

digital citizenship, which may result in a wasted opportunity of both generating a development within the so-called "orange economy" based on intellectual and creative production and of contributing to the accessibility to other human rights, such as those that have been previously indicated.

The human right to development implies the positive obligation of States to seek economic, social and political conditions so that people can carry out their life project without the oppressions that unmet needs impose, especially poverty and lack of knowledge. Nonetheless, given the conditions imposed by technological advances and globalization, the need arises to train citizens in the responsible and proactive use of the new technological reality. This reality has economic and social impacts, which are linked to and openly condition other human rights, in addition to the right to development. Therefore, the progression of a nation in a culture that favors digital citizenship favors progress at the same time. However, as has been stated, Mexico still focuses, despite its recent constitutional and legal reforms, on the advancement of infrastructure, without emphasizing its correct use.

Literature

1. Declaration on the Right to Development, in: <https://www.ohchr.org/sp/professionalinterest/pages/righttodevelopment.aspx>
2. Declaration on social progress and development, in: <https://www.ohchr.org/SP/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/ProgressAndDevelopment.aspx>
3. Quality standards for the evaluation of Development in <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/46297655.pdf>
4. Political Constitution of the United Mexican States in <https://www2.juridicas.unam.mx/constitucion-reordenada-consolidada/en/vigente>
5. General Education Law.
6. Federal Law of Science and Technology.

UDC 342.9(043.2)

Mendescarlo Silva V., Ph.D, research professor,
Lopez Ledesma M.E., Ph.D, research professor,
Beltran Saucedo M., Ph.D, research professor,
Autonomous University of San Luis Potosi, San Luis Potosí, Mexico

FIGURE OF THE DEFENDER OF RIGHTS AT HEARINGS IN MEXICO, GUARANTEE OF THE RIGHT TO INFORMATION

This information has been recognized in various ways in the legal environment, on the other hand, as a human right, progress in the field of international human rights law is reflected in various international documents (1), some of which we mention below. : Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Article 19), American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man

(Article IV), International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Article 19.1), American Convention on Human Rights (Article 13)). For its part, in the Mexican constitutional system, the right to information was recognized as a human right enshrined in Article 6 (2) after the 2011 reforms. This human right is interconnected with other rights, such as the right to Freedom, equality and non-discrimination and petitions. Thus, the Mexican State has pledged, through the ratification of universal and regional instruments, to pursue a policy of constitutional harmonization of the various international provisions relating to this right.

Within the framework of the regulatory framework that guarantees this right, regulatory laws have been created that develop the postulates established in the Constitution in this regard, which are called the General Law on Transparency and Access to Public Information, and the Federal Telecommunications Law, the purpose of which is to regulate access in the first place - for public information, and for others - the activities of individuals involved in its dissemination (3).

It is convenient to confirm that in Mexico it was necessary to create public policies to guarantee this human right, which entails creating the entire legal and institutional infrastructure that ensures its viability, in addition to guaranteeing protection through the amparo process. in Article 103, Part I of its Constitution (4).

Textually referred to Article 6° states:

“The manifestation of ideas should not be the object of any judicial or administrative investigation, unless it damages morality, privacy or the rights of third parties, provokes any crime or violates public order; the right of reply shall be exercised in the time provided for by law. The right to information will be guaranteed by the state.

Everyone has the right to free access to multiple and timely information, as well as to search, receive and disseminate information and ideas of any kind in any way of expression (...)”(5).

It follows that the right to express ideas is unlimited, with the exception of the well-listed exceptions. But let us meditate on the fact that the information transmitted by the media creates problems for a diverse population of the country for the following reasons: a multicultural Mexican composition in which indigenous languages are diverse, the presence of an audience of children among the audience, or the need for accessibility disability groups, making access to this right more difficult. All of the above, without regard to the fact that part of the content transmitted may be offensive, inadequate, superficial, immoral or misleading.

This leads to inoperability of legal provisions and discriminates people who cannot get adequate access to such content, on the other hand, the guiding principle of the universality of human rights not only internationally, but also at the state level, will also be violated by the arguments noted in the previous

paragraph.

After considering the scope of the human right to information, as well as its fundamentalization in the Mexican constitutional structure, it is necessary to revise the legislation regulating the media and technologies that ensure content access to a wide audience: the media, such as radio and television.

The communications sector in Mexico is represented by the Ministry of Communications and Transport, which is responsible for regulating and applying the provisions relating to this topic, mainly the Federal Telecommunications and Broadcasting Act.

There are also specialized administrative bodies in this sector whose purpose is to regulate the participation of individuals in the development of these activities, including the quality and ethics with which they are carried out. The Federal Telecommunications Institute (IFT), as the main autonomous body of the sector, is responsible for regulating, promoting and supervising the use, operation and operation of the radio frequency spectrum, networks and the provision of telecommunications and broadcasting services (TyR). in Mexico, as well as access to infrastructure and other important resources that contribute to guaranteeing the right to information and universal access to these services (6).

The Defender of the Ombudsman figure was inserted in Mexico from the Guidelines guaranteeing the rights of the audience, published in 2016 by the Federal Institute of Telecommunications, which establishes the duty of the concessionaires on broadcasting, television and/or audio. Restricted to promote, respect, protect and guarantee the rights to a hearing and to appoint a defense counsel, who must register with the Federal Telecommunications Institute (7).

However, the Federal Telecommunications and Broadcasting Act contains information on the Ombudsman for Delayed Hearing Rights, in 2017, in Articles 259-261 (8). As already mentioned, this figure was first included, a year ago, in general guidelines on audience rights, although it had no legal value and made its implementation mandatory. It should be recognized that the figure proposed in these guidelines has already indicated the presence of a protective ombudsman for the right to information for the audience.

Unfortunately, the legislators did not include in the 2017 legislative amendment the protective spirit with which administrative guidelines were issued, depriving the defender of their powers and subjecting them to internal and much weaker customs established by each medium, that is, the Basis in the Media Code of Ethics of each media. At the same time, any requirement for the independence of a human rights defender at hearings is destroyed, for example, to determine whether advertising is included in information spaces disguised as news, among other aspects.

Findings:

We can break away from the usual and constitutional content that protects and develops the human right to information in Mexico, that fundamental

principles and approaches must be observed in content that is transmitted through the media, such as the best interests of minors, accessibility of content for people with disabilities, non-discrimination, among other aspects.

Nevertheless, the development of legislative and political processes has been revealed; it is clear that we are in the presence of insufficient development of specialized institutions for the protection of human rights, mainly the right to information and its fundamental principles, since this Right has not been properly developed in the legislative sphere, although administrative guidelines already existed to adapt it.

Thus, it is concluded that in order to eliminate inappropriate content and fully guarantee the rights of the audience, and also not to subject them to content that violates their rights, this regression process should be reversed and the true quality of the ombudsman for audience advocate should be restored.

Literature

1. United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights: in <https://www.ohchr.org/sp>
2. The Political Constitution of the United Mexican States: www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/pdf/1_270818.pdf.
3. General Law on Transparency and Access to Public Information – DOF. www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5391143&fecha=04/05/2
4. Article 103 Political Constitution of the United Mexican States.
5. Section 6 of the Constitution.
6. Federal Institute of Telecommunications, at: <http://www.ift.org.mx/conocenos/filosofia>
7. Guidelines to guarantee hearing rights: <http://www.ift.org.mx/sites/default/files/industria/temasrelevantes/4746/documentos/lineamientosdchosaudienciasaccesible.pdf>
8. Federal Telecommunications and Broadcasting Act.

UDC 342.565 + 342.571

Guoqiang Fu,
Legal Specialist, Singapore

REVIEW OF THE SINGAPORE JUDICIAL SYSTEM (BEHIND THE SITES <http://mrmarker.ru/p/page.php?id=8575> <http://sud.gov.kz/rus/content/sudebnaya-sistema-singapura>)

The Singapore judicial system is considered to be one of the most effective – both in terms of speed of resolving legal disputes, as well as in fairness of decisions taken and, accordingly, trust in the courts. In 1999, 97% of respondents called court work impartial and 92% effective [1]. Business, both local and international, reacted in much the same way; not without reason since