

Основными нравственными ограничениями использования риторики ненависти в отношении людей, больных социально значимыми заболеваниями, являются принцип непричинения вреда, прямо запрещающий стигматизацию, и принцип предосторожности, обязывающий просчитывать последствия каждого слова, сказанного публично, при обсуждении таких тем, как здоровье и болезнь, общественное здоровье, здравоохранение. Если анализ возможных последствий позволяет выявить вероятность увеличения уровня агрессии в публичном пространстве, провокации использования риторики ненависти другими субъектами публичного дискурса, усиления стигматизации больных, то необходимо отказаться от риторики ненависти в пользу других способов выражения мнения, которые, вероятнее всего, не повлекут за собой подобного рода последствий.

*Статья подготовлена при финансовой поддержке РФФИ (17-03-00094)
The work was supported by RFBR (17-03-00094)*

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Александров, А. А. Психическое здоровье и этические проблемы современной психиатрии / А. А. Александров // Сахаровские чтения 2016 года: экологические проблемы XXI века: материалы 16-й междунар. науч. конф., 19–20 мая 2016 г., г. Минск, Республика Беларусь; под ред. С. А. Маскевича, С. С. Позняка, Н. А. Лысухо. – Минск: МГЭИ им. А. Д. Сахарова БГУ, 2016. – С. 296–297.
2. Гусейнов, А. А. Негативная этика. – СПб.: Изд-во СПбГУП, 2007. – С. 5–30.
3. Goffman, E. Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity / E. Goffman. – N.Y.: Simon & Schuster, 1986. – 147 p.

КРИПТОВАЛЮТА: ТЕХНОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ «ПРОРЫВ» ИЛИ УГРОЗА МИРОВОЙ ЭКОБЕЗОПАСНОСТИ? CRYPTOCURRENCY: TECHNOLOGICAL «BREAKTHROUGH» OR A THREAT TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY?

**Я. О. Тринева, В. Н. Куц
Y. Trynova, V. Kuts**

*Европейский университет, Национальная академия прокуратуры Украины,
г. Киев, Украина
trynovayana80@gmail.com*

European University, National Academy of Public General Prosecutor's office of Ukraine, Kiev, Ukraine

Изложены результаты анализа влияния практической реализации одного из видов нового знания – изобретения криптовалюты – на мировую энергетическую и экологическую безопасность. Приведены примеры противоречия этого нового опасного знания основным принципам биоэтики. Предложены возможные пути решения этой проблемы.

The theses contain the results of the analysis of the impact of the practical implementation of one of the new knowledge types - the invention of the crypto currency - on world energy and environmental security. Examples of the contradiction of this new dangerous knowledge to the basic principles of bioethics are given. Possible ways of solving this problem are suggested.

Ключевые слова: криптовалюта, биткойн, майнинг, экология, безопасность.

Keywords: cryptocurrency, bitcoin, mining, ecology, security.

Crypto currency is considered a variety of digital currency, the creation and control of which are based on cryptographic methods [1]. The term was fixed after the publication of an article on the system «Cryptocurrency», published in 2011 in the Forbes magazine [2]. Cryptographic currency is also called «electronic cash». The first type of crypto currency – «bitcoin» – appeared in 2009. As of 2018, there are already 33 types of active cryptocurrencies in the world.

Depending on jurisdiction, cryptocurrencies are considered as a payment instrument or as a specific commodity. Treatment with them may have certain limitations, for example, prohibiting operations with them for banking institutions. In 2015, the European Court recognized bitcoin as a currency in terms of taxation. At the same time, the court forbade imposing VAT on the purchase of goods and services with the help of a virtual currency. The European Court admits the possibility of a different approach by members of the European Union states to regulate cryptocurrencies. It follows that each country determines for itself what bitcoin is, currency or commodity.

On this basis, the Federal Republic of Germany adopted in 2018 the decision that the crypto currency is equal to traditional means of payment, subject to the following conditions: 1) if used by transaction participants as an alternative

contractual and immediate method of payment; 2) has no other purpose than to use as a payment method [3]. In Japan, bitcoyn is recognized as a legal tender [4]. In China, bitokoy operations are prohibited for legal entities, but are allowed for individuals [5]. The United States recognized bitcoin as virtual currency [6]. Ukraine did not recognize bitkoyin as a means of payment, however, in the declarations on incomes of state employee, references to the purchase of bitcoins appeared.

The list of jurisdictions that expressed their opinion on the legal status of the crypto currency is not exhaustive. It can be continued. However, in these theses, the financial side of the problem is not considered. Their goal is to draw attention to the phenomenon of the emergence of cryptocurrency from the point of view of safety for the existing planetary ecosystem. That is, we emphasize the bioethical aspect of the problem if we consider bioethics in its global meaning as knowledge of the preservation of life on Earth. Such studies are still absent, judging by the absence of relevant publications. This testifies to the lack of awareness of the urgency of this problem. Meanwhile, such an urgency is taking place. It is based on the fact that the existing technology of handling cryptocurrencies already now requires the consumption of huge amounts of electricity.

The costs of mining crypto currency can be visually demonstrated in the following comparative examples. So on «extraction» bitcoins 27 times more energy is spent, than for work of payment system Visa. According to expert estimates, the electricity that is currently consumed by the cryptocurrency miners would be enough to feed 1,25 million households in the US. One bitcoin-transaction consumes an average of 163 kWh. This is equivalent to supplying electricity to the average American home for about 5,5 days. The predicted growth of interest in cryptocurrencies will cause an increase in demand for this type of energy.

Such irrational consumption of energy resources already now leads to negative consequences. Thus, the mass media report that the mass production of crypto-currencies can lead to a shortage of electricity in Iceland [7]. This country, having cheap electricity, is very attractive for placing information processing centers necessary for the emergence of bitcoins. Almost all of the electricity Iceland receives from renewable sources (thermal springs, volcanoes). In addition, experts note another feature of mining in Iceland – Arctic air reduces the need for miners to invest in the purchase of expensive air conditioning equipment in server rooms. According to expert estimates, in 2010, 840 GWh of electricity will be required for bitcoin producers, while the entire population consumes about 700 GWh [8]. What to say about the countries in which electricity is obtained from non-renewable sources (coal, fuel oil, nuclear fuel). It is obvious that such sources are depleted. In addition, their processing pollutes the environment, from which life-threatening diseases multiply, and entire species of flora and fauna disappear.

Thus, there is a disappointing conclusion: the «production» of cryptocurrency is an excessively expensive energy aspect, a process that generates negative environmental and social consequences. Consequently, the question arises of the expediency of producing this new type of currency right now. Perhaps it is advisable to postpone it for a while, until humanity finds ways to neutralize its negative consequences? The search for such ways should begin with bioethics. Ukrainian scientist, academician Yu. Kundiev, who recently left this world, rightly called bioethics the science of minimizing risks, having in mind its applied significance. In a broad sense, this is knowledge about the principles of coexistence of all elements of the Earth's ecosystem, the observance of which ensures the safety of its existence.

The main such principles, as is known, are: 1) the principle of ecocentrism; 2) the principle of rationalism; 3) the principle of realism; 4) the principle of altruism; 5) the principle of transparency. Every new knowledge, even at the stage of its theoretical formation, must be correlated with the above principles of bioethics, that is, it is checked for compliance with them. If at least one of them contradicts, such knowledge must be recognized as dangerous. It can not be realized until such a contradiction is eliminated.

The start of the implementation of the inherently dangerous knowledge – the idea of introducing cryptocurrencies into the life of society – clearly contradicts the principles of bioethics. First, it does not conform to the principle of ecocentrism, as it depletes existing energy resources and exacerbates the already tense situation in the ecosystem. Secondly, it contradicts the principles of rationalism and altruism. This is manifested in the fact that today there is no acute need to produce cryptocurrency due to the predatory destruction of ecoresources for the sake of the egoistic inclinations of an insignificant part of the human community.

Production of cryptocurrency in its own danger can be compared with the production and use of nanotechnology. The latter, as well as cryptocurrencies, in addition to benefits, for example, use in therapy against cancer, cause considerable harm, in particular, they generate new oncological diseases.

At first, it is necessary to develop standards for energy and environmental security, for example, the limits on the permissible use of an energy source for the production of cryptocurrencies. Naturally, the determining factor for the admissibility of the limit should be the amount of environmental resource. For infringement of such limit to provide inevitability of legal reaction with application to the guilty person of administrative or criminal responsibility.

So, for example, under the legislation of Ukraine, one can be brought to administrative responsibility for introducing inventions that do not meet the established standards of environmental safety and other requirements in the field of environmental protection. It would seem that this violation can be imputed to a person who uses electricity to “produce” the cryptocurrency. However, in Ukraine there are no corresponding standards for energy and environmental security in this area. Consequently, such an offense remains outside the legal response.

Unfortunately, the world community now pays more attention to the legalization of cryptocurrency as a monetary or commodity. At the same time, the problem of global depletion of energy and environmental resources in the pursuit of augmentation of the cryptocurrency remains irrelevant. For the umpteenth time, we would like to emphasize the public's attention and the power of those holding that ensuring the safety of the ecosystem's existence should be a priority task for all modern jurisdictions. Any other problems, including the legal provision of crypto-currency, are secondary.

REFERENCES

1. *Мащенко П. Л.* Технология Блокчейн и ее практическое применение / П. Л. Мащенко, М. О. Пилипинко // Наука, техника, образование. – Олимп, 2017. – № 32. – С. 61–64.
2. Cryptocurrency // Forbes.
3. Embassy of bitcoin.
4. Japan OKs recognizing virtual currencies as similar to real money / The Japan Times.
5. Центральный банк Китая запретил банкам операции с биткойнами URL: www.vedomosti.ru/finance/news/2013/12/05/cb-kitaya-zapretil-bankam-operacii-s-bitcoin#ixzz2myQN49z2.
6. Bitcoin Virtual Currency: Unique Features Present Distinct Challenges for Deterring Illicit Activity.
7. В Исландии заявили о серьезной угрозе для страны от биткойна. URL: <https://economy.apostrophe.ua/news/jenergetika/2018-02-13>.
8. Исландия – рай для биткойн-майнеров. URL: <https://cryptos.tv>.

ПРИРОДА КАК СУБЪЕКТИВИРОВАННЫЙ ОБЪЕКТ ОБЩЕНИЯ NATURE AS SUBJECTIVED OBJECT OF COMMUNICATION

В. И. Фалько
V. Falco

*Мытищинский филиал Московского государственного технического университета им. Н. Э. Баумана,
г. Мытищи, Российская Федерация
vfalco@yandex.ru*

Mytishchi branch of the Moscow State Technical University. N. E. Bauman, Mytishchi, Russian Federation

Понимание природы как субъективированного объекта общения, как иллюзорного партнера во взаимоотношениях с человеком является неверным. Природная среда, воспринимая от человека, вступающего с ней в общение, атрибуты его субъектности, становится виртуальным субъектом и обретает черты реального партнера. На основе понимания общения человека и природы как ее субъективации дается сильная формулировка золотого правила нравственного природопользования.

Understanding of nature as a subjective object of communication as an illusory partner in the relationship with a person is incorrect. The natural environment, perceiving from the person entering into communication with it, the attributes of its subjectivity, becomes a virtual subject and acquires the features of a real partner. Based on an understanding of human and nature communication as its subjectivation, a strong formulation of the golden rule of moral nature management is given.

Ключевые слова: общение человека и природы, субъектность природы, виртуальный субъект, золотое правило нравственного природопользования.

Keywords: communication between man and nature, the subjectivity of nature, a virtual subject, the golden rule of moral nature management

В контексте формирования нравственного отношения человека к природной среде и современных исследований понятий субъекта и субъектности требуется переосмысление одного из главных принципов экологической этики и биоэтики – субъект-субъектные отношения человека и природы [1, с. 61]. В литературе и СМИ все чаще встречаются призывы строить партнерские отношения общества и природы как необходимому условию разрешения экологического кризиса. Во многих странах мира ширится движение в защиту прав животных и прав природы, но принятие соответствующих этических и, тем более, юридических кодексов наталкивается на их не правосубъектность. Многие ученые и философы соглашались с уже ставшим классическим тезисом С. Л. Рубинштейна: «Исходный реальный субъект всех «онтологических» понятийных характеристик это Мир, Космос, Вселенная» [2, с. 84], но при этом отказывают в статусе реального субъекта природной среде и экосистемам. Могут ли быть присущи природным системам и животным признаки реального субъекта или отношение к ним как субъектам – не более чем поэтическая метафора?