to demonstrate that the prediction was wrong.

Recommendation systems can reduce information overload, yet repeated reliance on them may gradually change the relationship between individuals and their own judgment. A freedom-supporting technological environment should explain uncertainty, provide meaningful alternatives, and allow users to control how recommendations are generated.

5. AI, Privacy, and the Politics of Surveillance

Data have become an important resource in contemporary economies and systems of governance. Digital platforms collect information about interactions, preferences, transactions, locations, and patterns of behaviour. AI systems can analyse these data to infer characteristics and predict future actions.

The collection and analysis of data can improve public services and support useful innovations. However, extensive data accumulation creates unequal relationships between institutions and individuals. Institutions may possess detailed knowledge about people while individuals have little understanding of how their information is processed, combined, or used.

Privacy supports autonomy, dignity, and democratic participation. People need spaces in which they can explore ideas, develop relationships, make mistakes, and reconsider their beliefs without constant observation. When individuals believe that their activities are continuously monitored, they may avoid lawful but controversial expression or refrain from exploring unfamiliar perspectives.

Digital services frequently rely on consent mechanisms, but formal consent does not automatically guarantee meaningful control. Information may be too complex for ordinary users to understand, and important services may be difficult to access without accepting extensive data collection.

Algorithmic profiling can also produce inaccurate or discriminatory classifications. Historical data may reflect existing inequalities, and automated systems can reproduce those patterns. Effective data governance therefore requires purpose limitation, data minimisation, security, independent review, and effective remedies for misuse.

6. AI, Democracy, and Political Agency

Political agency refers to the ability of citizens to understand public issues, express political preferences, participate in collective decisions, and influence institutions. Digital technologies have expanded opportunities for political communication, while AI can help citizens summarise policy documents, translate information, and support civic education.

However, political agency depends on the quality of the information environment. Online platforms use algorithms to rank and recommend information. When engagement becomes the dominant measure of success, emotionally charged or controversial content may receive disproportionate attention. Personalised information environments can also reduce exposure to competing perspectives.

Generative AI can produce realistic text, images, audio, and video. These capabilities have legitimate applications but can also be used to produce fabricated statements, impersonate public

figures, or generate misleading political messages. The response must protect information integrity without creating broad restrictions that suppress lawful expression.

AI-enabled surveillance may support legitimate security purposes, but indiscriminate monitoring can undermine political freedom when used to monitor lawful dissent. Democratic governance therefore requires legal limits, independent oversight, and accessible remedies.

Governments may use AI to improve administration, but public decisions involve judgments about fairness, rights, priorities, and the distribution of resources. Public authorities must remain responsible for decisions made with AI assistance, and citizens should be able to question decisions, obtain appropriate explanations, and seek human review.

7. AI, Employment, Education, and the Future of Human Capability

AI is transforming the organisation of work by automating tasks, assisting workers, and creating demand for new skills. Automation can improve productivity and reduce repetitive work, but it can also displace tasks, alter employment relationships, and increase uncertainty for workers.

The effects vary by occupation, sector, region, and the way organisations introduce new technologies. The political issue is not merely whether AI increases productivity, but how the benefits and costs of technological change are distributed.

AI-based management systems can allocate tasks, evaluate performance, monitor activity, and influence scheduling. These tools may improve coordination, but excessive monitoring can reduce worker autonomy. Workplace agency requires understandable evaluation criteria, appropriate human review, and opportunities for workers to participate in decisions about technological change.

In education, AI-assisted learning can provide personalised explanations, language support, practice exercises, and feedback. Yet education involves developing reasoning, curiosity, independent judgment, and the ability to evaluate evidence. If students delegate all intellectual work to AI without engaging with the material, they may weaken these capabilities.

AI can be useful for research assistance, editing, translation, and organising information, provided its use is transparent and consistent with academic rules. AI-generated content may contain inaccuracies or fabricated references, so students and researchers remain responsible for verifying claims. The objective should be to expand human capabilities rather than replace independent thought.

8. Algorithmic Bias, Social Inequality, and Justice

Algorithmic bias occurs when a system produces systematically unfair or inaccurate outcomes for individuals or groups. Bias can emerge from unrepresentative training data, historical inequalities, inappropriate variables, flawed design choices, or the context in which a system is deployed.

AI systems frequently learn from historical data that may contain the effects of unequal access to education, employment, credit, healthcare, or public services. When historical patterns are treated as neutral indicators of future outcomes, systems may reproduce the disadvantages embedded in the original data.

The benefits of AI may also be distributed unevenly because people and institutions differ in access to technology, digital skills, infrastructure, and financial resources. If access to high-quality AI becomes increasingly important for education, employment, and public participation, unequal access may create new forms of disadvantage.

The consequences can be particularly significant for marginalised communities, linguistic minorities, people with disabilities, and individuals with limited digital literacy. An inclusive approach must account for different languages, cultural contexts, disabilities, economic conditions, and levels of digital access.

Fairness cannot always be reduced to a single mathematical measure. High-impact AI systems require participation from relevant stakeholders, independent assessment, and clear procedures for resolving disputes.

9. The Crisis of Responsibility in AI-Mediated Decisions

When an AI-assisted decision causes harm, responsibility may be distributed across developers, data providers, system operators, managers, public officials, and institutions that rely on the output. This distribution can make accountability difficult and create a responsibility gap.

Human oversight is often proposed as a safeguard, but merely placing a human at the end of an automated process does not guarantee meaningful control. A reviewer may lack time, expertise, or authority to question the system. Meaningful oversight requires adequate training, access to relevant information, and authority to reject automated recommendations.

Explainability concerns the ability to understand the basis of an AI system's output at a level appropriate to its use. Decisions affecting employment, education, public benefits, or legal rights may require substantial justification. Affected individuals should be able to understand relevant factors, identify possible errors, and challenge outcomes.

Organizations must remain accountable for the consequences of systems they choose to deploy. Responsibility should be allocated clearly according to the roles and obligations of developers, operators, and decision-makers.

10. AI and Human Agency in India

India provides an important context for examining the relationship between AI, freedom, and social development. The country has a large and diverse population, multiple languages, substantial regional differences, and significant variations in access to digital infrastructure and educational resources.

AI may contribute to improved public services, agricultural information, healthcare support, educational access, translation, and administrative efficiency. However, differences in connectivity, digital literacy, institutional capacity, and access to remedies may influence who benefits from these technologies and who bears their risks.

The Indian constitutional framework provides important principles for evaluating AI governance. Article 14 guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws. Article 19 protects specified freedoms subject to constitutionally permitted restrictions, while Article 21 protects life and personal liberty. In **Justice K. S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India** (2017), the Supreme Court recognised privacy as a constitutionally protected right connected with liberty and dignity.

Digital public services may improve delivery and reduce delays, but errors in automated processes can exclude eligible people from important services. Public institutions should maintain accessible grievance mechanisms, alternative routes to service, and meaningful human review.

Language technologies can improve access to education and public information, but systems trained primarily on widely represented languages may perform less effectively in regional languages and dialects. Inclusive development requires representative data, local expertise, community participation, and evaluation under real-world conditions.

AI literacy is increasingly important for students, teachers, researchers, and citizens. Individuals should understand AI's capabilities and limitations, verify information, protect personal data, and know how to report harmful outcomes. AI applications in government should be governed by clear rules, independent scrutiny, and democratic participation.

11. International Governance and Ethical Principles

UNESCO adopted its Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in November 2021. It provides an international framework centred on human dignity, human rights, fairness, transparency, accountability, privacy, and human oversight. Its importance lies in connecting technological development with broader social and ethical objectives.

The OECD AI Principles emphasise inclusive growth, human-centred values, fairness, transparency, robustness, safety, and accountability. These principles provide a basis for evaluating whether AI systems support individual and collective well-being.

International human rights principles offer a common foundation for evaluating AI applications. Freedom of expression, privacy, equality, access to justice, and protection against discrimination remain important when decisions are made or supported by computational systems.

Ethical principles are valuable, but voluntary commitments alone may be insufficient when institutions face incentives to prioritise profit, speed, or administrative convenience. Ethical governance therefore requires an appropriate combination of legislation, technical standards, institutional oversight, professional responsibility, and public participation.

12. Research Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative, conceptual, and interdisciplinary research design. It examines the relationship between AI and human agency through political philosophy, technology studies, democratic theory, and international AI governance frameworks.

The study focuses on political and ethical implications rather than the technical performance of specific algorithms. It does not claim to measure the prevalence of algorithmic discrimination or establish statistical causal relationships between AI use and declining autonomy. Further empirical research could examine specific applications through interviews, case studies, institutional audits, surveys, and comparative policy analysis.

13. Major Findings and Discussion

The conceptual analysis produces several important findings.

First, freedom cannot be measured only by the number of choices. Digital platforms may offer many options, yet opaque ranking, concealed alternatives, or manipulative design can reduce the quality of choice. Meaningful freedom requires informed decision-making.

Second, human agency depends on the distribution of technological power. AI systems are created and operated within institutions, and their effects depend on who controls data, defines objectives, and determines acceptable risks. Safeguards must address institutional power rather than focusing exclusively on individual responsibility.

Third, automation can improve decisions but cannot eliminate political judgment. Decisions concerning rights, fairness, priorities, and acceptable risks involve normative judgments. Human institutions must remain responsible for establishing the values and rules that guide high-impact decisions.

Fourth, accountability is essential. People cannot exercise meaningful control when they are unable to understand or challenge decisions affecting their lives. Explanations, appeals, human review, and effective remedies should be integral to AI governance.

Fifth, social equality influences the experience of AI. Individuals with greater resources, education, and technical knowledge may be better positioned to use AI and challenge its errors. Digital inclusion and accessible services are therefore necessary.

Sixth, education is a central safeguard for freedom. Critical thinking and digital literacy enable individuals to evaluate AI-generated information, recognise uncertainty, identify possible bias, and retain responsibility for their decisions.

Finally, the crisis is institutional, not merely technological. AI does not inevitably undermine freedom. Its consequences depend on design choices, commercial incentives, regulatory frameworks, and institutional practices.

14. Policy Recommendations: Towards Human-Centred AI Governance

Protecting human agency requires coordinated action by governments, technology companies, educational institutions, civil society, and individual users.

1. ****Establish risk-based regulation.**** Distinguish low-risk applications from systems capable of significantly affecting rights, opportunities, or essential services. High-impact systems should face stronger requirements for testing, documentation, accountability, and independent oversight.
2. ****Guarantee meaningful human oversight.**** Decisions affecting employment, education, public benefits, legal rights, and other important interests should have safeguards against unreviewable automation. Reviewers must possess adequate information, expertise, time, and authority.
3. ****Strengthen transparency and explainability.**** Organisations should communicate when AI is used in ways relevant to people's rights or decisions. Affected individuals should receive understandable explanations and information about review procedures.

4. ****Protect privacy and limit unnecessary data collection.**** AI systems should process personal data only for justified and lawful purposes. Data minimisation, security, retention limits, and privacy safeguards should be integrated throughout the system lifecycle.
5. ****Introduce independent auditing and impact assessment.**** High-impact systems should be assessed before deployment and regularly evaluated during operation for accuracy, discrimination, privacy, security, accessibility, and social consequences.
6. ****Create effective appeal and remedy mechanisms.**** Individuals should have accessible ways to challenge significant automated decisions, correct inaccurate information, and seek remedies. Essential services should not become inaccessible merely because an automated process fails.
7. ****Promote AI literacy and critical thinking.**** Educational institutions should teach the capabilities and limitations of AI, verification of outputs, privacy awareness, and responsible use.
8. ****Strengthen democratic oversight.**** Public authorities should be accountable for AI use in governance. Appropriate disclosure, independent oversight, consultation, and public reporting can support legitimacy.
9. ****Support workers during technological transition.**** Governments and employers should invest in reskilling, lifelong learning, and transition support. Workers should participate in decisions about technological change.
10. ****Ensure inclusive and multilingual AI.**** Systems should be evaluated across languages, regions, disabilities, and social groups. Affected communities should participate in development and evaluation.
11. ****Encourage responsible innovation.**** Clear standards, testing environments, professional guidance, and public-interest research can identify risks early while enabling beneficial development.
12. ****Preserve human responsibility.**** Developers must consider foreseeable risks, organisations must assess whether systems are appropriate, and public authorities must remain accountable for decisions. Responsibility should be clearly allocated.

15. Rethinking Freedom for the Algorithmic Age

The rise of AI requires a more comprehensive understanding of freedom. Traditional accounts of liberty remain important, but algorithmic environments introduce questions about how choices are structured, preferences influenced, and institutional power exercised through data. Reflective autonomy is the ability to examine one's preferences, evaluate reasons, and make decisions in light of considered values. AI can support this capacity by providing information and helping individuals explore ideas, but it may weaken autonomy when it encourages uncritical acceptance or manipulates behaviour.

16. Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence is transforming the conditions under which human beings think, choose, communicate, and participate in society. Its influence extends beyond the automation of particular tasks to the organisation of information, distribution of opportunities, and exercise of institutional power.

This paper has argued that the crisis of human agency in the algorithmic age arises when technological systems influence important decisions without sufficient transparency, accountability, meaningful consent, or opportunities for contestation.

Drawing on political philosophy, the analysis has demonstrated that freedom cannot be understood solely as the absence of direct interference. Negative liberty highlights protection against coercion, positive liberty emphasises the capabilities required for self-determination, republican theory identifies the danger of arbitrary power, and theories of surveillance and democratic communication reveal how technological systems can shape behaviour and public reasoning.

These perspectives suggest that meaningful freedom requires informed choice, privacy, social inclusion, independent judgment, and protection against unaccountable institutional power.

AI offers considerable opportunities to improve education, healthcare, public administration, research, accessibility, and economic productivity. However, these benefits are not automatic. Their distribution depends on political decisions, institutional arrangements, technological design, and effective safeguards.

The Indian context demonstrates the importance of connecting AI governance with constitutional values, linguistic inclusion, digital literacy, and accessible public services. Technological innovation must remain compatible with equality, liberty, dignity, and accountable government.

References

1. Berlin, I. (1969). **Four essays on liberty**. Oxford University Press.
2. Crawford, K. (2021). **Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence**. Yale University Press.
3. Foucault, M. (1977). **Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison** (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1975)
4. Habermas, J. (1984). **The theory of communicative action: Volume 1: Reason and the rationalization of society** (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Beacon Press.
5. Nissenbaum, H. (2010). **Privacy in context: Technology, policy, and the integrity of social life**. Stanford University Press.
6. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). **Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence** (OECD/LEGAL/0449). OECD.
7. Pettit, P. (1997). **Republicanism: A theory of freedom and government**. Oxford University Press.
8. Russell, S. (2019). **Human compatible: Artificial intelligence and the problem of control**. Viking.
9. Supreme Court of India. (2017). **Justice K. S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India**, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
10. UNESCO. (2022). **Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence**. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (Recommendation adopted in 2021.)
11. Zuboff, S. (2019). **The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power**. PublicAffairs.

Citation: Banoth Sampath 2026. "Artificial Intelligence and the Crisis of Human Agency: Rethinking Freedom in the Algorithmic Age". *International Journal of Academic Research*, 13(1): 238-247.

Copyright: ©2026 Banoth Sampath. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.