UDC 347:410 (043.2)

Andoh Ernest Nyame Yie, Master,
the University of Salford, Salford, Manchester,
the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Scientific Advisor: Myronets O., PhD in Law

SOME ASPECTS OF DIGITAL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT IN THE UK

To call the internet and its accompanied increase in computing capabilities a «new» phenomenon would be something of a misnomer – the internet has been in development since the 1960s, and became publically available in August 1991. However, the globalisation of communications, associated erosion in state borders and dizzying acceleration of technological advancement over the past two decades have fundamentally changed the citizen-state relationship, introducing new actors, new platforms, new opportunities and new threats [1, p. 6].

Beside the grave risks to life posed by Covid-19, your rights in using Internet services may seem like a lower priority. However, as lockdown measures make entire societies digitally-dependent, it has never been more important to safeguard people's activities online [2]. The global community has got one more reason for its internal differently directed changes to give a rather quick reaction for its further existence and development in conditions of the fight against COVID-2019 [3, p. 439]. The prevention of human rights violations is a key part of the protective policy of every country in the world [4, p. 585].

Concern digital policy, including in relation to children, David Souter admits three quite reasonable points. First, when thinking about the future digital society, for everyone not just for children, policymakers should focus more on outcomes, giving scope to shape those outcomes rather than hoping that technology will turn up trumps. For this to work, multistakeholder consultation and dialogue must be more than public-private partnership. But it also can't simply rely on established civil society organisations which may not be as representative as they would like (or claim) to be, especially where vulnerable groups are concerned. Second, developing that dialogue's not simple. It's far too easy for it to rely on the articulate and easy-to-reach, especially the better educated or those in urban centres. Much of the international dialogue with «youth» that takes place in internet discourse, for instance, is with highly-educated younger people who speak fluent English, often from privileged or wealthy backgrounds. It isn't really dialogue with «youth» if it doesn't include dialogue with the underprivileged, less-educated, non-metropolitan majority. The dissimilarities among the young, among children, and indeed in any demographic group, matter just as much as

similarities. Third, enabling rights is about what governments – «states parties» in its jargon – do. Some governments will take it seriously; others are less rights-respecting. But it's governments – not businesses or civil society – that have responsibilities in international law to enable rights, that can put rights into practice and can require compliance [5].

The law does enable illegal content and unlawful activities to be addressed. This is about keeping the channels of communications open in a time when people are highly dependent on them. These are very sensitive matters where interference with rights can have a significant impact on the individual. It exposes certain fragility in digital systems. Safeguarding people's rights to communicate freely and go about their daily lives online without intrusion by State or private actors has never been more important [2].

It is possible to recommend 10 principles to guide the development of regulation online: 1) Parity: the same level of protection must be provided online as offline; 2) Accountability: processes must be in place to ensure individuals and organisations are held to account for their actions and policies; 3) Transparency: powerful businesses and organisations operating in the digital world must be open to scrutiny; 4) Openness: the internet must remain open to innovation and competition; 5) Privacy: to protect the privacy of individuals; 6) Ethical design: services must act in the interests of users and society; 7) Recognition of childhood: to protect the most vulnerable users of the internet; 8) Respect for human rights and equality: to safeguard the freedoms of expression and information online; 9) Education and awareness-raising: to enable people to navigate the digital world safely; 10) Democratic accountability, proportionality and evidence-based approach. Proper enforcement and resources will be necessary to implement these principles and promote their importance to all parts of the digital world [6, p. 3-4].

According to Souter D., the answer to bad government is good government, therefore, not less. Its citizens – in all their diversity; including children – that should (or should be able to) hold them accountable for how effectively they exercise responsibilities to rights across the board: civil and political; economic, social and cultural; the rights of women and of children; rights in the digital and the non-digital environment [5].

In conclusion, we have to admit that in the UK, in pandemic and post pandemic times, the digital world does not merely require more regulation but a different approach to regulation [6, p. 3]. Anyways, we think that modern British law in the mentioned sphere is quite developed and on the way to its further progress.

Literature

1. Marcus G. Human rights and the new(ish) digital paradigm. Contemporary challenges in securing human rights / Edited by Corinne Lennox. London. Human Rights Consortium, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, School of Advanced Study,

University of London, 2015. 163 p. URL: https://sas-space.sas.ac.uk/6205/1/06marcus.pdf (date of access: 18.01.2022).

2. Horten M. Digital rights – why they matter in a time of coronavirus. *Iptegrity*. 2020. URL: http://www.iptegrity.com/index.php/internet-freedoms/1113-digital-rights-why-they-matter-in-a-time-of-covid (date of access: 18.01.2022).

3. Myronets O.M., Danyliuk I.V., Dembytska N.M., Frantsuz-Yakovets T.A., Dei M.O. Current Issues and Prospects of Modern Higher Legal Education in Conditions of the Fight against COVID-19. *Cuestiones Políticas*. 2020. Vol. 37. № 65. P. 438-456. DOI: http://doi.org/10.46398/cuestpol.3865.29.

4. Myronets O.M., Burdin M., Tsukan O., Nesteriak Yu. Prevention of human rights violation. *Asia Life Sciences*. 2019. Supplement 21 (2). P. 577-591.

5. Souter D. Inside the Digital Society: Children’s rights in the digital society. *LSE*. 2021. URL: https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/medialse/2021/04/12/inside-the-digital-society-childrens-rights-in-the-digital-society/ (date of access: 18.01.2022).

6. Regulating in a digital world. 2nd Report of Session 2017-19. Select Committee on Communications. House of Lords. 2019. URL: https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/ ld201719/ldselect/ldcomuni/299/299.pdf (date of access: 18.01.2022).

УДК 342.41(043.2)

Аль-Зухаірі М.Т.,
начальник коледжу Імама Аль-Кадима,
Юридичний факультет, м. Багдад, Ірак

РОЛЬ ФЕДЕРАЛЬНОГО ВЕРХОВНОГО СУДУ ІРАКУ В МЕХАНІЗМІ ЗАХИСТУ ПРАВ І СВОБОД ЛЮДИНИ В УМОВАХ ДІДЖИТАЛІЗАЦІЇ

З часу створення Іраку як держави у 1921 році, лише у березні 1925 року вперше прийнято Основний Закон (перша Конституція Королівства Іраку). Конституція Королівства Іраку 1925 року закріпила принцип поділу влади між монархом та урядом, проте її положення не передбачали функціонування інституту судового контролю щодо захисту прав і свобод людини та громадянина.

Відлік реального розвитку зазначеного інституту варто починати з моменту закріплення у ст. 81 Конституції Королівства Іраку від 21 березня 1925 року (в редакції від 27 жовтня 1943 року) мети та завдань Верховного суду, що засновановувався для здійснення правосуддя над міністрами та членами Національної ради, які звинувачувалися у політичних злочинах та злочинах, пов’язаних із виконанням держаних обов’язків, та для здійснення правосуддя над суддями Касаційної палати за їх посадові злочини, а також для вирішення питань щодо тлумачення законів у відповідності до Основного закону [1]. Отже, Верховний суд