



Received: 03-05-2026
Accepted: 13-06-2026

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Human Dignity in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Realistic Humanistic Approach

Huynh Van Giau

Van Hien University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Corresponding Author: **Huynh Van Giau** [Email: giauhv@vhu.edu.vn]

Abstract

The rapid development of artificial intelligence is creating profound transformations in labor, social organization, power, and human life, and posing a requirement to redefine the place of humans in the process of modern development. In this context, the paper aims to develop an interdisciplinary, realist, humanistic theoretical framework to explain the process of development from survival to human dignity in the age of artificial intelligence. The research is carried out using a realistic humanistic methodology, combined with conceptual analysis, theoretical synthesis, dialectical interpretation, and an interdisciplinary approach spanning philosophy, sociology,

economics, jurisprudence, and technological research. Research results show that survival is the foundation of human existence; labor is a mechanism for developing capacity; creativity is a form of high development of the subject; freedom and responsibility are conditions for people to realize their capacities; and dignity is the result of that development under specific social conditions. On this basis, the paper proposes a realistic humanistic theoretical framework as a new paradigm to orient the development of society, technology, and institutions, to protect and advance human dignity in the era of artificial intelligence.

Keywords: Survival, Dignity, Realistic Humanities, Freedom, Artificial Intelligence

1. Introduction

The rapid development of artificial intelligence, big data, and algorithmic systems is creating profound transformations in all areas of social life. If, in previous periods, the development of science and technology mainly changed labor tools and modes of production, then in the age of artificial intelligence, it is human cognitive capacities, decision-making processes, and social relations that are becoming the areas undergoing restructuring and causing many new issues related to freedom, responsibility, power, social justice, and especially human dignity. In this context, the question of man's place in a world increasingly governed by technical systems has become one of the most important theoretical and practical issues of our time. Besides the great achievements that artificial intelligence brings, technical trends, data commercialization, and social automation also pose the risk of diminishing the role of humans as subjects. Many current approaches either reduce humans to biological conditions and economic benefits or absolutize technology as the decisive driver of social development. Meanwhile, studies of human dignity, freedom, and responsibility are often conducted separately from the realities of economic, political, and technological life. This fragmentation limits our ability to explain the changes that are taking place in contemporary society. From that practice, it becomes urgent to develop an interdisciplinary, realist, humanistic theoretical framework to clarify the process of development from survival to human dignity, both scientifically and practically. The research not only helps reaffirm the central position of humans in the era of artificial intelligence but also provides a theoretical basis to guide economic, educational, legal, and technological development policies toward the goal of comprehensive and sustainable human development.

2. Overview of the Research Situation

Human issues, survival, and dignity have been studied from various angles in the history of philosophy and social sciences. In classical philosophy, Aristotle held that man is a political being who can only fully develop his capacities in public life (Aristotle, 1998) ^[1]. In modern philosophy, Kant defines dignity as the intrinsic value of the human being as an end in itself rather than as a means to any other end (Kant, 1996) ^[8]. Hegel, meanwhile, approached human development through the

process of self-consciousness and mutual recognition in social life (Hegel, 1977) [6]. From the perspective of historical materialism, Marx argued that labor is the basic activity that constitutes the social nature of man and is a condition for man to transcend purely biological existence (Marx, 1978) [10]. Engels went on to assert the decisive role of labor in the formation and development of human society (Engels, 1987) [3]. Modern sociological studies emphasize the role of social structures, power, and institutions in shaping human behavior and development opportunities (Weber, 1978) [22]. Foucault argues that modern forms of power operate through knowledge, discourse, and social surveillance mechanisms rather than through direct violence (Foucault, 1977) [5].

In existential philosophy, Sartre emphasizes that circumstances do not entirely determine human beings but that they are always capable of choosing and taking responsibility for their actions (Sartre, 2007) [18]. Ricoeur approaches the human being as a subject who both acts and interprets himself in history and tradition (Ricoeur, 1992) [17]. Taylor argues that human identity and dignity are formed in socially and morally acknowledged relationships (Taylor, 1989) [19]. Recently, the development of artificial intelligence has spurred many studies on the impact of technology on freedom, labor, power, and human dignity (Floridi, 2014) [4]. Research on social data shows that algorithms are increasingly involved in the decision-making process and the organization of social life (Zuboff, 2019) [23]. The majority of current research still approaches people from distinct perspectives such as biology, sociology, economics, or data science (Joas, 2000) [7].

From the overview above, it is evident that the research gap lies in the lack of an integrated theoretical framework to explain the transition from biological survival to human social dignity in the context of artificial intelligence. In particular, there has been little research to clarify the dialectical relationship among conditions of existence, labor, freedom, responsibility, and dignity as a theoretical whole. It is necessary to develop an interdisciplinary realist humanistic theoretical framework that connects biological, social, economic, legal, and technological dimensions to explain human development in contemporary society.

3. Research Methods

The research is carried out based on a realistic humanistic methodology, with real people at the center of the analysis to clarify the progression from survival to dignity in the context of contemporary society and the development of artificial intelligence. This approach does not separate humans from specific conditions of existence but sees them as a unified whole within biological, social, economic, and technological factors. In terms of methodology, the study employs conceptual analysis to clarify the connotations and relationships among categories such as survival, labor, freedom, responsibility, creativity, and human dignity. At the same time, the theoretical synthesis method is applied to systematize research perspectives across philosophy, sociology, economics, legal science, and artificial intelligence research. On that basis, the dialectical interpretation method is used to identify the process of movement and transformation between objective conditions and the subject's capacity in human development. The study also takes an interdisciplinary approach to connect research findings in various fields in a unified analytical framework.

By collating, comparing, and generalizing existing theoretical perspectives, the paper builds an interdisciplinary, realist, humanistic theoretical framework, thereby explaining the transition from biological survival to human social dignity in the age of artificial intelligence.

4. Results

The results of the study suggest that human development can be explained through a unified chain of movements from survival to dignity. In this development chain, survival is the fundamental condition that ensures the survival of individuals and communities; labor is a method to help people adapt, transform nature, and form social relations; creativity is a manifestation of the development of subjective competencies; and freedom and responsibility are conditions for people to orient their behavior consciously. On this basis, dignity is defined not as an inherent attribute or an abstract value, but as a result of the realization of human capacity under specific socio-historical conditions. The study also shows that artificial intelligence is both a new productive force and a new social environment, which is profoundly impacting labor, power, freedom, and forms of social organization. The paper proposes an interdisciplinary, realist, humanistic theoretical framework to connect biological, social, economic, legal, and technological dimensions to explain and guide human development in the age of artificial intelligence.

5. Discussion

5.1 Human dignity as the foundation of social organization

In the history of human development, the question of human dignity has always been associated with the question of society's purpose. All forms of social organization, from the family, community, and state to economic and legal institutions, are ultimately concerned with creating the conditions for human beings to survive, develop, and affirm their own worth. "Creativity is the value of social life" (Lam, N. M., & Quoc, N. A., 2025, p. 877) [9]. In different historical periods, the understanding of human dignity differs. At one time, dignity was seen as a religious attribute, bestowed by supernatural forces; at another, it was understood as an inherent natural right of each individual; there are also periods when dignity is associated with social status, political power, or economic ownership. The diversity of approaches suggests that dignity is not an immutable concept but a historical category, reflecting the level of development of awareness and of social organization. Value is not a metaphysical attribute that exists independently of real human life. A person cannot have dignity if their basic survival conditions are not guaranteed. When human beings face poverty, war, violence, oppression, or exclusion from social resources, dignity is only a formal concept. Survival is the first foundation of dignity. The price is not the same as survival. Every living thing needs survival. However, only humans can be aware of themselves, reflect on their actions, and construct values that transcend direct biological needs. It is this ability that makes the difference between biological existence and human dignity.

The process of development from survival to dignity takes place through labor and social relations. Labor is not only the activity of creating material wealth but also the process of human transformation of nature and society, and of self-

transformation. Through labor, people develop cognitive capacity, form a sense of community, and build lifestyle values. In that process, people are no longer just objects governed by objective conditions but gradually become subjects capable of orientation and creativity. "It is created according to the law of value" (Van Y, N., Giau, H. V., & Quoc, N. A., 2024, p. 1879). Value cannot be understood as a static state but must be seen as the result of the development of human capacity under specific historical conditions. Personal competence can only be developed through social relationships. No one can achieve complete dignity by personal effort if social conditions prevent their development. A society that perpetuates extreme inequality, discriminates or deprives its members of access to education, health, and employment will undermine the ability of its members to realize their dignity. Value is not only an individual problem but also a societal one. The quality of a society is measured not only by the rate of economic growth or technological proficiency, but also by its ability to protect and develop human dignity.

In modern society, the development of the market economy has created favorable conditions for unleashing individual capacities and expanding freedom of choice. This process has also led to a tendency to conflate human values with economic values. When success is measured primarily by income, assets, or market position, dignity risks being reduced to a value. People can be judged not based on their humanities or social contributions, but on their ability to possess material resources. This is one of the great paradoxes of modern society: an increase in material wealth does not mean an increase in human dignity. The emergence of artificial intelligence makes this problem even more complicated. Algorithmic systems are increasingly involved in assessing competencies, allocating opportunities, and shaping social behavior. In many cases, an individual's value is quantified as data, scores, or performance indicators. This process can improve management efficiency but also has the potential to subject people to technical mechanisms: "The standardization of education according to technical criteria" (Nhung, L. T. T., & Quoc, N. A., 2025, p. 709) [12]. When decisions regarding employment, credit, education, or social security are entrusted to algorithmic systems, the question is how to ensure human dignity is not replaced by purely technocratic criteria.

In this context, dignity needs to be reaffirmed as a fundamental principle of society, not by denying the role of technology or economic efficiency, but by placing them at the service of human development. Technology is only meaningful when it contributes to the expansion of freedom, capacity building, and improvement of people's quality of life. Similarly, economic growth is only valuable when it creates conditions for people to develop comprehensively in material, spiritual, and social life. If technology and economics become self-sacrificing, they can lead to the alienation of social relations and the deterioration of human dignity. Social institutions need to be redesigned according to the principle of people-centeredness. Education is not only aimed at training human resources for the labor market but also at developing critical and creative capacity and social responsibility. The law not only protects property rights and social order but also ensures the practical conditions for each individual's development. The state must not only play a management role but also create a fair environment so that everyone has the opportunity to develop

their capacity. However, "the state is the product of man, but its existence exists in all its forms, one of which is the monopoly on the issuance of money" (Toan, V., & Quoc, N. A., 2025, p. 404) [20]. The market is not only a mechanism for allocating resources, but also needs to be adjusted to serve humanitarian and social goals.

In the framework of realist humanistic theory, dignity is understood as the ability to realize human capacities under what social conditions allow. Dignity does not exist outside of life but is formed through labor, creativity, cooperation, and responsibility. It is both the result of social development and the standard by which to evaluate its quality. A developed society is not the one that owns the most technology or creates the most wealth, but the society that creates the best conditions for people to develop comprehensively and live with dignity. In the age of artificial intelligence, the protection and development of human dignity is not only a moral requirement but also a condition for ensuring the legitimacy of social institutions. When dignity becomes a fundamental organizing principle, the fields of economics, politics, law, education, and technology will be guided by the goal of human development rather than just the pursuit of technical efficiency or short-term gain. This is also the basis for building a new civilization in which artificial intelligence supports human development rather than replacing or dominating humans. In that sense, dignity is not only the final result of the developmental process from survival but also the foundation for organizing and directing the future of human society.

5.2 From labor to creativity: The development of human capacity in the era of artificial intelligence

If survival is the initial condition of human existence and dignity is the highest form of human development, then labor is the historical bridge between these two states. Throughout the process of human development, labor not only creates material wealth but also shapes man himself as a social entity. Through labor, people move beyond their direct dependence on nature, forming consciousness, language, and social institutions. To understand the evolution from survival to dignity in the age of artificial intelligence, it is necessary to clarify the role of labor as a process of developing human capacities and to consider how this process is transforming in the context of new technologies. In the early stages of history, labor was primarily a matter of survival. Humans hunt, gather, grow crops, and raise livestock to meet their basic needs for food, shelter, and self-protection. Under such conditions, the majority of human energy is used to sustain life. Even at this stage, labor is no longer merely a biological activity. As people build tools, coordinate with others, and pass on experiences to the next generation, they begin to form social capacities that go beyond their instincts. Thus, "the survival instinct is the driving force for the survival of species, including humans" (Quoc, N.A., Van Y., N., 2024, p. 4080) [15]. Labor thus becomes a process of transformation from biological survival to social existence.

The development of civilizations has changed the content of labor. As productivity increases, time and resources are freed from the need for direct survival, facilitating the emergence of research, art, education, management, and creative activities. Labor is no longer only aimed at material production but is increasingly cognitive and creative.

Human capacity is expanded not only in physical strength but also in intellectual, emotional, and symbolic thinking. The profound goal of social development is not to maintain labor as a compulsion, but to create conditions for people to develop their capacities comprehensively. In the industrial and post-industrial economy, labor also reveals new contradictions. On the one hand, technology helps to improve productivity and improve material life. On the other hand, many forms of labor are fragmented, extremely specialized, and dominated by market mechanisms. In many cases, workers are judged primarily based on productivity, efficiency, or ability to generate profits. Labor then risks becoming a vehicle for economic goals rather than a process of human development. The separation between labor and human meaning gives rise to disorientation, a decline in subjectivity, and an identity crisis in modern life.

The emergence of artificial intelligence is profoundly changing this picture. If the previous industrial revolution largely replaced muscular labor, artificial intelligence is now entering areas considered characteristic of discourse labor. AI systems capable of processing data, recognizing images, analyzing information, supporting decision-making, and even creating language, art, or scientific products raise an important question: if machines can do more and more cognitive work, then what is the specific role of humans in the future? AI will replace humans in the majority of labor activities. In this view, human value is primarily determined by the ability to compete with machines. That approach tends to identify man with the function of labor and to see labor as the ultimate end of social existence. In fact, the goal of technological development is not to maintain the condition that people have to work more, but to free people from heavy, repetitive, or dangerous jobs. As AI takes over a large share of technical tasks, humans have the opportunity to shift their focus from forced labor to more creative, reflective, and humane work. However, "from pure belief in human values to forms of commercialization, politicization, and moral degradation" (Nam, O. V., & Quoc, N. A., 2025, p. 333) [11].

Within the framework of realistic humanistic theory, the core value of human beings lies not in the ability to perform technical operations faster than machines, but in the ability to create new values. Creativity is not just a scientific invention or an artistic creation, but also encompasses the ability to ask questions, construct meaning, set goals, and restructure social relationships. These activities, associated with life experience, moral responsibility, and reflection, make technical systems difficult to replace completely. The development of AI does not necessarily lead to a decline in the role of humans, but can open a new stage of human development. As basic material needs are increasingly secured by high-tech productivity, society can devote more resources to education, research, the arts, health care, and community development. People are conditioned to expand capacities that cannot be measured solely by economic efficiency, such as empathy, imagination, critical thinking, and social responsibility. That possibility does not automatically become a reality. If the benefits of AI are concentrated among a few groups that own the technology, AI development could increase social inequality. In that case, technology does not liberate people but creates new forms of dependence. A large part of the population may be excluded from the labor market or lose access to development resources. The core problem lies not in the

technology itself, but in the way society organizes and distributes the fruits of technology.

The transition from labor to creativity requires a comprehensive restructuring of social institutions. Education needs to shift from a model of knowledge transfer to a model that develops creative capacity, critical thinking, and lifelong learning. The legal system needs to protect the right of all citizens to access knowledge and development opportunities in the digital environment. Economic policy should aim to equitably distribute the benefits generated by technology rather than just maximizing production efficiency. At the same time, social organizations need to create spaces for people to participate in scientific and community activities in order to develop their capacities comprehensively. In this context, creativity is not only an economic activity, but also a condition for the realization of human dignity. An individual truly thrives only when he or she can actively participate in creating new values for himself and society. Creativity helps people overcome the limits of current conditions, expand their possibilities for the future, and contribute to transforming the world around them. However, "personal liberation cannot be achieved by technical or ethical reforms alone but necessitates a restructuring of the understanding of work, property, and freedom" (Chien, D. V., Minh, N. T., & Quoc, N. A., 2025, p. 1506) [2]. This is a higher expression of freedom because freedom is not only the ability to choose among existing options but also the ability to create new ones.

The development of artificial intelligence does not negate the historical role of labor but changes the content and goals of labor. If in the past labor was mainly aimed at ensuring survival, in the future it is increasingly aimed at developing creativity and realizing human capacity. The transition from labor to creativity reflects the movement from the need to exist to the need for development, from material conditions to human values. This is also an important link in the chain of development from survival to dignity that the realist humanistic theory framework proposes. In that sense, a society that develops in the age of artificial intelligence is not the one that uses the most technology, but one that knows how to use technology to expand human creative possibilities. When labor is liberated from coercion and creativity becomes the central driving force of social life, people will have more opportunities to develop their freedom, responsibility, and dignity. This is the foundation for a new development paradigm in which technology serves people and human development becomes the highest goal of social progress.

5.3 Algorithmic Power, Freedom, and Social Responsibility

The development of artificial intelligence has not only changed the way production, labor, and social communication are conducted but also created new forms of power. If in traditional societies, power is mainly exercised through political, religious, or military institutions, in a digitized society, power is increasingly exercised through data, algorithms, and artificial intelligence systems. This shift does not eliminate old forms of power but creates a new layer of power capable of directly impacting people's perceptions, behaviors, and decisions. The study of the relationship among algorithmic power, freedom, and social responsibility has become an urgent need in developing a realistic humanistic theoretical framework for the age of

artificial intelligence. Algorithmic power comes first and foremost from its ability to collect, process, and analyze huge volumes of data that humans cannot do with traditional methods. Through data, AI systems can identify behavioral trends, predict choices, and even influence personal decisions, making data a strategic resource, similar to land in an agricultural society or means of production in an industrial society. Those who control data and algorithms will be able to control economic, social, and political processes significantly. Power in the age of AI lies not only in material possession but also in the ability to control and process information.

Unlike traditional forms of power that are often expressed through direct command or coercion, algorithmic power operates more subtly. Digital platforms do not necessarily force people to act in a specific way, but often guide choices through recommendations, ratings, content personalization, and user experience optimization. As humans access information primarily through algorithmic systems, what they see, read, or interact with is increasingly influenced by pre-designed technical criteria. In many cases, individuals still feel free to choose, even though the possibilities for choice have been prearranged and shaped, raising an important question about the nature of freedom in the age of AI. In traditional approaches, freedom is often understood as the ability to choose without coercion. In an algorithmic environment, the problem lies not only in direct coercion but also in the ability to control the conditions under which choices are formed. If information, knowledge, and opportunities for action are filtered through algorithmic systems, freedom is no longer just a choice but a matter of access to multidimensional information, the right to understand technological mechanisms, and the ability to critique established directions.

Freedom is not the separation from all objective conditions but the ability to perceive and transform them. Humans have always existed within certain biological, social, and historical limits, but it is the ability to understand and actively influence those conditions that creates freedom. In the context of artificial intelligence, freedom requires humans not only to use technology but also to understand its operating logic and to participate in shaping the rules of technology governance. "People need to orient technological development rationally towards innovation and sustainable social values" (PHAM, K. D., & Quoc, N. A., 2025, p. 798) ^[13]. If humans are just passive users, the power of algorithms can gradually replace the ability to reflect and diminish subjectivity. Another challenge arises as AI systems are increasingly involved in decisions that have a great impact on people's lives. Algorithms are now used in recruitment, credit assessment, insurance review, medical diagnostic support, education management, and many other fields. These decisions can directly affect an individual's development opportunities, income, rights, and social standing. In many cases, algorithmic models act like "black boxes", making it difficult for even users to explain the mechanism that leads to the results fully. At that time, the issue of responsibility becomes more complicated than ever. In traditional social relationships, responsibility is often tied to a specific individual or organization. When a decision has negative consequences, it is possible to identify the

responsible entity through legal regulations or ethical standards. However, in an AI environment, the decision-making process often results from interactions among developers, data providers, system operators, and users. When an algorithm causes discrimination or an automated system has serious consequences, defining responsibility is no longer simple, necessitating an extension of the concept of responsibility from the individual sphere to technical structures and institutions. From a societal perspective, responsibility in the AI era is not only responsibility for current behavior, but also for the long-term consequences of technological development. Every decision regarding the design, implementation, or use of AI can affect generations to come. Technological systems are not absolutely neutral tools but always reflect the values, priorities, and interests of the people who build them. AI development needs to be situated within an ethical and legal framework to ensure the technology serves human interests rather than merely commercial or power interests.

One of the most obvious manifestations of algorithmic power is the unprecedented scale of digital monitoring mechanisms. Every human online activity, from searching for information and shopping to communicating and traveling, can be recorded and analyzed. This surveillance capability facilitates improvements in management and service delivery efficiency, but at the same time increases the risk of invasion of privacy and of personal autonomy. Without the right limits, society can move from governance by law to governance by data, in which human behavior is regulated primarily through monitoring and predictive mechanisms. Freedom and responsibility cannot be considered separate from the power structure of a digital society. A society is truly free only when its citizens can understand, control, and participate in shaping the technological systems that affect their lives. Similarly, the responsibility does not belong only to individuals but also to technology enterprises, state management agencies, social organizations, and the scientific community. Only when these actors share responsibility can AI development take place in a transparent, fair, and sustainable way. "In economic development for the sake of sustainable goals, people cannot just be products of institutions" (Quoc, N. A., 2025, p. 13) ^[14].

Within the framework of realistic humanistic theory, algorithmic power is not merely a threat but a new historical condition that must be recognized and governed. Like every other form of power in history, algorithmic power can become a tool that promotes or hinders human development depending on how society organizes and controls it. The goal is not to reject technology but to build mechanisms that guarantee technology for the development of freedom, responsibility, and human dignity. The future of AI society should not be determined by the level of automation or the computing power of machines, but by humans' ability to maintain their role as subjects in the development of technology. When algorithmic power is guided by democratic, rule-of-law, and humanistic principles, artificial intelligence can become a tool for expanding human capacity. Conversely, if that power operates outside of social supervision, it can undermine freedom and increase new forms of inequality. The restructuring of the

relationship between power, freedom, and responsibility is one of the important conditions for protecting human dignity in the age of artificial intelligence.

5.4 Realistic humanities as a new development model of contemporary society

Analyses of human dignity, the shift from labor to creativity, and the relationship between algorithmic power and freedom in contemporary society are at a critical historical turning point. Throughout the centuries, social development models have largely been built on the goals of increasing productive capacity, expanding political power, or maximizing economic growth. These goals have contributed to great achievements in science, technology, and material life. This same development process has also given rise to new paradoxes such as social inequality, the environmental crisis, the alienation of human relations, and the growing risk of dependence on technical systems. In the context of artificial intelligence becoming a productive force and a new living environment for humanity, the need to build a new development system centered on people has become more urgent than ever. One of the fundamental limitations of many current development models is the tendency to approach people in an individualistic manner. Biological approaches often explain human behavior primarily in terms of survival instincts and evolutionary mechanisms. Economic approaches tend to view people as subjects who maximize benefits. Meanwhile, many technocratic models evaluate people by their productivity, efficiency, or ability to adapt to technological systems. While each approach has value, when absolutized, they can detract from human comprehensiveness. Human beings are not only biological organisms, economic entities, or units of data, but also social, moral, and creative entities.

The realist humanistic theory framework is proposed to overcome that fragmentation by approaching the human being as a unified whole. In this approach, human beings are viewed in relation to nature, society, the economy, law, and technology. Biological survival provides the basis for human survival; labor and social relations facilitate the development of capacity; freedom and responsibility enable people to be subjects of action; and dignity is the result of realizing those capacities in social life. By connecting the different levels of human existence in a unified system of reasoning, the humanities of reality provide a new platform for analyzing and directing social development. The difference of realist humanism from many traditional humanistic systems is that it does not see man as an abstract entity that exists outside of history. Human beings have always existed in specific physical, economic, political, and technological conditions. The protection of human dignity cannot stop at moral statements or formal legal principles. It is more important to create realistic conditions for people to develop. A society cannot be considered humane if poverty, inequality, lack of educational opportunities, or exclusion from development resources persist. The humanities of realism are therefore associated with the construction of social conditions that enable people to develop their capacities and participate in community life in meaningful ways.

In the age of artificial intelligence, this requirement has become even more important. Technology is opening up possibilities unprecedented in human history. AI can support scientific research, improve healthcare, optimize production,

and improve the quality of public services. Without a humanistic orientation, these same technologies can also increase inequality, concentrate power, and diminish people's role as subjects. The problem is not in the technology itself, but in how society sets its goals and uses technology. The Humanities of Realism does not deny the role of AI but emphasizes that technology must be placed at the service of human development. The value of technology is not measured by the degree of automation but by the scalability of freedom, creative capacity, and human dignity. One area in particular that needs restructuring in the spirit of realistic humanism is education. For centuries, education has been mainly organized to impart knowledge and prepare human resources for the economy. As AI becomes increasingly capable of processing information and performing more cognitive tasks, the role of education needs to be redefined. The value of education no longer lies mainly in the provision of information but in the development of competencies that technology can hardly replace, such as critical thinking, the ability to reflect, creativity, empathy, and social responsibility. A realistic humanistic education must be geared towards the formation of people who can master technology rather than rely on it.

The law also needs to be reviewed in the new context. If the law only protects the right to own or maintains social order in a narrow sense, it will be difficult to meet the challenges posed by the digital society. The law should aim to ensure the conditions for the comprehensive development of human beings. "The relationship between law, property, and the individual clearly reflects the paradox of modern life" (Quoc, N. A., & Y, N. V., 2026, p. 22) ^[16]. That includes access to education, information, technology, employment opportunities, and social resources necessary to develop personal capacity. At the same time, the law must create mechanisms to control the power of algorithms, protect personal data, and ensure transparency in the use of artificial intelligence. For the state, the realistic humanistic system sets the requirement to shift from a mere management model to a model that creates conditions for human development. In an increasingly complex society, the role of the state is not only to maintain order or promote economic growth, but also to coordinate social resources to ensure that every individual has the opportunity to develop their capacity. This task requires a combination of governance efficiency and the values of democracy and humanity.

Similarly, the market needs to be seen as a tool rather than the ultimate end of development. The market plays an important role in allocating resources and promoting innovation. When social values are reduced entirely to market values, people are easily judged by price rather than by dignity. The humanities of realism do not deny the market economy, but emphasize that the market must serve human development, rather than turning people into means of serving the market, requiring regulatory policies to ensure that the fruits of technological progress and economic growth are distributed in a way that expands development opportunities for the whole society. From a broader perspective, the humanities can be seen as a new development system of civilization in the twenty-first century. If previous eras were characterized by a struggle to liberate man from dependence on nature, the challenge of the present age is to liberate man from dependence on systems created by man himself. As technology increasingly automates economic and cognitive activities, the most

important question is no longer how much data humans can produce or process, but who they want to be and what society aims to achieve. In the framework of realistic humanistic theory, the answer lies in placing human dignity as the ultimate goal of development. Survival, labor, knowledge, technology, power, and institutions all have meaning when contributing to the expansion of human development. A developed society is not the one with the most technology, but one that creates the best conditions for each individual to develop their capacity, exercise responsible freedom, and live a meaningful life. In that sense, the realist humanities are not only a theoretical framework but also a direction for the restructuring of society in the age of artificial intelligence, towards a civilization in which technology serves the human person and human dignity becomes the basic organizing principle of social life.

6. Conclusion

The study has developed an interdisciplinary, realist, humanistic theoretical framework to explain the process of development from survival to human dignity in the context of artificial intelligence, which is profoundly transforming social life. Value is not an abstract attribute or a pre-existing value. However, it is the result of the realization of human capacity through labor, creativity, freedom, and responsibility under specific socio-historical conditions. On that basis, the article asserts that technology, economics, law, and social institutions should be organized around the goal of human development rather than merely the pursuit of technical efficiency or material growth. Scientifically, research contributes to an integrated approach that connects the biological, social, economic, legal, and technological dimensions of human research. In practical terms, the proposed theoretical framework can be applied to education policymaking, social governance, lawmaking, and human-centered artificial intelligence development. The new research stops at the theoretical level. Further research needs to verify and develop this theoretical framework in specific areas such as education, digital economy, public governance, and artificial intelligence ethics.

7. References

1. Aristotle. *Politics*. Oxford University Press, 1998.
2. Chien DV, Minh NT, Quoc NA. Individuals, work, and coercion: A philosophical critique of freedom, creativity, and property in a commodity economy. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*. 2025; 9(5):1499-1507. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i5.7183>
3. Engels F. *The role of labor in the transition from ape to man*. Progress Publishers, 1987.
4. Floridi L. *The fourth revolution: How the infosphere is reshaping human reality*. Oxford University Press, 2014.
5. Foucault M. *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Vintage Books, 1977.
6. Hegel GWF. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Oxford University Press, 1977.
7. Joas H. *The genesis of values*. University of Chicago Press, 2000.
8. Kant I. *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
9. Lam NM, Quoc NA. The abundance of needs and the role of creativity in human evolution in a commodity economy. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*. 2025; 9(4):869-879. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i4.6126>
10. Marx K. *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. W. W. Norton, 1978.
11. Nam OV, Quoc NA. From survival instinct to religious belief: Socio-systems analysis in a global context. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*. 2025; 9(5):324-335. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i5.6833>
12. Nhung LTT, Quoc NA. Knowledge, freedom, and responsibility: A philosophical approach to education in the age of AI. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*. 2025; 9(8):701-710. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.55214/2576-8484.v9i8.9398>
13. Pham KD, Quoc NA. Human survival - core beliefs for sustainable development in globalization. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*. 2025; 9(3):790-800. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i3.5330>
14. Quoc NA. The dialectic of freedom and necessity: Individuality, norms and creativity in the structure of sustainable development. *Asian Journal of Arts and Culture*. 2025; 25(3), Article e284237. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.48048/ajac.2025.284237>
15. Quoc NA, Van YN. Protecting the survival of "species" is a social ethic that has become a goal of sustainable development. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning*. 2024; 19(10):4073-4081. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.18280/ijstdp.191035>
16. Quoc NA, Y NV. Law, property, and the individual: A critical reassessment. *Prophetic Law Review*, 2026, 1-26. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.20885/PLR.vol8.iss1.art1>
17. Ricoeur P. *Oneself as another*. University of Chicago Press, 1992.
18. Sartre J-P. *Existentialism is a humanism*. Yale University Press, 2007.
19. Taylor C. *Sources of the self: The making of modern identity*. Harvard University Press, 1989.
20. Toan V, Quoc NA. Human creativity and the instinctive circulation of money in the global economy. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*. 2025; 9(4):395-405. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i4.5994>
21. Van YN, Giau HV, Quoc NA. Changes of the state in the commodity economy. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*. 2024; 8(6):1870-1881. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v8i6.2353>
22. Weber M. *Economy and society*. University of California Press, 1978.
23. Zuboff S. *The age of surveillance capitalism*. Public Affairs, 2019.