



Received: 04-02-2026
Accepted: 14-03-2026

ISSN: 2583-049X

Human Life as a Dialectical Transformation: From Biological Instinct to Moral Freedom

Nguyen Anh Quoc

University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Vietnam National University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Corresponding Author: **Nguyen Anh Quoc**

Abstract

The article aims to clarify human life as a dialectical process of transformation among biological instincts, the material conditions of society, and individuals' creative capacity. The purpose of the study is to analyze how human freedom and morality emerge in relation to biological limits and social structures, thereby clarifying the philosophical underpinnings of human development in modern society. The research uses an interdisciplinary philosophical approach, combining qualitative philosophical analysis, dialectical methods, and the synthesis of knowledge from evolutionary biology, psychology, and sociology. Concepts such as instinct, freedom, property, and moral responsibility

are analyzed in relation to social life to build a systematic theoretical framework for human formation. The results show that human freedom does not exist outside of biological and social conditions but is formed through the process of perceiving and transforming those limits. Biological instincts form the basis for life, while social relations and labor activities expand creativity, personality formation, and moral living. It concludes that the sustainable development of society should be understood as the process of expanding the conditions under which human beings can develop their creative capacities, moral responsibility, and ability to live together in a humanistic community.

Keywords: People, Instincts, Freedom, Ethics, Society

1. Introduction

In the current context, human life faces many fundamental issues concerning the relationship among biology, society, and individual development. Rapid advances in science, technology, and economics have profoundly changed the way people produce, communicate, and organize social life. However, along with the expansion of technical competence, many important philosophical questions are also raised: how free are people really in modern social and economic structures? What material conditions ensure the comprehensive development of the individual? Moreover, how to maintain a balance between biological needs, social life, and moral responsibility? One of the most prominent problems today is the increasingly clear separation between people's creativity and the material conditions that determine their lives. In many cases, the development of markets and social institutions has reduced the value of human life to economic criteria such as performance, profit, or consumerism. Individual freedom, then, is at risk of being misunderstood as the ability to choose within predetermined conditions, rather than the ability to participate in the formation and modification of those conditions actively. In this context, it is necessary to examine the relationship among biological necessity, social structure, and human creative freedom. This article approaches the problem from an interdisciplinary philosophical perspective to clarify how the dialectical transformation among biological instincts shapes human life, the material conditions of society, and the individual's creative capacity. Thereby, the article contributes to clarifying the philosophical foundation of human development in contemporary society.

2. Overview of the Research Situation of the Project

The relationship between biological necessity and human freedom has long been a central theme across many fields of philosophy and the social sciences. The human being cannot be understood as a mere biological organism, but as an entity capable of organizing social life and creating new forms of existence through labor and social interaction (Gehlen, 1988) [3]. This approach emphasizes that human nature is formed in the interaction between natural conditions and social structures. In modern social philosophy, many works focus on analyzing the role of material conditions in individual development. Human autonomy is associated with the ability to participate in the organization and control of the material conditions that ensure one's

life (Fromm, 1991) [2]. When these conditions are separated from the individual, freedom risks being reduced to mere formal choices within predetermined social structures.

Besides, human moral behavior does not arise naturally as a biological law but is shaped through the socialization of individual needs and behaviors (MacIntyre, 2007) [5]. This suggests that ethics results from a transition between biological instincts and social norms through human participation in community life. Studies in evolutionary biology also provide important perspectives on the origins of social behavior and human cooperation. Some research suggests that many cooperative and mutually protective behaviors have evolved during human evolution, providing the biological basis for social and moral norms (Wilson, 2012) [9]. These studies contribute to clarifying that human social life is closely linked to the history of human biological evolution.

In social psychology, the formation of human personality and moral sense is associated with the development of cognition and social communication (Bandura, 1999) [1]. Through interaction with others, the individual learns to adjust his behavior to social norms and gradually develops a sense of moral responsibility toward the community. In addition, studies in economics and modern political philosophy raise questions about the relationship among markets, values, and people's moral lives. Some scholars suggest that the expansion of market mechanisms in social life may change the way people value social relationships and human activities (Sandel, 2012) [7]. When social values are converted into prices, many aspects of human life risk being reduced to economic exchanges.

In recent studies of modern society, many authors have also emphasized the role of social institutions in shaping individual opportunities and limitations. Some work suggests that power structures and social institutions can strongly influence people's ability to develop autonomy in social life (Giddens, 1991) [4]. This suggests that individual freedom is not only a psychological or moral issue, but is also tied to the organizational structure of society. Another research direction focuses on developing human capacity as a central element of social development. According to this approach, the development of society should be evaluated not only by economic growth but also by the possibility of expanding opportunities for individuals to develop their capacities and life choices they have reason to cherish (Sen, 1999) [8]. This perspective emphasizes the role of freedom as a fundamental condition of human development.

In addition, the formation of sustainable social relations depends on the levels of cooperation, trust, and sharing among individuals in the community (Putnam, 2000) [6]. When social relationships are weakened or dominated by short-term economic interests, the moral foundations of community life can be affected. Although many studies have approached the problem from different angles, there remains a lack of systematic analysis of the dialectical relationship among the biological basis of life, the material conditions of society, and human creativity. Therefore, the continued study of this issue within an interdisciplinary theoretical framework may contribute to further clarification of the philosophical basis of human development in modern society.

3. Research Methods

This paper is based on an interdisciplinary philosophical approach to analyzing the relationship among the biological basis of life, social structure, and human creativity. Instead of approaching humans from a single perspective, this study sees humans as an entity that is both biological and social, capable of creating and organizing their own lives. This approach allows us to clarify the process by which biological necessity and human freedom are formed and transformed in social life.

The research method primarily used in the article is qualitative philosophical analysis. Through analysis of basic concepts such as biological instinct, freedom, possession, and moral responsibility, the study aims to clarify the theoretical structure of these categories as they relate to human life. The conceptual analysis is combined with the synthetic method to build a systematic view of the formation and development of human life in the context of modern society.

In addition, the article uses dialectical methods to examine opposing relationships such as inevitability and freedom, instinct and creativity, and the personal and the social. These pairs of categories are not understood as separate or mutually negative elements, but as processes of mutual interaction and transformation in the development of human life. This approach allows for the identification of the intrinsic forces that drive personal and social development.

In addition, the research applies an interdisciplinary synthesis method, drawing on findings from evolutionary biology, psychology, and sociology. The combination of knowledge sources from various fields helps clarify the biological basis of social behaviors and the role of social institutions in shaping human freedom and responsibility. Through this approach, the paper aims to develop a comprehensive analytical framework for human life as a continuous transition among biological, social, and creative conditions (Human Philosophy, 2025) [48].

4. Discussion and Conclusion

4.1 From Biological Inevitability to Creative Freedom: The Dialectical Structure of Human Life

Life, whether on a biological or social level, never exists as an isolated entity. Every form of life is formed in a network of exchanges of matter, energy, and information with the environment. In contemporary science, living systems and socio-technical systems both function as complex structures of interaction and feedback, in which adaptation and transformation occur through continuous adjustment processes among the system's components (Almogahed *et al.*, 2026) [10]. For humans, this relationship occurs not only at the biological level. However, it is also mediated by social structures, especially the system of means of production, where human needs for survival, creativity, and social relations are formed and developed. It is in this space that man appears simultaneously as a biological organism and a social entity, where pairs of opposing categories, such as instinct and creativity, need and ability, necessity and freedom, do not exist separately but transform one another in the development of human life (Hing *et al.*, 2023) [26]. The means of production are therefore not only a means of ensuring material existence, but also a space for the

realization of human capacities. The relationship between the individual and the means of production is not a relationship between two static entities, but a dialectical one, in which dependence on material conditions simultaneously opens up the possibility of overcoming those very limits through labour, creativity, and social organization. In many analyses of modern organizational and technological systems, it has also been found that the physical and technical structure of systems can strongly influence how humans act and interact in the social environment (Burton-Jones & Hubona, 2006) ^[15]. It is the differences in position, role, and access to the conditions of production that create the internal contradictions of social life, manifested in opposing pairs such as possession and differentiation, means and purposes, values and prices. Thus, "even with the growing power of nonstate actors, open communication, tolerance for difference, and sincere comprehension are still essential" (Buruah, A. D., 2024, p. 386) ^[43].

In this structure, freedom is not unconditional arbitrariness, nor is it the ability to completely negate natural limitations. On the contrary, freedom can only appear in the heart itself as a new form of organizing life when people are aware of their limitations and transform them into creativity (Gallarotti, 2022) ^[45]. Freedom, in that sense, does not stand outside of necessity but rather is an extension of inevitability at the level of consciousness, where biological and material conditions become the basis for directed and responsible choices. In the context of modern society, power structures and bio-technical control systems can profoundly affect people's mobility, choice, and self-determination (Amoore, 2006) ^[11]. This shows that individual freedom depends not only on subjective will but also on the social and technological structures in which human beings exist. If natural processes operate in a linear causal chain, then conscious human behavior creates another dimension of movement. Humans can direct their actions toward future purposes, and that purpose can have the opposite effect on the present, transforming existing conditions (Akbar, 2023) ^[39]. Thanks to this ability, will and knowledge not only reflect the world, but also become active mechanisms that participate in the process of creating reality. However, when social and economic structures undermine individuals' ability to participate in shaping the conditions of their lives, people can fall into a state of precariousness and vulnerability to forces beyond their control (Butler, 2004) ^[16].

In such circumstances, freedom is in danger of being turned into an abstract concept. The individual is no longer able to participate in organizing the conditions of life, but can choose only within the limits of the pre-established conditions. Freedom was then reduced to the right to choose between the possibilities available, rather than the ability to create and shape one's own conditions of existence. The transformations of economic life and the organization of modern labor also show that organizational structures can create new forms of inequalities in the opportunity and ability of individuals to develop; they create "discrimination in the workplace" (Heilman, M. E., Caleo, S., & Manzi, F., 2024, p.186) ^[31]. The process by which man becomes the subject of life is associated with the ability to master the material and social conditions of existence. This mastery is not an act of pure material appropriation, but a process of liberation from the relations that make man a vehicle of social structures. When the means are subordinated to ends,

and the product of labor is separated from its creator, human life is prone to alienation, in which the individual no longer recognizes himself in what he creates.

In such circumstances, the value of human life risks being reduced to economic criteria such as income, employment status, or consumerism. When value is synonymous with price, when social relations are measured by the possibility of exchange in the market, freedom is no longer the creative capacity of life, but only the choice between forms of consumption. Technical and information systems can also strongly shape the way people act, communicate, and make decisions in social life (Anwar *et al.*, 2017) ^[12]. To fully understand the nature of human freedom, it is necessary to trace it back to the biological basis of life. The human body is not a discrete collection of parts, but a complex self-organizing and self-regulating system. Biological processes such as body temperature regulation, hormonal balance, energy metabolism, and tissue regeneration demonstrate that the body continually seeks to maintain equilibrium through internal feedback mechanisms. These mechanisms represent an early form of biological freedom, in which life is not passive before the environment but actively adjusts to sustain existence.

Feelings such as hunger, thirst, fatigue, or pain are not only physiological signals but also starting points in the formation of consciousness. It is from these imbalances that needs are awakened, behavior is regulated, and new forms of life organization are formed. In this process, the unconscious is not opposed to freedom. However, it is the basis on which life experiences are accumulated and transformed into self-organizing reactions of the body and behavior. From this perspective, the sustainable development of society cannot be understood only as technical growth or the redistribution of material resources. It requires a deeper understanding of the human being as a transformative entity: from instinct to creativity, from biological necessity to social freedom, from the biological body to the moral subject.

4.2 Sexuality, Individual, and Society: From Biological Instinct to Humanistic Creative Subject

Sex is one of the starting points of life and at the same time the intersection of biological instincts and human social life. It cannot be reduced to a mere physiological reaction because in humans, all biological behavior is mediated by consciousness, communication, and social norms. Therefore, sex becomes a special space where the dimensions of the body, power, and society are intertwined in a complex structure of human life (Belcher *et al.*, 2008) ^[13]. In that space, pairs of categories such as instinct and creativity, needs and responsibilities, individual and community are not only opposed but also mutually transformed in the process of shaping human life. When sex operates as a free act associated with love, consent, and responsibility, it opens up a space of human creativity where the individual is not only the subject of desire but also the subject of attachment to others. In that case, sex is not only the satisfaction of biological needs but also a form of profound communication between free human beings, where emotions, beliefs, and responsibilities are intertwined in a humanistic relationship such as "attitudes, self-efficacy, and social norms" (Herath, T. C., Herath, H. S., & D'Arcy, J., 2020, p. 24) ^[32]. However, under certain social conditions, sex can be detached from the emotional base and responsibility,

becoming an object dominated by mechanisms of exchange and power. At that time, the human body is at risk of being reduced to an object of possession or exchange, and the relationship between people shifts from subjective to instrumental. Power structures and control mechanisms can directly impact people's bodies and private lives, transforming personal relationships into spaces governed by social institutions (Jones *et al.*, 2017) ^[30]. This reversal of means and ends not only distorts personal relationships but also profoundly impacts the moral structure of society. From an interdisciplinary perspective in anthropology, sociology, philosophy, and psychology, sex is not only a biological event but also a complex form of social communication. Through sex, people not only regenerate life, but also regenerate social relationships, moral norms, and intergenerational responsibilities. The child is born not only as a result of a biological process but also as an extension of social history, in which the community's values, experiences, and responsibilities are passed down through generations. Physical and reproductive relationships are always tied to broader social structures, in which rules, norms, and power co-shape human life (Giaccaria & Minca, 2011) ^[20].

In this process, the role of the woman cannot be understood as a mere biological function. In the depths of anthropological philosophy, the woman appears as a creative middle ground between what does not yet exist and what is forming. Pregnancy and childbirth are not only biological processes but also acts of life creation, in which biological instinct and human will come together to usher in a new existence. Motherhood, from this perspective, is not only an instinctive reaction but also a form of development of human freedom. In motherhood, the instinct to protect life is transformed into conscious love, and biological cohesion becomes the foundation for a human relationship between individuals. Through this process, biological life is elevated to social life. Interpersonal relationships of care and responsibility play an important role in shaping the moral foundation of community life (DeCaroli, 2001) ^[18].

Nor can the upbringing and education of children be reduced to a pure legal obligation or social responsibility. It is a long-term transformation in which the instinct to protect life is gradually transformed into a sense of responsibility for the future. Parents not only instill biological life in their children but also instill life experiences, values, and abilities that enable them to participate in social life as free subjects. The process of children's maturation can therefore be understood as a journey beyond the limitations of biological necessity toward the formation of human freedom. From simple behaviors such as learning to walk and speak, to more complex abilities such as thinking, creativity, and social communication, every step of a child's development reflects a process of transformation between instinct and knowledge, between nature and society. Children are not only objects of education but also subjects who are gradually forming themselves through interaction with the world. From this perspective, the individual cannot be understood as an isolated entity. Each individual is both a product of social relationships and a subject that reproduces those relationships through his or her behavior and creativity. It is through social interaction and participation that the individual gradually forms his sense of responsibility and position in the community (Darling, 2014) ^[17]. Self-possession is not a static state, but the ability

to master the process of personality formation, in which need is transformed into ability, and that ability becomes the foundation of freedom.

In interacting with the world, humans create many types of products, from behavior and language to physical objects. These products reflect the extent to which humans can realize their capabilities. However, when these products enter into the exchange relations of economic life, they can be converted into commodities and evaluated according to the abstract criteria of price. In such cases, human values are easily obscured by the logic of performance and economic interest. In that process, the individual is both the result of society and the force of social regeneration. When people see each other as subjects who share a common world, social relationships can develop on the basis of trust and cooperation. On the contrary, when others are seen as tools to serve their own ends, social relations risk being transformed into relations of possession and submission, undermining the human foundation of community life. In the context of globalization and increasingly complex social mobility, power structures and borders can profoundly affect people's personal lives and social relationships (Everuss, 2020) ^[19].

The division of labor, an objective condition of social organization, can become a resource for cooperation and development if it enables each individual to develop their capacities. However, if that assignment serves only exploitation and performance goals, then human creativity risks shrinking, and social relations can become fragmented. In the history of human development, social life has become increasingly complex thanks to the formation of intermediary systems such as tools, knowledge, skills, and social institutions. It is these systems that further clarify the dialectical relationship between inevitability and freedom: man is both shaped by material and social conditions, and capable of creating new conditions to expand the scope of his freedom (Berinsky, Huber, & Lenz, 2012) ^[37].

4.3 Possession, personality, and transformation between freedom and inevitability in human living space

Human life, in its depths, is a space of constant transformation between the ability to own oneself and the danger of being possessed by social structures. Human existence does not take place as a purely objective process, but as a network of relationships in which instinct and will, structure and function, individual and community always interact and transform each other. In this network, human social roles, such as the father's role in the family, reflect not only individual identity but are also shaped by the material conditions, property relations, and social institutions in which the individual exists. The social personality of the individual is often perceived and evaluated through institutionalized stereotypes, which, in turn, directly affect people's ability to assert themselves and develop in everyday life (Heilman, 2001) ^[23]. The family is not only a space of private affection but also a social institution in which life relationships are organized and reproduced across generations. In the family, biological life is transformed into social life through relationships of care, education, and responsibility. However, when economic structures and rigid social norms overly dominate family relationships, family members risk being reduced to vehicles for goals outside their own lives.

Not only in the material realm does the transformation between freedom and inevitability take place; it also occurs in the spiritual realm. In the history of human thought, many systems of thought and religion have sought to liberate the human will and awaken the personality. However, in some historical circumstances, these spiritual values can be repositioned in power structures, where their original meanings are transformed. When that happens, ideological systems intended to expand human freedom can become instruments for maintaining social order and reinforcing submissive relations. However, the history of human development also shows another trend: the continuous expansion of human capacities through the development of cognitive and productive means. From expanding the senses with observational tools such as microscopes and telescopes, to expanding intelligence through machines, data, and artificial intelligence, humans have gradually expanded their ability to understand and transform the world. However, with this expansion, the question of the purpose of development has become increasingly important: human satisfaction is no longer tied solely to material needs but also to the ability to live with and for others (Ahmed & Karin, 2024) [40].

In the depths of social life, the individual is not an isolated unit but a crystallization of relationships among needs, abilities, and the meaning of life. Each individual both carries the community's history and contributes to its future. Human value cannot be fully reduced to economic criteria such as income or labor productivity. When people are judged primarily by their performance, role, or ability to meet organizational norms, personality is easily reduced to a set of functional attributes rather than being seen as a living, holistic entity (Heilman, 2001) [23]. However, in modern economic systems, the individual is often organized as a link in the chain of production and services. In such conditions, social communication is easily reduced to the exchange of personality attributes such as knowledge, skills, or professional competence. This reduction can lead to a separation between man and his product, between social position and personality values. When institutions are designed primarily according to the logic of control, punishment, and efficiency, individual behavior is more susceptible to systemic pressure than to self-awareness of the purpose and meaning of action (Herath & Rao, 2009a) [24].

Social segregation, therefore, is not only a functional difference but also reflects a separation between the ability to create oneself and the ability to master what one creates. When the individual no longer recognizes himself in his products and activities, he or she may fall into a state of alienation, where the human being is reduced to an instrument of social processes of production and organization. Pressures from sanctions, norms, and organizational structures can cause subjects to act more in line with the logic of adaptation and submission than with the logic of freedom and creativity (Herath & Rao, 2009b) [25]. At a deeper level, the process of human development can be understood as a continuous transition between needs and abilities. When human abilities meet the needs of oneself and others freely, social relations can become harmonious and creative. Under such conditions, the truth of life does not emerge as an abstract model but as a living entity in concrete individuals, which is "the findings

supported that a model of motivation" (Chen, R., Wang, L., Wang, B., & Zhou, Y., 2020, p. 12 of 14) [34].

In this structure, each individual is simultaneously the result and condition of social relations. One person's capacity can become another person's need and vice versa. Social relations thus operate not only according to the logic of possession but also according to the ability to transform between personality attributes. Even intimate relationships, such as love, reflect this logic: if love stops at the satisfaction of individual needs, it can transform into possession; but if love is understood as the donation of possibilities to one another, it can become a creative form of freedom. From this perspective, social life can be understood as a chain of exchanges not only between material products but also between human capacities. In fields such as education, health, and the arts, individual creativity not only serves their own interests but also creates the conditions for the community to survive and develop. This ability can only be promoted when the individual is not reduced to the object of behavioral regulation mechanisms, but is seen as a subject who can reflect, choose, and take responsibility for his or her actions (Ifinedo, 2012) [27].

On the biological level, all living things exist according to the laws of life. In the natural world, the behavior of species is often governed by survival instincts, where life and death are determined by natural conditions rather than moral norms. However, in humans, the emergence of consciousness and creativity has opened up a new dimension of existence. Humans not only survive but also reflect on their behavior and orient it toward human values. It is the ability to go beyond instinct to create new forms of life that characterizes human beings (Johnston & Warkentin, 2010) [28]. Humans not only use the material conditions of life, but also reorganize them through labor, knowledge, and social cooperation. In the process, human abilities can be transformed into new needs, and needs stimulate the development of new abilities. However, this ability does not happen automatically; It is always placed in the tension between creativity and fear, between freedom and the pressure to adapt. Fear-based and deterrent mechanisms can change behavior, "fear-based enforcement alone." (Badreddine, S. *et al.*, 2026, p. 17 of 21) [35] However, it also shows that people are highly susceptible to being led by external structures when they lack a foundation of reflection and internal autonomy.

The evolution of humanity is not only a biological process but also a moral and social one, in which each individual learns to live for himself and to facilitate others' lives. Man is not born as a complete subject of consciousness; Each individual begins life as a biological organism that has not yet distinguished between instinct and society. It is through interaction with the social environment, via education, communication, and creativity, that the individual gradually forms personality and moral consciousness. The transition between instinct and creativity, between owning oneself and the ability to give to others, thus becomes the basis for the formation of the human being as a comprehensive social-ethical entity. Moreover, it is on this basis that the issues of good, evil, responsibility, and freedom can be fully posed in human life. At this depth, freedom is not only the ability to escape oppression but also the ability to reject forms of power that diminish human dignity and to open up new spaces for the subject's self-creation (Jones, 2012) [29].

4.4 From instinct to morality: the transition between inevitability and freedom in the formation of the individual and community

In the pre-moral stage of human life, the personal self is not clearly separated from that of others. Biological reflexes and direct environmental conditions primarily guide human behavior at this stage, which does not imply the capacity for conscious choice and therefore does not entail a full sense of responsibility. Children in their early development cannot be attributed to "good" or "evil" because they are not yet able to distinguish right from wrong based on reflective knowledge and are not fully aware of the consequences of their behavior. However, it is the collisions with the limits of biology, the social environment, and community norms that become important conditions for the awakening of self-awareness. These limitations, which are the inevitable necessities of life, open up the point of transformation between instinct and creativity, between the unconscious and reflection, between inevitability and freedom. At this point of transformation, man begins to move beyond the pure operation of biological instinct to form morality as a form of freedom associated with responsibility.

Responsibility, in that sense, is not just a norm imposed from the outside by laws or social institutions. Responsibility is first and foremost an endogenous human ability: the ability to perceive the consequences of one's behavior, regulate one's behavior, and direct action towards protecting and sustaining life not only for oneself but also for the community. When society protects children, it is not only the implementation of a moral or legal norm but also the manifestation of the survival instinct socialized through the relationships between the individual and the community. It is "democratic norms, especially on growth of civil society, freedom of speech, freedom of media, still need to be developed for boosting its soft power". (Tanzim, Z., & Juhra, F. T., 2021, p. 466). However, man cannot be reduced to a mere product of biological instinct or of social conditions. In the very structure of instinct are the seeds of creativity, an ability that allows man to overcome the mechanical repetition of material life. This creativity is not only a capacity for tools, but also the ability to create meaning in life through communication, education, and intellectual reflection. As a result, humans can not only adapt to the environment but also shape and transform their environment (Saaida, 2023) [42].

In conditions where human capacity is used purely as an instrument of production and consumption processes, the individual's ability to choose may be narrowed. Moral responsibility then becomes blurred, and freedom risks being identified with the need for survival. This condition can lead to a form of alienation, in which the individual is separated from himself, from the community, and from the meaning of his actions (Charlesworth, 2017) [46]. The contradictions between the individual and society, between inevitability and freedom, between abstract reason and practical life, have since ceased to be purely philosophical problems but existential crises in human life. In many political and social contexts, power structures can strongly shape human behavior and perceptions, thereby governing moral choices through broader institutional and power dynamics (Hagmann & Korf, 2012) [21]. Ethics can only have a substantive basis when the individual re-establishes his or her role as a subject capable of choice, creativity, and responsibility. In the natural world, creatures act on survival

instincts and do not question good and evil. However, in human beings, with freedom and consciousness, the categories of good and evil arise from the relationship between creativity and responsibility for life. Good can be understood as the ability to consciously create and protect life, while evil appears when freedom is distorted into blind submission to the instinct of possession or power.

Ethics does not lie in negating or suppressing instinct, but in the ability to transform instinct into conscious behavior. Through communication, education, and reflection, people learn to evaluate their behavior, recognize its consequences, and direct their actions in line with humanistic values. "These values are mainly knowledge of the meaningfulness of work, communication, passion, and support" (Balková, M., Lejsková, P., & Ližbetinová, L., 2022, p. 8) [36]. The ethical behavior of the individual depends not only on external rules but also on cognitive capacity, education, and the formation of a sense of responsibility in the social environment (Burns *et al.*, 2015) [14]. When property relations are detached from moral responsibility, they can become instruments of domination and differentiation. When purely economic criteria replace social norms and the means are celebrated as the ultimate end, truth is at risk of distortion and freedom of manipulation. However, "principles, economic prosperity, call for the effective implementation of regional and international agreements, reliance on diplomacy and peaceful settlement of disputes can greatly contribute" (Baniya, D. B., 2021, p. 66) [38]. In such circumstances, human values of life can be turned upside down, and human relationships are easily reduced to instrumental ones.

The moral truth of human life, therefore, lies not in the negation of biological instinct but in the harmony between needs and abilities, between possessions and limits, between the individual and the community. The need for survival is an inevitable condition of life; however, when behavior goes beyond that need and becomes an instrument for asserting power or satisfying desires for possession, freedom can be distorted into coercion. When social structures reproduce patterns of power, individuals' abilities for development and autonomy can be systematically limited (Heilman *et al.*, 2024) [23]. In many of humanity's social traditions, rules and taboos do not simply stem from superstitious beliefs, but from human self-limitation efforts to maintain a balance between biological and social life. These principles reflect a form of ecological ethics in which human beings perceive their existence as tied to that of the world around them.

People not only communicate with nature, but also with each other. When one person's abilities meet others' needs, and vice versa, interpersonal cooperation can become a resource for society's creative development. In many areas of modern life, advances in knowledge and technology also show that human capacity can be promoted only through learning, sharing, and the development of cognitive capacity within the community (He *et al.*, 2020) [22]. A person who loves himself does not hurt others, not only because he is afraid of social sanctions, but also because he is aware of the deep connection between his existence and the community's. Human happiness is not the result of instinctual suppression, but rather the harmony between needs and abilities, between the individual and the world around him (Coppock, 2019) [44].

Deep human relationships, such as love, pleasure, responsibility, and creativity, can meet in a congregation of

free subjects. When pleasure is separated from communication and responsibility, it can lead to isolation; when placed within a humanistic relationship, it becomes part of the creative life between people. Occupations and forms of social labor are also the result of a transition between needs and abilities. No one is born with a preexisting occupation; careers form when individual abilities are organized in relation to society's needs, which "influence policies and societal direction" (Carroll, P., & Esposito Amideo, A., 2024, p. 1025) ^[33]. In the context of digital societies and increasingly complex technological systems, the way people interact with technical systems also influences how they make decisions, learn, and shape their behavior in the social environment (Burton-Jones & Hubona, 2006) ^[15]. In that sense, love, labor, and creativity are not separate spheres, but different forms of the same process: the process by which people come together to nurture and expand life. However, the development of governance and control systems in modern society also shows that individual freedom is continually confronted by new power structures, especially in areas related to data, technology, and social governance (Amoore, 2006) ^[11]. It is in recognizing and transforming these limitations that people can continue to expand the space of freedom and responsibility in their common life. But when it "pursues its economic, political and security interests in the region, and enables it to play the role of a great power that enjoys the prestigious capability of attracting foreign citizens and polities alike to engage in relationships" (Hudson, V., 2022, p. 489) ^[47].

5. Conclusion

The article has approached human life from an interdisciplinary philosophical perspective to clarify the dialectical relationship between biological necessity and social freedom in the formation of individuals and communities. The results of the analysis show that the human being cannot be understood merely as a biological organism or as a product of social structures. Man is a living entity in which biological instincts, material conditions of life, and creative capacities are constantly interacting and transforming each other. The free formation of human beings does not occur outside the limits of nature and society. However, it arises in the very process of human perception and the transformation of those limits through labor, communication, and creativity. From the foundation of biological instincts, through family and social relations and civilized institutions, individuals gradually develop the capacity for self-awareness and responsibility, thereby forming their personality and moral life.

The moral problems of man are inseparable from the material conditions and social relations in which man exists. When property relations and social structures allow the individual to develop their capacity in cooperation with others, freedom can become the foundation of human life. Conversely, when these relationships undermine people's ability to take control of their lives, phenomena such as alienation and a crisis of values can emerge. The sustainable development of society cannot be measured only by economic growth or technological progress. However, it should be understood as the process of expanding the conditions under which people can develop creative capacity, moral responsibility, and the ability to live together in a humane community. It is in this continuous

transformation between inevitability and freedom that people can create a meaningful life for themselves and for society.

6. References

1. Bandura A. Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 1999; 3(3):193-209.
2. Fromm E. *Escape from freedom*. New York, NY: Henry Holt, 1991.
3. Gehlen A. *Man: His nature and place in the world*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1988.
4. Giddens A. *Modernity and self-identity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991.
5. MacIntyre A. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* (3rd ed.). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007.
6. Putnam RD. *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 2000.
7. Sandel MJ. *What money cannot buy: The moral limits of markets*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2012.
8. Sen A. *Development as freedom*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1999.
9. Wilson EO. *The social conquest of earth*. New York, NY: Liveright, 2012.
10. Almogahed A, *et al*. Towards an effective refactoring taxonomy for sustainable software systems. *PLoS One*. 2026; 21(1):e0336296. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0336296>
11. Amoore L. Biometric borders: Governing mobilities in the war on terror. *Political Geography*. 2006; 25(3):336-351. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2006.02.001>
12. Anwar M, He W, Ash I, Yuan X, Li L, Xu L. Gender difference and employees' cybersecurity behaviors. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 2017; 69:437-443. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.12.040>
13. Belcher O, Martin L, Secor A, Simon S, Wilson T. Everywhere and nowhere: The exception and the topological challenge to geography. *Antipode*. 2008; 40(4):499-503. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2008.00620.x>
14. Burns A, Roberts TL, Posey C, Bennett RJ, Courtney JF. Assessing the role of security education, training, and awareness on insiders' security-related behavior: An expectancy theory approach. In 2015, the 48th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. *IEEE*, 2015, 3930-3940.
15. Burton-Jones A, Hubona GS. The mediation of external variables in the technology acceptance model. *Information & Management*. 2006; 43(6):706-717. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2006.03.007>
16. Butler J. *Prearious life: The powers of mourning and violence*. Verso, 2004.
17. Darling J. Asylum and the post-political: Domopolitics, depoliticisation and acts of citizenship. *Antipode*. 2014; 46(1):72-91. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12026>
18. DeCaroli SD. Visibility and history: Giorgio Agamben and the exemplary. *Philosophy Today*. 2001; 45(Suppl):9-17. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.5840/philtoday200145Supplement2>
19. Everuss L. Mobile sovereignty: "The case of boat people" in Australia. *Political Geography*. 2020;

- 79:102162. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2020.102162>
20. Giaccaria P, Minca C. Topographies/topologies of the camp: Auschwitz as a spatial threshold. *Political Geography*. 2011; 30(1):3-12. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2010.12.001>
 21. Hagmann T, Korf B. Agamben in the Ogaden: Violence and sovereignty in the Ethiopian-Somali frontier. *Political Geography*. 2012; 31(4):205-214. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2011.12.004>
 22. He W, *et al.* Improving employees' intellectual capacity for cybersecurity through evidence-based malware training. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 2020; 21(2):203-213. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-05-2019-0112>
 23. Heilman ME. Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues*. 2001; 57(4):657-674. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00234>
 24. Herath T, Rao HR. Protection, motivation, and deterrence: A framework for security policy compliance in organisations. *European Journal of Information Systems*. 2009a; 18(2):106-125. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2009.6>
 25. Herath T, Rao HR. Encouraging information security behaviors in organizations: The role of penalties, pressures, and perceived effectiveness. *Decision Support Systems*. 2009b; 47(2):154-165. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2009.02.005>
 26. Hing LSS, Sakr N, Sorenson JB, Stamarski CS, Caniera K, Colaco C. Gender inequities in the workplace: A holistic review of organizational processes and practices. *Human Resource Management Review*. 2023; 33(3):100968. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2023.100968>
 27. Ifinedo P. Understanding information systems security policy compliance: An integration of the theory of planned behavior and the protection motivation theory. *Computers & Security*. 2012; 31(1):83-95. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2011.10.007>
 28. Johnston AC, Warkentin M. Fear appeals and information security behaviors: An empirical study. *MIS Quarterly*. 2010; 34(3):549-566. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/25750691>
 29. Jones R. Spaces of refusal: Rethinking sovereign power and resistance at the border. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*. 2012; 102(3):685-699. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00045608.2011.600193>
 30. Jones R, Johnson C, Brown W, Popescu G, Pallister-Wilkins P, Mountz A, *et al.* Interventions on the state of sovereignty at the border. *Political Geography*. 2017; 59:1-10. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2017.02.006>
 31. Heilman ME, Caleo S, Manzi F. Women at work: Pathways from gender stereotypes to gender bias and discrimination. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*. 2024; 11(1):165-192. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-110721-034105>
 32. Herath TC, Herath HS, D'Arcy J. Organizational adoption of information security solutions: An integrative lens based on innovation adoption and the technology-organization-environment framework. *ACM SIGMIS Database*. 2020; 51(2):12-35. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3400043.3400046>
 33. Carroll P, Esposito Amideo A. Gender equality: Opportunities and challenges for the OR community. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*. 2024; 75(6):1011-1029. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01605682.2024.2343343>
 34. Chen R, Wang L, Wang B, Zhou Y. Motivational climate, need satisfaction, self-determined motivation, and physical activity of students in secondary school physical education in China. *BMC Public Health*. 2020; 20(1):1687. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-09750-x>
 35. Badreddine S, *et al.* Predicting cybersecurity behaviours in higher education institutions: A data-driven analysis of policy, culture, and motivation in the UAE context. *Information*. 2026; 17(2):152. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/info17020152>
 36. Balková M, Lejsková P, Ližbetinová L. The values supporting the creativity of employees. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2022; 12:805153. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.805153>
 37. Berinsky AJ, Huber GA, Lenz GS. Evaluating online labor markets for experimental research: Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Political Analysis*. 2012; 20(3):351-368. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpr057>
 38. Baniya DB. Soft power in the contemporary world: Recommendations to the small states' security. *Unity Journal*. 2021; 2:54-69. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.3126/unityj.v2i0.38809>
 39. Akbar A. Iran's soft power in the Middle East is promoted through the promotion of the Persian language. *Contemporary Politics*. 2023; 29(4):424-445. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569775.2023.2169305>
 40. Ahmed ZS, Karin U. Saudi Arabia's soft power in Pakistan. *Journal of Political Power*. 2024; 17(1):42-64. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2024.2341024>
 41. Zerine Tanzim. Soft Power Strategy of China in the 21st Century: Strengths and Weaknesses. *International Journal of Advanced Research*. 2021; 9(5):459-467. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/12860>
 42. Saaida M. The role of soft power in contemporary diplomacy. *International Journal of Research Publication and Review*. 2023; 4(4):3119-3130. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.4.423.36302>
 43. Buruah AD. Influence of soft power in shaping diplomacy and foreign policy. *Education and Social Welfare*, 2024. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.47362/EJSS.2024.5214>
 44. Coppock A. Generalizing from survey experiments conducted on Mechanical Turk: A replication approach. *Political Science Research and Methods*. 2019; 7(3):613-628. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/psrm.2018.10>
 45. Gallarotti GM. Esteem and influence: Soft power in international politics. *Journal of Political Power*. 2022; 15(3):383-396. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2022.2135303>
 46. Charlesworth H. International Legal Encounters with Democracy. *Glob Policy*. 2017; 8:34-43. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12488>
 47. Hudson V. The impact of Russian soft power in Kazakhstan: Creating an enabling environment for cooperation between Nur-Sultan and Moscow. *Journal*

- of Political Power. 2022; 15(3):469-494. Doi:
<https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2022.2127280>
48. Human philosophy. Methodology, 2025. Access from
<https://philosophical.website/>