



DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20007973

# FREEDOM, NECESSITY, AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR: RECONSTRUCTING SUBJECTIVITY IN THE STRUCTURES OF REAL LIFE

Nguyen Van Y\*

University of Finance - Marketing  
Email: [nvy@ufm.edu.vn](mailto:nvy@ufm.edu.vn)  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0003-3069-9836>

Received: 02/04/2026  
Accepted: 23/04/2026

Corresponding Author: Nguyen Van Y  
([nvy@ufm.edu.vn](mailto:nvy@ufm.edu.vn))

## ABSTRACT

*This article examines the relationship among necessity, freedom, and human behavior, proposing a reconstruction of subjectivity grounded in real-life conditions. It argues that freedom is not opposed to necessity but emerges within it through conscious action. The central problem posed is the distortion of freedom as behavior is increasingly dominated by norms, habits, and technocratic mechanisms, leading to a decline in the individual's capacity for conscious choice. In terms of methodology, the study uses an interdisciplinary philosophical approach, combining conceptual analysis, phenomenology, and criticism. Conceptual analysis clarifies the meanings of key categories such as freedom, necessity, and behavior; phenomenology that restructures life experience from needs to actions; while the critical method points to the role of norms and currencies in shaping and alienating behavior. The results show that freedom is not the opposite of necessity, but exists in the condition of necessity itself through conscious behavior. However, when behavior is standardized and repeated, freedom is replaced by compliance, causing the subject to lose autonomy. The article concludes that restoring freedom does not require negating social structures, but re-establishing behavior as a conscious process of choice and responsibility.*

---

**KEYWORDS:** Freedom, Necessity, Behavior, Subject, Norm, Alienation.

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary context, human life is increasingly dominated by normative systems, institutions, and technocratic mechanisms. As a result, behavior no longer arises directly from lived needs but is guided by external criteria. In many cases, behavior is no longer a manifestation of the subject but a reaction to standardized requests. This raises a fundamental philosophical question: whether human beings still act as free subjects or have become products of the very structures they create. Along with this, the rise of repetition, habituation, and automation in life, from labor and consumption to forms of social interaction, has led to a decline in the ability to make conscious choices. When behavior is conditioned by efficiency, norms, or quantifiable benefits, freedom is gradually identified with the ability to adapt or conform. Responsibility, which is an inevitable consequence of freedom, is also accordingly shifted from the individual to the system. In this context, the re-examination of the relationship among necessity, freedom, and behavior is not only theoretical but also an urgent requirement for understanding and re-establishing man's position as a living subject in real life.

## 2. OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH SITUATION

The question of the relationship between freedom and necessity has long been at the heart of philosophy, especially in the debates about the will and the determinism of nature (Kane, 2002). In this tradition, four main groups of positions can be distinguished: determinism, compatibilism, existentialism, and action theory.

First, from a deterministic standpoint, human behavior is seen as the result of an objective chain of causation, in which prior conditions dictate every action. From this perspective, freedom is not a real capacity but merely a subjective perception arising from a lack of understanding of the causes that govern behavior (Honderich, 1993). This position has the advantage of explaining the regularity of the natural world, but it struggles to explain the subjective experience of choice and responsibility.

Second, compatibilism seeks to reconcile necessity and freedom by arguing that freedom does not exclude necessity, but exists when behavior is in accordance with the subject's will, motivation, and internal structure (Ayer, 1954). According to this approach, an action can still be seen as free even if it is conditioned by previous conditions, as long as it reflects the individual's desires. However, this view

is still criticized because it has not fully resolved the problem of the origin of the will and the true level of the subject's autonomy.

Third, in existential philosophy, freedom occupies the fundamental position of the human person, in which the individual must always choose and take responsibility for himself in all circumstances (Sartre, 2007). Freedom here is not an optional possibility but a condition of human existence. However, this approach tends to absolutize freedom and does not adequately clarify the role of physical, social, and historical conditions in shaping behavior (Warnock, 1965). In parallel, phenomenology adds that humans have always existed in relation to the living world, where meaning is formed through experience and behavior (Merleau-Ponty, 2012).

Fourth, the philosophy of action shifts its focus from metaphysical issues to behavioral analysis as the central point for understanding the subject. Accordingly, man does not exist as an existing entity but is defined through his actions (Davidson, 1980). This view is further developed by emphasizing that action is not only a physical event but also a process that carries meaning associated with reason and purpose (Anscombe, 1957). From this perspective, freedom is understood as the ability to act rationally under specific conditions (Frankfurt, 1971).

In addition to these positions, sociological and critical approaches emphasize the role of norms and social structures in shaping behavior. Human behavior does not take place in a void but is always governed by social norms and institutions (Durkheim, 1982). In the modern context, economic and monetary systems act as intermediaries that transform human relations, as value is converted into universal units of measurement (Simmel, 2004), leading to the risk of alienation, where people no longer act as subjects but as elements of the system of exchange (Marx, 2004).

More recently, interdisciplinary approaches have continued to assert that freedom should be understood as the ability to choose in limited conditions, rather than as outright negativity (Dennett, 2003). At the same time, some studies emphasize that the decline in the capacity for conscious action in modern society is directly related to the process of normalization, habituation, and automation of behavior (Arendt, 1998).

Although these positions have offered diverse approaches, a significant research gap remains. First, deterministic and compatible theories focus primarily on causal or volitional structures, but do not clarify the role of behavior as a specific intermediate process between necessity and

freedom. Second, existential philosophy emphasizes individual responsibility but does not fully explain the distortion of behavior under systemic social conditions. Third, the philosophy of action, although it clarifies the role of action, does not fully integrate normative, monetary, and social structure factors in shaping behavior. Finally, critical approaches to alienation, while pointing to the role of the system, do not provide a unified theoretical model for explaining how subjects are distorted and can be reconstructed through behavior.

This study is situated at the intersection of existentialism, phenomenology, and critical social theory. While Jean-Paul Sartre emphasizes radical freedom and responsibility, and Maurice Merleau-Ponty situates subjectivity within lived experience, this paper extends these traditions by integrating structural constraints emphasized by Émile Durkheim and Karl Marx. Accordingly, freedom is conceptualized as a process enacted within necessity through behavior. From this gap, the paper aims to restructure the relationship among necessity, freedom, and behavior by viewing behavior as the intersection of objective conditions and conscious choice, and by clarifying the conditions under which the subject can be alienated or reconstituted in real life.

### 3. RESEARCH METHODS

This paper adopts an interdisciplinary philosophical methodology, combining conceptual analysis, phenomenological restructuring, and critical approaches to clarify the relationship among necessity, freedom, and behavior in human life. The focus of the method is not on describing surface phenomena, but on tracing the underlying structure of behavior as the possible condition of freedom (Human Philosophy, 2025). First, the conceptual analysis method is used to clarify the connotations of central categories, including necessity, freedom, behavior, norms, and responsibilities. These concepts are not understood as static entities but as situated in dynamic relationships, where each category is meaningful only when defined in relation to the others. This approach allows us to avoid pure abstraction and bring concepts back to the foundations of real life. This study is strictly non-empirical and does not rely on survey or interview data, but develops its argument through conceptual and theoretical analysis.

Next, the phenomenological method is applied to restructure the human life experience from within, through analysis of the chain of movement from needs to behaviors, and from behaviors to

responsibility. Rather than assuming an existing subject, the article treats the subject as the result of action, formed and transformed over time. This allows for free identification not as a fixed property, but as a process carried out under specific conditions. Additionally, critical methods are used to analyze how social structures, such as norms and currencies, shape and distort behavior. By comparing behavior as a conscious choice and behavior as compliance, the article clarifies the forms of subjective alienation in modern life. Finally, the synthesis method is applied to connect individual analyses into a unified theoretical structure, in which behavior is conceptualized as the intersection of necessity and freedom, and as a foundation for re-establishing the human subject in real life.

## 4. DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

### 4.1. *Natural Awareness and Human Freedom*

Perception is not the accumulation of discrete facts. It is relational awareness. Objects gain meaning only within networks of space, time, and movement. Interdisciplinary studies show that knowledge becomes coherent only when situated in a whole (Bojarczuk, 2026). Philosophically, this implies that reality is structurally unified. Therefore, cognition must place objects within their conditions of existence. All measurements involve uncertainty (Pfeifer et al., 2025). This is not merely technical but epistemic. Knowledge is not the possession of truth, but an ongoing approximation under limitation. Therefore, mathematics is internally consistent but not necessarily empirically valid. Detached from experience, it becomes a closed system. Experimental research shows that theory gains validity only through testing (Kelly, 2025); thus, truth lies in the relationship between theory and lived reality.

Space, time, and movement are interdependent. The choice of reference frame shapes understanding. Therefore, perception is always situated and non-neutral. Science itself is a social activity (Alberts et al., 2025). Knowledge reflects not only the world but also the conditions of the knower. Objectivity is therefore conditioned, not absolute. When applied to human existence, the object of cognition shifts from things to action. Humans are not static entities but processes of acting. Freedom must therefore be understood as the capacity to act. Communication research shows that behavior is inherently interactive (Higham, 2025). The subject does not precede action but emerges through it. Freedom is thus relational and enacted.

Human capacities develop through interaction with the environment (David-Tenorio & Torres-Rojas, 2025). This implies that individuality is not

fixed but formed. Freedom is the capacity for transformation through action. Differences between individuals lie less in biology than in patterns of action. Empirical studies link traits to moral behavior. Behavior is, therefore, the site where ethical structure becomes real. Creativity expands the field of possible action. Organizational studies show that innovation depends on creative activity (Asif & Shahbaz, 2025). Freedom is thus not only choosing among options, but generating new ones. The body follows natural necessity, but its needs are not fulfilled in a predetermined way. Freedom arises in this indeterminate space. Biological research shows life as a complex organization (Navarro-Quiroz et al., 2026), suggesting that freedom is a higher-order form of natural organization.

Needs initiate action but do not determine its form. Social research shows that human needs are diverse and dynamic (Camelia et al., 2025). The gap between need and action constitutes the condition of freedom. Action not only satisfies needs but reshapes them. It is both reactive and constructive. Humans, therefore, do not merely adapt but transform their conditions. Ecology demonstrates that elements gain meaning only relationally (McPeck, 2025). Humans are part of nature and agents of its transformation. Behavior mediates this dual relation. Research in robotics shows that adaptability determines effectiveness (Woodman & Kramer-Bottiglio, 2025). Philosophically, this implies that freedom is not escape from conditions, but the capacity to act within them. The decisive difference of humans lies in responsibility. Ethical studies show that responsibility cannot be eliminated (Frost, 2025). Freedom, therefore, necessarily entails responsibility. In conclusion, perception is not the grasp of isolated objects. It is the understanding of the relation between necessity and freedom in action. In action, humans are both conditioned and self-determining, and only through this can they exist as free subjects.

#### **4.2. Conduct, Freedom, and Responsibility**

Needs are the starting point of life, but they do not create human life on their own. Needs only become life when fulfilled through action. Thus, behavior is not a mere biological reaction, but a form in which man realizes himself. Behavior is not a purely natural phenomenon. It always carries a social structure. Research shows that behavior is simultaneously influenced by beliefs, competencies, and norms (Herath et al., 2020), from which the thesis can be drawn: behavior is always a mediated process in which nature is inevitably transformed into socially meaningful action. From there, freedom does not

exist outside of behavior. It appears only in the ability to choose how to act in the conditions that are already there. Without behavior, freedom is just a concept; when the act is completely regulated, the content is freely lost. However, not every behavior is free behavior. When the behavior repeats itself long enough, it turns into a habit. Empirical research shows that habit impairs conscious control (Berinsky et al., 2012), so philosophically, repetition can transform behavior from free to inevitable.

When the behavior is habitualized, it loses its function of establishing the subject. It only reproduces what it already has. Therefore, satisfying a need does not necessarily equate to freedom; a life can be productive yet unfree if its actions are repetitive. In such conditions, people no longer appear as subjects but as products of the system. Studies on commodity societies show that individuals are increasingly synchronized by the mechanisms of production and consumption (Chien et al., 2025), from which it can be affirmed that alienation is not only in consciousness but in the structure of behavior. In contrast, deprivation does not produce freedom on its own. Suffering only shows the limits of existence. Freedom only comes when people act consciously to overcome that limit. Studies on ethical behavior show that value orientation is associated with benevolent behavior (Lei et al., 2026). The philosophical thesis here is that morality does not exist prior to behavior, but only in behavior. Value is only real when implemented. From there, the individual cannot be understood as a fixed biological entity. The individual is the result of the course of action. Thus, human history is not just about natural adaptation, but the process of transforming need into freedom through behavior.

Behavior plays an intermediary role between the body and the world. Needs are inevitable, but how to implement needs always opens up choices. It is this range of choice that is the condition of the emergence of freedom. Therefore, freedom is not the opposite of necessity. It arises in the heart as inevitable as the ability to choose how to act. Freedom does not break conditions but restructures the way people live within them. However, freedom is always associated with responsibility. An act is only free when the subject is responsible for it. Responsibility is not an external consequence, but an intrinsic structure of freedom. When entering social life, behavior is affected by norms. Institutions shape the way people act (Bogdandy et al., 2017), from which it is deduced that socialized behavior is always at risk of being replaced by compliance. It is necessary to distinguish between two types of behavior. Free behavior is

consciously chosen behavior. Standard behavior is an act that is performed because it has been prescribed. The two forms may be similar, but differ in nature.

When the norm supersedes judgment, responsibility shifts from the subject. Research on organizational ethics shows that rules can serve as a mechanism for avoiding responsibility (Yasmin et al., 2024), implying that norms do not create ethics without personal choice. Humans then act as part of the mechanism. They react according to process instead of selection. Research on intelligent systems shows that humans are prone to becoming passive agents if they lose their ability to reflect (Gong et al., 2026), from which it is inferred that the subject exists only when they can reflect. So freedom is not a state of availability. It is a process. It only appears when humans are aware of their ability to choose and implement it. Freedom is also historic. It develops along with social conditions and the capacity for action. Research on innovation shows that new possibilities emerge only when humans expand their capacity to act (Gama & Magistretti, 2025). Hence, freedom is not just a choice but also the ability to choose.

However, in a monetary society, freedom is easily distorted into power. When value is attributed to quantity (Quoc & Van, 2024), freedom is understood as the ability to own rather than the ability to live. This is the corrupt form of freedom. Therefore, true freedom lies not in possession but in the ability to master behavior. A free person does not have a lot, but one who is not completely governed by the logic of possession. From this, it can be concluded that the problem does not lie in eliminating needs or norms. The problem is to re-establish the relationship between them - the need to go through conscious behavior. Standards must be subject to the judgment of the subject. Only when behavior becomes a conscious choice associated with responsibility does the human being exist as a subject. At that time, freedom is no longer a concept, but a form of life.

### **4.3. Standards, Currency, and Ownership**

Freedom does not exist outside of life. It is only content when it is tied to behavior and to the ability to master behavioral outcomes. Therefore, ownership is first and foremost a relationship in which the subject is confirmed through his product. Political economy studies show that property rights play a central role in the organization of labor and resources (Levi & Russell, 2025). From this, it can be deduced that ownership is not only a human-animal relationship but also a mechanism for establishing or depriving the subject of status. However, possession

is not the same as freedom. It is only a form of freedom when associated with the act of living. When separated from behavior, possession transforms into a tool of control and stratification. Labor and sexual relations are both forms of exercising the right to life. However, in society, when people are conditioned by institutions and power and their behavior is governed entirely from the outside, behavioral freedom declines.

From there, the standard appeared. Standards form when specific behaviors are abstracted into a general measure. When legalized, it becomes a tool for classifying and controlling people. Initially, standards and currencies were instrumental. One party organizes the behavior, and the other serves as an intermediary. However, when tools become the purpose, life is turned upside down: people serve standards and currencies rather than the other way around. Research on legitimacy shows that what is considered valid is often simultaneously the governing mechanism (Eyal & Fu, 2025). Therefore, the standard is not neutral; it is always associated with the power to define what is right. Currencies also operate according to this logic. When it becomes a universal measure, it translates living value into quantitative value. As a result, freedom is reinterpreted as the ability to possess rather than the ability to live.

Studies of automated systems show that behavior can be integrated into a pre-designed process (Fudulu et al., 2026). Philosophically, this suggests that when behavior is standardized, the subject is gradually removed from the center of decision-making. From there, the basic behaviors are distorted. Labor becomes a buy-and-sell function. Person-to-person relations are pulled into the logic of exchange. At that time, human life capacity is commercialized. Studies on commodity economics show that labor power is attributed to exchange value (Lam & Quoc, 2025). The philosophical thesis is that when behavior is valued, freedom is transformed into an object that can be bought and sold. The standard and the currency do the same thing: the abstraction of life. On the one hand, people are reduced to measurable attributes; on the other, relations are reduced to the amount of exchange. When combined, they place their lives under impersonal power.

As a result, moral values can also be distorted. When standardized into distribution criteria, they become control tools. Legal research shows that norms always operate in multi-tiered power networks (Krajewska, 2015), so ethics can be translated into governance techniques. In

organizations, individuals are forced to adapt to standards. This is necessary to operate the system. However, when compliance becomes purpose, creativity and responsibility diminish. Management research shows that standardization increases efficiency (Dalban et al., 2026). Philosophically, however, systemic efficiency is often achieved by narrowing the subject's free space. For example, in contemporary organizational environments, employees often follow standardized performance indicators such as KPIs. While such behavior appears efficient, it may not reflect conscious choice but rather compliance with institutional norms. In such cases, behavior ceases to be an expression of subjectivity.

When the behavior is completely regulated, the responsibility is also shifted. The individual is only responsible for compliance, not for the meaning of the behavior. This is a form of irresponsibility in the technocratic system. Research on norm fragmentation shows that responsibilities become difficult to define when regulation overlaps (Bagi et al., 2026). Therefore, the more norms there are, the easier it is for the subject to dissolve into the mechanism. It is necessary to distinguish between personal freedom and organizational freedom. Freedom is not just a choice within the scope of permission. It requires self-determination associated with responsibility.

Studies of transnational order show that norms are only part of life (Duval, 2018). Therefore, no system can represent the whole truth of life. When the norm exceeds the limit, it turns people into vehicles. At that time, the so-called cause of man forces man to submit to it. This is a structural form of falsehood. This alienation enters the inner life. People begin to judge themselves by external standards. Ownership does not liberate, but creates new dependence. Recent studies show that modern life is a space of conflict between values, power, and markets (Nhung & Quoc, 2025). From there, it can be affirmed that alienation not only comes from the outside but also from the internalization of the dominant logic. However, the process is reversible. When the norm causes a life crisis, people begin to doubt it. Research shows that perception changes when old assumptions are challenged (da Silva et al., 2026), thereby freeing the subject from dependence.

Truth, therefore, is not an abstract proposition. It is the conformity between behavior and life. When the norm legitimizes the wrong, the truth appears as a need. Studies on modeling show that organizational structures are only effective when they are relevant to reality (Janes & Lazzara, 2025).

The philosophical thesis is that not all standards are wrong, but all standards must serve life. So it is not a matter of getting rid of standards or currencies. The problem is to limit them to the tool role. When they become a purpose, they distort life. Ownership also needs to be reinterpreted. It is not only the right to own things, but the right of the subject to their behavior and living conditions. Only in this understanding is possession associated with freedom. Re-establishment of freedom is the re-establishment of the subject in behavior. People must choose, evaluate, and take responsibility for their actions. At that time, standards and currencies return to their role as tools, and life is free from corruption.

#### **4.4. Norms, Enslavement, and Freedom**

Standards are not neutral. It is the product of historical conditions and power structures. Research shows that social categories are formed from the practice of life (Merlo Pinzón et al., 2026), so the norm is not an eternal truth but must always be tested by life. When it is still associated with reality, norms are behavior-oriented. When it is separated from reality, it legitimizes the wrong. So, the most dangerous falsehood is not the individual, but the normalized falsehood. The process of forming standards is always associated with establishing valid criteria (Verschraegen, 2018). This shows that power works by defining what is right. Whoever controls the standard controls how reality is understood. False norms do not exist through violence, but through habit. A wrong thing can be accepted if it is long enough and popular enough. Therefore, validity does not guarantee correctness.

Legal research shows that norms always operate in power networks (Bengoetxea, 2022). From this, it can be deduced that no standard guarantees its value. Every standard needs to be criticized. When people follow the wrong norm, they fall into slavery. This enslaved person did not need to be coerced. It is an unconscious submission to the wrong disguised as the right. Research on reflective impairment shows that a loss of critical capacity leads to pattern dependence (Guo et al., 2026). The philosophical thesis is that slavery begins when the subject loses the ability to distinguish between reality and what is presented as reality. In social organization, norms are easy to shift from tools to control mechanisms. Institutions not only organize behavior but also shape how people understand life (Brinks & Pérez, 2025). At that time, dependence is not only material but also spiritual.

The difference between individuals does not lie in knowledge, but in the ability to face the truth.

Research on reflection shows that cognition depends on the capacity for self-examination (Chelouche-Dwek & Fonagy, 2026). So freedom begins with reflection, not from the accumulation of information. Education can liberate or standardize people. When education only trains adaptation, it reproduces submission. Educational research shows that the learning environment is only valuable when it nurtures the subject (Maginnis, 2025). When education loses its critical function, creativity declines. A stable order does not prove it right. Many injustices exist mainly because of the stability maintained by norms and habits. Slavery is not a permanent state. It is broken when the norm causes a life crisis. Risk management research shows that change starts with risk identification (Sanders et al., 2024), so freedom starts with questioning.

Freedom does not begin with a declaration, but from the experience of wrong. When people recognize the gap between norms and their lives, they begin to break free from subordination. Therefore, freedom is first and foremost the capacity to discriminate. This distinction requires reason and verification. Benchmark research shows that conclusions are subject to empirical testing (Chang & Wang, 2024). Therefore, a norm is valid only when it is suitable for life, not merely internally consistent. When freedom is not yet a need, people do not fight for it. They can accept injustice as usual. Freedom only comes when falsehood becomes intolerable. However, freedom is always conditional. It can expand or shrink depending on the context. So freedom and slavery can coexist in an order.

Pressure to survive is the cause of maintaining submission. Research shows that modern power organises living conditions in such a way that compliance becomes a safe option (Ergunova et al., 2026). Therefore, critique of norms must be associated with material conditions. As life becomes more diverse, the free space expands. Development research indicates that innovation enhances livability (Edoja et al., 2026). Thus, freedom develops in multi-center structures. In that condition, people are no longer measured by a single standard. Equity entails acknowledging each individual as a unique value (Smith, 2025). Freedom, therefore, is associated with individual dignity, not with homogeneity. To achieve this, people must overcome normative dependence. They must use norms as tools. Research on bias shows that every system can accumulate bias (Ferrara, 2023), so norms always need critical monitoring.

The problem is not to eliminate the norm. Society cannot exist without rules. The problem is to restore

the relationship between norms and life. Norms are only valid when they serve life and expand freedom. When it does the opposite, it loses its legitimacy. This is the final evaluation criterion of all standards. When norms return to instrumental positions, life becomes flexible. Humans can choose and take responsibility. At that time, freedom is no longer a slogan but a way of life. In conclusion, slavery began when people lost their ability to criticize. Freedom begins when individuals recover that capacity and puts the norm under his control. Only then will the behavior return to the truth of life, and the person will exist as a subject.

## 5. CONCLUSION

This article has shown that the question of freedom cannot be understood as a category separate from the inevitable, but must be placed within the structure of human behavior. It is not necessarily the limit that is the opposite of freedom, but the fundamental condition for freedom to appear and be realized. It is in behavior, where needs, choices, and responsibilities meet, that man becomes a real subject. However, in modern society, behavior is increasingly dominated by habits, norms, and exchange mechanisms such as currency. When behavior is no longer the result of conscious choice but becomes compliance or repetition, freedom is structurally distorted, and the subject is corrupted. This shows that the loss of freedom is not the absence of freedom, but the replacement of free behavior with externally regulated forms of behavior. In this condition, individuals may evaluate themselves through external metrics such as income or performance indicators rather than lived experience. This reflects a form of alienation in which freedom is reduced to possession instead of self-determined action. From there, the article affirms that the re-establishment of the human subject does not lie in the negation of social structures but in the restoration of behavior as a conscious process, in which the individual chooses, acts, and takes responsibility. Only then will freedom cease to be an abstract concept, but become a lived practice grounded in conscious behavior and responsibility.

### *5.1. Practical Value and Scientific Significance, Limitations, And Problems Of Continuing Research*

The paper has scientific significance in that it restructures the problem of freedom not as an abstract metaphysical category but as a process associated with real-life behavior. This approach helps clarify the intrinsic relationship among

necessity, freedom, and responsibility and provides a theoretical framework for analyzing the formation and deformation of the subject under modern social conditions. In practice, the study helps to identify mechanisms that impair people's capacity for conscious action, thereby suggesting an approach to restoring the role of the individual as a free agent in areas such as education, labor, and social organization. However, the article still has certain limitations. First, the analysis is primarily based on philosophical arguments and does not yet fully integrate empirical data from the social sciences. In

addition, the scope of the research focuses on the general theoretical level, without delving into specific contexts such as the digital environment or artificial intelligence. In subsequent studies, it is necessary to pursue an interdisciplinary approach that combines philosophy with cognitive science, sociology, and economics to test and enrich the theoretical framework. At the same time, the analysis of new forms of behavior in the context of modern technology will be an important direction to continue developing the problem.

## REFERENCES

- Alberts, B., Nurse, P., Schier, A. F (2025). Science, Education, Leadership, and Politics: An Interview with Bruce Alberts and Paul Nurse. *Annual Review of Cell and Developmental Biology*. 41:1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-cellbio-101323-034601>
- Anscombe, G. E. M. (1957). *Intention*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Arendt, H. (1998). *The human condition (Second Edition)*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Asif, S., & Shahbaz, M. S. (2025). Project Success Through Organizational Climate and Work Behavior: Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Research*, 10(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.51847/cUhkprt6DJ>
- Ayer, A. J. (1954). *Freedom and necessity*. London, UK: Macmillan.
- Bagi, Z., Knop, R., Tulcan, C., Tripon, R., Marinaş, R., & Kusza, S. (2026). Without Borders? The Impact of Political Barriers and Land Use on the Animal Health Dynamics and Genetic Structures of Large Game Species in the Carpathian Basin and Surrounding Regions – A Systematic Review. *Veterinary Sciences*, 13(3), 302. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vetsci13030302>
- Bengoetxea, J. (2022). Legal institutions as comparators of legal cultures. *Oñati Socio-Legal Series*, 12(6), 1647-1673. <https://doi.org/10.35295/osls.iisl/0000-0000-0000-1361>
- Berinsky, A. J., Huber, G. A., & Lenz, G. S. (2012). Evaluating online labor markets for experimental research: Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Political Analysis*, 20(3), 351-368. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpr057>
- Bogdandy, A. V., Goldmann, M., & Venzke, I. (2017). From Public International to International Public Law: Translating World Public Opinion into International Public Authority, *European Journal of International Law*, Volume 28, Issue 1, 1 February 2017, Pages 115-145, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chx002>
- Bojarczuk, A. (2026). Advances in Sport Physiology, Nutrition, and Metabolism. *Applied Sciences*, 16(6), 3061. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app16063061>
- Brinks, D. M. & Pérez, G. 2025. Legalization, Judicialization, Lawfare: On the Light Side and the Dark Side of the Turn to Law. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*. 21:55-70. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-061824-074150>
- Camelia, A. Indah, Enny Narwati, and R. Yahdi Ramadani. (2025). "Threat to Success Integration and Resettlement for Female Refugee: Exercising Poor Rights to Health". *Brawijaya Law Journal* 12 (1):19-42. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.blj.2025.012.01.02>
- Chang, Y. C., & Wang, P. H. (2024). Empirical foundation of normative arguments in legal reasoning. *European Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, 1(1), 69-88. <https://doi.org/10.62355/ejels.18070>
- Chelouche-Dwek, G., & Fonagy, P. (2026). Parent Learning Groups in Alternative Provision: A Mixed-Methods Study of Psychoeducation, Mentalization, and Peer Support for Parents of Children with Neurodevelopmental and Conduct Difficulties. *Children*, 13(3), 431. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children13030431>
- Chien, D. V., Minh, N. T., & Quoc, N. A. (2025). Individuals, work, and coercion: A philosophical critique of freedom, creativity, and property in a commodity economy. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 9(5), 1499-1507. <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i5.7183>
- da Silva, J. M., Bertola, L. D., DeWoody, J. A., Steeves, T., Sunnucks, P., Vilaça, S. T., Hoban, S (2026). Conserving Genetic and Genomic Diversity in Accordance with the Global Biodiversity Framework. *Annual Review Animal Biosciences*. 14:399-428. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-animal-030424-070756>

- Dalban, C. M., Coman, E., Bătrănu-Pințea, V., Anton, M., Para, I., & Mazuru, L. I. (2026). Mapping European Countries' Resilience to Cognitive Warfare. *Administrative Sciences*, 16(3), 160. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci16030160>
- Davidson, D. (1980). *Essays on actions and events*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- David-Tenorio, L. E., & Torres-Rojas, I. S. (2025). Generation of soft skills and their relationship with the social interaction of the individual. *Gaceta Médica de Caracas*, 133, S63-S70. <https://doi.org/10.47307/GMC.2025.133.s1.7>
- Dennett, D. C. (2003). *Freedom evolves*. New York, NY: Viking.
- Durkheim, E. (1982). *The rules of sociological method* (S. Lukes, Ed.; W. D. Halls, Trans.). New York, NY: Free Press. (Original work published 1895)
- Duval, A. (2018). The Olympic Charter: A Transnational Constitution Without a State?. *Journal of Law and Society*, 45: S245-S269. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jols.12112>
- Edoja, P. E., Okoh, R. N., Udueni, E. O., & Aye, G. C. (2026). Macroeconomic Drivers of Poultry Price Volatility in Nigeria: A Study of Inflation and Exchange Rate Dynamics. *Commodities*, 5(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.3390/commodities5010003>
- Ergunova, O., Mukhanova, G., & Somov, A. (2026). AI-Supported Student Skills Profiling: Integrating AI and EdTech into Inclusive and Adaptive Learning. *Social Sciences*, 15(3), 209. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci15030209>
- Eyal, G., Fu, Z. (2025). The Work of Legitimacy. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*. 21:1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-062124-122722>
- Ferrara, E. (2023). Fairness and bias in artificial intelligence: A brief survey of sources, impacts, and mitigation strategies. *Sci*, 6(1), Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.3390/sci6010003>
- Frankfurt, H. G. (1971). Freedom of the will and the concept of a person. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 68(1), 5-20.
- Frost, S. R. (2025). Extinct Primates and What They Can Tell Us About Future Extinctions. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 54:443-458. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-081723-114501>
- Fudulu, C.-F., Boicu, M.-G., Vasluianu, M., Neculoiu, G., & Dobrea, M.-A. (2026). User-Centered Energy Management System for a University Laboratory based on Intelligent Sensors and Fuzzy Logic. *Buildings*, 16(6), 1257. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings16061257>
- Gama, F., & Magistretti, S. (2025). Artificial intelligence in innovation management: A review of innovation capabilities and a taxonomy of AI applications. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 42(1), 76-111. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12698>
- Gong, E. J., Bang, C. S., & Shin, Y. S. (2026). Applications of Large Language Models in Medical Research: From Systematic Reviews to Clinical Studies. *Bioengineering*, 13(3), 365. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bioengineering13030365>
- Guo, M., Wang, Q., Li, M., Sun, L., Wang, T., Xu, G., & Wang, L. (2026). Neural Oscillatory and Network Signatures of Age-Related Cognitive Decline Under Motor-Cognitive Dual-Task Conditions. *Brain Sciences*, 16(3), 335. <https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci16030335>
- Herath, T. C., Herath, H. S., & D'Arcy, J. (2020). Organizational adoption of information security solutions: An integrative lens based on innovation adoption and the technology-organization-environment framework. *ACM SIGMIS Database*, 51(2), 12-35. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3400043.3400046>
- Higham, J. P. (2025). Multimodal Communication in Nonhuman Primates and Humans. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 54:427-441. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-052721-085302>
- Honderich, T. (1993). *How free are you? The determinism problem*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Human philosophy. (2025). *Methodology*. <https://philosophical.website/>
- Janes, K. A., & Lazzara, M. J. (2025). Systems Biology of the Cancer Cell. *Annual Review of Biomedical Engineering*. 27:1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-bioeng-103122-030552>
- Kane, R. (2002). *The Oxford handbook of free will*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Kelly, D. F. (2025). Liquid-Electron Microscopy and the Real-Time Revolution. *Annual Review of Biophysics*. 54:1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-biophys-071624-095107>
- Krajewska, A. (2015). Bioethics and Human Rights in the Constitutional Formation of Global Health. *Laws*, 4(4), 771-802. <https://doi.org/10.3390/laws4040771>
- Lam, N. M., & Quoc, N. A. (2025). The abundance of needs and the role of creativity in human evolution in a commodity economy. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 9(4), 869-879. <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i4.6126>

- Lei, W., Xia, X., Dai, D. Y., & Wang, G. (2026). How Conscientiousness Influences Prosocial Behavior Among Adolescents: The Role of Empathy and Social Support. *Behavioral Sciences*, 16(3), 468. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs16030468>
- Levi, M., Russell, E. (2025). Property Righting: The Politics of Rights Over Land and Labor. *Annual Review of Political Science*. 28:37-56. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-033123-021046>
- Maginnis, M. S. (2025). The Future of Virology Education. *Annual Review Virology*. 12:43-57. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-virology-092623-110921>
- Marx, K. (1992). *Early writings* (R. Livingstone & G. Benton, trans.). London, UK: Penguin Books. (Original work published 1844)
- McPeck, M. A. (2025). The Evolutionary Ecology of Species Interactions: Shared Mechanisms of Natural Selection and Population Regulation. *Annual Review Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*. 56:1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-102723-044137>
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2012). *Phenomenology of perception* (D. A. Landes, Trans.). London, UK: Routledge. (Original work published 1945)
- Merlo Pinzón, J. A., Montero Ocampo, A. L., & Sánchez Maldonado, J. E. (2026). La comunalidad como principio ontológico-político. *Prometeica - Revista de Filosofía y Ciencias*, 33, e21472 (1-17). <https://doi.org/10.34024/prometeica.2026.33.21472>
- Navarro-Quiroz, R. C., Navarro Quiroz, K., Navarro Quiroz, V., Gabucio, A., Fernández-Cisnal, R., Geribaldi-Doldán, N., Fernandez-Ponce, C., Gomar, I. S., Bello Lemus, Y., Zárate Peñata, E., Pacheco-Lugo, L. A., Londoño-Pacheco, L. C., Rebolledo Cobos, M., Acosta Hoyos, A., Pava Garzon, D., Villarreal Camacho, J. L., & Navarro Quiroz, E. (2026). Organizational Principles of Biological Systems. *Biology*, 15(6), 500. <https://doi.org/10.3390/biology15060500>
- Nhung, L. T. T., & Quoc, N. A. (2025). Knowledge, freedom, and responsibility: A philosophical approach to education in the age of AI. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 9(8), 701-710. <https://doi.org/10.55214/2576-8484.v9i8.9398>
- Pfeifer, T. W., Schonfeld, H. B., Scott, E. A., Aller, H. T., Gaskins, J. T., Olson, D. H., Braun, J. L., Graham, S., Hopkins, P. E.. (2025). Limitations and Advances in Optical Thermal Transport Measurements: Extremes in Properties, Length Scales, and Temperature. *Annual Review Materials Research*. 55:37-70. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-matsci-080423-010435>
- Quoc, N.A., Van Y., N. (2024). Protecting the survival of "species" is a social ethic that has become a goal of sustainable development. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning*, Vol. 19, No. 10, pp. 4073-4081. <https://doi.org/10.18280/ijstdp.191035>
- Sanders, A., Khatarina, J., Assegaf, R., Toumbourou, T., Kurniasih, H., & Suwarso, R. (2024). The Omnibus Law on Job Creation and its potential implications for rural youth and future farming in Indonesia. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 65(2), 248-262. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apv.12408>
- Sartre, J.-P. (2007). *Existentialism is a humanism* (C. Macomber, Trans.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (Original work published 1946)
- Simmel, G. (2004). *The philosophy of money* (T. Bottomore & D. Frisby, Trans.). London, UK: Routledge. (Original work published 1900)
- Smith, A. F. (2025). An Analysis of the Colonialist Roots of William Rees's Case for Human Population Decline. *Journal of World Philosophies*, 9(2). Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/jwp/article/view/7031>
- Verschraegen, G. (2018), *Regulating Scientific Research: A Constitutional Moment?*. *Journal of Law and Society*, 45: S163-S184. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jols.12108>
- Warnock, M. (1965). *The philosophy of Sartre*. London, UK: Hutchinson.
- Woodman, S. J., Kramer-Bottiglio, R (2025). Stretchable Shape Sensing and Computation for General Shape-Changing Robots. *Annual Review Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*. 8:1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-control-030123-013355>
- Yasmin, M., Haliah, Kusumawati, A., & Darmawati. (2024). The effect of brainstorming, auditor ethics, and whistleblowers on audit opinions of government financial reports: The moderating role of management support. *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, 14(4), 276-294. <https://doi.org/10.55493/5002.v14i4.5019>