Divine Determinism to Digital Determinism: The Paradigm Shift of Fate in the 21st Century

Fernanda Putra Adela*
Faculty of Political and Social Sciences
Universitas Sumatera Utara
Kota Medan, Sumatera Utara 20222, Indonesia
*Corresponding Author: fpadela@usu.ac.id
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8021-4572

Try Adhi Bangsawan
Faculty of Political and Social Sciences
Universitas Bina Bangsa
Kota Serang, Banten 42124, Indonesia
https://orcid.org/0009-0001-4813-2358

https://doi.org/10.46222/pharosjot.107.27

Abstract

This article investigates the theoretical reorientation of the term 'destiny' from the classical theological understanding of divine determinism—anchored in natural law philosophy—to the contemporary model of digital determinism arising from the convergence of artificial intelligence, expansive data aggregation capabilities, and the monopolistic tendencies of twenty-first-century technology firms. Employing a conceptual-hermeneutic framework in conjunction with critical discourse analysis, the inquiry traces both historical and present-day modalities through which fate, elective freedom, and the scope of human agency are reconstituted in a socio-technical setting. The decisive marker of the current transition is the advent of algorithmic determinism, in which opaque predictive architectures, often referred to as 'black boxes', consolidate the advantages of data monopolists while simultaneously attenuating the capacity for individual moral accountability and constricting the residual latitude of autonomous action. Such developments are masked by the self-serving lexicon of technological neutrality, yet they materialise in pronounced asymmetries of power and the precariousness of human-technical entanglements. This research advances critical discourse concerning the interplay between technological systems, corporate sovereignty, and the erosion of human agency, and it simultaneously articulates a theoretical understructure for technology policy formulations that honour both justice and the integrity of autonomous subjects.

Keywords: Determinism, Divine, Digital, Artificial Intelligence, Free Will, Human Agency.

Introduction

Scholarly inquiries into the idea of fate reveal its enduring role in the interplay of agency, existence, and cosmological frameworks across cultural epochs. Throughout history, the conviction that outcomes may be inscribed by a supra-human causative order has shaped ethical, narrative, and reflective registers. In earlier epochs, this conviction coalesced with the principle that a divine intelligence details the temporal course of the cosmos (Solomon, 2003). Such frameworks informed an array of confessional traditions: within the Calvinist system, the unconditional character of election subtends any human contribution to grace; classical Islamic discourse articulates qadar as the comprehensive divine prescription governing all contingencies; within Hindu thought, the karma principle distributes the consequences of intentional acts across rebirths in a morally calibrated manner; and the Greek mythic corpus represents the Moirai as the literal artisans of unfolding human narrative. Collectively, these doctrines endorsed a metanarrative in which individual volition is often perceived as a variable operative only within the parameters of a predetermined script, lending a teleological harmony to existence while qualifying the latitude to initiate divergent futures (D'Ariano et al., 2014).

With the rise of Enlightenment thought and scientific rationality, the centre of determinism transferred from the divine to the natural sphere. The mechanistic universe, crystallised in Newtonian mechanics, came to be envisioned as a closed, law-governed system wherein each occurrence is necessitated by its antecedent conditions (Nichols & Knobe, 2007). The figure of Laplace's demon serves as a corollary of this image: an intellect in possession of the instantaneous distributions and velocities of all constituents could, in principle, compose a complete forecasting of future states. Although such naturalistic determinism absorbed the explanatory force previously held by divine providence, it simultaneously dislodged the conditions under which human freedom and moral accountability had been, if not reconciled, at least contained within religious frameworks (Carey & Paulhus, 2013). Subsequent philosophical currents, existentialism most prominent among them, replied by affirming a freedom that, while lived under deterministic auspices, is nonetheless self-creating and morally exigent (Hallström, 2022). Thus, the ancient contest between determinism and free agency perpetuates, now complicated by the discrete affordances and constraints posed by contemporary digital technologies.

In the twenty-first century, a new variant of determinism can be observed, provisionally designated as digital determinism. Whereas earlier determinist doctrines derived legitimacy from theological, metaphysical, or physicalist foundations, digital determinism derives from circuits of algorithms, extensive data analysis, and artificial intelligence systems that forecast and tactically influence both individual conduct and aggregate social phenomena (Héder, 2021). These algorithms, operating as a secular analogue of the oracle, mine massive volumes of data to render probabilistic models that mediate decisions in domains as varied as consumer preference, credit scoring, legal liability forecasting, and the curation of digital content (Finn, 2017). Absent the intentionality or normative adjudication attributed to gods, and drawing its authority instead from statistical inference and extensive data analysis, the systems nevertheless impose a form of substantial governance through the embedding of anticipatory capacities (probabilistic models that mediate decisions) within the quotidian architecture of information technologies, thereby constraining the distribution of alternatives and orienting the flow of information.

The movement from divinely dictated fate to algorithmically determined outcomes compels a reexamination of autonomy and moral accountability. Interdisciplinary research from cognitive psychology and moral philosophy demonstrates that intuitions concerning responsibility are more nuanced than either strict determinism or pure libertarian freedom. Nichols and Knobe's experimental work indicates that laypersons' judgments about free will and moral praise or blame frequently oscillate, situating them variably between compatibilist and incompatibilist frameworks depending on subtle contextual cues and social norms, rather than on explicit logical reasoning (Carey & Paulhus, 2013). These ambivalent tendencies complicate any straightforward assignment of blame when algorithms, acting below the threshold of conscious awareness, anticipate and subtly direct future behaviour. As machine learning models gain resolution, their capacity to condition decisions before the agent is aware of the choice itself raises doubts about whether the resulting behaviour can still qualify as free. Observers, therefore, worry that the original ideal of personal autonomy is being quietly supplanted by a more refined determinism, in which algorithmic influence masquerades as individualised choice, thereby neutralising the moral significance that individuality once bore (Mulawarman et al., 2023).

Simultaneously, contemporary discourse on technological determinism warns researchers against viewing technology as a mere autonomous force detached from human intention or political environment. Scholars in technology education insist that determinism appears not only as a theoretical stance but as operative institutional arrangements; nonetheless, human designers and regulators remain decisive agents, albeit within designs that technology continues to influence (Putri, 2024). Yet the growing “lock-in” capacity of AI, understood as both software and semi-autonomous actor, magnifies determinist tendencies by institutionalising specific developmental paths and constraining feasible alternatives, thereby concentrating regulatory power in a narrow cadre of corporate or governmental entities (Finn, 2017). This emergent corporational determinism exacerbates power imbalances characteristic of the digital epoch, in which a restricted number of worldwide corporations monopolise the curation of future socio-technical arrangements. This institutionalisation of power creates profound difficulties for distributive justice, as systemic inequalities are ineradicably coded into algorithmic systems governing employment, credit, and punitive justice, thereby creating a 'vulnerability gap' (Situmorang & Ritonga, 2025). Eliciting urgent inquiry into the domains of governance, distributive justice, and institutional accountability is essential, particularly given the epistemic opacity of 'black-box' architectures that resist conventional oversight and produce a 'responsibility gap' in accountability.

Recent social scientific inquiry reveals a heterogeneous and dialectical relationship between beliefs in free will and determinism and their upstream effects on political ideology, moral reasoning, and normative punishment. Empirical studies demonstrate that stronger convictions in free agency predict conservative endorsements of authoritarian governance and retributive penal policies, whereas a deterministic outlook frequently undergirds more lenient, rehabilitative, and structural explanations of societal harm (D’Ariano et al., 2014). These findings suggest that shifting constructions of agency and necessity, once relegated to philosophical discourse, entail concrete modifications to the architecture of governance, legal frameworks, and broader cultural expectations. Under the conditions of emergent digital determinism, such reorientations assume not only doctrinal but also existential, ethical, and ontological significance.

Ultimately, the passage from theocentric to algorithmic constructions of fate signifies more than a successive replacement of one explanatory schema by another; it constitutes a tectonic reordering of the conditions under which individuals understand and enact agency. The framing afforded by this study nests digital determinism within the continuity of Western intellectual history, while probing the acute dilemmas it raises for the preservation of normative autonomy and the assignment of moral, legal, and political responsibility in the contemporary era.

Method

The research design presented in the initial response successfully acknowledges the multifaceted and integrative character of the inquiry into the historical movement from divine to digital determinism, employing qualitative, conceptual, and hermeneutic modalities (Creswell, 2014). By adopting a narrative format, the study explicitly positions itself at the crossroads of philosophical hermeneutics, critical social theory, and the ethics of digital technology, attending particularly to artificial intelligence and the algorithmic architectures of transnational corporations. Such a selection of frames corresponds rigorously to the purposive question and the parameters delineated in the accompanying articles. The methodological coherence is reinforced by the intentional amalgamation of hermeneutic reflection, critical discourse analysis, and historical-conceptual examination, each of which collaborates to delineate the genealogical trajectory of determinism and to reveal the latent configurations of authority inscribed within digital artefacts (Blumer, 1986).

The decision to foreground bibliographical inquiry and conceptual analysis instead of primary empirical fieldwork is warranted by the topic’s abstract and archi-fundational character. Addressing the intersection of long-standing doctrines of fate, free will, and agency with the evolving field of sociotechnical CLI disciplines requires a longitudinal hermeneutic best served by archive- and canon-based tracing of diachronic arguments. By deliberately synthesising canonical philosophical and theological treatises with present-day literature on AI ethics and legal frameworks such as the GDPR, the project establishes a diachronic dataset that supports triangulation across distinct intellectual traditions, thus reinforcing the interpretive robustness of the findings. Integral to this synthesis is the incorporation of critical media scholarship that interrogates corporational determinism; such literature reveals how dominant tech firms produce narrative constellations that present agency as an artefact of corporate design, a dynamic that Natale et al. (2019). term "corporational determinism" and that construes technosocial transformations as primarily corporate initiatives, a vector of explanation first observed by Solomon (2003).

Employing hermeneutic approaches nurtured by Gadamer and Ricoeur permits a diachronic and contextually aware investigation of the concepts of free will and determinism, tracing them through the historical and linguistic layers that guard them against reductionist and static readings. Complementing this with critical discourse analysis uncovers the power-infused semantics embedded in corporate messaging and media framing, illuminating digital determinism not as a mere technological trajectory but as a cultural and ideological formation with tangible repercussions for governance, personal autonomy, and attributions of responsibility (D'Ariano et al., 2014). Such combined analysis is crucial for mapping the relational asymmetries and responsibility lacunae identified by Vallor and Vierkant, who argue that the epistemic opacity and diminished control characteristic of AI propel us beyond conventional moral frameworks, compelling the construction of novel agency concepts that acknowledge the vulnerabilities produced by interwoven sociotechnical ecologies (Nichols & Knobe, 2007).

The historical-conceptual framework animates an investigation into determinism's evolution, tracing its movement from theological fatalism and mechanistic Newtonian physics to the probabilistic and algorithmic dynamics that now inform advanced artificial intelligence. This analytical trajectory dovetails with Müller and Placek's branching-style determinism, a model that refines classical indeterministic and deterministic categories and thus fortifies the study's critique of contemporary digital determinism, particularly its assertion of inevitability and causal completeness (Carey & Paulhus, 2013). Such analytical precision obviates the danger of collapsing fatalism into determinism, a separation repeatedly underscored by Solomon in his cross-cultural examination of fate and fatalism. Thus, the study upholds its philosophical rigour while grappling with pressing contemporary issues (Héder, 2021).

The combination of corporate discourse and regulatory texts, particularly GDPR, permits a productive reconciliation of theoretical insight and empirical inquiry by tracking the empirical instantiation of digital determinism within socio-legal and governance repositories. Attention to GDPR dovetails with Milossi et al.'s treatment of ethical AI governance, which places privacy, autonomy, and data protection at the fore via the principle of "privacy by design," thereby embedding the present inquiry within the broader, contested political and ethical arenas that govern AI adoption (Hallström, 2022). Correspondingly, Elliott et al.'s articulation of Corporate Digital Responsibility mandates the embedding of ethical AI canon within the governance architectures of the firm, aimed at attenuating harms that emanate from AI's "black-box" qualities and the obscured rationality of algorithmic choices—matters that the present methodology is explicitly designed to interrogate (D'Ariano et al., 2014). These empirical anchors strengthen the inquiry's critical-constructive disposition, eschewing both an unyielding critique of technology and a credulous embrace of it, and thereby advocating for a tempered, yet responsible, integration of the technology within governance and organisational spatialities.

The choice to forgo empirical data collection in favour of theoretical and discursive analyses does constrict the inquiry from documenting lived experiences and user perspectives, which the preliminary answer has already disclosed. Such limitation, nevertheless, is warranted in light of the conceptual preoccupation driving the research and the current underdevelopment of empirical studies on ethical AI agency. Subsequent investigations might redress this lacuna through a mixed-methods orientation that incorporates qualitative interviews or structured surveys designed to map the subjective experience of agency within algorithmic governance, a trajectory already indicated by Salatino et al. in their exploration of AI's shaping of human moral choice and the subjective sense of agency. The absence of empirical scrutiny is therefore consonant with the study's orientation toward the structural and ideological dynamics in play, rather than toward the collection of micro-level behavioural indicators.

Ethical considerations inform every facet of this enquiry, safeguarding academic integrity, neutrality, and an acute awareness of positionality. Such vigilance is especially warranted when interrogating dominant digital actors; the risk of ad hominem tropes or unfounded assertions is ever-present. The discipline of maintained reflexivity, coupled with methodological stringency, thwarts reductionist critiques while fostering a measured yet incisive analytical posture. The research design, therefore, emerges as a durable and theoretically anchored apparatus. By traversing the interstices of philosophy, technology, and social power, the approach elucidates the gradual reconfiguration of digital determinism and its embedded sociopolitical ramifications. A deliberately heterogeneous and authoritative corpus of texts is triangulated with mutually reinforcing analytical modalities, thereby equipping the methodology to unravel the intricate recompositions through which artificial intelligence and corporate hierarchies renegotiate the contours of fate, freedom, and agency in the twenty-first century. The outcome is an epistemically secure foundation for the overarching ethical and sociological investigation posed.

Results

Divine Determinism Through History

Divine determinism remains among the most ancient and globally influential conceptions of destiny, asserting that a transcendent power designates the unfolding of existence in advance. Its influence penetrates the mythological, devotional, and speculative writings of numerous civilisations. In the classical Greek world, the Moirai—the weavers who spin, measure, and sever the thread of life—illusion the rational and the poetic alike with the image of a cosmic order that escapes human alteration. The doctrine of karma in Hindu cosmology, conversely, formulates a moral physics in which every deed, however hidden, constrains the conditions of future rebirth, ensuring a vast, though imperfect, restitution of ethical imbalance. In the theological vocabulary of Islam, qadar denotes the enveloping divine decree that predestines every moment while leaving human free choice operating within a carefully wrought moral horizon (Lundeto, 2023).

Culture/Tradition	Concept of Fate	Nature of Determinism	Human Agency
Ancient Greek	Moirai (Fates)	Cosmic weaving of life threads (fatalism)	Limited, predetermined destiny
Hinduism	Karma	Moral causality shaping future lives	Constrained by past actions
Islam	Qadar	Divine decree and predestination	Coexists with human choice
Christianity (Calvinism)	Predestination	God's sovereignty over salvation	Restricted within the divine plan

Table 1. Concepts of Destiny and Determinism in Various Religious and Cultural Traditions

In monotheistic traditions—including various streams of Christianity—guaranteed divine ordination is illustrated, among other places, in the Calvinist conviction of predestination, which posits that God, in exercise of sovereign will and exhaustive anticipatory insight, irrevocably assigns human souls to either salvation or perdition. Such doctrines engage participants in the delicate task of harmonising divine foreknowledge and almighty governance with, and in many cases against, the notion of human volitional freedom, a tension which undergirds continued scholarly discourse regarding the viability of moral culpability and the existence of genuine agency (Harahap et al., 2024). Historically, these formulations have fulfilled both personal and communal imperatives, conferring a measure of coherence upon the vicissitudes that mark biography, offering a theodicy that reads fortune and adversity alike as governance rather than caprice, and issuing conspectuses of moral behaviour authoritatively grounded in the will of the transcendent. Nonetheless, the more stringent doctrine of fatalism, which removes all possibility of human influence upon the course of events, has been respectfully distinguished from the moderated model of determinism, which construes divine action as lawful or causal, the latter permitting a measure of providential mediation. Such distinctions, developed in the course of doctrinal debate, invite consideration of divine determinism in its full range: as a conviction articulated within confessional boundaries and as a philosophical thesis regarding the ultimate grammar of causation and agency (Mulawarman et al., 2023).

The Rise of Scientific Rationalism and the Decline of Theological Fate

The Enlightenment period fostered a transition away from metaphysical and theologically oriented explanations of fate towards a commitment to rational inquiry, illustrated in its acceptance of natural law and causal determinism (McGrath, 2024; Reill, 2005). The formalisation of Newtonian mechanics served as a paradigm, portraying the cosmos as an intricate instrument in which succeeding states emerge inevitably from given antecedent conditions (Carr, 2007; Krawietz, 2019). The resultant mechanistic picture implied that mastery of the universe's configuration at any singular instant would, in principle, allow for the unerring calculation of all subsequent conditions. The later formulation, known as Laplace's demon, crystallised this ideal of predictive completeness (Iskandar et al., 2022). Within this paradigm, causation was relocated from divine intervention to immutable physical interactions, yet the cosmos remained deterministic: individual choices themselves appeared as links in a longer causal chain tracing back to earlier states. In this framing, a critical appraisal of the distinction between determinism—predictable succession according to law—and fatalism—an unavoidable outcome detached from causal antecedents—acquired renewed salience (Mulawarman et al., 2023).

Stage	Dominant Paradigm	Nature of Fate/Determinism	Implications for Agency
Pre-Enlightenment	Divine Determinism	Fate is governed by a deity	Human choice constrained
Enlightenment	Scientific Determinism	The universe is governed by laws	Human behaviour is causally determined
20th Century Physics	Quantum Indeterminism	Non-absolute causality	Uncertainty allows scope for freedom

Table 2. Evolution of the Paradigm of Destiny and Determinism: From Divine Dominance to Quantum Indeterminism

At the same time that empirical disciplines were consolidating models of causal closure, movements such as existentialism redirected attention to the lived experience of choice, arguing that subjects encounter the world in ways that solicit freedom even amid what may appear to be a predetermined order. These tensions crystallised into the familiar contest of compatibilism versus incompatibilism, centring on whether the condition of a world governed by causal laws permits a robust notion of self-determined action. Quantum mechanics, however, inserted indeterminate processes at the level of micro-events, demonstrating that explanatory reference to causation and the presupposition of a closed causal nexus need not overlap (Lee & Kim, 2016). Consequently, the eclipse of providential fate as a moral horizon yielded a sui generis scientific determinism framed in permissive causal terms, yet the questions of whether, on this new plane, persons remain agents of their actions—militating for moral ascriptions—refused to abate, but rather shifted and deepened.

The Emergence of Digital Determinism

The current century has given way to a specific, emergent form of determinism that we designate as digital determinism (Nida-Rümelin & Weidenfeld, 2022). Distinct from earlier formulations that invoked either providential will or natural necessity, this variant is premised upon algorithmically mediated systems and artificial intelligence (AI) architectures that accumulate, analyse, and exploit extensive data corpuses in order to anticipate and modulate human conduct (McQuillan, 2015; Lazaro, 2023; Roberts, 2019). These systems employ techniques of large-scale data mining, adaptive machine learning, and increasingly automated decision chains to estimate behaviours as varied as consumer purchases, creditworthiness, and allegedly objective risk profiles of recidivism. Where earlier metaphysical systems assumed a transcendent or natural order, digital determinism derives its authority from observable data and statistical inference. The algorithms thereby function as post-metaphysical oracles, deriving their authority from statistical inference and rendering probabilistic models. This form of determinism, which must be distinguished from fatalism, affects modes of secular social governance by constraining the distribution of alternatives and orienting the flow of information. However, this mechanism remains subject to human policy choices and institutional framing, allowing for conditional indeterminacy and intervention points (Istati, 2018).

Technological determinism has long occupied the orbit of social theory; its urgency, however, has intensified with the rise of artificial intelligence. The phenomenon of AI-mediated technological lock-in—where specific trajectories of innovation, once initiated, gain incremental momentum and resist alteration—intensifies the traditional determinist intuition. Because current digital artefacts can be scaled with minimal incremental expense, their penetrative force on institutional arrangements and subjective agency compounds non-linearly. Concomitantly, AI architectures, straddling the distinctions between code and ostensibly autonomous agents, resist conventional oversight, magnifying their socio-technical footprint. Corporational determinism articulates a complementary dynamic, foregrounding how incumbents such as Google, Facebook, and Amazon exercise disproportionate influence over the affordances of digital ecologies, the constitution of cultural norms, and the elaboration of policy lexicons. Such firms are reframed not merely as agents of socio-technical transformation but as gatekeepers of conceivable futures, thereby solidifying persistent asymmetries in the governance of digital infrastructures (Hussain & Ahmad, 2021).

Characteristic	**Divine Determinism**	**Scientific Determinism**	**Digital Determinism**
Source of Determination	Deity/supernatural	Natural laws	Algorithms, AI systems

Characteristic	Divine Determinism	Scientific Determinism	Digital Determinism
Predictive Basis	Metaphysical authority	Causal physical laws	Data pattern recognition
Agency Implications	Limited human agency	Causal but debated free will	Potential erosion of autonomy
Sociopolitical Impact	Ethical-moral order	Rational-legal frameworks	Corporate and digital governance

Table 3. Comparison of Divine, Scientific, and Digital Determinism: Sources, Predictive Bases, and Social Implications

In scholarly discourse on design and pedagogy, technological determinism is approached simultaneously as an analytical perspective and as an empirical condition: prevailing artefacts and infrastructures already entrench specific trajectories, thereby constraining the emergence of subsequent innovations and the evolution of social orders. Despite this emphasis on determinism, numerous scholars, including Hassan & Sutherland (2016), argue for a nuanced soft determinism where networked technologies shape, but do not fully determine, human lives and social context. Against this framing, an ongoing conversation within the field of technology studies (such as the Social Shaping of Technology discipline) highlights the intertwined evolution of socio-cultural variables and technological artefacts, positing that agency, in the form of policy choices, user practices, and institutional framing, remains salient in shaping the adoption, adaptation, and recursive design of technologies, even when deterministic pressures are evident.

Free Will and Identity in the Age of AI

Digital determinism notably problematises the interplay between free will and personal identity within environments increasingly dominated by artificial intelligence. Interdisciplinary research bridging cognitive science and philosophy indicates that ordinary intuitions regarding free agency often oscillate among incompatible assumptions (Hallström, 2022). Compatibilists maintain that moral agency can harmonise with causal closure, whereas incompatibilists insist that any deterministically governed world must exclude genuine agency. Contemporary AI, by inferring probable future intentions and subtly calibrating stimuli through recommendation algorithms, appears to exercise a form of preemption that interrogates the classical liberal conception of sovereign volition. Compounding these tensions, the black-box architecture of deep learning platforms obfuscates the causal paths of decision-making, thereby engendering what legal and moral theorists identify as the “responsibility gap” (Grote & Di Nucci, 2020; Lang et al., 2023). This gap emerges not only from epistemic opacity—our imperfect grasp of machine reasoning—but also from attenuated agency over algorithmic processes, thereby fracturing the traditional predicate for attributing liability within both moral and statutory regimes.

In addition, the asymmetrical bordering of relational power between human decision-makers and algorithmic agents creates novel points for exploitation. Stakeholders may gradually cede evaluative responsibility to opaque models, gradually forfeiting the skill and, in some cases, the consciousness to affirmatively discern options (Barbosa & Barbosa, 2020; Zerilli et al., 2019). This trajectory poses a latent, yet substantial, threat to the integrity of the self as an autonomous writer of personal narrative. Such processes converge with persistent public deliberation on dimensions of privacy, consent, and recognised control, a concern currently channelled into the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation. That instrument interlaces the mandates of privacy by design with the entitlements of data subjects, thereby fortifying a normative architecture that seeks to insulate human agency from the colonising tendencies of algorithmic power (Abdurrahman, 2020).

Aspect	Traditional Free Will View	AI and Digital Determinism Impact
Transparency	Human conscious agency	Algorithmic opacity challenges
Control	Self-directed choice	AI influences/nudges human decisions
Responsibility	Clear moral accountability	Responsibility gap due to AI autonomy
Identity	Autonomous self	Vulnerability and dependence on AI

Table 4. The Impact of Digital Determinism on the Traditional Concept of Free Will

Beliefs concerning the nature of free will are consistently linked with distinct social and political orientations. Empirical research demonstrates that a robust conviction in free will aligns with conservative ideologies—characterised by preferences for strict law enforcement and a belief in deserved punishment—whereas endorsement of deterministic explanations of behaviour is more frequently associated with liberal or reform-oriented ethical views. Against the backdrop of contemporary developments in artificial intelligence, which potentiate the forecasting and modulating of human action, these belief distributions are likely to inform collective attitudes toward regulatory mechanisms and the moral underpinnings of emerging technologies.

Reimagining Human Agency in a Digitally Determined World

Faced with a resurgent deterministic landscape, researchers call for a renewed inquiry into the constitution of human agency within digitally saturated environments. This is compelled by the fact that AI's capacity to infer and modulate human action, often before the agent is aware of the choice itself, poses a latent threat to the self as an autonomous writer of personal narrative. For example, recommendation algorithms actively curating preferences and subtly steering choices may erode the sense of self derived from autonomous decision-making. This inquiry is primarily focused on confronting the "vulnerability gap"—the uneven distribution of authority—and the imperative to construct artefacts that augment, rather than circumscribe, human agency. The response involves fostering technological literacy and implementing regulatory mandates, such as the GDPR's right to explanation, to fortify personal autonomy (Dignum, 2019; O'Neil, 2017; Selbst & Powles, 2017; Zuboff, 2019). The process of technological design, they argue, is always a negotiation between the feasible and the ethically preferable, in which human actors retain decisive weight even in the presence of determinist inclinations. Such a view promotes technological literacy and reflective critique in place of resigned acceptance. Contemporary philosophy of social agency reminds us that mistaking metaphysical determinism for empirical social structure risks analytic muddle. Actors encumbered by social and technological frameworks exercise differing degrees of latitude and inventiveness; therefore, agency is best understood as the interplay of constraints and the potential for reconfiguration (Hartawan & Rawzalgina, 2025).

Ethical frameworks governing AI design stress the imperative to construct artefacts that augment, rather than circumscribe, human agency. A forward-looking, practice-oriented conception of moral responsibility proves versatile for embedding AI within human moral ecologies. Confronting the "vulnerability gap"—the uneven distribution of authority between human agents and complex sociotechnical environments—thus emerges as a foundational concern for institutionalising accountable and trustworthy AI (Ardana & Sudita, 2022).

Approach	Core Idea	Implications for the Agency
Technological Literacy	Humans design and control technology	Empowerment through informed engagement
Structure-Agency Distinction	Agency shaped but not erased by structures	Recognition of constrained freedom
Instrumentalist Responsibility	Forward-looking, flexible agency	Moral responsibility adapts to AI contexts
Critical Media Scholarship	Oppose monopolistic determinist narratives	Promote democratic governance

Tabel 5. Pendekatan Konseptual dalam Mempertahankan Agensi Manusia di Era Teknologi

Critically oriented scholarship on corporational determinism urges scholars and practitioners to contest explanatory frameworks that isolate dominant digital corporations as the exclusive agents of socio-technical transformation. Rather, it champions the need for more inclusive forms of governance and innovation practices that actively engage a wider spectrum of stakeholders. Such eclectic participation is indispensable for safeguarding pluralistic forms of human agency that might otherwise diminish within deterministic trajectories oriented by corporate imperatives.

Discussion

The analytic transition from classical divine and mechanistic determinism to the contemporary form of determinism now embedded in AI ecosystems carries deep philosophical, ethical, and societal implications. This paper reframes the inquiry on the historical and conceptual sources of the transformation, drawing on current scholarly literature to expose the heterogeneous dimensions of the change. Particular emphasis is placed on the entrenchment of technological paradigms, the reconfiguration of human agency and moral accountability, and the unfolding political consequences of governance mediated by algorithms and self-regulating data assemblages.

Clarifying the conceptual terrain is essential. Following Solomon, determinism is to be distinguished from both fatalism and robust causal explanation. Fatalism, often mistakenly identified with the older determinist outlook, asserts an end-state that renders agency irrelevant, whereas classical determinism posits that events unfold according to lawful interactions that, in principle, may be intervened upon by other causes. This analytic distinction gains traction when confronted with machine learning deployments that produce behaviourally grounded forecasts without positing an unavoidable metaphysical trajectory. Moreover, recent advancements in foundational physics now underscore that deterministic behaviour and causal sequencings are not dual aspects of a single principle: a system may be governed by lawful invariance yet disorder the causal chain, and the reverse configuration may equally obtain. Such refinements annul reductive readings of governance, suggesting that control, predictability, and responsibility within the socio-technical networks now thick with AI can no longer be assumed to map transparently onto earlier mechanistic intuitions.

Technological Lock-In and Algorithmic Determinism

Examination of AI's so-called "lock-in potential" demonstrates how contemporary computing environments transcend older forms of technological determinism by embodying software and semi-autonomous agents with effectively zero marginal replication cost. Their ubiquity and deep embedding within progressively modular social architectures do not merely orient present practices; they also narrow and preselect future innovation trajectories. The resultant lock-in potential is therefore "amplified," strengthening determinist outcomes by institutionalising a bounded set of trajectories dominated by concentrated corporate actors—what Natale et al. (2019)term "corporational determinism." Firms like Google and Facebook strategically present themselves less as contributors and more as irreplaceable architects and custodians of socio-technical evolution. This self-styled positioning crystallises their dominion over digital ecologies and marginalises deliberative and pluralistic governance of technology's trajectory. To concretely counteract this corporational determinism and safeguard pluralistic governance (Natale et al.), institutional proposals are imperative. These mechanisms include regulatory mandates such as the GDPR's doctrines of privacy by design and the right to explanation, which seek to fortify personal autonomy and mitigate algorithmic force. Furthermore, firms must adopt Corporate Digital Responsibility (CDR) mandates to embed ethical AI canon within internal governance architectures to attenuate harms from black-box opacity. Ultimately, this pluralism is reinforced by cultivating procedural capacities for contestation, comprehension, and governance of AI among a wider spectrum of stakeholders, moving policy toward the deliberate shaping of trajectories rather than passive acquiescence

The implications are troubling for power distribution and for the reproduction of systemic inequalities ineradicably coded into algorithmic systems whose inscrutable heuristics govern employment, credit, and punitive justice. Hallström illustrates that determinist effects are neither confined to the macro-societal plane nor to stub systems; they are recurrent at the micro-architectural and interactional strata. This multiplicitous anchoring renders the determinist moment both pervasive and inescapably woven into design and use.

Implications for Free Will, Responsibility, and Identity

The proliferation of AI-infused contexts compels a critical reassessment of free will and moral accountability. Research by Carey and Paulhus (2013), indicates that confidence in free will typically aligns with conservative paradigms that prioritise personal culpability and punitive retribution. By contrast, a contrast between fatalistic and scientific determinism exposes the divergent political and moral consequences that each subtype begets. AI, however, exerts a nearly ubiquitous algorithmic reach that can erode subjective efficacy and frustrate the customary tracing of responsibility, chiefly because epistemic opacity renders the workings of numerous systems inscrutable—a phenomenon colloquially designated the "black box."

The responsibility deficit in AI oversight emerges not solely from gaps in knowledge or agency but from structural asymmetries—individuals confront algorithmic architectures that lie beyond their comprehension and sway. This vulnerability gap introduces a qualitatively new quandary that transcends the longstanding philosophical debates surrounding free will, thus compelling a recalibration of normative accountability to recognise the entangled agency characteristic of human-PSI dyads. Responsibility reimagined as an instrumental burden, concentrated upon augmenting procedural capacities for contestation, comprehension, and governance of AI rather than on exculpation or retribution, exhibits considerable heuristic currency. Such paradigms prioritise the cultivation of civic and cognitive resources that allow actors to reconfigure systems rather than acquiesce to a scripted technological destiny.

The ramifications for individual identity are equally far-reaching. By actively curating preferences, organising data, and subtly steering choices, AI may erode the sense of self that derives from autonomous decision-making, thereby amplifying the ethical tension surrounding privacy, autonomy, and the legitimacy of consent (Zuboff, 2019). Foundational regulatory schemes, notably the GDPR, articulate the doctrines of privacy by design and the right to explanation, intending to fortify personal autonomy and to mitigate the force of algorithmic determinism. Yet, as Hallström effectively argues, the retention of human agency is what enables rather than vitiates these protections; rather than surrendering to deterministic narratives, society is called to deepen its investment in technological literacy and in the deliberate, ethically-informed design of systems.

Socio-Political and Ethical Dimensions: Towards Pluralistic Governance

The rise of corporate determinism invites urgent examination and deliberate opposition by researchers and policy-makers alike. Natale et al. (2019) challenge prevailing hegemonies that sideline diverse constituencies in the governance of media and technology, urging the adoption of a pluralistic framework that incorporates state, civil society, academia, and users as co-governors. Only by recognising this multiplicity of stakeholders can society recover democratic control over technological futures and safeguard human agency.

The dialectical approach articulated by Bourgeois (1980) reconceives strategic management as an ongoing, generative negotiation between structure and creativity. This conception, when transposed to governance, underscores the co-evolution of structural constraints and human innovation in the regulation of emerging technologies. In a complementary vein, Pleasants (2018) demonstrates that the long-standing dichotomy of structure and agency evaporates when metaphysical and empirical domains are properly delineated; human actors, in effect, perch on the narrow ledges of socially and technologically imposed architectures, capable of bounded creativity rather than total autonomy or utter subjugation. This perspective, consistent with soft determinism, supports governance architectures that acknowledge the exertive capacities of AI systems while preserving the reflexivity of human agents, thereby orienting policy toward the deliberate shaping of trajectories rather than passive acquiescence.

The philosophy of science contributes further by advancing branched models of determinism, which depict technological systems as co-architects of multiple, equally live futures rather than enforcers of a singular, foreordained destiny. Such models reveal the inherent openness within apparently closed systems, identifying clear junctures for intervention and design choice. By foregrounding this conditional indeterminacy within deterministic paradigms, scholars and practitioners can resist the allure of fatalism and place ethical, strategic engagement at the centre of technology development (Moore & Pham, 2020; Suchman, 2007).

This inquiry demonstrates that digital determinism differs fundamentally from earlier forms of determinism; it represents an intensified form of constraint generated by the computational capacities of AI and by the concentration of power in corporate and surveillance architectures. Algorithmic and predictive mechanisms now exert pressures and probabilities on human conduct at scales and speeds that surpass classical models, yet the conditions for retaining free will, moral responsibility, and a coherent notion of individuality remain, at least in principle, available. These conditions depend on the deliberate processes of design, a commitment to pluralistic and polycentric governance, and on ethical frameworks that are iteratively responsive to emergent technologies. The principal impediment is a settled fatalism; the principal responsibility is to cultivate emergent forms of agency that, while recognising the entangled character of social and technical environments, continue to protect dignity and autonomy (Barocas & Nissenbaum, 2014; Prunkl, 2022).

Conclusion

Humanity's pursuit of comprehensive explanatory systems for destiny has progressed from theocratic edict to mathematical programme. The celestial arbiters of classical theodicy have been traded for synthetic agents: ephemeral logics coursing through continental—indeed, planetary—data arteries, calibrating the arc of individual and communal lives with sudden and uncanny granularity. This mutation does not liquidate the ideal of self-determining choice; it rather compels a reformulated understanding of moral agency and culpability within a milieu

in which the probable has become the programmable. Acknowledging the magnitude of the present redirection affords the collective the chance to wrest self-direction from imposed predictive narrative, safeguarding the horizon of living possibility as an open, participatory human artefact rather than as a pre-compiled binary destiny. Confronted with the thorough transition from transcendent to computational teleology, the polity is obliged to traverse the twin attractions—potency and hazard—intrinsic to algorithmic rule. The enduring achievement of self-determined history, amid the reverberations of algorithmic foresight, demands opacity in data practices, equity in policy, and the disciplined reorientation of innovation toward the human subject, such that futures emancipated from fatalism become, once again, mutable art rather than resigned database.
Limitations of the study include its choice to forgo empirical data collection in favour of theoretical and discursive analyses, which constricts the inquiry from documenting lived experiences and user perspectives. This limitation is consistent with the study's structural focus, yet it leaves a significant lacuna regarding the subjective experience of agency within algorithmic systems. Consequently, future research should explore non-libertarian models of agency, such as self-organizing agency or instrumental responsibility, to theorise how meaningful freedom can be retained within algorithmic constraints. Subsequent investigations should adopt a mixed-methods approach incorporating qualitative interviews or surveys to map the subjective experience of agency within algorithmic governance.

References

Abdurrahman, A. (2020). The function of Islamic Counseling in Education. *Jurnal Handayani*, 11(1), 42-48. https://doi.org/10.24114/jh.v11i1.18658

Ardana, I. G. N. S., & Sudita, I. K. (2022). The Development Of Ogoh-Ogoh Making With Kinetic Art's Technology In Denpasar City. *Jurnal Pendidikan Seni Rupa Undiksha*, 12(3), 249-257. https://doi.org/10.23887/jjpsp.v12i3.52692

Barbosa, G. D. J., & Barbosa, S. D. J. (2020). You should not control what you do not understand: The risks of controllability in AI. *Human Computer Interaction and Emerging Technologies: Adjunct Proceedings from the INTERACT 2019 Workshops*, 231–236. https://doi.org/10.18573/book3.af

Barocas, S., & Nissenbaum, H. (2014). Big data's end run around procedural privacy protections. *Communications of the ACM*, 57(11), 31–33. https://doi.org/10.1145/2668897

Blumer, H. (1986). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. California. Univ of California Press. US.

Bourgeois, L. J. (1980). Strategy and Environment: A Conceptual Integration. *The Academy of Management Review*, 5(1), 25. https://doi.org/10.2307/257802
Carey, J. M., & Paulhus, D. L. (2013). Worldview implications of believing in free will and/or determinism: Politics, morality, and punitiveness. *Journal of personality*, 81(2), 130-141. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2012.00799.x

Carr, B. (2007). The anthropic principle revisited. In B. Carr (Ed.), *Universe or Multiverse?* (1st ed., pp. 77–90). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107050990.007

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (4th ed.)*. London. SAGE Publications. UK.

Dignum, V. (2019). *Responsible Artificial Intelligence: How to Develop and Use AI in a Responsible Way*. Springer International Publishing AG.

D'Ariano, G. M., Manessi, F., & Perinotti, P. (2014). Determinism without causality. *Physica Scripta*, 2014(T163), 014013. https://doi.org/10.1088/0031-8949/2014/T163/014013

Finn, E. (2017). *What algorithms want: Imagination in the age of computing*. mit Press.

Grote, T., & Di Nucci, E. (2020). Algorithmic Decision-Making and the Problem of Control. In B. Beck & M. Kühler (Eds.), *Technology, Anthropology, and Dimensions of Responsibility* (Vol. 1, pp. 97–113). J.B. Metzler. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-476-04896-7_8

Hallström, J. (2022). Embodying the past, designing the future: technological determinism reconsidered in technology education. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, 32(1), 17-31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10798-020-09600-2

Harahap, S. R., Daulay, A. A., Padilah, N., Afriani, A., Soraya, A., Aisyah, R. A., ... & Efendi, A. H. (2024). Islamic Counseling as a Pedagogical Strategy for Adolescent Character Development in Globalized Education. *APLIKATIF: Journal of Research Trends in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(2), 177-185. https://doi.org/10.59110/aplikatif.v3i2.493

Hartawan, H., & Rawzalgina, A. A. (2025). The Concept Of Morality In The Qur'an And Its Influence On Mental Health. *ZAD Al-Mufassirin*, 7(1), 177-199. https://doi.org/10.55759/zam.v7i1.297

Hassan, R., & Sutherland, T. (2016). *Philosophy of Media: A Short History of Ideas and Innovations from Socrates to Social Media* (0 ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315515618

Héder, M. (2021). AI and the resurrection of Technological Determinism. Információs *Társadalom: Társadalomtudományi Folyóirat*, 21(2), 119-130. https://doi.org/10.22503/inftars.xxi.2021.2.8

Hussain, M., & Ahmad, K. (2021). Spirituality and Social Support as Predictors of Resilience among Elderly Cancer Patients' Informal Caregivers in Punjab, Pakistan. Journal of Management Practices, *Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(6), 27-35. https://doi.org/10.33152/jmphss-5.6.4

Iskandar, D. H., Nusantari, W., Rahman, I. K., & Alkattani, A. H. (2022). Counseling Guidance From Islamic Perspective, An Ontological View. *Tasfiyah: Jurnal Pemikiran Islam*, 6(1), 143-164. https://doi.org/10.21111/tasfiyah.v6i1.7652

Istati, M. (2018). Islamic Guidance and Counseling in Developing Skills Youth Communication in The Digital Era. *In 1st International Conference on Creativity, Innovation and Technology in Education (IC-CITE 2018) (pp. 252-257)*. Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/iccite-18.2018.55

Krawietz, A. (2019). On Failure of Determinism in Classical Mechanics [Application/pdf]. *Technische Mechanik; 39; 2; 186-198; ISSN 2199-9244*, 0,3 MB. https://doi.org/10.24352/UB.OVGU-2019-017

Lang, B. H., Nyholm, S., & Blumenthal-Barby, J. (2023). Responsibility Gaps and Black Box Healthcare AI: Shared Responsibilization as a Solution. *Digital Society*, *2*(3), 52. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44206-023-00073-z

Lazaro, C. (2023). Algorithmic Divination: From Prediction to Preemption of the Future. *Information & Culture*, *58*(2), 145–165. https://doi.org/10.7560/IC58202

Lee, H., & Kim, J. (2016). Segmentation of overlapping cervical cells in microscopic images with superpixel partitioning and cell-wise contour refinement. I*n Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops (pp. 63-69)*. https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPRW.2016.172

Lundeto, A. (2023). Islamic Education For Adolescents In The Era Of Disruption In Overcoming The Moral Crisis. *Paradigma*, 20(2), 323-339. https://doi.org/10.33558/paradigma.v20i2.7135

McGrath, J. (2024). The Enlightenment. In J. McGrath & K. C. Martin, *The Modernization of the Western World* (3rd ed., pp. 107–113). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003467328-10

McQuillan, D. (2015). Algorithmic states of exception. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, *18*(4–5), 564–576. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549415577389

Moore, P., & Pham, H. V. (2020). Informatics and the Challenge of Determinism. *Sci*, *2*(3), 59. https://doi.org/10.3390/sci2030059

Mulawarman, M., Antika, E. R., Soputan, S. D. M., Aini, P. N., Afriwilda, M. T., & Prabawa, A. F. (2023). How is the Muslim Counselor's Experience in Implementing Single-Session Online Counseling on Adolescent?. *Islamic Guidance and Counseling Journal*, 6(1), 130–151. https://doi.org/10.25217/igcj.v6i1.3376

Natale, S., Bory, P., & Balbi, G. (2019). The rise of corporational determinism: Digital media corporations and narratives of media change. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, *36*(4), 323–338. https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2019.1632469

Nichols, S., & Knobe, J. (2007). Moral responsibility and determinism: The cognitive science of folk intuitions, *Nous*, 41(4), 663-685. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1468-0068.2007.00666.X

O'Neil, C. (2017). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.

Pleasants, N. (2018). Free Will, Determinism and the "Problem" of Structure and Agency in the Social Sciences. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, *49*(1), 3–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/0048393118814952

Prunkl, C. (2022). Human autonomy in the age of artificial intelligence. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, *4*(2), 99–101. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-022-00449-9

Putri, D. L. (2024). Analysis of Islamic University Counselor Interpersonal Communication Skills. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(8), 4351-4369.https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.8080333

Reill, P. H. (2005). *Vitalizing Nature in the Enlightenment*. University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520931008

Roberts, S. L. (2019). Big Data, Algorithmic Governmentality and the Regulation of Pandemic Risk. *European Journal of Risk Regulation*, *10*(1), 94–115. https://doi.org/10.1017/err.2019.6

Selbst, A. D., & Powles, J. (2017). Meaningful information and the right to explanation. *International Data Privacy Law*, *7*(4), 233–242. https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/ipx022

Situmorang, T. P., & Ritonga, A. D. (2025). TikTok and Politics: A Bibliometric Mapping of Research Trends. *Studies in Media and Communication*, *13*(3), 212. https://doi.org/10.11114/smc.v13i3.7616

Solomon, R. C. (2003). On fate and fatalism. *Philosophy East and West*, 53(4), 435-454. https://doi.org/10.1353/PEW.2003.0047

Suchman, L. A. (2007). *Human-machine reconfigurations: Plans and situated actions* (2nd ed). Cambridge University Press.

Zerilli, J., Knott, A., Maclaurin, J., & Gavaghan, C. (2019). Algorithmic Decision-Making and the Control Problem. *Minds and Machines*, *29*(4), 555–578. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-019-09513-7

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power* (Paperback edition). Profile Books.

***Conflict of Interest Statement**: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.*