Prague Law Working Papers Series No III/2021 – New issue of Charles University in Prague Faculty of Law Research Papers

The new issue of Prague Law Faculty's open-source electronic periodical offers a set of working papers on various topics. The following provides a general outline of their content. Their full versions can be downloaded free of charge from http://www.prf.cuni.cz

Xin Li contributed a study called: **Discuss Maritime Boundary under the South China Sea Arbitration Case.** According to the author, the delimitation of the Maritime Boundary tends to be an important issue in international law, especially in the international law of the sea and maritime boundaries are not only a matter of national maritime areas, but also a matter of biological resources, seafood resources and energy resources. The ocean is a vast treasure. When countries develop marine resources, many problems arise over maritime boundary, the division of the economic zone, the overlap of the continental shelf, political issues, etc. Such problems affect not only states but also international law. The present paper analyses the practice of maritime boundaries in the context of the South China Sea Arbitration Case, starting with the PCA decision and then analysing the decision in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. The issue of maritime delimitation tends to be one of the key environmental issues for many neighbouring countries in the world, and in the case of China and the Philippines, historical factors, human activities, and international treaties could be all important factors in delimiting maritime boundaries. While China and the Philippines presented different evidence regarding the Spratly Islands, the composition of the arbitral tribunal and the manner in which the arbitration was conducted were also important factors in deciding the case throughout.

Meagan Zabadal treats in her contribution the topic of **Hate Speech and Minority Protection in the United States**. Minority protection and hate speech have been separately analysed and debated extensively, but the relation between the two is not a highly discussed topic. Whether it's due to their race, religion, ethnicity, gender, or any other aspect, minority groups become a target for hate speech because of their differences. The dissemination of hateful messages results in real harm, both to the intended victims and to the society in which it is permitted to happen. Hate speech can influence those around and even change an individual's opinion and feelings towards a minority group. This can spark other issues, such as discrimination and hate crimes. In this paper, the author analyses how hate speech is handled in the United States, and what this means in respect to minority protection. The Supreme Court tries to always uphold this freedom by overturning laws that undermined it. Hate speech is protected under the First Amendment, even though the effects it may have towards minorities. The Supreme Court looks at the regulation of hate speech based on the individual facts of the case to decide if the regulation is constitutional or not. To decide, the Supreme Court currently applies the incitement principle, which means the speech can be restricted if it is intended to incite or produce imminent lawless action. The Supreme Court does not provide consideration for the protection of minorities when deciding a freedom of speech case. Its main priority is protecting the right of freedom of expression. The Supreme Court is not concerned with the negative impact hate speech may have on minorities if the speech does not produce imminent lawless action. Hate speech will also not be restricted simply because it offends the minority. Even laws designed to protect racial minorities have not been upheld because they offend freedom of speech. The United States Constitution provides for the freedom of expression, and current case law points that protecting this freedom will always be given greater priority over the protection of minorities in regards to hate speech.

Václav Šmejkal devoted his text to the **Three Challenges of Artificial Intelligence for Antitrust Policy and Law.** His paper addresses the challenges that the increasing use of artificial intelligence, in particular smart algorithms that collect and process large amounts of data for internet gatekeepers (i.e. the largest online service providers), poses for competition protection. The analysis focuses on three areas: the potential clash between competition protection and consumer (privacy) protection that may be caused by the push for sharing and portability of client data in order to open up online

markets; then the issue of super-dominance caused by internet gatekeepers escaping both their competitors and effective control due to the massive deployment of AI; and finally, the issue of the algorithmic price collusion that seemingly turns some existing competition protection paradigms on their head. These three challenges are critically analysed with regard to their reflection in the literature and in the existing decision-making practice of competition authorities. The conclusions can hardly be final and definitive. Most of the assumptions and rare conclusions regarding the impact of AI on antitrust will be confirmed or not by further developments. Their very formulation and visibility may contribute to a debate that - if it gains the necessary scope and momentum - could influence law-making and law-applying bodies.

Martin Hobza together with Aneta Vondráčková address the issue of **Crypto-Asset Services under the Draft MiCA Regulation**. The draft Markets in Crypto-assets Regulation (MiCA) seeks to regulate crypto-asset services and crypto-asset service providers within the European Union as an area, which was mainly built on the idea of independence from the current "traditional" financial system and its regulatory framework. MiCA, inspired by the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID II) as a cornerstone of the EU financial services regulation, now aims to change the paradigm. Their paper deploys cross-sectoral approach, focuses on examining the scope and categorising the relevant crypto-asset services compared with the investment services catalogue under MiFID II. By analysing the definitions and content of individual services, it seeks to identify possible differences and frictions. It also examines the impacts MiCA might have on how to interpret the scope of individual corresponding investment services under MiFID II, and vice versa. Further, it categorises and evaluates prospective requirements put on the crypto-asset service providers (CASPs). As a result, the paper introduces three crypto-asset service categories, emphasizes the relevant differences of MiCA and MiFID II lists, as well as provides an overview of the new requirements put on crypto-asset service providers.

Václav Šmejkal[1]

[1] Associate Professor, JUDr. Václav Šmejkal, Ph.D., Charles University Law Faculty, Prague, Czech Republic and ŠKODA AUTO University, Mladá Boleslav, Czech Republic