e-ISSN **3041-248X**

**Philosophy and Governance**

https://www.eu-scientists.com/index.php/fag

# The Relationship Between Natural and Digital Human Rights: Problems of Legal Definition

Nataliia Morska [1] *

[1] *Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University (Ukraine). Associate Professor at the Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences, Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor.*

*** *Corresponding Author,*** e-mail: morska-n@ukr.net

**ARTICLE INFO**

***Research Article***

**DOI:** 10.70651/3041-248X/2026.2.11

***Received:***
8 January 2026
***Accepted:***
11 February 2026
***Published online:***
15 February 2026



**ABSTRACT**

This paper delves into the link connecting innate and digital human entitlements via a philosophical viewpoint. Special attention is paid to viewing digital prerogatives as a potential continuation of established notions of innate law. The chief difficulties mentioned concern the lack of a common method for specifying a person's digital entitlements and the intricacy of harmonizing these with natural rights. The aim of this study is a deep philosophical and legal comprehension of the bond between original and digital human entitlements, and to confirm the workability of creating a global understanding of digital rights. The research utilises dialectical, historical-philosophical, comparative-legal, formal-legal, systemic, hermeneutic, axiological, and generalisation techniques. The outcomes showed that an individual's digital entitlements surface as a fresh facet of protecting volition and privacy amid digitalisation; they partly uphold the notion of inherent rights, yet concurrently necessitate their separate legal and philosophical foundation due to the distinct features of the digital realm. The fundamental essence of human entitlements as a philosophical and legal concept within jurisprudence is clarified. The substance and chief characteristics of innate human rights are examined, and their standing in the contemporary legal structure is established. The development of scientific methods for comprehending human entitlements and their impact on shaping the contemporary notion of rights is examined. The substance and juridical essence of electronic human entitlements as an element of information statute are unveiled. The primary categories of digital entitlements are established, and their characteristics are described amid society's digitalization. Worldwide legal standards regarding human rights are examined. The link between inherent and electronic human privileges is explored, with their connection and potential ordering ascertained. Difficulties within the judicial definition of digital human privileges are noted, principally the lack of a uniform approach to their grasp. Disagreements between local and worldwide laws concerning the control of digital entitlements are assessed. The potential for merging legal positivism with inherent law perspectives during the specification of digital rights is evaluated. Conceptual frameworks for grasping digital rights as a fresh phase in the progression of personal freedoms amid worldwide digital metamorphosis are sketched out.

**KEYWORDS**

human dignity, freedom, digital environment, human identity, personal autonomy, natural and digital human rights, international standards, legal regulation, legal definitions.

e-ISSN **3041-248X**

**Філософія та управління**

https://www.eu-scientists.com/index.php/fag

# Співвідношення природних та цифрових прав людини: проблеми правової дефініції

Наталія Л. Морська [1 *]

[1] *Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет імені Володимира Гнатюка (Україна). Доцент кафедри філософії та суспільних наук, канд. філос. наук, доцент.*

*** *Автор-кореспондент,*** e-mail: morska-n@ukr.net

**СТАТТЯ**

***Дослідницька***

**DOI:** 10.70651/3041-248X/2026.2.11

***Отримана:*** 08.01.2026 р.
***Прийнята:*** 11.02.2026 р.
***Опублікована:*** 15.02.2026 р.



**АНОТАЦІЯ**

У статті досліджено співвідношення природних і цифрових прав людини крізь призму філософії. Особливу увагу приділено осмисленню цифрових прав як можливого продовження класичних ідей природного права. Ключовими труднощами виокремлено відсутність спільного підходу до визначення цифрових прав особистості, складність їх узгодження з природними правами. Метою дослідження є усебічне філософсько-правове осмислення співвідношення природних і цифрових прав людини та обґрунтування можливості створення загальної дефініції цифрових прав. У дослідженні використано діалектичний, історико-філософський, порівняльно-правовий, формально-юридичний, системний, герменевтичний, аксіологічний та метод узагальнення. Результати дослідження показали, що цифрові права особистості постають як новий вимір захисту волі та приватності в умовах цифровізації. З'ясовано сутність прав людини як філософсько-юридичної категорії у межах правової філософії. Проаналізовано сутність і ключові ознаки природних прав людини та визначено їх місце в сучасній правовій системі. Досліджено еволюцію наукових підходів до розуміння прав людини та їх вплив на формування сучасної концепції прав. Розкрито зміст і правову природу цифрових прав людини як складової інформаційного права. Визначено основні види цифрових прав та охарактеризовано їх особливості в умовах цифровізації суспільства. Проаналізовано міжнародно-правові стандарти у сфері прав людини. Досліджено співвідношення природних і цифрових прав людини, встановлено їх взаємозв'язок та можливу ієрархію. Виявлено проблеми правової дефініції цифрових прав людини, зокрема, відсутність єдиного підходу до їх тлумачення. Проаналізовано колізії між національним і міжнародним правом у сфері регулювання цифрових прав. Оцінено можливості поєднання юридичного позитивізму з природно-правовими підходами у процесі визначення цифрових прав. Окреслено концептуальні підходи до осмислення цифрових прав як нової стадії еволюції прав особистості в умовах світової цифрової трансформації.

**КЛЮЧОВІ СЛОВА**

людська гідність, свобода, цифрове середовище, людська ідентичність, автономія особи, природні та цифрові права людини, міжнародні стандарти, правове регулювання, правові дефініції.

## 1. Introduction

Virtual reality, as a new dimension of human existence, creates a unique space for the formation of personality. The digital environment poses several difficult tasks for a person: on the one hand, the danger of interference in personal life increases, and on the other hand, there are problems of guaranteeing equal access to digitalization. Under such circumstances, the established ideas about the rights of the individual, which have crystallized in the material world, require revision and adaptation to the peculiarities of digital existence [7, p. 5].

Digital reality is becoming not only a technical, but also a philosophical challenge: it forces us to reconsider the very essence of human freedom, autonomy and dignity, raises questions about the balance between innovation and ethical principles, and also requires the formation of new categories of legal and moral protection that take into account the dynamics of the digital environment. The formulation of the problem of defining digital human rights as a new category in law is due to the rapid digitalization of society and the emergence of new technologies that radically change the ways a person interacts with information, other people and the state. Traditional concepts of human rights formed in the physical world do not always adequately reflect the challenges of the digital environment, in particular, algorithmic control, collection and processing of personal data, artificial intelligence, platform economy, and digital surveillance [4, p. 183].

Digital rights of the individual appear as a response to these challenges and must guarantee the protection of the will, privacy, and autonomy of the individual in the digital environment. At the same time, their legal definition encounters numerous difficulties. Thus, digital rights need to be formulated as a separate, autonomous category that preserves the philosophical core of natural rights, but takes into account the specifics of the digital environment and new ways of implementing and protecting human rights. The problem of rethinking human rights in the context of technological transformation is that the classical concepts of freedom, dignity and privacy were formed in the physical, "real" world and do not always adequately reflect the new challenges of the digital environment [9]. With the advent of the Internet, artificial intelligence, big data and algorithmic control, there is a need to revise traditional approaches to human rights, because digital technologies create new forms of interference in private life, new opportunities for manipulation and inequality of access to information [4, p. 183]. This forces the legal system and the philosophy of law to seek a balance between the protection of fundamental values and the development of technology, rethinking the very principles of human rights: their universality, limits and ways of implementation. At the same time, the task arises to determine which human rights should be logically transformed in the digital dimension, and which require the creation of new, specialized categories – digital rights that can ensure the dignity and autonomy of the individual in the context of global technological transformation.

Philosophical and legal approaches to understanding the will, dignity and autonomy of a person are based on two interrelated planes: ontological and normative [7, p. 5]. From a philosophical point of view, will is considered the ability of a person to independently determine their own actions and life priorities, and autonomy is considered an internal ability for self-government and moral responsibility. Dignity in this context is a cornerstone value that outlines the inviolability of a person as a subject of law, regardless of external circumstances [24]. From a legal point of view, freedom, dignity and autonomy are embodied in specific legal guarantees and human rights: the right to privacy, freedom of speech, the right to choose a lifestyle and participate in public life. Rethinking these categories in modern conditions of digitalization requires taking into account the specifics of new forms of interaction and control [18]. The synthesis of philosophical and legal approaches allows not only to formulate the content of fundamental rights in the digital age, but also to create the basis for the emergence of digital human rights that ensure the realization of freedom, dignity and autonomy in the new technological conditions.

## 2. Literature Review

Recent years have shown a rapid increase in scientific interest in the relationship between natural human rights and the so-called "digital rights", which is due to the digitalization of social relations, the development of artificial intelligence, big data and the platform economy. In the works of D. Byelov and M. Bielova [7, p. 5], digital rights are perceived as a continuation of natural rights. A similar position is taken by K. Bieliakov et al. [4, p. 183], who emphasize the integrative nature of digital rights.

J. Cohen [9] analyzes the transformation of the right to privacy under the conditions of algorithmic governance. In the European scientific tradition, quite considerable attention is paid to the normative consolidation of electronic rights. In particular, the works of K. Yeung and M. Lodge [24] studied the impact of EU regulations (GDPR, AI Act) on the change of human rights. Y. Shany [18, p. 461] studied the transformation of international law, in particular, human rights under the influence of digitalization. He proposed the concept of "three generations of digital rights" and proved that digital rights are not separate, but are part of the existing system of international law. S. Shaelou and Y. Razmetaeva [17, p. 567] focused on the impact of artificial intelligence systems on fundamental human rights. Their work is to form an approach to combining the digital legal order with the principle of the rule of law and European heritage. A. Dukalskis [11, p. 334] examines the political influence of states on changing human rights standards in global institutions. A. Ahmed Taha [1, p. 429] focused on international legal mechanisms for the protection of human rights in the digital age. S. Tillaboev [20, p. 45] has actually classified digital human rights and defined their main types. G. Teravosa and S. Nagari [19, p. 1] investigated digital constitutionalism and the adaptation of human rights to technological changes.

Thus, the scientific discussion is at the stage of forming conceptual foundations. The proposed article aims to overcome these gaps by clarifying the legal definition of digital rights and substantiating their relationship with natural human rights, which will form a more holistic theoretical model in this area.

## 3. Problem Statement

The purpose of the study is to philosophically and legally comprehend the content and boundaries of freedom, dignity and autonomy of the individual, as well as to analyze the transformation of these fundamental values in the digital environment to clarify the correlation of natural and digital human rights and substantiate the prospects for their generally accepted definition.

## 4. Methods and Materials

The study was based on a comprehensive review of scientific works related to the theoretical, legal and philosophical aspects of natural human rights, the development of the concept of digital rights, the problems of digitalization of society, as well as the issues of freedom, dignity and autonomy of the individual in the context of modern technological transformations.

One of the most important research methods was comparative legal analysis to outline different legal approaches to the definition of "human rights" and "digital rights"; dialectical method for analyzing the development and relationship of natural and digital human rights, historical and philosophical method for studying the evolution of concepts of natural rights; formal legal method for the study of legal norms in their "pure" form; a systematic method for considering human rights as a single structure; hermeneutic method for interpreting the content of basic concepts and categories; axiological method for studying the value foundations of human rights and a method of generalization for formulating conclusions.

## 5. Results and Discussion

The idea of natural rights in classical philosophy is based on the belief that human rights are inseparable from human nature and do not depend on the state or legislation. John Locke considered natural rights as rights to life, liberty and property; he emphasized that their protection is the main goal of the creation of any state, and the violation of these rights is morally unacceptable and legitimately allows resistance to tyranny. Jean-Jacques Rousseau emphasized the freedom and equality of people [21, p. 438]. Human dignity as an ontological basis of rights means that the value and inviolability of a person are recognized as a fundamental characteristic of his being, regardless of external circumstances or legal norms. In a philosophical sense, it is an intrinsic property of a person that determines their right to respect, self-realization and protection from any form of humiliation or discrimination. The issue of the universality of natural rights causes active discussions in the philosophy of law and international law. On the one hand, natural rights are proclaimed as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights [18, p. 461]. On the other hand, in practice, the implementation of these rights largely depends on historical, social, economic and political conditions, which calls into question their absolute universality.

Many researchers emphasize that the universality of natural rights is an ideal that serves as an ethical and legal guideline rather than a complete reality, because specific forms of protection and guarantees of human rights vary from society to society. However, it is the desire for universality that determines the basis of international human rights standards and stimulates the development of a global legal culture, forming a common basis for the protection of freedom, dignity and autonomy of the individual in various contexts, including the digital age [17, p. 567].

The consolidation of natural rights in international legal acts, in particular in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, became an important stage in the formalization of the ideas of natural law in the global legal space. The Declaration declares that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights, recognizing the fundamental rights – to life, liberty, personal integrity, participation in public and political life – as universal and inalienable [22]. This document establishes the legal basis for human protection at the international level [21, p. 438]. In the context of digital transformation, there is a need to rethink human rights, because classical concepts of natural rights do not always adequately correspond to the specifics of algorithmic control, collection and processing of personal data, artificial intelligence and digital platforms. The digital environment not only changes the forms of implementation of fundamental rights, but also gives rise to new categories – digital human rights, which should ensure the protection of dignity, freedom and autonomy of the individual in the new technological conditions [1, p. 429].

The digital environment is becoming a new dimension of human identity. Virtual platforms, social networks, digital services and online communities allow a person to spread their own ideas, maintain social connections and create virtual projections of themselves, which often become an extension of the physical self [17, p. 567]. In this context, digital identity is not a simple reflection of real life, but acts as an autonomous component of the individual, which has its own rights, duties and vulnerabilities. On the one hand, the digital environment expands the possibilities of self-expression and autonomy; on the other hand, it increases the risks of manipulation, interference with privacy and control by the state or corporations [11, p. 334]. According to Michel Foucault's ideas, power manifests itself in complex networks of social practices, norms and discourses. In the digital age, these ideas take on a new meaning: algorithms, big data, artificial intelligence, and digital platforms act as tools of "distributed power" that form models of action, assess risks, and regulate user behavior [14, p. 146].

This leads to the transformation of the subject of law, which emphasizes the need to rethink the legal mechanisms of protection. In this regard, there is a need for the formation of digital human rights, which take into account new forms of power and control, ensure the protection of privacy, freedom and autonomy of a person in the context of digital surveillance and algorithmic regulation of social actions [18, p. 461].

The modern digital environment creates new challenges for the usual understanding of freedom. In this light, freedom ceases to be a full-fledged right, turning into the subject of delicate control mechanisms, which often remain invisible to the person of the law. The task is complicated by the fact that digital surveillance is carried out not only by the state, but also by international technology companies, which accumulate and process significant amounts of data, outline patterns of behavior and create conditions for social and financial influence [21, p. 334]. This creates a paradox: man formally remains free, but his freedom is largely determined by algorithmic structures, which requires a rethinking of human rights in the digital age.

In this regard, there is a need to form digital human rights that would ensure a balance between the development of technology and the protection of autonomy, privacy and freedom of the individual, establishing new boundaries of power and control in the digital space. Digital human rights arise as a necessary response to fundamental changes taking place in the way of existence of a modern person in the context of digital transformation [7, p. 5]. Artificial intelligence, algorithmic systems, big data, and global digital platforms not only change social, economic, and communication practices but also affect the very essence of human existence, creating new existential challenges [19, p. 1]. They do not replace natural rights, but act as their logical continuation in the new conditions, reflecting the need for the right to adapt to the existential challenges of the digital age and protect a person both in the physical and virtual worlds.

The digital transformation of modern society creates new conditions for human existence, in which interaction, communication and self-expression take place not only in the physical, but also in the digital environment. Digital reality forms a unique space of existence where the social, cultural and professional roles of an individual are realized, while exposing them to algorithmic control, data

collection and processing, artificial intelligence and global platforms. In these conditions, there is a need to rethink the traditional concepts of human rights: freedom, dignity and autonomy of the person, which have historically been formed in the physical world [15, p. 11]. Digital human rights appear as a new category that ensures the protection of fundamental human values in the digital space and defines the limits of the influence of the state, corporations and algorithmic systems (Table 1).

***Table 1. International Standards and Practice of Legal Regulation of Digital Rights***

| Adjustment level | Organization / State | Basic Standards / Documents | Key provisions |
|---|---|---|---|
| **International** | Council of Europe | Digital Rights Resolutions and Recommendations | Personal Data Protection, Countering Algorithmic Discrimination, Digital Security of Citizens |
| | UN | Resolutions of the General Assembly and Human Rights Committees | The right to access information, freedom of expression in the digital environment, protection from digital surveillance |
| **European Union** | EU | GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation) | Privacy standards, control over the processing of personal data, rights of data subjects |
| **USA** | United States (federal and state level) | Privacy and data protection laws (e.g. CCPA) | Personal data protection, digital privacy, limitations of algorithmic profiling |
| **Asia and Africa** | China, India, South Africa | National laws on cybersecurity, data regulation, and digital platforms | Protection of digital freedoms, cybersecurity, regulation of online content; The level of implementation of digital rights varies |

*Source:* Formed by the author based on [5, p. 110; 3, p. 106; 8, p. 635]

Digital human rights are a logical continuation of natural rights in new technological conditions and, at the same time, require their own legal and philosophical definition. The key aspect that will be taken into account is ensuring a balance between the development of digital technologies and guaranteeing fundamental human rights, as well as the adaptation of international standards to the challenges of the digital age [1, p. 429]. In the modern world, rapid digitalization is changing fundamental aspects of human existence, creating new conditions for the implementation of human rights and freedoms. Traditional natural rights, which have historically been formed on the basis of the concepts of inherent dignity, freedom and autonomy of a person, are increasingly interacting with digital rights that arise as a response to the challenges of the information and technological environment [3, p. 106].

The correlation of natural and digital human rights is becoming a central issue of modern jurisprudence and philosophy of law, since digital rights do not replace classical rights, but expand their scope and require a rethinking of protection mechanisms. The relevance of the study is due to the need to form a comprehensive legal system that can ensure the implementation of fundamental human rights both in the physical and digital environments, as well as guarantee a balance between individual freedom and technological control [14, p. 146]. Digital human rights are seen as a logical extension of natural rights in the digital environment, where traditional freedom, autonomy and dignity of the individual are realized through new technological tools.

With the growth of digital technologies, there is a phenomenon of duplication and expansion of the content of classical rights. For example, freedom of speech is implemented both in the physical environment and in the online space, which creates a need to determine the limits of responsibility, admissibility of speech and restrictions on digital platforms. Similarly, the right to privacy is complemented by digital rights to the protection of personal data, and the right to access information is complemented by digital rights to information security and transparency algorithms [3, p. 106]. Such a "multiplicity" of rights can lead to conflicts in legislation, ambiguity of interpretations and difficulties in protecting human rights in real and digital spaces at the same time.

Digitalization and the application of artificial intelligence (AI) and big data technologies pose new challenges for human rights. Algorithmic assessment of user behavior, automated decision-making in the financial, educational, or medical fields, as well as modeling social processes, can restrict freedom, create risks of discrimination, and violate the right to privacy. In addition, the collection and processing

of large amounts of data often take place without the explicit consent of the user, which calls into question the effectiveness of traditional mechanisms for protecting rights [6, p. 228].

In such conditions, there is a need for the formation of specific digital rights. International standards – recommendations of the Council of Europe and UN resolutions, serve as a guideline for states to adapt national legislation to these challenges. The correlation of natural and digital human rights reflects the modern process of adaptation of classical concepts of freedom, dignity and autonomy to the conditions of the digital environment [2, p. 130]. Natural rights enshrined in national constitutions and international acts, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, serve as the basic basis for the formation of digital rights. They define fundamental values that digital rights only expand or detail in new technological conditions [25].

Digital rights can be seen as derivatives of natural rights that arise in response to specific challenges of the digital environment – personal data protection, digital privacy, freedom of access to information and autonomous management of digital identity [16]. Digital rights arise as derivative or detailed implementations of these fundamental freedoms in the digital environment, providing protection of the individual from algorithmic control, digital surveillance and privacy violations.

Table 2 demonstrates the logical relationship between natural and digital rights, provides examples of international standards and national legislation governing digital freedoms, and reflects a possible hierarchy of these rights. It allows you to clearly see how digital rights specify and complement traditional human rights, ensuring their relevance in the modern information environment.

***Table 2. Correlation of natural and digital human rights***

| Natural law | Digital law | Relationship / Comment | Hierarchy/role in the system |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Right to privacy** | Right to digital privacy, protection of personal data | Digital law details classical law, adapting it to the online environment | Natural law is basic, digital law is a tool for its implementation |
| **Freedom of speech** | The right to freedom of expression in the digital space | Ensures the implementation of freedom of speech through online platforms | Natural law is fundamental, digital – concretization in the digital environment |
| **Right of access to information** | The right to digital access to knowledge and information resources | Digital law expands traditional access, taking into account the Internet and digital databases | Digital Law as a Mechanism for the Practical Implementation of Natural Law |
| **The right to autonomy and self-determination** | The right to control one's own digital identity | Protects the autonomy of the individual in the face of algorithmic control and digital surveillance | Digital law ensures the practical implementation of autonomy in the digital environment |
| **The right to dignity** | The right to protection from digital manipulation and cyberbullying | Covers the moral and social aspects of dignity in the online space | Digital law complements natural law, ensuring its relevance in the digital world |

*Source:* Formed by the author based on [16; 13; 12]

Natural rights remain the fundamental foundation, while digital rights act as tools for the practical implementation of these freedoms in the digital space. The hierarchy of rights requires adaptation of classical principles and simultaneous adherence to international standards [22]. International standards, such as the GDPR, UN Resolutions and recommendations of the Council of Europe, establish general principles for the protection of digital freedoms [26, p. 268]. Similarly, freedom of speech and digital access to information in some states may be limited by censorship or security norms that contradict international standards.

Such conflicts emphasize the need for harmonization of national and international legislation, the creation of mechanisms for harmonization of norms and effective international instruments for the control and protection of digital rights. Without this, there is a risk of legal gaps, violations of digital freedoms and inequality in access to human rights protection in the global digital environment [3, p. 106]. In addition, there are difficulties with the classification of digital rights. Some researchers divide them into derivatives of natural rights (the right to digital privacy, freedom of speech on the Internet), others – into independent categories that regulate the interaction of a person with information systems, algorithms and artificial intelligence [10, p. 59]. The lack of a unified classification system complicates

both the practical implementation of users' rights and the formation of coordinated international regulation.

This creates additional risks for the effective protection of digital rights. Solving this problem requires an interdisciplinary approach that combines legal, philosophical and technological aspects, as well as the development of unified terms and classifications of digital rights at the international level. D. Bielov et al. [5, p. 110] emphasize that the lack of uniform standards of digital rights leads to conflicts between national and international norms, in particular in the field of personal data protection and freedom of expression in the digital space. M.A. Airapetov notes that these collisions create legal uncertainty for users and emphasize the need to harmonize national legislation with international standards [2, p. 130]. I.V. Zakharchuk [26, p. 268] emphasizes that national laws must take into account international norms of digital rights. Kh. Didukh states that a comparative review of Ukrainian and European legislation reveals differences in the use of words and grouping of digital rights [10, p. 59].

T. Yamnenko and D. Misko emphasize that the variety of terms – "digital rights", "information rights", "electronic rights" – complicates the creation of a systematic classification and harmonization of national and international legislation [23, p. 101]. K. Bieliakov et al. [4, p. 183] note that digital rights have a dual character: they are both derived from natural rights and specific to the digital environment, which requires a clear definition of their nature and boundaries of application.

Legal positivism focuses on the formal consolidation of rights in certain norms and laws, which ensures their legal clarity and verifiability. In the case of digital rights, this means creating clear legislative decrees on personal data protection, digital privacy, access to information, and algorithmic fairness. Such positivist provisions allow establishing specific rights and obligations, determining punishment for violations and guaranteeing law enforcement effectiveness [17, p. 567].

According to D. Belov and M. Belova, the combination of positivist and natural law approaches allows the formation of digital rights as a legal category that is both specific and universal, ensuring a balance between normative certainty and fundamental freedoms [7, p. 5]. K. Bieliakov et al. emphasize that the integration of these approaches contributes to the creation of a system of digital rights that takes into account both the transformation of society and the sustainable values of human dignity [4, p. 183]. The combination of positivism and natural law is the best way for the development of digital rights, as it ensures their formal consolidation in the legal system and, at the same time, observance of fundamental human freedoms and principles of justice. This approach allows laying a solid foundation for further harmonization of national and international legislation in the field of digital rights.

Natural rights, formulated by classical thinkers such as John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, reflect fundamental values: the right to life, liberty, property and dignity. In the digital age, these values need to be adapted to new realities, where human interaction with information technologies, algorithms and big data becomes the main factor in the realization of rights [21, p. 438].

Digital rights include, in particular, the right to digital privacy, protection of personal data, access to information, freedom of expression online and control over digital identity. They arise as a response to new existential challenges: algorithmic control, digital surveillance, data manipulation and concentration of information power. According to D. Belov and M. Belova, digital rights form a new level of legal protection, which allows combining the fundamental principles of natural rights with modern technological challenges [7, p. 5]. K. Bieliakov et al. emphasize that digital rights are not autonomous from natural ones, but act as their technological and normative continuation, which ensures the universality and practical implementation of rights in the digital environment [4, p. 183].

The combination of humanistic values with modern technologies means that digital rights must take into account the principles of dignity, autonomy, privacy and freedom, even if they are implemented through algorithms or big data. As D. Belov and M. Belova note, the formation of digital rights should be based on the fundamental principles of natural rights in order to provide an ethical and legal basis for the digital society [7, p. 5]. K. Bieliakov et al. add that only the integration of humanistic values into regulations and technological practices allows creating a sustainable system of digital rights that protects users from the risks of the digital age and ensures their right to personal autonomy [4, p. 183].

The search for a balance between technological progress and humanistic values is to create a digital space where innovations do not replace human rights, but serve their implementation. Legislative certainty, international standards and philosophical understanding of dignity and freedom form the basis for such a balance, allowing to combine the effectiveness of technology with respect for fundamental human values. Digital human rights in today's globalized world require harmonized international standards that ensure their universality and effectiveness in different countries [10, p. 59].

The UN, through its resolutions and initiatives, defines general principles for the protection of digital rights, such as the right to privacy, access to information, freedom of expression online, and protection of personal data.

The Council of Europe develops specific legal standards and recommendations that take into account the specifics of digital technologies. According to D. Belov and M. Belova, the involvement of international organizations in the formation of digital ethics makes it possible to harmonize national practices with global standards, which creates legal mechanisms for protecting the individual in the digital environment [7, p. 5]. K. Bieliakov et al. add that international institutions not only form norms, but also contribute to the development of a universal concept of digital rights, which integrates technological innovations and humanistic values [4, p. 138]. International organizations act as key agents of the global ethics of digital rights, forming a framework for the coordinated implementation of digital freedoms and the protection of human dignity in the digital space. They ensure a balance between technological progress and fundamental values, creating the basis for the further development of international law in the field of digital technologies.

The system of digital human rights requires a clear legal definition and systematic harmonization with natural rights. Scientifically grounded proposals for improving the legal definition include the following areas:

1. Unification of terminology and classification of digital rights. It is necessary to establish uniform terms that reflect the specifics of digital rights, for example: “the right to digital privacy” “the right to control personal data”, “the right to digital autonomy”. As noted by T. Yamnenko and D. Misko, a clear definition of digital rights contributes to their harmonization at the national and international levels [23, p. 101].

2. Combination of natural law and positivist approaches. The natural law approach defines universal principles (dignity, freedom, autonomy), and the positivist approach ensures their formalization in laws. V. Bochkova and N. Baadzhi emphasize that the integration of both approaches makes it possible to create digital rights that are both normatively defined and universal [6, p. 228].

3. Harmonization of national legislation with international standards increases legal certainty and protection of users [2, p. 130].

4. The creation of global digital ethics implies the need for ethical awareness of digital rights as a basis for legal regulation [5, p. 110].

Improving the legal definition of digital rights requires a systematic approach that integrates:

- clear terminological framework;
- integration of positivist and natural law approaches;
- harmonization with international standards;
- adaptability to technological changes;
- formation of global digital ethics.

Digital rights, therefore, are a logical continuation of natural rights, but they also carry a specific worldview content: they form a new concept of human interaction with technology, define the ethical framework of the digital society, and emphasize the importance of a humanistic approach in technological innovations. As I. Pyvovar notes, digital rights are both legal and philosophical in nature [15, p. 11]. S. Shaelou and Y. Razmetaeva emphasize that digital rights create the basis for comprehensive protection of the individual in the global information space [17, p. 567]. The philosophical understanding of digital rights allows us to see them not only as a legal norm, but also as a worldview category that forms a new idea of freedom, responsibility and autonomy in the context of globalization of the information space.

## 6. Conclusions

In the process of research, it was found that digital human rights are a logical continuation and development of natural rights adapted to the conditions of the digital space. It is determined that the lack of a single terminology and delimitation of digital rights creates legal uncertainty and complicates effective legal ordering. Digital rights have not only a legal, but also a philosophical and ideological dimension, which emphasizes their role in the formation of a new understanding of the will, duty and independence of a person in digital reality. Based on the analysis, it is advisable to unify the terminology and classification of digital rights, harmonize national legislation with international standards, integrate the principles of natural law into positivist norms, take into account the dynamics of technological

development and form a global digital ethics that combines technological development and humanistic values.

The implementation of these measures will create a system of digital human rights that will be effective, universal and humanistically oriented, capable of ensuring the protection of fundamental freedoms in the context of the rapid development of the digital environment.

Further scientific research should focus on detailing the classification of digital rights, developing means of their flexible implementation in the context of rapid technological progress, determining the effectiveness of international norms and practices of the national legal system, as well as on the worldview of digital rights as a category that combines the will, respect and independence of the individual in the digital space.

## References


1. Ahmed Taha, A. H. (2023). The International Protection of Human Rights in the Digital Age and its Impact on International Responsibility. *Journal of Law and Emerging Technologies*, *3*(2), 429–468. https://doi.org/10.54873/jolets.v3i2.160
2. Airapetov, M. A. (2025). *Tsyfrovi prava i svobody liudyny. realnist bez nalezhnoho unormuvannia* [Digital human rights and freedoms: a reality without proper regulation]. *Visnyk NTUU «KPI». Politolohiia. Sotsiolohiia. Pravo, 1*(65), 130–137. https://doi.org/10.20535/2308-5053.2025.1(65).332569 (in Ukrainian)
3. Andrushchenko, O.P. (2023). *Vplyv tsyfrovizatsii na tsinnisni priorytety rozvytku prav liudyny* [The impact of digitalization on the value priorities of human rights development]. *Informatsiia i pravo, 4*(47), 106–115. https://doi.org/10.37750/2616-6798.2023.4(47).291594 (in Ukrainian)
4. Bieliakov, K. I., Tykhomyrov, O. O., Radovetska, L. V., & Kostenko, O. V. (2023). Digital rights in the human rights system. *Intereulaweast*, X (1), 183-207. https://doi.org/10.22598/iele.2023.10.1.10
5. Bielov, D.M., Peresh, I.Ye., & Pokorba, I. (2024). *Tsyfrovi prava liudyny: doktrynalni zasady* [Digital human rights: Doctrinal foundations]. *Analitychno-porivnialne pravoznavstvo*, (2), 110–115. https://doi.org/10.24144/2788-6018.2024.02.17 (in Ukrainian)
6. Bochkovoi, V. A., & Baadzhy, N. A. (2025). *Obmezhennia tsyfrovykh prav liudyny v umovakh suchasnykh pravovykh vyklykiv* [Restrictions on digital human rights in the face of modern legal challenges]. *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho Natsionalnoho Universytetu*, *84*(4), 228–233. https://doi.org/10.24144/2307-3322.2024.84.4.31 (in Ukrainian)
7. Byelov, D., & Bielova, M. (2024). Digital human rights: separate doctrinal basis. *Visegrad Journal on Human Rights*, (1), 5-11. https://doi.org/10.61345/1339-7915.2024.1.1
8. Capellà i Ricart, A. (2025). Fundamental Rights' Protection in the Digital Environment: Collective Actions Defending Diffuse Interests and Public Interest. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, (48), 635–655. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10603-025-09604-2
9. Cohen, J. E. (2019). *Between Truth and Power: The Legal Constructions of Informational Capitalism*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190246693.001.0001
10. Didukh, Kh.V. (2024). *Tsyfrovi prava: ukrainskyi ta yevropeiskyi dosvid* [Digital rights: Ukrainian and European experience]. *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho Natsionalnoho Universytetu*, *85*(1), 59–65. https://doi.org/10.24144/2307-3322.2024.85.1.7 (in Ukrainian)
11. Dukalskis, A. (2023). A fox in the henhouse: China, normative change, and the UN Human Rights Council. *Journal of Human Rights*, *22*(3), 334–350. https://doi.org/10.1080/14754835.2023.2193971
12. Council of Europe. (1950). *European Convention on Human Rights*. https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Convention_ENG
13. United Nations. (1966). *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-political-rights
14. Marchenko, A., & Marchenko, O. (2025). *Relihiia i vlada u filosofii M. Fuko* [Religion and power in the philosophy of M. Foucault]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu*, (59), 146–156. https://doi.org/10.30970/PPS.2025.59.16 (in Ukrainian)
15. Pyvovar, I. V. (2025). *Suchasna model realizatsii prava na liudsku hidnist* [A modern model of implementing the right to human dignity]. *Naukovyi visnyk Lvivskoho derzhavnoho universytetu vnutrishnikh sprav*, (2), 11-14. https://doi.org/10.32782/2311-8040/2025-2-2 (in Ukrainian)
16. Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the european parliament and of the council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-

content/EN/HIS/?uri=CELEX:32016R0679

17. Shaelou, S., & Razmetaeva, Y. (2023). Challenges to Fundamental Human Rights in the age of Artificial Intelligence Systems: shaping the digital legal order while upholding Rule of Law principles and European values. *ERA Forum*, (24), 567–587. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12027-023-00777-2
18. Shany, Y. (2023). Digital Rights and the Outer Limits of International Human Rights Law. *German Law Journal*, (24), 461–472. https://doi.org/10.1017/glj.2023.35
19. Teravosa, G., & Nagari, S. B. (2025). Digital Constitutionalism and the Future of Human Rights: A Comparative Review. *Legalis: Journal of Law Review*, *3*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.61978/legalis.v3i1.791
20. Tillaboev, S. (2023). Digital human rights. What are the main human rights in the digital environment? *International Journal of Law and Criminology*, *3*(8), 45–49. https://doi.org/10.37547/ijlc/Volume03Issue08-09
21. Tsurkan-Saifulina, Yu.V. (2024). *Poniattia svobody u filosofii prava: vid klasychnykh teorii do suchasnykh realii* [The concept of freedom in the philosophy of law: from classical theories to modern realities]. *Yurydychnyi naukovyi elektronnyi zhurnal*, (9), 438–440. https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0374/2024-9/105 (in Ukrainian)
22. United Nations General Assembly. (2023). *Resolution 78/213*. https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/78/213
23. Yamnenko, T. M., & Misko, D. O. (2022). *Rozvytok tsyfrovykh prav v Ukraini* [Development of digital rights in Ukraine]. *Yurydychnyi visnyk*, *4*(65), 101–106. https://doi.org/10.18372/2307-9061.65.17045 (in Ukrainian)
24. Yeung, K., & Lodge, M. (Eds.) (2019). *Algorithmic Regulation*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198838494.001.0001
25. *United Nations General Assembly. (1948). Zahalna deklaratsiia prav liudyny* [Universal Declaration of Human Rights]. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_015#Text (in Ukrainian)
26. Zakharchuk, I. V. (2025). *Tsyfrovi prava hromadian Ukrainy: konstytutsiino-pravove zakriplennia ta mekhanizmy realizatsii* [Digital rights of citizens of Ukraine: Constitutional and legal enshrining and implementation mechanisms]. N*aukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho natsionalnoho universytetu*, *90*(1), 268–273. https://doi.org/10.24144/2307-3322.2025.90.1.34 (in Ukrainian)