

INTERACTIONS BETWEEN VARIETIES OF SPONTANEOUS AND ORGANIZED SOCIAL ORDER IN CYBERSPACE: IN TERMS OF SUSTAINABLE SECURITY

Vytautas ŠLAPKAUSKAS

Mykolo Romerio universiteto Viešojo saugumo akademija
El. paštas: slapkauskas@mruni.eu
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9637-6672

DOI: 10.13165/PSPO-22-29-19

Abstract. *The interaction between the variety of spontaneous and organized social order constantly occurs in reality. Organized order can be successfully created only by observing the general social rules that have been formed in the practice of spontaneous order development. The creation of social networks in cyberspace enables many subjects to engage in this interaction in various forms of self-expression. Research on sociocultural expression, which is expanding in social networks, opens up a new deep problem – the tensions of interaction between organized and spontaneous varieties of social order, e.g. personal data protection and crime issues. The experience of escalating these tensions in cyberspace is also transferred by the subjects to real life. It influences changes in the development of the social order towards a decline in the sustainability of security at all levels of human relations – at the level of individuals and their groups.*

Sustainable security is the long-term balance between subjective freedom and social security, embodied in the general or social rules of conduct that have grown up in the culture of society, and the implementation of which we call justice. Historically, for a long time, social order was formed spontaneously in order, first of all, to guarantee the safety of a group of people. Joint subjective efforts to guarantee security led to groups of people becoming communities, and the freedom of individuals was linked to the creation of a social order. In the process of transition to more modern social forms of life, individual persons and their groups have accumulated greater power than other entities. Their pursuit of freedom of expression and personal gain led to conflicts between the varieties of spontaneous and organized social order. In such a context, the opposite concept of freedom was formed: freedom is only outside the social order.

On the basis of the pursuit of benefits and self-expression, both concepts of freedom now compete in social networks. When subjects adhere to common norms of behavior and base their interaction on the pursuit of common security, their concept of freedom is formed within the social order. However, it is also the opposite: when the rules of social order serve only to achieve the great benefit of a part of the subjects, the concept of freedom without restrictions is inevitably formed. Its compliance and unlimited expansion erode sustainable security.

The aim of this study is to reveal the sustainable security approach and its methodological possibilities to examine the peculiarities of the interaction of organized and spontaneous social order varieties in cyberspace.

Keywords. *Spontaneous social order, organized social order, sustainable security, freedom, safety.*

Introduction

In modern development of mankind, more and more opportunities for self-expression are being acquired by subjects of an open society. The growing dynamism of their activities is implied by intertwined global processes: 1) formation of a global information civilization; 2) above the formation of national political communities and their associated identities; and 3) the effects of the development of globalization and the braids of their interaction. In their impact, we observe a world-wide interconnection of social ties and relationships that is ever-expanding and complex. Under its influence, there is an "epochal scroll in the cultural worldview" (Tomlinson, 2002, p.48). One of the signs of this scroll is the growing intensification of interaction between varieties of spontaneous and organized social order in cyberspace.

„Spontaneous order is a general social order, which, without being the result of any effort, develops as a result of the interaction of many individuals. <...> The constructed order, on the contrary, always provides for an exogenous goal in relation to individuals, to which the former must be more or less subordinated. In the first case, individuals are connected by a relationship of horizontal, in the second – by a relationship of vertical dependence; the first are relations of mutual benefit, the second are relations of one – sided benefit. Precisely because the latter are relations of one-sided benefit, one or another coercion is necessary to maintain them“ (Degutis, 1998, p.218).

The creation of social networks in cyberspace enables a large and age-wide circle of subjects to engage in this interaction. Research on the growing diversity of sociocultural expressions in social networks opens up a new deep problem – the growing tensions of interaction between varieties of organized and spontaneous social order. Typical examples of its expression are the theft of personal data and identities and other crimes in cyberspace. Subjects in the escalation of these tensions can transfer the experience gained into real life, where smart technologies take root. This would lead to the development of social order towards the aggravation of the problem of security sustainability at all levels of human relations – at the level of individuals and their groups. Therefore, the study of this phenomenon requires the development of methodological access based on a sustainable security approach.

Two concepts of freedom compete in social networks for benefits and self-expression. When subjects adhere to common norms of behavior and base their interaction on the pursuit of common security, their concept of freedom is formed within the social order. But the opposite is also true: when the demands of an organized social order move away from sociocultural justice, the concept of freedom without restrictions inevitably forms. Its compliance and unlimited expansion erode sustainable security.

The subject of this study is the rules of procedure for social networks. **Purpose of the study** - to reveal the sustainable security approach and its methodological possibilities to examine the peculiarities of the interaction of organized and spontaneous varieties of social order in cyberspace. The study is based on methods of analysis, comparison, interpretation and generalization of documents.

Definition of a sustainable security approach

In modern Western civilization, a liberal understanding of social relations is deeply rooted, which is based on the constant emphasis on the primacy of individual freedom over other social phenomena and the desire to expand it indefinitely. On the one hand, the tendency towards absolutisation of individual freedom inevitably leads to a softening of the rules of social order and a diminution of the social role of the public (common) good, but on the other hand, it increasingly individualizes the perception of security in such a way that it also distorts the understanding of responsibility. Individuals seek to emphasize the legal responsibility of other entities and demand it from the state institutions when personal security is violated. Therefore, it is no coincidence that in the context of the absoluteness of the expression of subjective freedom, conflicts of subject relations are noticeably aggravated (Naujas demokratijos ir religijos konflikto etapas, 2022) part of which are related to mismatches and different interpretations of one's own sense of security and that of others. It is therefore necessary to examine the dilemma of the relationship between subjective freedom and individual and public security. Although the question "What is more important, subjective freedom or security?" is banal, but it becomes especially important when general or social security is clearly weakening. This dilemma can and should be addressed by trying to define a sustainable security approach.

We will define the sustainable security approach after examining its elements – "sustainable" and "security". What is sustainable? Lithuanian Dictionary provides the following meanings of "sustainable": strong, durable; constant, immutable; immune, enduring, resistant; long-lasting, non-persistent (Tvarus reikšmė - Lietuvių kalbos žodynas). A deep analysis of the individual meanings of the adjective "sustainable" reveals that with this word we can describe the longevity of a permanent, steady state of any object, phenomenon, relationship, or process. For example, any spiritual, political, economic or legal relationship can be described as being in a sustainable balance, i.e., 1) at rest, equalizing forces, or 2) in a state of harmony (Kas yra pusiausvyra? Terminų žodynas). The word "rest" expresses a state of calm, seriousness and balance (Kas yra Ramybė? Terminų žodynas). The word "harmony" expresses the alignment of someone (definition and meaning of harmony), i.e., describes the dynamic process of interaction of forces or elements and / or its result. Therefore, in summary, we can state that sustainable balance expresses the long-term process of harmonization of any interaction forces (elements) and the result achieved, e.g., the methods of legal regulation have achieved a balance of subject rights (freedom) and legal obligations (responsibility).

Security is a state of protection and insurance against dangers and confidence in one's own knowledge. This threefold interpretation of the meaning of security is conditioned by the fact that security itself expresses a relationship with someone in which there is no threat relationship to the subjects. That is, the ratio of subjects must be in sustainable balance, i.e., the "subjective forces" expressing it must be in a state of harmony. There can be various subject relationships at the individual level and that of the group of individuals. For example, the physical, mental, social, spiritual relationship of an individual with himself, other people, their groups, objects of nature, values, activities, its tools and products, with God. Internal and intergroup relations of a group of individuals, their relationship with individuals, objects of nature, activity and its products, with God.

The question is raised: what concepts express "subjective forces", so that with them it would be possible to describe different subject relations, their forms and content? The emergence of entity relationships requires the freedom of entities to make decisions, which are based not only on the subject's knowledge of the benefits, but also on the possible threats that may arise to him and other subjects of the relationship being created as a result of improper implementation of subjective freedom. The emergence and functioning of threats will inevitably affect the state of both personal and general security, which can lead to a loss of sustainable balance. So all subject relationship is linked by two concepts: freedom and security. Freedom is based on the knowledge and will (power) of individuals and their groups to build relationships that do not violate personal and social (general) security. In case of security threat, the subjects of the relationship must voluntarily assume social (legal) responsibility for the consequences of their act or action (inaction) in order to restore a sustainable balance between freedom and security again.

The (not)emergence of threats to the subjects of the relationship or security is conditioned by the level of culture of their interaction and interaction with the environment, expressed by the object - oriented relationship of the elements of the content of culture – knowledge, competence and skills; value orientations and stereotypes; experience of creative activity - and the subjective ability to base the interaction itself on them. Interaction between individuals and their groups manifests itself in four forms – communication, cooperation, competition and conflict. That is, on the one hand, communication, cooperation, rivalry and even conflict are always regulated by the culture of behavior of society and its groups – by the corresponding requirements for the implementation of values and norms, but on the other hand, their subjective implementation may not correspond to the objective reality of security. Therefore, it is no

coincidence that the reasons for the emergence of threats are various: 1) subjective, e.g., subjective interpretation of the behavior of the subject(s) of the relationship as posing a threat to the state of security; 2) objective, e.g., the emergence and functioning of threats independent of the will of the subjects of the relationship; 3) mixed, e.g., the relationships that arise from the subjective pursuit to control threats generate new threats to the development of security. Therefore, a sustainable security approach must include objective security, sense of security (subjective security) and confidence in security (absence of doubt).

Is sustainable security a purely theoretical construct or does it actually exist in the practice of relationships? Historically, the earliest processes of cultural selection in humanity form a sustainable security as a balance between social security and subjective freedom, because otherwise the continuity of human existence would be very problematic. This balance was embodied in the common norms of behavior of groups of people, the constant observance of which is the common basis for the formation and establishment of human communities and spontaneous social order. Social order is formed spontaneously only when the practical mind of group of individuals links the benefits of following common rules of conduct with the security of individuals and the ability to survive basic needs (according to A. Maslow) in the process of satisfaction.

Compliance with common rules of conduct that embodied sustainable security (as a balance between social security and subjective freedom) ensured: 1) the formation and establishment of human communities, 2) the formation of sense of common good – justice and normative justice. The process of awareness of the common good - justice through cultural selection of the rules of social life has reversibly influenced the strengthening of social control of the community and the development of its self-regulation ability. Therefore, Linas Baublys, having examined the ancient concept of justice, quite rightly argues that "justice is a fundamental principle of social life, indicating certain - moral, legal, economic, political limits and possibilities of human behavior" (Baublys, 2005, p. 33).

Thus, a sustainable security approach can be defined on the basis of the analysis presented. Sustainable security is the long-term balance between subjective freedom and social security, embodied in the general or social rules of conduct that have grown up in the culture of society, and the implementation of which we call justice. When subjects adhere to common norms of behavior and base their interaction on the pursuit of common security, the concept of freedom functioning within the limits of the correct social order is formed. However, the opposite may be the case: when the demands of social order move away from sociocultural justice, the concept of freedom as the absence of constraints is inevitably formed, the observance of which, and especially its unlimited expansion, destroys sustainable security.

Social order and the relationship of its varieties

In the most general sense, a social order is a set of characteristics of community relations and relationships that have worked out and developed in individual societies or social groups, the practice of which helps to survive and achieve a higher standard of living for as many members of a society or social group as possible. It is necessary to realize that human groups have formed and survived on Earth in very different natural conditions. Therefore, in the process of adapting human groups to the natural environment and its purification practices, different characteristics of interrelationships and relationships that determine the survival of individuals are formed, which: 1) groups of people gradually institutionalized as common rules of group behavior; 2) compliance with common rules of behavior led to the formation of groups of people as communities and the subsequent development of their interaction with each other

– societies and nations. The formation of general or social rules of behavior and their observance at the same time condition a two-way process - the spontaneous formation of both the community and its social order. Therefore, it can be said that there is as much community (society) as its members adhere to common rules of conduct.

The spontaneous formation and development of the social order is a process whose "driving force" comes from the need to satisfy basic human needs. In the theory of human needs A. Maslow stressed that "these needs, or values, relate hierarchically and evolutionarily – in terms of strength and primacy. For example, security is more powerful and stronger, a more urgent, earlier emerging, vital need than love, and the need for food is usually stronger than every other need. In addition, all these needs can be considered the steps along the time trail to a general self-actualization that includes all basic needs" (Maslow, 1989, p. 343).

Meeting basic human needs inevitably led to the development of such rules of social behavior, which not only helped to survive as many groups of people practicing them as possible, but also to achieve higher goals in life. In other words, in order to avoid dangers and increase mutual trust or to meet basic needs, systems of social assessments and norms have developed and are now developing: what is happening, what is good, what is evil, what must be sought and what must be avoided, how to behave in one situation or another, etc. On their basis, it is decided what is meant by one or another event, phenomenon (system of meanings), what is the relationship of events, phenomena, things (system of relations). All this is now the most important elements of the culture of society.

It is very important to realize that the social order is an inevitable and continuous creation of human, existing as a creation of human activity. Human creates it by constantly reflecting on his experiences and thoughts, projecting them into the external world and embodying them, giving them a concrete form. This is how he can express himself as a subject of inner coexistence. Human's thoughts are most often associated with increasing his own security and other egoistic interests, for example, the needs of freedom. Social order is not a part of the "nature of things" and cannot be derived from the "laws of nature".

But we rarely, or not at all, realize that the social order is expressed by a large number of institutions "which are really the result of human activity, but are not the result of human design" (Ferguson, 1767, p.187). The difference between the two categories of phenomena - "the result of human activity that is not the result of human thought" and "the result of human thought" gave F. A. Hayek a basis to think on self-creating systems and to distinguish two varieties of social order: a) a self-grown (spontaneously) social order as if it had arisen from within without a prior purpose, and (b) a social order created by specific people as if it had been created consciously from outside (Hayek, 1998, p. 65-67).

Hayek emphasizes that "the difference of this kind of order from the one that someone creates <...> is fundamental to understanding social processes and social policy. We have few terms to describe these two orders. Order made <...> can also be described as a construction, as an artificial order or, especially if it concerns a managed social order, as *organisation*. On the other hand, the developed order, which we have described as self-occurring, <...> in English it is most convenient to call *spontaneous order*. Classical Greek <...> has two different words to denote these two varieties of order, namely the word *taxis* - a man-made order, for example, combat order, and a developed order was described by the word *kosmos*, which originally meant right order in the state or society" (Hayek, 1998, p.65-66).

All deliberately created orders inevitably serve or served the purposes of their creators, are usually relatively simple and specific, their existence can be determined by observation and intellectually covered. None of these traits are necessary for a spontaneous order. Its level of complexity is not limited by the possibilities of the individual human mind, its existence is not

necessarily revealed to our senses, since it can be based on purely abstract relationships that we can only reconstruct in thought. Since it is not made, we cannot reasonably say that it has a definite purpose, although the perception of its existence allows us to successfully pursue many different goals. That is, the spontaneous order performs a function, i.e., serves to realize the goals of various entities. On the basis of this function, public confidence in spontaneous order is formed, since it expands our capabilities. Therefore, in order to use this function of spontaneous order, subjects adapt to its rules that directly affect only some of them, and as a whole do not necessarily know. Spontaneous order develops through the incorporation of new circumstances and rules and inevitably becomes complicated in such a way that all circumstances and rules cannot be covered by any individual mind. After all, an order that has developed spontaneously can expand into such a complex social order that will not be subordinated to the intellectual processes of conscious coordination and regulation, because for its development the knowledge of all its individual members will be used, which will never be concentrated in a single mind. Inevitably, therefore, such a spontaneous order will limit our possibilities of control (Hayek, 1998, p. 67-71).

Since spontaneous order develops without a prior purpose as a result of the interaction of many individuals, it is impossible to predict it. A classic example of this order is the market, in which all individuals seek benefits and, as a result, relationships spontaneously develop between them. Thus, the market provides the function of obtaining benefits. Its examination reveals that the receipt of benefits is associated with the quality of goods and services. The essential feature of the quality of goods and services is their sustainability. Thus, a deep analysis of the market order reveals that the market is viable and functional only when its order is consistent with a sustainable security approach. Such functionality is also inherent in the spontaneous order of society, which developed on the basis of the maintenance of customs and traditions.

All artificial arrangements are constructed under conditions of spontaneous order that exist and function in reality. "Although spontaneous order and organization always coexist, it is impossible to combine these two principles of order as one likes. <...> To some extent, every organization must rely on rules, not just specific orders. <...> Only by following rules and not specific orders, individuals have access to knowledge that no one as a whole has. Each organization, whose members are not merely tools of the organization, defines by its orders only the function to be performed by each member, the objectives to be achieved, and certain general features of the methods to be used, and leaves everything else to be decided by individuals according to their knowledge and abilities," says Hayek (p. 79).

It is very important to realize that the rules of organization and spontaneous order are different in their origin and role. The rules of the organization are created to fulfill specific goals and regulate relations between the management and its subordinates and the details of activities. Therefore, they will be different for different members of the organization. The rules of spontaneous order are formed in the process of interaction between individuals as a consequence of their relationship of freedom and security. They do not depend on specific goals and apply equally to all members of a society or group. The rules of spontaneous order are used by individuals as available knowledge to achieve their goals. Therefore, organisations must take care that the cooperating individuals rely on common rules. This is especially important when we move to a common order of society as a whole. "We cannot maintain this complex order under the direct leadership of its members, it can only be maintained indirectly – by maintaining and improving the rules that allow the formation of a spontaneous order," states Hayek (p. 82). Therefore, it can be unequivocally stated that artificial orders can be functional if they comply with the general rules of the spontaneous order and do not contradict its further development.

Inversion of interaction between freedom and security in cyberspace consumption policy

Security is becoming increasingly important in cyberspace. This is due to the increasing number of crimes in cyberspace, the growth of their diversity and complexity. It is no coincidence that the Prosecutor Office of the Republic of Lithuania stresses that "with the development of information technologies, economic, financial and other activities rapidly moving to cyberspace, the number of criminal acts committed in cyberspace in the Republic of Lithuania, as in the whole world, is constantly growing, and it is predicted that it will continue to grow. These acts are extremely latent, more complex, and their investigation and disclosure is extremely complicated due to the exceptional professionalism and ability of criminals to disguise themselves on the internet" (Nusikaltimai elektroninėje erdvėje, 2019).

In cyberspace, there is a layered interaction of organized and spontaneous order. Directly organized procedures in cyberspace are created by website and network managers and compliance with its rules is supervised by handlers. In the creation of the organizational order in cyberspace, national and above-national entities are increasingly involved not directly, which regulate the activities of all entities and users and control their responsibilities by means of legislation of the relevant legal force. As a result, site and network managers are increasing their responsibilities to improve internal arrangements in a way that is consistent with international and national legislation. Also, the responsibilities of website and network managers to control the behaviour of users of cyberspace in order to comply with the rules of common procedure and to manage emerging risks and infringements are increasing.

Creation and consumption of electronic space has its own history. Early users associated cyberspace more with the free provision of information (e.g., advertising), receiving and interpersonal communication. Therefore, managers and handlers of electronic communications and websites took a liberal approach to interaction between users in order to achieve their economic benefits. Even the idea that absolute freedom of individuals is possible in the virtual world and no one can regulate it has been disseminated. On the basis of human freedom of expression and the pursuit of benefits, the priority of unlimited subjective freedom was promoted, which enabled sites managers to attract users, accumulate their databases and derive enormous benefits from the management of these bases.

On the other hand, it can also be argued that on the basis of human freedom of expression and benefits, the interactions between users of cyberspace developed a spontaneous order that destroyed the classical concept of sustainable security. This means that although the organizational order of the sites formally existed, it was not developed, and its violations were liberally controlled. Consequently, there has been a gradual development of subjective freedoms - with as few constraints as possible -resulting in a spontaneous order, which is the opposite of the spontaneous order of security. It is necessary to remember that from the point of view of sustainable security, subjective freedom must not be opposed to the security of a group of people or society. However, at the beginning of the creation and use of cyberspace, the expression of subjective freedom and the disregard for security prevailed. Security was interpreted solely at the level of preventing physical threats. Since in the virtual world, subjects are disconnected from physical contacts, the provision was made that their security was not threatened.

It now must be stated that the consumption of cyberspace is already equivalent to the consumption of reality. For example, in 2015, there were 2.07 billion users of social networks, and in July 2021, it was 4.48 billion. Since 2015, social media growth rate was an average of 12.5% per annum. Growth is now declining, as the data of 2019-2020 shows 9.2% growth rate (Dean, 2021). Thus, there has been a transformation and we have to turn to the concept of

sustainable security, because the freedom of users of cyberspace has become a challenge to the security of themselves, groups of people and states. The new reality of digital space (first of all, elimination of time and space restrictions, anonymity, large-scale possibilities of operation) allows new forms and ways of illegal activity and distinguishes computer crimes as special and different from the usual crimes of the “earthly world” (Ugnė Grigaitytė, Miglė Mackevičiūtė, 2022, p. 278).

Users of the cyberspace are very different in terms of their interests, knowledge and experience, but actively, especially the younger generation, participate in various activities that involve: 1) the production, dissemination and reception and interpretation of a wide variety of information, 2) the provision and receipt of goods and services; 3) the creation of virtual groups and communities and the maintenance of their functioning, 4) the creation and maintenance of images of objects and entities. Digital opportunities involve them in activities because they rely on their knowledge, freedom of virtual interactions and anonymity. However, a significant proportion of users do not have the necessary competences to reasonably assess the risks of their activities in cyberspace. There will always be a risk that the wide-ranging capabilities of digital technologies enable the security of users of cyberspace to be compromised. Therefore, it is necessary to develop their protection and threat recognition competences. On the other hand, the behavior of cyber users is changing, as they increasingly inform the virtual police patrol about the observed violations (Policijos virtualus patrulis pasidalijo rezultatais: kaip sekėsi ir kas labiausiai patraukė dėmesį?, 2021).

It is very important to stress that international and national legislation increasingly defines and regulates the risks arising in cyberspace. In the context of their implementation, managers and managers of social networks change their position in relation to the subjective interaction of freedom and security. They develop new rules for the management of social networks, compliance with which would allow achieving a balance between freedom of expression and social security of subjects, i.e., there is an inversion of the interaction between freedom and security, which is consistent with a sustainable security approach. “Facebook” community standards, for example, describe what is allowed and not allowed to do in the “Facebook” system.

“Facebook” “society’s standards goal is to create a place for expression and give people a voice. “Meta” wants people to be able to talk openly about the issues that matter to them, even if some may disagree or find them objectionable. In some cases, we allow content, which would otherwise go against our standards, if it’s newsworthy and in the public interest. We do this only after weighing the public interest value against the risk of harm, and we look to international human rights standards to make these judgments” (Facebook Community Standards, 2022).

This community emphasizes that “our commitment to expression is paramount, but we recognize the internet creates new and increased opportunities for abuse. For these reasons, when we limit expression, we do it in service of one or more of the following values:

1. Authenticity. “We want to ensure that the content people see on “Facebook” is authentic. We believe that authenticity creates a better environment for sharing, and that’s why we don’t want people using „Facebook“ to misrepresent who they are or what they’re doing.

2. Security. We’re committed to making „Facebook“ a safe place. We remove content that could contribute to a risk of harm to the physical security of persons. Content that threatens people has the potential to intimidate, exclude or silence others and isn’t allowed on „Facebook“.

3. Privacy. We're committed to protecting personal privacy and information. Privacy gives people the freedom to be themselves, choose how and when to share on „Facebook“ and connect more easily.

4. Dignity. We believe that all people are equal in dignity and rights. We expect that people will respect the dignity of others and not harass or degrade others“ (Facebook Community Standards, 2022).

“Facebook” community standards detail various forms of prohibited and controversial behavior and policies to prevent them. For example, how violence and criminal behaviour can occur in a social network? For users to better understand and recognize prohibited behaviour, “Facebook” managers decompose it into separate elements: violence and incitement, dangerous individuals and organizations, coordination of intentional harm and promotion of criminal activity, restricted goods and services, fraud and deception. Security is decomposed into the following elements: suicide and self-harm, sexual exploitation of children, violence against children and child nudity, sexual exploitation of adults, bullying and harassment, exploitation of people, violations of privacy. Controversial content includes hate speech, violent and shocking content, adult nudity and sexual activity, sexual harassment (Facebook Community Standards, 2022).

"Facebook" community is the social network with the most users. Its managers and handlers seek to establish in cyberspace standards of community behavior, compliance with which will lead to the development of a culture of freedom of expression, but also attract even more users. Therefore, their policies, on the one hand, seek to define as fully as possible the forms of intolerable behavior and the appropriate practices for their prevention, but, on the other hand, reserve the opportunity for themselves to publish content that does not meet the declared standards but is in the public interest. Thus, the possibility of double standards remains, although, insuring against possible errors, notes that decisions will be based on an assessment of the public interest benefit / harm risk ratio and in accordance with international human rights standards. Competition between all social networks is likely to be based on a policy of balancing freedom and security. Therefore, there is hope that the promotion of a sustainable security policy in cyberspace will lead to the development of a spontaneous order of security in the real world.

Conclusions

Linguistic and etymological examination of the meanings of “sustainability” and “security” allows a reasonable definition of a sustainable security approach. Sustainable security is the long-term balance between subjective freedom and social security, embodied in the general or social rules of conduct that have grown up in the culture of society, and the implementation of which we call justice. The main meaning of the term " sustainable security " is the qualitative description of the state of security.

In the processes of cultural selection of humanity, sustainable security is formed as a balance between social security and subjective freedom, because otherwise the continuity of human existence would be very problematic. This balance was embodied in the common norms of behavior of groups of people, the constant observance of which is the basis for the formation and establishment of human communities and their social order. Social order is formed spontaneously only when the practical mind of a group of individuals relates the benefits of following common rules of conduct with the security of individuals and the ability to survive in the process of satisfying basic needs.

From the point of view of sustainable security, cyberspace consumption policy is undergoing an inversion of the interaction between freedom and security. Its formation is determined by the pursuit by international and national authorities of the relevant legal power to control the increase in the number, diversity and complexity of cybercrime through legal regulation. Managers and handlers of social networks establish standards of community behavior in cyberspace, the observance of which will lead to the development of a culture of freedom of expression. They emphasize that decisions on network user behaviour will be based on an assessment of the public interest benefit / risk of harm and in accordance with international human rights standards. Competition between all social networks is likely to be based on a policy of balancing freedom and security. Therefore, there is hope that the promotion of a sustainable security policy in cyberspace will lead to the development of a spontaneous order of security in the real world.

References

1. Baublys L. Antikinė teisingumo samprata ir jos įtaka Vakarų teisės tradicijai. Vilnius: Mykolo Romerio universitetas, 2005.
2. Brian Dean. Social network Usage And Growth Statistics: How Many People Use social Media In 2022?, https://backlinko.com/social_media_users, žiūrėta 2022 05 25.
3. Darna apibrėžimas ir reikšmė (zodis.eu), žiūrėta 2022 05 25.
4. Degutis A. Friedrichas Hayekas ir spontaninė visuomenės tvarka. // *Teisė, įstatymų leidyba ir laisvė. I tomas. Taisyklės ir tvarka*. Vilnius: Eugrimas/ALK, 1998. P. 215-224.
5. Hayek Fr. A. Teisė, įstatymų leidyba ir laisvė. I tomas. Taisyklės ir tvarka. Vilnius: Eugrimas: 1998.
6. Facebook Community Standards, 2022. Facebook Community Standards | Transparency Center (fb.com), žiūrėta 2022 05 25.
7. Ferguson A. An Essay on the History of Civil Society. London, 1767.
8. Kas yra Pusiausvyra? | Terminų žodynas (zodynas.lt), žiūrėta 2022 05 25
9. Kas yra Ramybė? | Terminų žodynas (zodynas.lt), žiūrėta 2022 05 25
10. Maslow A. Psichologijos duomenys ir vertybių teorija // Gėrio kontūrai. Vilnius: Mintis, 1989.
11. Naujas demokratijos ir religijos konflikto etapas. < <https://www.delfi.lt/uzsakomasis-turinys/pt/naujas-demokratijos-ir-religijos-konflikto-etapas.d?id=90330401>>, žiūrėta 2022 05 29
12. Nusikaltimai elektroninėje erdvėje | Lietuvos Respublikos prokuratūra (prokuraturos.lt), žiūrėta 2022 05 25.
13. Policijos virtualus patrulis pasidalijo rezultatais: kaip sekėsi ir kas labiausiai patraukė dėmesį?, 2021. <https://klaipeda.diena.lt/naujienos/kriminalai/nusikaltimai/policijos-virtualus-patrulis-pasidalijo-rezultatais-kaip-sekesi-ir-kas-labiausiai-patrauke-demesi-1031610>, žiūrėta 2022 05 25.
14. Tvarus reikšmė - lietuvių kalbos žodynas (lietuviuzodynas.lt), žiūrėta 2022 05 25
15. Tomlinson J. Globalizacija ir kultūra. Vilnius: Mintis, 2002.

16. Ugnė Grigaitytė, Miglė Mackevičiūtė. Nusikaltimai virtualioje erdvėje – šiuolaikiniai iššūkiai ir prevencijos galimybės // *Teisės mokslo pavasaris 2020*. Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2020. P. 274-294.