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Abstract: The technological revolution and the search for the “new post-pandemic normality” require a re-reading of the freedoms of communication (freedom of expression and freedom of information), in order to conceive, in the face of the change of the paradigm of digital actors to three elements (individual, state and company), a new system that brings together the public and the particular which can be called collective and private, capable of forming awareness for peace in the face of the guarantee of the right to non-discrimination, centered on the balance between the legal and the civic possible through the binomial instruction-respect, that is, the individual recognition of respect for human dignity as guided by human rights in the perspective of fundamental freedoms in the posting and sharing of information on social networks, as oriented by the education values.

1. INTRODUCTION

Humankind lives in times of challenges and adaptations that are easily perceived by the increase of tensions, social and political, facilitated by the technological revolution, in particular the growth of social networks, whose information, not always true and morally acceptable, quickly reaches a huge number of people. There is a phenomenon to be studied: what limit should be imposed on freedoms of communication in the context of digital networks, in the context of free access to social networks?

In fact, the issue is broad and needs to be restricted to two criteria: the legal (the duty to be regulated by law, in which coercion contributes to determining what the individual must do in a legal perspective) and the civic (personal conduct based on individual conscience that stimulates “positive” social action). Since then, two new questions have arisen: what to protect? And, how to protect?

The object of protection must be the individual in his particularity as a human being, both in the access to quality information justified in the principle of truth and in the preservation of his dignity (v.g., honor, privacy, freedom, etc.) against the abusive use of the freedoms of communication imposed or shared against him. Among the offenses to dignity by the abusive use of the freedoms of communication, discrimination stands out and will receive more attention.

Since this is a prospective analysis and not merely a critical or descriptive one, the paper intends to reflect on two points in order to contribute to the theoretical-practical solution: (a) the
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change in the social, political and legal paradigm that modified the relationship between two actors (State and individual) to, by adding the third vertex, recognize it of interest to three actors (State, individual and companies that control the digital public sphere); and, b) integrate to the discourse the values inherent to education in the perspective of a culture of peace in a world in sustainable development for all human beings.

Considering the breadth of the argument, the second point of exploration will be restricted to the values of education aimed at instruction (theoretical foundation for true and positive knowledge) and respect among the equals (a practical foundation that induces the reproduction in the society of “positive social action” according to the humanitarian element in a democratic perspective), both justified on premises recognized by the General Assembly of United Nations within the system of culture of peace (A/RES/53/243) and the system of education for democracy (A/RES/71/8).

Deducing the analysis, as said, the conclusion intends to propose elements based on the instruction-respect binomial justified in the values of education that form the individual conscience for the use of the freedoms of communication in the digital environment in the scope of social networks in favor of non-discrimination, having in the observation of the Portuguese constitutional system experience as a practical element of ponderation.

2. POST-WARS AND A NEW LEGAL VISION ON FREEDOMS OF COMMUNICATION

In the post-war world, the natural endowment of the manifestation of reason through speech giving an opinion or expressing a position in front of the discourse has gained greater legal attention, whose international trend towards effective protection began to be introduced into a human being consciousness and induced into political-constitutional programmes by Article 19 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UN/UDHR), as per A/RES/217(I-II) of 10th December, 1948.

Since then, the legal guarantee has been established for individuals to, if they wish, express their opinion as they wish, without interference or external limitation, guaranteeing in the same way, the right to receive information, which originated the normative reading of the concept of the universal right guaranteed by individual freedom against everyone, including the State.

The induction to the political-constitutional programmes germinated on the occasion of the European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR) which recognized the premises of the UN, provided in Article 10 for freedom of expression. The legal treatment was much more cautious when defining the duty and the exceptions so that the duty guaranteed the right to express opinions and information as well as to receive information and ideas without any restrictions (mainly political) or hindrance, especially from public authorities, continued; the exceptions were to define the restrictions (ECHR, Article 10, I).

Thus, the restrictions were divided into two parts: a) recognition of the power of States to define rules for prior authorizations to broadcasting, cinematographic, or television companies (ECHR, Article 10, I, in fine); and, b) recognition that the exercise of this universal right in the dimension of individual freedom could degenerate into excesses that affect other related and interconnected rights.
Regarding excesses, the possibility of imposing restrictions, formalities, conditions, or sanctions has been foreseen, with prior legal definition justified in the duties and responsibilities, as well as based on the democratic principle, whenever limited “in the interests of national security, territorial integrity or public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, for the protection of the reputation or rights of others, for preventing the disclosure of information received in confidence, or for maintaining the authority and impartiality of the judiciary” (ECHR, Article 10, 2).

In the context of nation-states, the transposition of international rule into domestic law was verified. Thus, the communication freedoms assumed the normative efficacy of a positive law that was approved by the principle of legality typical of a sovereign rule of law that intended to follow democratic values.

Thus, the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic of 1976 (in a framework of the 2005 Constitutional Revision) provided for freedom of expression in association with freedom of information, maintaining, in a broad sense, the provisions of the ECHR, both in the main provisions and in the exceptions, with the novel recognition on the nature of the offenses committed in excess of the right immanent to freedom of expression and information, which are subject to the general principles of criminal law or to the illicit offense of mere social order with the subsequent judicialization of the act in courts or administrative bodies (CPR/1976, Article 37, 3), and ensured the rights of reply and rectification, to individuals and enterprises, in addition to any compensation proportional to the damage (CPR/1976, Article 37, 4).

In the scope of supranational law, the treatment was similar. After all, it is perceived in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (CFREU) in its Article 11, 1, the reproduction of the general rule conceived in Article 10, 1, of the ECHR, without mentioning the exceptions. However, the following paragraph when it determines that “the freedom and pluralism of the media shall be respected”, allows numerous considerations, including the one that sees the change of the paradigm on which freedom of expression was erected by the dual system, to a broader conception, with a third actor beyond the individual and the nation-state.

3. FREEDOMS OF COMMUNICATION AND TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION: CHANGING THE PARADIGM TO THE TRIPLE ACTORS SYSTEM

The deductive systematization, from the UDHR (Article 19), through the ECHR (Article 10) and the CFREU (Article 11), to the CPR/1976 (Article 37), admits the recognition of the dualistic or dyadic system of protection of the freedoms of communication limited to the respect to the freedom of expression and freedom of information that relates two political-legal actors, the State and the individual (citizen or enterprise), each with rights and duties previously defined in law and clarified in principles, among them the principle of protection of citizens’ trust.

Such principle of protection of citizens’ trust is interpreted according to the principle of truth by which the freedoms of communication should be read in the sense of acquisition of knowledge.
qualified by good information defined by truth, so that “healthy participation in civic life depends on the healthy formation of public opinion. The more enlightened the citizens of a country, the less likely they are to be the target of manipulation of their political will”\(^5\).

At the dawn of the 21st century marked by the technological revolution, the reading of the dualistic relationship becomes more difficult. Here is the paradigm reversal point: in the domain of the information age with the accelerated technological progress that has enabled rapid access to knowledge (about facts and opinions, scientific and vulgar, academic and general), largely due to the social networks favored by the new stage of dialogue and knowledge, known as the Internet, freedoms of communication have come to be seen through a broader prism, without physical boundaries.

The change of paradigm presents a new reality, although it has favored access to information: the facilitation of issuing opinions and disseminating knowledge allows the publication of opinions that may violate the limits and restrictions on freedom of expression (v.g. fake news, hate speech, political manipulation\(^6\), etc.), spread by information and social networks, especially the Internet. So, we realize the importance of a third political actor that needs to be legally integrated into the normativity of freedoms of communication (freedom of speech and freedom of information) and put under the watchful eye of civility understood by respect, tolerance, and good practices.

This third actor is defined by Jack Balkin as the “third group of players: a privately owned infrastructure of digital communication composed of firms that support and govern the digital public sphere that people use to communicate” (Balkin, 2018, p. 2012), stimulated the normative rereading forcing the novel regulation in the face of the third vertex of this new relational triangle that replaced the previous linear model formed by two actors.

Thus, in a broader sense, the right to be forgotten\(^7\) is recognized, in addition to the encouragement to States to create laws that prevent the irresponsible use of cyberspace (the practice of

---

\(^5\) Personal and free translation of: “a participação sadia na vida cívica depende da formação saudável da opinião pública. Quanto mais esclarecidos os cidadãos de um país, menor é a probabilidade de serem alvo de manipulação da sua vontade política” (Machado, 2020, p. 223).

\(^6\) As stated by Jónatas Machado and Iolanda Brito: “With the internet and social networks, as well as with information technologies, the level of connectivity between people has increased exponentially. If, on the one hand, this circumstance has reinforced the scrutiny of public powers, which is no longer an exclusive function of the press, it is also true that, on the other hand, without the mediation of journalism, the necessary filter to ensure the reliability of news content is non-existent. The recent phenomenon of the massive use of fake news, i.e. false information published on the Internet with the intention of influencing opinion, had an impact on the result of the Brexit referendum, on the US elections that elected Donald Trump as President and even on the presidential elections that elected Jair Bolsonaro (...)”; as a personal and free translation of: “Com a internet e as redes sociais, assim como com as tecnologias da informação, o nível de conectividade entre as pessoas aumentou exponencialmente. Se, por um lado, esta circunstância veio reforçar o escrutínio dos poderes públicos, que deixou de ser uma função exclusiva da imprensa, também é certo que, por outro lado, sem a mediação do jornalismo, passa a inexistir o necessário filtro para garantir a fidedignidade dos conteúdos noticiosos. O recente fenómeno do recurso massivo a fake News, ou seja, a informação falsa publicada na Internet com a intenção de influenciar a opinião, teve impacto no resultado do referendo do Brexit, nas eleições norte-americanas que elegeram Donald Trump como Presidente e ainda nas eleições presidenciais que elegeram Jair Bolsonaro” (Machado, 2020, p. 223).

\(^7\) In European Law, we highlight as some of the main elements on the “right to be forgotten”: a) in the normative scope, Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council, 27 April 2016, Article 17, and Law n°. 75/2021, 18 November, from the Assembly of the Portuguese Republic; b) in the jurisprudential scope, Google Spain SL., Google Inc. vs. Agência Española de Protección de Datos (AEPD), Mario Costeja González (CJEU, Case C 131/12), and European Court of Human Rights (EChHR), Case 77419/16 - Case: Biancardi vs. Italy.
disinformation and other offenses to individual freedoms), the guarantee against all forms of discrimination and protection against virtual-digital crimes\(^8\), including social networks\(^9\).

Beyond the normative adequacy, a greater tension between individuals is perceived, facilitated by the “expanded contents of the Net” (internet) restricted to spontaneity\(^10\), ease\(^11\), visibility\(^12\), permanence\(^13\), and expansibility, as previewed by Raúl Trejo Delarbre (2015, p. 38-41), which favor digital hate speech in social networks characterized by intolerance in all its manifestations\(^14\).

The clash between freedoms of communication and the right to privacy is immediately perceived, in addition to the right to true and reliable information, that is, the individual’s power to communicate in the networked digital environment and the right to public protection that can be opposed by the individual in the face of this related right.

Moreover, it is no longer a matter of the relationship between the nation-state and the individual, since the social networks and related ones make the issue more complex, which, among countless variables, may be restricted to the careful look of non-discrimination, both of not preventing freedom of expression and information, and of preventing its misuse when it incites discrimination, especially by hate speech, in its multiple possibilities (v.g. racism, xenophobia, homophobia, bullying, etc.).

---

\(^8\) With special relevance “against the apology of terrorism, incitement to hatred and violence against a person or group of persons because of their race, colour, ethnic or national origin, ancestry, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or physical or psychic disability, harassment or sexual exploitation of children, female genital mutilation and persecution”; as a personal and free translation of: “contra a apologia do terrorismo, o incitamento ao ódio e à violência contra pessoa ou grupo de pessoas por causa da sua raça, cor, origem étnica ou nacional, ascendência, religião, sexo, orientação sexual, identidade de gênero ou deficiência física ou psíquica, o assédio ou exploração sexual de crianças, a mutilação genital feminina e a perseguição” (Law nº. 27/2021, 17 May, Article 4, 3).

\(^9\) By example: a Carta Portuguesa de Direitos Humanos na Era Digital, introduced by Lei n.º 27/2021, de 17 de maio; e Gesetz zur Verbesserung der Rechtsdurchsetzung in sozialen Netzwerken (Netzwerkdurchsetzungsgesetz - NetzDG).

\(^10\) In the virtual environment, the manifestation of opinion, by words or images, follows the unmeditated impulses to the detriment of common sense, conduct facilitated by the false idea of personal concealment, either by physical distance – individuals are more thoughtful in the presence of their interlocutor, at least for fear of reaction – or by dissimulation, or as Delarbre (2015, p. 38) said: “A phrase that slips fleetingly from the keyboard to the Web before we put our wisdom chip to work, a photograph that we share before thinking about whether we really want it to be seen by others... it has happened to all of us” (“Una frase que se desliza fugaz del teclado a la Red antes de que pongamos a funcionar el chip de la sensatez, una fotografía que compartimos antes de pensar si realmente queremos que sea vista por otros... a todos nos ha sucedido”).

\(^11\) The free access and simplicity to post, without filters or restrictions, as well as the propensity of people to denigrate or applaud others, without reflection or argumentation, contributes to the spread of insults and other aggressions.

\(^12\) People post on social networks, or interact on the internet, with the primary purpose of being seen, of being known by others: “Expressions of aggression and hatred, even if they were intended for a specific person or group, are there to be known by others” (“Las expresiones de agresión y odio, aunque estuvieran destinadas a persona o un grupo específicos, aparecen allí para ser conocidas por otros” – Delarbre, 2015, p. 40).

\(^13\) Once the information is disclosed on the internet, however fast the repentance may be, it is not possible to return to the status quo ante, so that what allows the greatest engagement is welcome; as Delarbre (2015, p. 41) reminds us: “But scorn and offence fare better (i.e. run faster) both in the gossip that animates any group of people interacting offline and in the collection of networks and mirrors that is the internet” (“Pero escarnios y ofensas corren con mejor suerte (es decir, corren más rápido) tanto en el chismorreo que anima a cualquier grupo de personas que se relacionan fuera de línea como en esa colección de redes y espejos que es internet”).

\(^14\) María Elena Ramírez (2015, p. 51-59) highlights some initiatives to combat the intolerance that leads to hate speech: Young People Combating Hate Speech Online (European Union), PantallasAmigas (Spain), and #SinTags (Mexico).
4. FREEDOMS OF COMMUNICATION AND RIGHT TO NON-DISCRIMINATION

The freedoms of communication in direct relation to the right to non-discrimination must be taken as an ideological limit to human conduct in social networks, which challenges reflection on the numerous possible consequences of free human action in the face of the duty to respect human dignity.

In this sense, Alejandra Lagunes Soto Ruiz (2015, p. 96), proposes the following question: how to understand freedom of expression (extendable to freedom of information) and the right to non-discrimination in the context of social networks? In her reflection, Ruiz proposes a dual analysis girded to the legal and civic aspects, with the moderation of speech being the Mexican reality that allows her to state: “The challenge of facing this problem is different because while discrimination by the authorities is solved with regulation and adequate implementation mechanisms, discrimination among empowered citizens with the microphone of social media needs a deeper solution”.

In fact, the proposed solution is limited to the formation of awareness for non-discrimination based on tolerance and respect, both induced by education that raises civic responsibility by which individuals themselves control the public space, regulating the freedoms of communication.

5. CULTURE OF PEACE AND AWARENESS: A BRIEF STRAIGHT TO THE POINT

The analysis of the formation of consciousness for non-discrimination that sustains positive media discourses on the values inherent to human dignity, possible before the norm and the conduct in perspective of legal and civic aspects, can be linked to the broader aspects of the culture of peace, as an international micro-system conceived in the domain of the United Nations peace system.

---

15 Personal and free translation of: “El reto de enfrentar este problema es distinto, porque mientras la discriminación por parte de las autoridades se resuelve con regulación y mecanismos de implementación adecuados, la discriminación entre ciudadanos empoderados con el micrófono de las redes sociales necesita una solución más profunda” (Ruiz, 2015, p. 98).

16 “Let us imagine for a moment what the development of a true civic awareness scheme in social networks could generate: a mechanism in which all users ensure a free-discrimination environment, where in a decentralised way the conditions of freedom and equality of all people are monitored.”; as a personal and free translation of: “Imaginemos por un momento lo que el desarrollo de un verdadero esquema de conciencia cívica en las redes sociales podría generar: un mecanismo en el que todos los usuarios aseguren un entorno libre de discriminación, donde de manera descentralizada se vigilen las condiciones de libertad e igualdad de todas las personas” (Ruiz, 2015, p. 99).

17 There is a direct reference to the proposal of systematization of “peace”, as a foundation and constitutive principle of the UN, divided into four phases unveiled in the reading of the United Nations periods of sessions, between 1945 and 2018, as said elsewhere, “we propose a four-step analysis of the United Nations peace system conceived: a one, by the laying of the foundations for the conception of the system with temporal restriction in the first five periods of sessions, especially between the third and the fifth (A/RES/3/190; A/RES/3/217; A/RES/4/290; A/RES/5/377; A/RES/5/380; A/RES/5/381; and, A/RES/5/494); two, for establishing a culture of peace (A/RES/53/243; A/RES/33/73; and A/RES/39/11); three, for declaring the right to peace (A/RES/71/189); and four, for promoting peace as a vital requirement for the full enjoyment of human rights for all (A/RES/33/170);” as a personal and free translation of: “propôe-se a análise, em quatro passos, do sistema de paz das Nações Unidas concebido: a um, pelo assentamento das bases para a concepção do sistema com restrição temporal nos cinco primeiros períodos de sessões, mormente entre o terceiro e o quinto (A/RES/3/190; A/RES/3/217; A/RES/4/290; A/RES/5/377; A/RES/5/380; A/RES/5/381; e, A/RES/5/494); a dois, pela instauração da cultura de paz (A/RES/53/243; A/RES/33/73; e, A/RES/39/11); a três, pela declaração sobre o direito à paz (A/RES/71/189); e, a quatro, pela promoção da paz como requisito vital para o pleno desfrute dos direitos humanos para todos (A/RES/33/170)” (Pires, 2019, p. 88).
considering that the foundations are the same: the values inherent to human dignity and the duty of all, including the States, to respect and protect them, in the narrow limit of the UDHR.

Specifically within the scope of the Declaration on a Culture of Peace welcomed in A/RES/53/243, inspired and made possible by the optimistic feeling of the end of the Cold War (?!), three assertions are recognized: the first, wars are born in the minds of human beings, so that it is there that peace must be strengthened (a premise previously stated in the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization); the second, the perception that peace, more than the simple absence of conflict, requires a positive, dynamic and participatory process of promoting dialogue in order to seek a negotiated solution in a spirit of understanding and cooperation of all actors; and, the third, the concrete need to seek the elimination of all forms of discrimination and intolerance.

To justify the assertions, the Declaration assumes that the successful implementation of the culture of peace is only possible through the dissemination of values, attitudes, behaviors and lifestyles dedicated exclusively to the promotion of peace among individuals, groups and nations (art. 2). So, the education, on all levels and aimed at the dissemination of human rights, is the fundamental means for its edification (art. 4), while everyone must be committed to its strengthening, that is, governments have the primary function of promoting it (art. 5), civil society is committed to its full development (art. 6), the mass media must contribute to its strengthening (art. 7), development (art. 8), and dissemination of qualified and educational information (art. 7), as well as the United Nations must continue with its mission to play the critical role leading to the strengthening of the movement (art. 9), and parents, teachers, politicians, journalists, religious bodies and groups, intellectuals, all those who carry out scientific, philosophical, creative and artistic activities, health professionals, humanitarians, directors of governmental and non-governmental organizations, to whom the key role of promoting the culture of peace belongs (art. 8).

Furthermore, the culture of peace, as a set of values, attitudes, traditions, behaviors and lifestyles is based on:

a) respect for life, the end of violence and the promotion of non-violence through education, dialogue and cooperation (Article 1, a);

b) respect for the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence of States, and non-interference in matters that are eminently within the internal jurisdiction of States (Article 1, b);


The reflection is part of the rationale discussed in the paper entitled: “From the inversion of the theoretical-practical paradigm to the current conception of peace as a vital requirement for the full enjoyment of human rights in equality”, with the original title: “Da inversão do paradigma teórico-prático até a atual concepção da paz como requisito vital para o pleno desfrute dos direitos humanos em igualdade” (Pires, 2019, p. 78-98).

The reflection is part of the rationale discussed in the paper entitled: “From the inversion of the theoretical-practical paradigm to the current conception of peace as a vital requirement for the full enjoyment of human rights in equality”, with the original title: “Da inversão do paradigma teórico-prático até a atual concepção da paz como requisito vital para o pleno desfrute dos direitos humanos em igualdade” (Pires, 2019, p. 78-98).

21 The reflection is part of the rationale discussed in the paper entitled: “From the inversion of the theoretical-practical paradigm to the current conception of peace as a vital requirement for the full enjoyment of human rights in equality”, with the original title: “Da inversão do paradigma teórico-prático até a atual concepção da paz como requisito vital para o pleno desfrute dos direitos humanos em igualdade” (Pires, 2019, p. 78-98).
c) Unrestricted respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and their dissemination (Article 1, c);

d) a commitment to the peaceful resolution of conflicts (Article 1, d);

e) in the effort to satisfy the needs of development and protection of the environment (Article 1, e);

f) respect for and promotion of the right to development (Article 1, f);

g) respect for and promotion of equal rights and opportunities, especially for women and men (Article 1, g);

h) respect for the right of all people to freedom of expression, opinion, and information and its promotion (Article 1, h); and

i) adherence to the principles of liberty, justice, democracy, tolerance, solidarity, cooperation, pluralism, cultural diversity, dialogue, and understanding at all levels of society and among nations (Article 1, i).

It is perceived, therefore, that the civic use guided by the legal aspect of the freedoms of communication is a theme belonging to the normative system of culture of peace, therefore restricted to the elements of A/RES/53/243. Thus, converging the assertions on the culture of peace in which the conscience for peace, externalized by dialogue inspired by cooperation and understanding leads to the repeated social practice of combating discrimination (guarantee non-discrimination), beyond the regulation enforceable to all (individuals, State, and companies that control the digital public sphere), with the precious help of education, is directly applicable to the guarantee and protection of freedoms of communication.

6. EDUCATION AS AN INSTRUMENT OF THE CULTURE OF PEACE WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATION

Education as an instrument for strengthening the culture of peace in the face of the challenge of forming awareness for peace leads to numerous paths of analysis, the most common being the link with the right to peace (A/RES/71/189, Article 4) and democracy (A/RES/71/8, Article 2), when discussing the transposition of values from the individual to society, as seen in reflections on legal and civic criteria, even with restrictions on freedoms of communication.

In summary, the Declaration on the Right to Peace (A/RES/71/189), recognizes as ideological bases, among others\(^ {22} \), the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Declaration on the Right to Development, the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, the Preparation of Societies for Living in Peace, the Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace, and the Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace, regulated the theme in five articles\(^ {23} \).

\(^ {22} \) For example, the United Nations Millennium Declaration (A/RES/55/2), the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (A/RES/70/1), the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document (A/RES/60/1), the Declaration on the Principles of International Law, particularly those relating to friendly relations and cooperation among States (A/RES/25/2625), the Definition of Aggression (A/RES/29/3314), and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (A/RES/25/1514).

\(^ {23} \) The reflection is part of the rationale discussed in the paper entitled: “Forced migratory flows and culture of peace: a hypothetical contribution based on education as a pillar of democracy and alternative solution to the crisis of the welfare state”, with the original title: “Fluxos migratórios forçados e cultura de paz: um contributo hipotético baseado na educação como pilar da democracia e na solução alternativa à crise do estado assistencialista” (Pires, 2018, p. 67-87).
Beyond the concept that all (States and human beings) have the immanent right to live in peace, regardless of particularities (A/RES/33/73, Article 1), and that this right is sacred (A/RES/39/11, Article 1), the interpretation has been extended to also include the enjoyment of peace, in the sense of the promotion and protection of all human rights and the achievement of full development for all (A/RES/71/189, Article 1).

This provision would be possible with the respect, application and promotion of equality and non-discrimination, justice and the rule of law, and guarantees against fear and destitution, without prejudice to the other rights referred to in the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of international and regional instruments on the subject (A/RES/71/189, Article 5), raised to the condition of duties enforceable against States (A/RES/71/189, Article 2), extendable to the United Nations and the specialized agencies/bodies within the limits of their competencies, responsibilities and actions (A/RES/71/189, Article 3).

States, the United Nations and specialized agencies/bodies must adopt sustainable measures appropriate to the fulfillment of their task, and the support and assistance of international, regional, national and local organizations and civil society are requested (A/RES/71/189, Article 3) to fulfill their duty to ensure the enjoyment of peace within a human rights framework and in pursuit of full development. In all cases, appropriate education, inspired by the values of tolerance, dialogue, cooperation and solidarity among all human beings, must serve as a basic instrument for building and strengthening the right to peace (A/RES/71/189, Article 4).

Furthermore, education within the framework of democratic values as recognized in the Resolution on Education for Democracy (A/RES/71/8) has elevated education to the status of a tool to foster constructive and inclusive political participation in relation to human development, in the same way as it has contributed to the strengthening of democracy, good governance and the rule of law at all levels.\(^\text{24}\)

In this sense, education has gone beyond the condition of the universal right to be provided to all, especially in the context of public policies (UNUDHR, Article 26), to constitute a pillar of democracy understood as “the universal value based on the free expression of the will of people to determine their own political, economic, social and cultural systems and their full participation in all aspects of their lives, economic, social and cultural systems, and their full participation in all aspects of their lives,” with the proviso that “although democracies share common features, there is no single model of democracy and democracy does not belong to any country or region” (A/RES/71/8). Furthermore, it was recognized that education contributes to:

a) strengthening democracy, good governance and the rule of law at all levels;
b) the reduction of economic inequality;
c) the realization of human rights, gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls;
d) the achievement of all internationally agreed development goals, including the Sustainable Development Goals, the development of human potential, the eradication of poverty and the fostering of greater understanding between peoples.

\(^\text{24}\) The reflection is part of the rationale discussed in the paper entitled: “Forced migratory flows and culture of peace: a hypothetical contribution based on education as a pillar of democracy and alternative solution to the crisis of the welfare state”, with the original title: “Fluxos migratórios forçados e cultura de paz: um contributo hipotético baseado na educação como pilar da democracia e na solução alternativa à crise do estado assistencialista” (Pires, 2018, p. 67-87).
This led to the adoption of a series of recommendations with emphasis on encouraging the Member States and national, regional and local educational authorities to engage in the adoption of public policies to strengthen “education for democracy”, through the dissemination of education in accountability for public affairs, human rights education and education for sustainable development, in their educational systems, based on the promotion and consolidation of values and democratic governance and human rights, taking into consideration innovative approaches in order to facilitate the empowerment of citizens and encourage their participation in political life at all levels (A/RES/71/8, Article. 6); a responsibility that should be shared by all.

Once the inductive normative foundation of the legal aspect is delimited, it becomes possible to recognize the meaning of education in theoretical and practical dimensions. The theoretical dimension induces the search for true and positive knowledge about social acting by which the individual should seek to educate himself according to elements justified in human rights and fundamental freedoms, whose foundation is given in guarantee of human dignity in the broadest perspective; and the practical dimension to guide the social action itself, the practice of conduct according to the knowledge acquired in accordance with human rights and fundamental freedoms in perspective of human dignity.

Such a sense of education applied to the right to non-discrimination delimited to the freedoms of communication indicates a double effective system: the collective one (formation of a collective conscience focused on human values in perspective of fundamental freedoms) and the private one (induction of human conduct that halts and ends the wrong behaviors, those that offend human dignity, especially the discriminatory ones, strengthened by the perception of the principle of respect among equals).

The expected results, from the theoretical and practical dimensions to the creation of the collective and private systems, intend to confirm, in the face of acting as the culture of peace guides, the efficiency of the binomial instruction-respect, through the verification that the search for good information converges not to post bad information; in the same way, teaching good information presupposes not sharing bad information.

7. CONCLUSION

In final words, the transposition of normative values to human conduct in society (passage from legal to civic) requires the participation of all actors who occupy the three vertices in the digital media relationship (social media and Internet), although the commitment of the one who issues the opinion and/or provides information (author of the post), as well as the one who replicates the opinion/information (author of the share) is more relevant.

Such dynamics of individual commitment and social responsibility based on respect and tolerance guaranteeing the conscience for peace applied to non-discrimination should be the foundation for conscious social engagement in the face of the new conception of freedom of expression within the triadic digital media relationship that has come to govern the freedoms of communication.

The transposition of this foundation to the collective and private systems is intended to confirm, in the context of conduct oriented by the culture of peace, the efficiency of the binomial instruction-respect, through the observation that the seek for good information converges with not posting bad information; in the same way, teaching good information presupposes not sharing bad information.
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