

KHARYTONOV EU. O.

National University «Odesa Law Academy»,
Head of the Department of Civil Law, Corresponding Member
of the National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine, Doctor of Law, Professor

KHARYTONOVA H. I.

National University «Odesa Law Academy»,
Head of the Department of Intellectual Property and Corporate Law,
Corresponding Member of the National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine,
Doctor of Law, Professor

TOLMACHEVSKA YU. O.

National University «Odesa Law Academy»,
Master of Law

**DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES AS A THREAT OF HUMAN RIGHTS:
PREVENTION OF THE RULE OF LAW CRISIS**

The article covers digital technology as a symbol of the transition from the old to the new way of society. The authors claim that the growth of the influence of international information corporations, which actually acquires executive power, is dangerous. So it is about the need to overcome the legal vacuum that has emerged in the field of digital technology. It is concluded that the legal support of the IT-sphere should be through the use of legal means (the formation of IT-law, IT-legislation, etc.), as well as organizational efforts of state authorities and public institutions (interactive civil society).

Key words: *digital technologies, IT-law, human rights, the rule of law, social networks, democracy.*

The widespread use of digital technologies in modern society caused the emergence of the danger of violation of human rights, related to the possibility of influencing through social networks for the formation of public consciousness, manipulation of it in order to achieve political goals, violation of privacy, etc.

Note, that it was possible to read about the change of technology and the paradigm in general, about the work with the masses a decade ago. It was written about the Arab Spring, when the opposition's actions were coordinated in social online networks, then about Trump, who won exclusively with the help of Twitter, and now it is a question of the «revolutionary» methods of Zelensky's team that translated campaigning into the network [1]. It promotes e-voting, conducting referenda through networks, etc., which may lead to threats of violation of political and other human rights.

In our opinion, in the digital age, the threats mentioned are intensified by the so-called «democratic pendulum». The essence of the latter is that in one period people are ready to sacrifice their welfare for the sake of «higher goals», in another – to sacrifice «higher goals» for social justice. When «higher

goals» are protected, then people begin to worry about their social insecurity. But when, on the contrary, their basic social needs are secured, then the focus is on ensuring freedom and quality of life. Democracy is intended to ensure that each group of these interests has the right to vote. Such fluctuations are not a defect in democracy ... it is a sign of nature in general [2].

In these circumstances, autocratic manipulative means of influence on society through social online networks, taking into account the large audience covered by these networks, the accumulation of huge information databases by information groups not only about their users, but also on a wide range of others, the speed of collecting, disseminating and the transmission of information has an advantage over traditional democracy and market economy. There is a danger that democracies that are slower than autocracy, because they emerge from the freedom and dignity of the individual, the need for human rights, the balance of interests of members of society, in this competition will be in loser.

The growth of the influence of international information corporations, which actually acquires executive power, is dangerous. This power is not legitimate by laws. Therefore, algorithms transform our lives into «Black Box». The possibility of manipulation grows dramatically. Instead, the autonomy of the individual, as the foundation of freedom, is threatened [3, p. 36].

Digital technology is a symbol of the transition from the old to the new way of society. Therefore, it is fair to think of Charles Keindleberger that the transition from the old to the new order often results in a lack of rules and institutions that entails an increased risk of uncontrollable conflicts due to the destruction of confidence [4, p. 373].

So it is about the need to overcome the legal vacuum that has emerged in the field of digital technology.

To solve this problem, the government, as a mechanism for organizing the life of this society, must implement a number of measures within the legal field. Thus, there is an «objectification» of these phenomena (in particular, subjective rights), their transition from an abstract civilization to the level of values of society, legal constructs, and categories, institutions of the state.

Significant efforts are required from the government to introduce certain civilizational phenomena, ideology, concepts, etc. into society. These include the creation of «IT-law», which is formed as a symbiosis of virtual and real reality, reflecting attempts to introduce IT in the usual legal field, virtual in nature.

The effort should be made not only by the government, but also by society, since without it the process is slowing down, and sometimes it becomes impossible at all. Such a condition is not obligatory, but in cases when the state imposes values that are contrary to its mentality and the natural way of evolution, the probability of a reversal of the process exists. Therefore, the legal provision of the IT-sphere cannot be reduced to the publication of normative acts but requires the adoption of a number of organizational measures.

Since the activity of the government is only one of the means of legal support, we must distinguish between governmental and non-governmental (public) legal support.

The activity of the government on the legal provision of IT-sphere should be carried out in ways:

1) methodological, doctrinal and ideological support (development of the concept, principles of legal support, etc., support of the doctrine of law in this field, creation of a world-view basis, etc.);

2) legislative provision (issuing legislative acts, authorizing legal practices and standards of morality in the field of IT-relations);

3) ensuring the proper implementation of the rules of the legislation concerning the IT sphere, with the help of the relevant state institutions, the judicial system;

4) information and advocacy (explanation of the essence of the provisions being implemented, implementation, etc., legal education in the IT-sphere);

5) organizational support (creation of appropriate institutions).

Thus, the legal support of the IT-sphere should be through the use of legal means (the formation of IT-law, IT-legislation, etc.), as well as organizational efforts of state authorities and public institutions (interactive civil society).

The paradox lies in the fact that in the conditions of the digital revolution, public-law protection requires, first and foremost, the interests of individuals in the private sphere. This is explained by the fact that democracy, which by its very nature is slower than autocracy because they derive from the freedom and dignity of the individual, in this competition is structurally in loser. As George Soros has pointed out, autocratic countries combined with monopolies of the platform and the ability to create collective values of individual data can have an edge over democracies. If capitalism of data is really better suited to autocracies than democracies, then along with the latter, there is also a social market economy under threat, and with it a legal state. As George Soros has pointed out, autocratic states combined with platform monopolies and the ability to create collective values of individual data can have an edge over democracies. If capitalism of data is really better suited to autocracies than democracies, then along with the last one, there is also a social market economy which is under threat, and with it a constitutional state. Totalitarian regimes can use new technological possibilities more consistently, narrowing (or blurring) the existing ethical limits.

Therefore, it seems right to think that democracy and a market economy should show that they are better than autocratic state capitalism in the digital age. To do this, they must create conditions for the protection of individual autonomy and competition in the digital market economy. The protection of truth, competition, and welfare in the digital age are becoming a matter of survival of liberal democracy and a social market economy [3, p. 36-37].

The achievement of this goal is possible only through the active use of the mechanism of private law and public-law regulation of the corresponding relations in the field of human rights protection in order to ensure, ultimately, the rule of law in this area.

References:

1. Makarov Y. Dy`yavol iz g`adzheta // Ukrayins`ky`j ty`zhden`. 2019. № 19 (599). Access mode: <https://tyzhden.ua/Columns/50/229963>.
2. Mary`novy`ch M. Demokraty`chny`j «mayatny`k» ta Ukrayina // Zbruch. 30.4.2019. Access mode: <https://zbruc.eu/node/88946>.
3. Genning` Fepel`. Vakuum pravyl ta insty`tucij // Ukrayins`ky`j ty`zhden`. № 7. 15-21.02. 2019. 271 p.
4. Charles P. Kindleberger: Debt Situation of the Developing Countries in Historical Perspective (1800–1945), in: Außenwirtschaft, Vol. 36 (1981), No. IV, pp. 372–380.

ZAHORODNII V. E.

National University «Odesa Law Academy»,
Rector, PhD in Law, Associate Professor

TISHCHENKO V. V.

National University «Odesa Law Academy»,
Head of the Department of Forensic Science, Corresponding Member of the
National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine, Doctor of Law, Professor

DYNTU V. A.

National University «Odesa Law Academy»,
Associate Professor at the Department of Forensic Science, PhD in Law

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CRYPTOCURRENCY

Key words: *Cryptocurrency, virtual currency, digital economy, Bitcoin.*

The process of establishing cryptocurrency as a mean of payment for current digital economy is described in the article. Moreover, the distinction between virtual currency and electronic money is scrutinized.

Currently because of «The Forth Industrial Revolution» [1, p. 35] and «rapid development of IT technologies the framework of economy was changed and caused the emergence of new phenomena – digital economy, which can be considered, as a series of economic, social and cultural activities that are performed online and are related to the use of information and communication technology» [2]. Thus, the digitalization of the economy has set up the boundless environment with renewed trading rules. Furthermore, it triggers the creation of the virtualization of the world bank system – a transformation of banking on the base of informational technology implementation into bank sector; according to the form it is a transition of bank sector into electronic flatness of utilization which can be seen in