

непоіменованих договорів. Його предметом є майно, щодо якого встановлюється обмежене речове право, а також дії сторін, спрямовані на виникнення та реалізацію цього права. До основних характеристик договору узурфрукта належать такі: він може набувати ознак як реального, так і консенсуального; має каузальний характер; є двостороннім взаємозобов'язуючим; може бути відплатним або безоплатним; строковим або безстроковим.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА:

1. Про особливості регулювання діяльності юридичних осіб окремих організаційно-правових форм у перехідний період та об'єднань юридичних осіб : Закон України від 9 січня 2025 року № 4196-IX. URL : <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/4196-20#Text> (дата звернення : 10.04.2026).
2. Проект Цивільного кодексу України від 6 лютого 2026 року № 14394-1. URL : <blob:https://itd.rada.gov.ua/e4b129d0-4ba3-4e7a-ab02-411bb8fcd5c2> (дата звернення : 10.04.2026).
3. Гречко М. Як укладати договори, яких немає в кодексах? *Юридична газета*. 2017. № 41 (591). URL : <https://yur-gazeta.com/publications/practice/inshe/yak-ukladati-dogovori-yakih-nemaie-v-kodeksah.html> (дата звернення : 10.04.2026).
4. Оновлення договірною регулювання приватноправових відносин в Україні : монографія / за заг. ред. А. Б. Гриняка, О. О. Кота, М. Д. Пленюк. Київ : НДІ приват. права і підприємництва ім. акад. Ф. Г. Бурчака НАПрН України, 2020. 488 с.
5. Гудима М.М. До питання про поняття предмета цивільного договору. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського національного університету*. 2013. Випуск 23. Частина 1. Том 1. С. 182-186.
6. Цивільний кодекс України від 16 січня 2003 року № 435-IV. URL : <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/435-15#Text> (дата звернення : 10.04.2026).

UDC 340.1

Edna Raquel Hogemann

*PhD in Law with a Postdoctoral degree in
Human Rights. Associate*

*Professor at the Federal University of the State of
Rio de Janeiro (UNIRIO). Brazil*

GOVERNANCE IN THE AGE OF AI: PUBLIC POLICY AND ELECTORAL SAFEGUARDS IN BRAZIL

1. Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become a transformative force in contemporary societies, reshaping not only economic and technological structures but also democratic governance. Its ability to process large volumes of data, automate decisions, and influence communication flows has significantly altered political participation and electoral dynamics.

In Brazil, this transformation is intensified by high digital connectivity. According to the *Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística* (IBGE) [1, p.123], in 2024 about 93.6% of households—nearly 75 million—had internet access. At the individual level, 89.1% of people aged 10 or older were users, with over 95% accessing the internet daily. These figures confirm that digital environments are now central to political communication, especially through platforms such as WhatsApp, Instagram, and TikTok.

However, connectivity does not ensure equal access to quality information. IBGE data reveal disparities between urban and rural areas, as well as inequalities linked to income and education. Within this uneven digital ecosystem, AI-driven practices — such as algorithmic curation and targeted messaging—both enhance civic engagement and intensify risks like disinformation, informational asymmetry, and threats to electoral integrity [2, p.78].

2. Public Policy Challenges - Inequality and Digital Literacy Data

Despite notable progress in digital connectivity and the consolidation of regulatory frameworks, like the edition of *Lei Geral de Proteção de Dados Pessoais* (LGPD) [7] Brazil continues to face complex public policy challenges in addressing the effects of artificial intelligence on democratic governance. A central issue is the persistence of digital inequality. Although internet access is widespread, its quality and patterns of use differ significantly across social groups. Data from IBGE indicates that a large portion of the population relies primarily on mobile devices for internet access, often through limited data plans. This mobile-centered model restricts exposure to diverse and reliable information sources and favors the consumption of brief, highly shareable content.

Additional evidence from the *Comitê Gestor da Internet no Brasil* (CGI.br), particularly the TIC *Domicílios* surveys [3, p.34], shows that lower-income populations are more likely to depend exclusively on smartphones and less likely to engage with in-depth or verified information. This context strengthens the influence of algorithmically curated content and viral messaging, frequently associated with misinformation.

These structural conditions have direct implications for democratic participation. Limited digital literacy can hinder the ability to identify manipulated content, such as deepfakes or misleading narratives, resulting in unequal exposure to disinformation that disproportionately affects vulnerable groups [4, p. 56].

Another major challenge concerns regulatory capacity. While Brazil has established important legal instruments, such as the *Marco Civil da Internet* and the *Lei Geral de Proteção de Dados*, [5] technological innovation—

especially in AI—advances more rapidly than regulatory adaptation. This creates gaps that can be exploited by new forms of digital manipulation.

Policymakers must balance combating disinformation with safeguarding freedom of expression [6, p.18]. Institutional capacity is therefore crucial, requiring technical expertise, coordination, and ongoing monitoring. Strengthening digital literacy through education and inclusive policies remains essential for democratic resilience.

3. Case Study: Brazilian Elections (2018–2024) The evolution of Brazil's electoral governance between 2018 and 2024 offers a clear example of how democratic institutions have adapted to challenges posed by artificial intelligence and digital technologies. The 2018 elections represented a turning point, as digital platforms, especially WhatsApp, became central to political communication.

Their widespread use enabled the rapid and large-scale dissemination of political content, including disinformation. The encrypted nature of these platforms, however, significantly limited monitoring and regulatory capacity.

In response, the *Tribunal Superior Eleitoral* (TSE) initiated institutional reforms to strengthen electoral integrity. By the 2022 elections, a more proactive strategy had been implemented, including cooperation agreements with major digital platforms to accelerate content removal, the creation of fact-checking partnerships and verification channels, and the development of digital tools—such as chatbots and official communication systems—to provide reliable information to voters.

Empirical evidence from the TSE indicates that these measures reached millions of users, highlighting both the scale of disinformation and the effectiveness of coordinated institutional responses. Additionally, real-time monitoring mechanisms were introduced, significantly reducing the circulation time of harmful content. This marked a new era of governance in subsequent elections.

During this period, the role of the judiciary expanded considerably. Electoral Justice [8] increasingly assumed regulatory functions in digital political communication, reflecting a broader process of judicialization. By 2024, Brazil had consolidated a model defined by strong institutional coordination, increased regulatory intervention, and continuous adaptation. Nevertheless, persistent disinformation networks and emerging AI-generated content continue to challenge electoral resilience.

Conclusion

The analysis of democratic governance in the age of artificial intelligence highlights the complex interaction between technological innovation, institutional adaptation, and the protection of democratic principles. In Brazil, expanding digital connectivity, as shown by data from IBGE, has made online platforms central to political communication. At the same time, evidence from the CGI.br reveals persistent inequalities in access and digital literacy, which influence citizens' exposure to information and vulnerability to disinformation.

Institutional responses, particularly by the TSE, demonstrate significant regulatory innovation through coordinated actions and proactive safeguards.

However, the rapid evolution of AI continues to challenge legal frameworks, requiring ongoing adaptation.

Brazil's experience shows that democratic resilience depends on both effective regulation and inclusive policies that promote digital literacy, transparency, and accountability.

REFERENCES:

1. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. (2025). *Internet is present in 74.9 million households in Brazil*. IBGE News Agency. <https://agenciadenoticias.ibge.gov.br/en/agencianews/44050-internet-is-present-in-74-9-million-households-in-brazil.html>
2. Balkin, J. M. (2018). Free speech in the algorithmic society: Big data, private governance, and new school speech regulation.
3. Comitê Gestor da Internet no Brasil. (2023). *Pesquisa sobre o uso das tecnologias de informação e comunicação nos domicílios brasileiros: TIC Domicílios 2023*. CGI.br. <https://cetic.br/pt/pesquisa/domicilios/>
4. Benkler, Y., Faris, R., & Roberts, H. (2018). *Network propaganda: Manipulation, disinformation, and radicalization in American politics*. Oxford University Press.
5. Brazil. (2014). Lei nº 12.965, de 23 de abril de 2014 (Marco Civil da Internet). Diário Oficial da União. http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2011-2014/2014/lei/l12965.htm
6. Castells, M. (2010). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
7. Brazil. (2018). Lei nº 13.709, de 14 de agosto de 2018 (Lei Geral de Proteção de Dados Pessoais – LGPD). Diário Oficial da União. http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2018/lei/l13709.htm
8. Tribunal Superior Eleitoral. (2022). Resoluções sobre propaganda eleitoral e enfrentamento à desinformação nas eleições. <https://www.tse.jus.br>

UDC 340.1

Marieta Safta

*Prof.Habil, Titu Maiorescu University Bucharest,
Faculty of Law*

RETHINKING SOVEREIGNTY IN AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD: THE EUROPEAN UNION MODEL¹

Abstract

This article examines the transformation of sovereignty in the context of increasing global interdependence, with particular focus on the European Union as

¹ The present analysis builds on and develops the findings of a broader study coordinated and published in M Safta (coord), *Curierul Judiciar*, no 2/2025 (C H Beck 2025), where the topic is examined in detail https://www.ujmag.ro/reviste/periodice/curierul-judiciar-nr-2-2025?srsId=AfmBOoo9euZ_vS2GH_0sNvy26VgM3MIIBEGFsaSxHzOWr-aMH3I4RSK