Global Journal of Arts Humanity and Social Sciences
ISSN: 2583-2034

GSAR PUBLISHERS
GLOBAL SCIENTIFIC AND ACADEMIC RESEARCH

OPEN ACCESS

Global Journal of Arts Humanity and Social Sciences
ISSN: 2583-2034
Abbreviated key title: Glob.J.Arts.Humanit.Soc.Sci
Frequency: Monthly
Published By GSAR Publishers
Journal Homepage Link: https://gsarpublishers.com/journal-gjahss-home/

Volume - 6 | Issue - 11 | November 2026 | Total pages 1165-1172 | DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24077024

CREATIVE HUMAN BEINGS IN A TECHNOLOGICAL WORLD

By

Dinh Thi Hue
Master's Degree: DNU (Dong Nai University), Vietnam

Article History
Received: 25- 10- 2026
Accepted: 05- 11- 2026
Published: 09- 11- 2026

Corresponding author
Dinh Thi Hue

Abstract

Human beings, at their deepest essence, are not merely passive recipients of the world, but creative subjects—those capable of shaping, transforming, and restructuring reality. Creativity is not an auxiliary ability or the privilege of a select few geniuses; it is the core of humanity, what distinguishes humans from pre-programmed technical systems. This creativity is not limited to the arts, science, or technology, but permeates every action, choice, and way of life. When a person seeks to resolve a conflict, imagines a new way of life, or simply questions seemingly obvious things, they are practicing creativity—an liberating act that allows them to transcend external limitations.

Keywords: Human beings as creative subjects; Artificial intelligence and human potential; Sustainable development and internal balance; Education and the building of free character; From consumer to creator.

1. Humans as creative subjects

In a technocratic context, where technology and money tend to standardize life and suppress differences, affirming human beings as creative subjects becomes a condition for protecting freedom and rebuilding humanity. Digital systems, by optimizing user behavior, have transformed many choices into automated sequences of reactions: people believe they are making their own decisions, but in reality, they are navigating a labyrinth where every path has been pre-designed. From music and fashion to social relationships, everything is gradually being shaped by technological platforms, making creativity rare, fragile, and easily commercialized.

Humanistic philosophy since the Renaissance has elevated man as a free, creative being, transcending natural and social constraints to unlock new possibilities. According to this view, man is not fixed in an immutable order but has the right to shape himself. Pico della Mirandola, in his Discourse on Human Dignity , wrote that man is "the artist of himself," empowered to "sculpt his being" as he wishes. Modern existential philosophy, with Sartre and Camus, continues to develop this concept by viewing man as a self-constructing being in freedom, where every action is an affirmation of subjectivity. Sartre emphasized that "man is condemned to freedom"—meaning he cannot shirk the responsibility of creating himself, even when faced with an absurd and empty world.

However, today's technocratic world is subtly undermining this creative capacity. Algorithmic systems not only optimize consumer behavior but also suggest pre-existing options, gradually turning people into programmed entities rather than self-determining subjects. Every decision – from what book to read, what music to listen to, to building relationships – risks being dictated by recommendation mechanisms hidden within digital platforms. When creativity is confined within pre-designed patterns, people become more like reflexive machines than independent thinkers.

In particular, the commercialization of creativity has made its expressions easily assimilated into the consumer system. In the fields of art, music, and entertainment, creativity is no longer a free exploration, but is packaged into products for mass consumption. Consumers think they are discovering something new, but in reality, they are repeating trends designed to maximize attention and profit. This is a form of soft power, where creative ability is reduced to a choice between predetermined options, and freedom becomes an illusion.

From a dialectical perspective, creativity is not a static state but a continuous process of overcoming limitations. It requires

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

individuals to dare to confront uncertainty, accept risks, and learn to experiment even when there is no guarantee of success. It is in the encounter with failures that creativity truly becomes an liberating act, where individuals assert their freedom from external pressures of assimilation.

How can people restore their creativity in a technocratic world? The answer lies in fostering a reflective consciousness, learning to question deeply ingrained patterns and prejudices. Simultaneously, it requires creating spaces – both physical and spiritual – where people are allowed to experiment, make mistakes, and rediscover their buried potential. Then, creativity will no longer be the privilege of a select few artists or inventors, but will become a universal capacity enabling each person to create a free, rich, and meaningful life.

Human beings as creative subjects require a fundamental shift: from a passive state, where individuals merely receive and react to the world, to an active, engaged state, where they construct and reshape the very reality in which they live. Creativity, in its deepest sense, is not merely the ability to create something new or invent unprecedented forms, but also the capacity to reimagine what already exists, explore alternative possibilities, and have the courage to realize them. Writing a story, composing a piece of music, designing a building, or even reorganizing the rhythm of daily life – all can become creative acts if individuals approach them with an active, conscious, and free spirit.

In a technocratic world where technology and money permeate every aspect of life, creativity is being homogenized and confined to pre-existing frameworks. Digital platforms shape aesthetics, tastes, and even human dreams through recommendation algorithms and behavioral optimization systems. Users believe they are freely choosing, but in reality, they are merely navigating a network of possibilities designed to maximize profits for centers of power. In this context, affirming humanity as a creative subject is no longer a privilege of artists or philosophers, but becomes an urgent liberation task to restore human dignity.

From a dialectical perspective, creativity is not the privilege of a select few geniuses, but a universal potential in every human being. This potential is suppressed when individuals accept pre-existing patterns, when they assimilate themselves into power and technological systems that operate according to standardized and optimized logic. But this potential can explode when people realize that they are not entirely determined by social and technological structures. It is in the clash between the individual and the world, where people dare to question, dare to make mistakes, and dare to step outside their comfort zone, that creativity is unleashed as a form of resistance and liberation.

Modern humanistic philosophy has repeatedly emphasized the role of creativity in shaping human nature. Sartre called man a "being beyond himself," meaning that man is not fixed by any inherent nature or regulation, but must construct himself through action. Heidegger pointed out that man always exists as a "being-in-the-world," where creativity is not a peripheral activity, but the very essence of how man dwells in the world. Creativity, therefore, is not simply the production of new things, but the way man asserts his freedom and responsibility in a constantly changing world.

However, in the age of technocrats, human creativity is easily commercialized and instrumentalized. Creative industries turn art into commodities, where aesthetic value is replaced by exchange value. Social media platforms, which promise connection and inspiration, simultaneously encourage superficial forms of creativity aimed at attracting views and interactions, rather than nurturing spiritual depth and originality. When creativity is reduced to a tool for achieving efficiency or maximizing profits, people gradually lose creativity as a free and liberating capacity.

How can people restore and nurture creativity in a technocratic world? The answer lies in building educational, artistic, and community spaces where creativity is encouraged and protected from assimilation and commercialization. Education should not be limited to the transmission of knowledge, but should become a liberating space where learners are encouraged to question, experiment, and take responsibility for their choices. Art needs to be redefined not as a consumer product, but as a way of life, where people discover and express their deepest potential.

From a dialectical perspective, creativity is a process of both breaking down and constructing: breaking down old limitations while simultaneously opening up new possibilities. It requires the courage to confront uncertainty, to accept failure as part of the journey, and to continue searching for more meaningful forms of existence. When people practice creativity in all aspects of life – from work and learning to relationships – they not only resist the alienation brought about by technocratism, but also build a foundation for true freedom.

At that point, human beings are no longer driven consumers, but become **creative subjects** , capable of constructing free, rich, and humane forms of existence. Creativity, therefore, is not just a capacity, but a mission: a mission to assert oneself as an independent entity and contribute to enriching the common world.

2. Artificial intelligence and human potential

Artificial intelligence (AI) is becoming one of the most powerful shaping forces of the 21st century, unlocking unprecedented possibilities while simultaneously posing fundamental challenges to human existence. While AI promises to transform how we work, learn, communicate, and create, it also shakes the foundations of what was once considered a human privilege: independent thinking, empathy, and existential creativity. Realistic human philosophy seeks not only to understand and adapt to this new technology, but also to deeply reflect on the relationship between AI and human potential in an increasingly technocratic world.

AI offers data processing and computing capabilities far beyond human capabilities. From deep learning machines capable of image recognition and language translation, to automation systems that can replace both manual and knowledge labor, AI is restructuring the entire foundation of labor and production. Many expect that AI will free humans from arduous, repetitive tasks, thereby ushering

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

in an era of innovation where people live in leisure and freedom. However, history shows that every technological leap is accompanied by social restructuring and new forms of inequality. The question is not "What can AI do?", but "What is AI doing to humans?".

Indeed, while AI can replace humans in many technical tasks, it cannot replace the depth of lived experience, the ability to create meaning in uncertainty and contradiction. Human potential lies not only in analyzing information or reproducing knowledge – things that AI does better – but in the ability to imagine things that do not yet exist, to feel the pain of others, and to ask questions about what should be done, not just what can be done. Philosophy has long emphasized that humans cannot be reduced to a signal processing system, but are moral, creative, and self-determining subjects. Kant asserted that human dignity lies in the ability to act according to the free principles they themselves set. Heidegger warned that technology, if not placed within a humanistic order, would lead to a situation where humans are "subordinate to calculation" – becoming a kind of "resource" like any other entity.

This situation is gradually becoming apparent in the technocratic world. Today's AI systems not only offer suggestions but also make decisions for humans in fields ranging from commerce and education to law and healthcare. Large-scale language models, social media recommendation algorithms, and behavioral analytics tools not only simulate thinking but are increasingly interfering with the formation of opinions, tastes, and personal choices. AI is no longer just an external tool but is becoming an internal paradigm shaping how humans understand themselves and the world. Instead of reflecting, people are increasingly delegating their thinking to technical systems, gradually losing the ability to live a conscious and responsible life.

From a dialectical perspective, the relationship between AI and humans is not merely an interaction between user and tool, but a process that is both cooperative and tense. AI is a product of human intelligence, but once operated within specific economic and power systems, it can turn around and reshape its own creative subject. This is an existential paradox: humans create AI, but risk being redefined by AI – in its technocratic form. It is in this situation that the philosophy of real human beings invites us to return to the fundamental question: how can humans live as free subjects in a world they themselves have created but which is increasingly beyond their control?

Affirming human potential in the age of AI does not mean denying technology or dreaming of a pre-technocratic world. On the contrary, it demands philosophical courage: the courage to question the fundamental assumptions shaping life, the courage to preserve creative space and the capacity for reflection in an environment so optimized it's suffocating. Education, the arts, philosophy, and liberating forms of community must be restructured as spaces that nurture creative freedom – where people are not reduced to data points, but are seen as living, choosing, and creating subjects.

How can humans live with AI without being defined by it? How can technology serve human development instead of assimilating humans into predictive models? The answer lies not only in technology, but in philosophy. We need a way of thinking that is both reflective and action-oriented – where AI is used as a liberating tool, but never as a substitute for humanity. Then, AI is no longer a threat or a salvation, but becomes a space for dialogue, where humans reaffirm themselves as creative, responsible, and free subjects in an ever-changing world.

Artificial intelligence (AI), with its superior data processing and computing capabilities, is gradually becoming a new power structure in the technocratic world. It is not only changing how people work, learn, and communicate, but also reshaping how we understand ourselves and the world around us. While many praise AI as a tool to liberate humans from arduous and monotonous tasks, many also warn of the risk it poses to critical thinking, creativity, and self-determination – core elements of humanity. Realistic human philosophy, therefore, poses an urgent task: not only to analyze the impact of AI, but also to construct a vision where technology is placed within a humanistic order, supporting rather than replacing humans.

AI, if designed and used with a humanistic spirit, can become a catalyst for unlocking human potential. When mechanical and repetitive tasks are automated, people can free up time and energy to engage in creative activities, education, self-care, and personal development. In this perspective, AI acts like an "auxiliary brain," supporting cognitive abilities without encroaching upon or replacing human mental sovereignty. It becomes a springboard for people to reconnect with humanistic values: love, empathy, creativity, and a sense of responsibility to the world.

However, that scenario didn't just appear out of nowhere. In reality, most current AI systems are designed to maximize profits and optimize human behavior to serve technology corporations. Recommendation algorithms not only shape consumer preferences but also deeply influence how we interact socially, receive information, and even form political opinions. Power lurks within lines of code and databases, orchestrating life according to logics that are difficult for humans to recognize. If we leave AI development to market mechanisms, humans risk becoming programmed entities, gradually losing their ability to think critically and act autonomously.

From a dialectical perspective, the relationship between AI and humans is not an absolute opposition, but rather a complex and contradictory interactive process. AI can expand human cognitive and behavioral capabilities, but it also carries the risk of alienation when humans delegate decision-making power to technocratic systems. It is within this tension that human creative potential and freedom can be unleashed or stifled, depending on how we design, use, and position the technology.

Affirming human beings as creative subjects in the AI era requires a shift in perception: from a passive state, where humans merely consume provided technologies, to an active state, where humans design and control technological systems to support the holistic

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

development of humanity. Education plays a crucial role in this process. A liberal education system will help people develop the ability to reflect, question fundamental assumptions, and learn to use AI as a tool to expand their potential instead of being assimilated.

Creativity, morality, and freedom – the three elements that constitute the depth of humanity – can only be preserved if people maintain their spiritual sovereignty against the temptations of technocratic convenience. Existential philosophy has reminded us that humans are not determined by any system, even when placed in specific conditions. Sartre asserted that "man is condemned to freedom" – meaning, whether he likes it or not, he is responsible for his own existence. In the technocratic world, this statement resonates even more strongly: freedom is no longer a luxury, but a condition for humans to maintain their humanity amidst a network of automated systems.

How can humans both harness AI and unleash their creative potential, ethics, and freedom? The answer lies not in more advanced technologies, but in how we construct social, cultural, and educational institutions. We need to build open learning spaces and communities where technology is placed under human control and people are encouraged to use AI as a means of self-discovery, not a replacement.

At that point, AI is no longer a threat or a savior, but becomes part of the dialogue between humanity and the world. It is in this process that humanity affirms itself not as a passive entity defined by technology, but as a creative subject capable of shaping technology, shaping society, and redefining the meaning of life.

3. Sustainable development and internal balance

The concept of “sustainable development” has long been a common term in political, economic, and environmental discourse, often presented as a solution to balance growth and resource conservation. Governments, businesses, and international organizations have put forward a range of strategies emphasizing emission reduction, biodiversity conservation, and efficient use of natural resources. However, in the modern technocratic world – where people are caught in a cycle of consumption, efficiency optimization, and assimilation into technological systems – this concept needs to be redefined. Sustainable development cannot simply be about managing external resources; it must become a humane and intrinsic project where people cultivate a balanced life, maintain freedom, creativity, and a deep connection with themselves and the world.

Existential philosophy has warned of the danger of humanity losing itself in the pursuit of external goals. Kierkegaard called this "silent despair"—a state where people no longer have self-determination but live mechanically, repeating imposed patterns. Meanwhile, the technocratic world is transforming existence into mere tools, where everything—including people—is judged by its usefulness, consumerability, and contribution to the growth engine. Realistic human philosophy reminds us that, for sustainable development, humanity needs a transformation: from viewing itself as a means to an economic system to asserting itself as an end in itself, with values that transcend technocratic calculations.

In the technocratic world, development is often synonymous with economic growth, market expansion, and efficiency maximization. Algorithms and data models shape consumer behavior, driving people to shop, work, and play in rhythms designed to maximize profits. But this development comes with consequences: ecological crises, psychological stress, individual isolation, and the breakdown of community relationships. Material growth does not equate to spiritual richness. A sustainable society cannot simply stop at reducing carbon emissions or recycling waste; it must ask deeper questions about how people live, work, and dream.

Sustainable development, in its philosophical spirit, first and foremost requires a balance between the use of technological resources and the preservation of space for reflective thinking, emotion, and creativity. Heidegger once warned of the danger of humans becoming "reserve resources"—exploited and optimized like any other object in the digital world. To counter this trend, a foundation needs to be rebuilt where humans can move beyond instrumental logic to live an authentic life, where human values are prioritized over performance and profit.

From a dialectical perspective, sustainable development is not only about maintaining ecological balance but also about liberating people from imposed norms. A green economy that still maintains alienating institutions will never lead to a humane society. A profound transformation is needed: from soulless production and consumption systems to communities where creativity, freedom, and solidarity become central principles.

How can we create a humanistic concept of sustainable development in a technocratic world? The answer lies not in new technological tools or mere macro-policies, but in the ability of each individual and community to learn to ask themselves: What kind of life do we truly want? What are we willing to give up to cultivate deeper values? Liberal education and reflective cultural spaces can play a vital role in sparking these questions, helping people move beyond being driven consumers and become free agents capable of creating new forms of life.

At that point, sustainable development ceased to be a slogan and became a way of life, where people harmonized with nature, with their community, and with their own inner selves. A truly sustainable civilization is one that knows how to set limits on endless optimization and open up space for authentic, creative, and loving presence.

Internal balance is not merely a temporary psychological state, but a core element that enables individuals to create a rich and sustainable life. While political, economic, and technical discourses often emphasize resource management, system optimization, and technological development, realist human philosophy reminds us that all forms of sustainable development will be empty if they ignore the ability of each individual to maintain inner balance. Internal balance, therefore, is not separate

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

from sustainable development, but is the foundation upon which it becomes authentic and humane.

In the modern world, people are swept up in a whirlwind of external signals: digital announcements, consumer trends, and norms programmed by social media. They move from one goal to another in constant haste, to the point of forgetting to listen to their own deep needs. Practicing inner balance does not mean withdrawing from the world or evading social responsibility. On the contrary, it requires a conscious commitment: daring to stop, contemplate, and consciously choose what is truly necessary for human development.

This is reminiscent of Eastern philosophical traditions such as Taoism, which emphasizes that living in harmony with nature is not passivity, but rather a way of harmonizing with the profound laws of life. "Wu Wei" (non-action) is not about doing nothing, but about rejecting forced actions that go against the natural order of things. Similarly, in the technocracy, people need to learn to recognize invisible pressures – from algorithmic suggestions and advertising to coercive social structures – so as not to become victims of them.

From a dialectical perspective, sustainable development is inseparable from internal balance. A society that achieves impressive growth indicators but has citizens who are stressed, anxious, and detached from themselves will sooner or later fall into crisis. Conversely, an individual who finds inner balance will be able to contribute to more harmonious development models, where human values are placed on par with – if not higher than – economic and technological goals. Internal balance is not only valuable to the individual but also a symbiotic driving force, helping to maintain the stability and sustainability of the wider community.

In the technocratic world, one of the greatest challenges to inner balance is the constant flow of information and the accelerating pace of life. Mobile devices transform people into both "always connected" and "always disconnected" entities, where every moment is filled with external signals, leaving no space for reflection. Heidegger once warned of the danger of being "thrown into the world " without the ability to make independent decisions. To rebuild inner balance, people need to restore spaces of stillness – spaces for contemplation, for being present with themselves and with the world around them.

How can we achieve a sustainable form of development without sacrificing humanity and freedom? The answer lies in restructuring social and technological systems so that they do not become oppressive forces, but rather tools to support people in finding balance. This includes building educational and cultural institutions that foster individual reflection, creativity, and solidarity, as well as developing humanistic technologies—tools designed to encourage mindfulness rather than addiction and manipulation.

Development, then, is no longer an endless race for efficiency and consumption, but becomes a process of nurturing a rich, free, and humane life. Such a society does not measure success solely by GDP or the quantity of products produced, but by the ability of each individual to live a full, balanced, and meaningful life.

4. Education and the development of a free character.

Education, in its deepest sense, is not merely a process of transmitting knowledge or skills, but a journey of nurturing individuals as free, creative beings capable of living meaningful lives. The philosophy of education reminds us that true education does not aim to create technically perfect individuals to serve the economic machine, but rather to unlock human potential – the capacity for independent thinking, creativity, and responsible action. In the age of technocratism, where education is increasingly being transformed into a tool for training human resources for systems of optimization and control, restoring the liberating mission of education is more urgent than ever.

Liberal educational philosophy has repeatedly pointed out that education cannot simply be about "cramming" knowledge into "empty containers"—an image Paulo Freire calls the "banking education" method. In this method, learners are seen as passive entities whose only task is to receive and reproduce information. Freire criticized this type of education for reinforcing power structures and paralyzing people's capacity for reflection and creativity. He proposed replacing it with a dialogical approach to education, where teachers and learners explore and construct knowledge together. Education then becomes a liberating process, where individuals are encouraged to question, analyze, critique, and reconstruct reality.

In a technocratic world, education is increasingly equated with skills training to adapt to the labor market and technological systems. Curriculums are designed to maximize performance, measured by quantitative indicators such as grades, certificates, and market competitiveness. Students are pressured to become "multitaskers," technically proficient but lacking the ability to reflect on the meaning and purpose of life. The consequence is a generation that may be technologically proficient but distant from the capacity for reflection, creativity, and empathy – qualities that make up a free and independent personality.

From a dialectical perspective, liberal education does not deny the importance of technical skills or knowledge, but emphasizes that they are only meaningful when considered in relation to the holistic development of the individual. A genuine education does not turn learners into tools to serve external goals, but rather views them as ends in themselves – subjects with unique value and potential. Existential philosophy suggests that education should help people recognize their own freedom, dare to face difficult choices, and take responsibility for them.

Restoring the liberating mission of education in the technocratic era is no easy task. It requires a reshaping of pedagogical methods, from teaching reflective and critical thinking skills to expanding the space for creativity and experimentation. A liberating classroom is one where students are encouraged to question the obvious, learn to engage in dialogue instead of passively receiving,

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

and dare to experiment without fear of failure. At the same time, it demands a shift in the perception of the teacher: no longer the "keeper of absolute truth," but a companion, an inspirer, and an motivator for learners to explore their own potential.

How can we create a liberal education system in a technocracy? The answer lies in developing educational institutions that place people at the center, nurturing not only professional skills but also moral, spiritual, and aesthetic qualities. Education then becomes a journey of cultivating well-rounded individuals – people who are not only technically proficient but also self-reflective, committed, and creative.

Cultivating a free and independent personality requires education that goes beyond simply imparting knowledge or training skills; it must open spaces for experience, mistakes, and discovery. Freedom cannot be imposed externally as a norm or regulation; it can only arise from within, when individuals are placed in situations that demand choices, reflection, and responsibility. A truly liberal education should encourage independent thinking, nurture imagination, and help individuals learn to confront the uncertainty that is inherent in life.

Modern educational philosophy has repeatedly emphasized that freedom is not something to be granted, but rather a capacity to be developed through practice and experience. Paulo Freire warned against a "bank" type of education – where learners are treated like empty vessels to be filled with knowledge – which paralyzes critical thinking and creativity. Instead, he proposed a dialogue-based approach where teachers and learners together construct meaning, question, and learn. In this environment, learners are empowered to experiment, to fail, and to take responsibility for their choices.

In the age of technocratism, where all educational activities tend to be standardized to optimize efficiency and serve the needs of the labor market, restoring a humanistic education has become more urgent than ever. The current education system often produces individuals who are technically skilled but lack the ability to reflect on the purpose of life, the capacity for empathy, and the ability to engage. People are standardized into "human resources," becoming cogs in a smoothly operating machine that lacks meaning.

From a dialectical perspective, education is not merely a tool for transmitting knowledge but also a process of liberation. It helps individuals identify the oppressive structures that invisibly bind their understanding, question assumptions that are taken for granted, and thereby open up new possibilities for existence. Liberal education is not about imposing pre-existing personality models, but about inviting people to explore themselves, recognize their unique potential, and develop it in relation to the community.

A truly humanistic education will not standardize individuals into homogeneous entities for easy management within a technocratic system, but will encourage them to become creative subjects. These subjects will not only be free in thought but will also dare to act to build autonomous communities where the values of justice, solidarity, and creativity are nurtured. Existential philosophy has affirmed that a person only becomes their true "self" when they dare to choose, commit, and take responsibility for their choices.

How can we design an education that fosters independent thinking in the age of AI? The answer lies in restructuring the curriculum to integrate scientific knowledge, art, and ethics as integral components. Subjects should not be taught solely through information transmission, but should open up spaces for dialogue, creativity, and liberation, where learners are invited to question and experiment. Simultaneously, learning spaces should be designed as learning communities where teachers are no longer monopolists of truth but rather companions, helping learners develop self-reflection and creativity.

Such an education is no longer about training skills to meet economic standards, but becomes a process of accompanying individuals in unlocking their freedom, discovering the meaning of life, and realizing their human potential. Education is then no longer confined to short-term goals but becomes a long-term mission: nurturing individuals who are free, creative, and capable of contributing to the creation of humane communities.

5. From consumer to creator

In today's technocratic and globalized world, human beings are increasingly defined by their role as consumers. Economic systems, social media, and digital platforms have transformed consumption from merely a material act into an identity, even a criterion for judging a person's value. In this context, the shift from consumer to creator is not simply a behavioral change, but a spiritual revolution, a liberating step that helps people restore their humanity and rebuild their inner freedom.

Existential philosophy has long warned of human alienation in modern societies – where individuals are easily drawn into a state of superficial existence, guided by external values, and gradually lose the ability to define themselves. Heidegger called this “das Man” (neutral being), where people live according to pre-existing formulas, repeating socially programmed behaviors without any awareness of the authenticity of their existence. Meanwhile, consumer society has created a “one-dimensional” model of humanity – confined within market-driven needs, losing the ability to imagine alternative ways of living.

Consumers, in the technocratic world, are often portrayed as free individuals. But that freedom is largely an illusion: choices are suggested by algorithms, trends are designed to optimize profits, and personal preferences are exploited as data to serve the market. In this system, people become passive, content with consuming products and ideas created by others, rarely questioning their own authenticity or inherent creativity.

The shift from consumer to creator requires a philosophical commitment. Creativity is not the prerogative of artists or scientists, but an innate ability in every human being as they proactively construct meaning, reconstruct relationships with the world, and open up new possibilities for existence. In creativity, humans are no longer driven by desires for manipulation, but begin

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

a process of reflection, experimentation, and realization of values that align with the deepest needs of humanity.

From a dialectical perspective, creativity is not a fixed state but a dynamic process – a journey that transcends external constraints and internal limitations. It requires individuals to break free from imposed thought patterns, courageously confront uncertainty, and accept the possibility of failure as an inevitable part of development. In this process, human beings affirm their subjectivity, no longer being assimilated into passive entities within the technocratic machine.

Innovators, unlike consumers, are not satisfied with what is readily available. They question the "obvious," explore possibilities beyond consumer logic, and seek to transform their own lives. In a technocratic context, this is a revolutionary act of liberation. Because when people dare to reinvent their lives, they also shake the power structures that operate based on standardization and control of behavior.

How can we foster a shift from consumption to creativity? The answer lies not in abandoning technology or turning our backs on the modern world, but in developing educational, artistic, and community spaces where individuals are encouraged to explore, experiment, and create. Supported by a humane environment, people can restore their creative potential as a liberating force, breaking free from rigid forms of existence and opening up more authentic possibilities for life.

In that context, creativity is not merely about producing something new in a material sense, but becomes a way of life – where every action and every choice bears the mark of inner freedom and humanistic spirit. It is a necessary step for humanity to rebuild its lives in a technocratic world and open up a vision where freedom and humanity are at the center.

Conversely, a creator is not just an artist or inventor, but anyone who dares to confront reality, explore their inner potential, and create new values. Creators are not limited by pre-existing stereotypes; they courageously break free from conformity and open up new possibilities for themselves and their communities. From changing perspectives on a small issue and experimenting with different lifestyles to building creative community spaces, all are expressions of a vibrant creative spirit.

In everyday life, creative individuals are those who dare to question seemingly obvious things, rejecting established norms. They recognize that every small action—from organizing work and nurturing relationships to redesigning living spaces—can become an opportunity to assert their subjectivity and cultivate freedom. In a technocratic world where every choice seems to be dictated by algorithms, creative individuals emerge as a subtle force of resistance, reminding us that humans are not programmed entities, but sources of unprecedented possibilities.

From a dialectical perspective, the process of becoming a creator is a journey of liberation. It requires individuals to identify and overcome the invisible forms of power operating in daily life, from market manipulation to digital design. Digital platforms are built to optimize consumer behavior, trapping individuals in a cycle of repeated, predetermined choices. Creators, by breaking free from these cycles, restore their initiative and open up more diverse and enriching ways of living.

The creative journey is also a process of reconnecting with the world. When people create, they not only build new values but also explore the deeper layers of humanity, where freedom, responsibility, and solidarity become the pillars of an authentic life. Creators do not seek escape from the world, but engage with it with a transformative spirit, seeking to reshape social, economic, and technological relationships so that they serve humanity rather than hinder it.

In a technocratic environment, creators also face significant challenges. Every system tends towards standardization, transforming creativity into mass-produced consumer goods. The entertainment, arts, and even technology industries often assimilate creativity into a market, undermining its liberating potential. True creators must overcome these temptations to assert their creative ability as a human act, not reduced to mere utility or commercial value.

How can people move beyond the role of consumers and become creators? The answer doesn't lie in purely technological solutions, but requires a profound restructuring of educational, economic, and social systems. Education needs to open spaces where experimentation, imagination, and collaboration are encouraged; the economy needs to shift from a profit-maximizing logic to one that supports communal creativity; and social spaces need to be designed to foster reflection and engagement.

At that point, people will no longer passively wait for values from the outside, but will become the authors of their own lives. They will no longer be defined as cogs in a consumer machine, but will emerge as free, creative subjects capable of creating new forms of existence. This is a necessary step to usher in a truly creative and humanistic era – where people are both builders of the world and builders of themselves.

References

1. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2002). *Collected Works* (Vol. 1). Hanoi: Su that National Political Publishing House.
2. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1995). *Collected Works* (Vol. 2). Hanoi: Su that National Political Publishing House.
3. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1995). *Collected Works* (Vol. 3). Hanoi: Su that National Political Publishing House.
4. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2002). *Collected Works* (Vol. 4). Hanoi: Su that National Political Publishing House.
5. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1993). *Collected Works* (Vol. 8). Hanoi: Su that National Political Publishing House.
6. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2002). *Collected Works* (Vol. 20). Hanoi: Su that National Political Publishing House.
7. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1995). *Collected Works* (Vol. 21). Hanoi: Su that National Political Publishing House.
8. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2000). *Collected Works* (Vol. 42). Hanoi: Su that National Political Publishing House.

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

9. Nguyen, AQ (2023). The *Differentiation of Human Beings in the Commodity Economy* . Hanoi: Tri Thuc Publishing House.
10. Nguyen, AQ (2024). *Philosophy of the Human – Differentiation and Possession of* the Human Being. GlobeEdit Publishing.
11. Nguyen, AQ (2024). *Social Philosophy – The Evolution of Humanity* . GlobeEdit Publishing.

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).