

## DIGITAL CULTURE IN MODERN UKRAINE: PHILOSOPHICAL DIMENSIONS OF THE FOURTH INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN THE CONTEXT OF NATIONAL IDENTITY PROBLEMS

A new approach to the analysis of the digital culture of modern Ukraine is proposed as a space of intersection of technological modernization, conditioned by the logic of the fourth industrial revolution, and state-building practices of Ukrainian national identity. *The purpose* of the study is to consider the philosophical dimensions of the digital culture of Ukraine in the logic of the fourth industrial revolution through the problem of national identity, in particular, the characteristics of how digital infrastructures transform belonging, how digital social solidarity arises and consists of what ethical challenges accompany this process. *Methods*: analytical method, synergistic principle, holistic approaches to society, socio-philosophical analysis, theories of information and information society, and elements of discourse analysis of digital media. *Scientific novelty*. It is proved that digitalization in Ukraine cannot be reduced to a technocratic upgrade of services: it forms new modes of belonging, solidarity, trust, and autonomy, which become part of the normative core of the national idea. Through the prism of the phenomena of digital nationalism, data as a resource of power, technological sovereignty and information warfare, it is argued that the Ukrainian case demonstrates a special type of «digital modernity under pressure»: institutional resilience and civic engagement are strengthened by digital infrastructures, but at the same time the risks of external dependence, «data colonization» and algorithmic inequality are increasing. The latest research shows how digital public services and the co-production of public services in a crisis support the trust and subjectivity of citizens; network identities in social media during war tend to strengthen intra-group solidarity; information security and regulation become an element of the political ethics of the nation. The concept of a «digital national idea» is proposed as a combination of dignity, freedom, solidarity, technological sovereignty, the rule of law and openness. *Conclusions*. A philosophical framework is proposed that combines: the concepts of «digitalization» and «platformization» of cultural production and the mediation of social ties; the ethics of digital governance and «soft ethics» as a tool for regulating technological systems; the issues of digital sovereignty and «data» as a resource of power; the anthropological challenges of Industry 4.0 (reformatting of labor, corporeality, agency, trust, and solidarity). Ukraine demonstrates a special type of digital modernization, where the war acted as a «critical turning point» and an accelerator of digital cooperation between the state, local communities, and civil society. It is argued that Ukraine's digital culture is not reduced purely to «technical progress», but is a field of ethical identity choices, where national identity acquires the features of network solidarity and symbolic defense.

**Keywords:** digital culture, Ukraine, philosophy of culture, philosophical anthropology, national identity, Industry 4.0, digital sovereignty, nationalism, data ethics, information warfare, trust.

**Formulation of the problem.** Digital culture in Ukraine in the 2020s is not just a set of technologies and ways of using them, but a new transformation of the «lifeworld» (E. Husserl), where communication itself, historical and cultural memory, and modes of visibility/recording of socially significant events are radically changing. After 2022, both the acceleration of these changes and their institutionalization occur, when, for example, state digital services such as «Actions» have become the basis not only for convenience, but also for survival and mobilization of all resources in war conditions, as well as an example of the cultural representation of the state in the world.

**The degree of research into the problem and analysis of recent publications.** The concept of the fourth industrial revolution (Industry 4.0), popularized by economist and founder of the World Economic Forum Klaus Schwab, describes the current phase of humanity's transformation, marked by the merging of physical, digital, and biological systems. In his work «The Fourth Industrial Revolution» (2016) [Schwab, 2016] Schwab emphasizes that we are

witnessing an «exponential growth» of technologies, where computerization, in particular through artificial intelligence, the Internet of Things, big data, cloud computing and cyber-physical systems [Colombo, Karnouskos&Hanisch, 2021], is becoming the main driving force for the transformation of society, the economy and even human anthropology [Schwab, 2016]. Computerization in the era of Industry 4.0 (4IR) ceases to be instrumental and acquires anthropological power. We are no longer simply «using computers» [Schwab, 2016], we are embedded in an environment that thinks, predicts, evaluates and reacts independently. This creates a new type of reality where human subjectivity dissolves in the dynamics of algorithms. Schwab calls this transformation «the merging of technologies and the blurring of boundaries between the physical, digital, and biological worlds» [Schwab, 2016], which directly impinges on philosophical foundations of autonomy, corporeality, identity, and responsibility. Schwab emphasizes that the pace of change far exceeds the capacity of political, ethical, and social systems to adapt. This imbalance is particularly pronounced in the field of computer technology, where innovations are being introduced without sufficient public dialogue [Schwab, 2016]. For example, autonomous vehicles, facial recognition, social rating systems, all of these things affect privacy, mobility, and dignity, but are often implemented according to a logic of efficiency rather than justice [Cunha, Silva, & Maggioli, 2022].

Computerization is not just a part, but the core of the fourth industrial revolution [Schwab, 2018], because it is computer calculations and digital structures that are platforms [Nieborg&Poell, 2018] for: the automation of labor (robots replace humans not only in physical, but also in intellectual work) and the algorithmization of social life [Kolodiziev, Shcherbak, Kostyshyna, et al., 2024] (from advertising to the control of behavior in society like the Chinese social rating system).

Digital structures can also be the basis of what was considered traditional corporeality, including the rethinking of the biological body (cyborgization, biodigital technologies) and the new control of space-time, which, with the help of globalized platforms [Kozachenko, 2021] allows one to be in both ordinary and virtual reality.

Critics of K. Schwab (e.g. Yuval Noah Harari [Harari, 2016; Harari, 2018], Shoshana Zuboff [Zuboff, 2019], Bernard Stiegler [Stiegler, 2015]) point out the risk of techno-enthusiasm: revolution is not only about opportunities, but also about losses. We are dealing with a process of profound anthropological shift, where man ceases to be a self-sufficient moral being, delegating his ethical «I» to technology. The ethic of responsibility acquires particular importance here: «what we can do is not always what we should do» [Colombo, Karnouskos, Hanisch, 2021]. Industry 4.0 requires not just technical or economic management [Ivić&Troitino, 2022], but the creation of philosophical models that would allow us to understand the place of man in a post-anthropocentric world [Edler, Blind, Kroll&Schubert, 2023].

Information philosopher Luciano Floridi, in his book «The Fourth Revolution: How the Infosphere is Reshaping Human Reality» (2014) [Floridi, 2014], offers an alternative and deeper conceptual framework for understanding modern computerization. In contrast to Schwab's economic and technological pathos, L. Floridi speaks of an ontological transformation of being, where information technologies do not simply change the environment, but transform the very structure of reality and the position of man in it. L. Floridi considers the «Fourth Revolution» as an «existential shift».

L. Floridi rightly claims that the history of knowledge and self-awareness of mankind has undergone three great revolutions: the Copernican revolution, which displaced man from the center of the Universe, the Darwinian revolution, which showed the unprestigious place of man in biological hierarchies, the Freudian revolution, which proved the fact that «we do not control our own psyche» and finally the information revolution [Floridi, 2014]. The fourth revolution, the information revolution, is that we are no longer unique agents of knowledge: algorithms, artificial intelligence systems, information flows begin to think, analyze and make decisions instead of us. L. Floridi introduces the concept of «infosphere» [Floridi, 2014] as a general information ecosystem that includes people, computers, objects with sensors, algorithms, digital processes. In

this system, man no longer has an exclusive epistemological status, but is only one of the information agents. This creates a new ecology of responsibility, L. Floridi speaks of information ethics [Floridi&Cowls, 2019], which is based not only on autonomy, but also on minimizing informational harm (e.g., manipulation of algorithms) [Bachmann, Putter&Duczynski, 2023] and maintaining informational dignity (reflecting dignity in a person's digital presence) [Twizeyimana&Andersson, 2019]. The responsibility of developers as new «architects of reality» is also envisaged [Floridi, 2014]: «We are now modifying our environment to such an extent that we must accept moral responsibility for the infosphere itself, not just for our actions within it» [Floridi, 2014, p. 91].

Considering the paradigm of the fourth industrial revolution, it can be noted that digitalization is transforming into a system where big data («big data») [Matveieva, Navumau&Gustafsson, 2022], cyber-physical systems [Colombo, Karnouskos&Hanisch, 2021], social networks, cloud services and artificial intelligence shape new socio-technical orders [Cunha, Silva&Maggioli, 2022]. We hypothesize in particular that the fourth industrial revolution (4IR) is not philosophically and ethically neutral, as it permeates diverse cultural circles and identities, changing institutional practices into ways of belonging to the new digital world.

**The purpose of the article** is to outline the philosophical dimensions of Ukraine's digital culture in the logic of the fourth industrial revolution through the problem of national identity, in particular, the characteristics of how digital infrastructures transform belonging, how digital social solidarity arises and consists of it, what ethical challenges (the spread of disinformation, digital inequality) accompany this process.

**Methods:** analytical method, synergistic principle, holistic approach to society, socio-philosophical analysis, theories of information and information society. Also used are ethical criticism of socio-technical systems and elements of discourse analysis of digital media (taking into account research on war and media discourse), in the context of the concept of «digital practices» as the formation of identity in networked public discourses.

**Presentation of the main material and the results of the study.** Digital culture in the context of platformization means that the production and circulation of symbols (news, memes [Munk, 2025], videos, art, educational materials, political messages) increasingly depend on platforms as infrastructures, rules and algorithmic «frames of visibility» [Nieborg&Poell, 2018]. Platforms do not simply «transmit» culture, but shape it through commercial and political logics of ranking, moderation, monetization and attention management. In digital governance, technological solutions become carriers of norms: what can/cannot be done in the system often defines the boundaries of civic action.

Hence the importance of «soft ethics», ethics that complement legal regulation and work as a method for constructing responsible digital systems (principles of transparency, accountability, non-discrimination, respect for human dignity, security, data minimization).

Digital sovereignty [Ivić&Troitino, 2022] in Europe is often described as a response to the «erosion» of national autonomy in the digital economy: control over data, infrastructures, standards and rules of platforms becomes part of the question of identity and political self-determination. For Ukraine, this issue is exacerbated by the war, where digital channels act both as a tool for self-organization and a potential «attack surface» (cyber threats, information and psychological influences) [Bachmann, Putter&Duczynski, 2023]. In our opinion, a new type of citizenship is being formed through digital services, such as the «Diia» service. The Diia ecosystem (digital documents, access to services, integration of e-services) has become one of the central symbols of the Ukrainian digital project [Kornieiev, Yatskevych, 2024].

Its philosophical meaning goes beyond administrative convenience: it is a redefinition of the «state-human» relationship as interaction in the interface, where the citizen acts as both a user and a subject of law, and as a bearer of digital identity [Kornieiev, Yatskevych, 2024]. Studies of digital services in wartime conditions show that digital tools are able to maintain the continuity of public services, as well as catalyze cooperation between the state and civil society [Matveieva, Navumau&Gustafsson, 2022].

At the same time, the digital state constructs a new type of digital citizenship: participation in petitions, e-consultations, interaction with registers, digital identification, which becomes not only a «technical procedure» but also a social ritual of belonging [Matveieva, Navumau&Gustafsson, 2022]. In this sense, digital culture begins to perform the function of «everyday nationality» («banal nationalism» in the digital dimension): the nation is confirmed through repetitive practices of interaction with infrastructure.

War acted as an accelerator of digital cooperation and solidarity, transforming digital tools into a medium of collective action: from aid coordination to event documentation, from community communication to the support of public services. In the study «Government Information Quarterly» (2025) [Gustafsson, Matveieva, Wihlborg, Borodin, Mamatova&Kvitka, 2025] war is described as a “critical break” that restructures the rules and roles of actors and stimulates polycentric models of co-governance, where digital platforms become a common space for interaction.

The logic of Industry 4.0 often emphasizes productivity, efficiency and automation [Cunha, Silva&Maggioli, 2022]. However, systematic reviews highlight that the «human operator» in the fourth industrialization is often described in a simplified manner, and social dimensions (risks, inequality, gender aspects) can be marginalized by a technocentric approach. For Ukraine, the issue of human agency is combined with war, where technology becomes not only productive, but also existential, the best means of protection, resilience, recovery and institutional continuity. In our opinion, national identity in the digital age does not disappear, but changes form. Empirical studies of the Ukrainian context show that after a full-scale invasion, the role of intra-group solidarity increases as a factor associated with engagement and content distribution on social networks, i.e. «we-community», «we-together» becomes a more powerful mechanism of digital mobilization than «hatred of the other» as a dominant one [Wu, Gu&Xie, 2024]. Philosophically, this means that identity in digital culture increasingly manifests itself as a practice of solidarity, rather than just a «set of signs».

The discursive fields of war in the information sphere create competing narratives, including who is the «victim», the «aggressor», the «nation», the «territory», the «truth», and the «post-truth» [Bachmann, Putter&Duczynski, 2023]. Media discourse analysis shows the role of the media in legitimizing and manipulating identities (including rhetorical markers that seek to «reformat» regional identity) [Brusylovska&Maksymenko, 2023].

In the classical tradition, the national idea describes an «imagined community» (Benedict Anderson), its historical meaning, political goals, and ethical principles. In Ukraine, 2014–2025, a radical shift is taking place: the national idea is increasingly articulated through the language of infrastructures, services, registries, digital channels of interaction, cyber resilience, technological autonomy. It is not an «appendage» to identity, but its medium. Digital environments not only transmit symbols of the nation, they change the ways of belonging and participation: from bureaucratic vertical to horizontal cooperation, from a «paper» state to the state as an interactive interface [Edler, Blind, Kroll&Schubert, 2023].

The war (full-scale since 2022) made this shift existentially tangible: digital tools have become part of maintaining social order and services in crisis (including the co-production of services between the state and civil society) [Kozachenko, 2021]. Recent research on e-governance in times of war points to the role of digital services in supporting public interaction and adaptive governance [Matveieva, Navumau, &Gustafsson, 2022]. Thus, a philosophical question arises: how does digitalization enter the structure of the Ukrainian national idea, whether as a new form of subjectivity, or as an ethic of the common, as a politics of sovereignty, or as a struggle for truth in information warfare [Bachmann, Putter&Duczynski, 2023].

Research on «digital nationalism» shows: the nation is reproduced not only through visible symbols and discourses, but also through the “invisible” architecture of digital ecosystems, domains, algorithms, national digital environments, and infrastructure standards [Ivić&Troitino, 2022]. This means that national identity is increasingly being shaped as a techno-social practice,

based on developed habits, platforms, protocols, modes of visibility and attention [Mihelj&Jiménez-Martínez, 2021].

For the Ukrainian context, it is important that war accelerates the «condensation» of identity: in Ukrainian social networks during the war, the importance of markers of group belonging [Oleinik, 2025] and intra-group solidarity as factors of engagement and support increases, which indicates a change in the affective and symbolic economy of publicity [Kyrychenko, Brik, van der Linden& Roozenbeek, 2024; Geissler, Bär&Pröllochs, 2023].

Data can also act as power, and in the new conditions the risk of «data colonization» is raised. Digitalization is also a political economy of data. Regulatory debates about «data colonialism» [Couldry&Mejias, 2019] describe a situation where social life becomes an object of continuous data mining, and their processing forms a new order of dependence. This creates a dilemma for the national idea: how to combine openness and integration into global digital markets with control over critical data and infrastructures [Couldry & Mejias, 2019].

The concept of «technological sovereignty» in innovation policy interprets sovereignty not as self-sufficiency, but as the ability of the state and society to provide access «to critical technologies» and to form the rules for their «application for public purposes» [Edler, Blind, Kroll & Schubert, 2023]. This is directly related to the Ukrainian national idea: freedom here requires infrastructural capacity.

The concept of «public value of e-government» allows us to connect technical changes with an ethical and political sense: digital services are important not only in terms of efficiency, but also in terms of «trust and legitimacy, openness», as well as reducing corruption risks and spreading «social inclusion», «fairness of access» [Twizeyimana&Andersson, 2019]. This is critical for the Ukrainian national idea: the idea of the state as «ours» (and not someone else's) is produced through the experience of fair and accessible interaction.

A study of digital service provision in Ukraine during the war shows that resilience is achieved not only through centralization, but also through the co-production of services between local authorities, civil society organizations and digital platforms, which creates a «joint» institutional response capacity [Kolodiziev, Shcherbak, Kostyshyna, et al., 2024].

Thus, the philosophical component of the national idea acquires the infrastructural dimension of solidarity as an action («co-production»), and not only as a symbol. In a digital society, solidarity is the ability to jointly maintain life support networks.

Research on the Ukrainian diaspora in conflict conditions shows: social networks are a space where identity is «reflashed», and the nation becomes a daily practice of communication, and not just a legacy [Kozachenko, 2021]. This is especially important for Ukraine, where mobility (forced migration) is combined with digital presence: the national idea functions as a network of mutual visibility and support.

High-quality empirical work on the analysis of Ukrainian social media indicates: after 2022, the role of posts expressing group identity increases [Desoutter, 2025]; and in-group solidarity may have a stronger connection with engagement than pure hostility to the «out-group» [Kyrychenko, Brik, van der Linden & Roozenbeek, 2024], [Geissler, Bär & Pröllochs, 2023].

From the point of view of philosophical anthropology, this can be interpreted in such a way that the national idea in the digital environment is not only «anti-», but also «pro-»: about reciprocity, care, dignity, which becomes a resource of resilience. The work on Ukrainian speeches at the UN in 2022–2023 describes the mechanisms of countering Russian disinformation in official rhetoric, effectively recording that «truth» becomes part of institutional security and international subjectivity [Taranenko, 2024].

Thus, the national idea includes an epistemic dimension: being a nation means supporting regimes of verifiability, evidence, and accountability for action, speech, in conditions where fakes and manipulation are weapons. The latest analysis of the Ukrainian case on the regulation of AI-disinformation highlights a key tension: how to preserve freedom of expression but ensure resilience to massive manipulation, particularly in conditions of war [Marushchak, Petrov&Khoperiya, 2025].

On a philosophical level, this means: the national idea requires an ethics of digital law, balancing security and human rights, where «extraordinary» should not become the norm. Ukrainian digitalization is taking place against the backdrop of the global Fourth Industrial Revolution: automation, cyber-physical systems, platforms, data-driven governance. However, the philosophical criterion for success here is not only productivity, but human-centricity: digitalization should emphasize dignity, the ability to act, access to rights, equality of participation [Couldry&Mejias, 2019]. Research on «human-focused» cyber-physical systems in the context of Industry 4.0 emphasizes the need to embed «human values into the design of digital ecosystems» [Colombo, Karnouskos&Hanisch, 2021].

In the public dimension, this is specified as a question of public infrastructure, which should create public value, inclusion, trust, ethics of governance. Comparative studies of digital public infrastructure (DPI) show that digital transformations in the public sector have an effect when institutions are able to transform technology into public good [Desai & Manoharan, 2024]. Even the most successful digital services carry the risk of exclusion: different groups may have limited access, skills or trust [Couldry & Mejias, 2019]. Research on digital inclusion in e-government shows the ambivalence of intermediaries and «bottlenecks» of digital services, which affect administrative burden and accessibility. The question of trust is key for digital citizenship. Comparative studies of e-service adoption and «civic tech» in Eastern Europe (with a focus on Ukraine) show that participation and trust do not «automatically» arise from digitalization, but require interaction design, a philosophy of transparency, a sense of justice and real accountability.

Based on the above framework, it is proposed to understand the digital national idea of Ukraine as a normative complex consisting of five interrelated principles: dignity, solidarity, freedom as technological sovereignty, truth and critical thinking, openness as a European legal and value horizon. Dignity is understood as digital law, where digital services should not turn a person into a «register entry», a person should maintain the status of a bearer of rights and autonomy. Solidarity as an infrastructure involves joint action of citizens and the state, volunteering, «co-production» («co-production» as a norm in a crisis). Freedom as technological sovereignty is interpreted as the ability to guarantee access to critical technologies and determine the rules of their use without falling into isolationism [Edler, Blind, Kroll&Schubert, 2023].

Epistemic stability and truth in the post-truth era are extremely important principles and include fact-checking, counter-disinformation and the development of critical thinking. Openness as a European horizon, and therefore digitalization, must be compatible with human rights, the rule of law, European data security standards and democratic procedures.

Disinformation can be perceived as an attack on identity. Disinformation functions not only as a «falsehood», but also as a technology for the breakdown of trust and the fragmentation of collective identity. In this sense, information security is a component of cultural security.

In modern society, data is becoming the main resource of power, moving from «data colonization» to digital sovereignty. The critique of «data colonialism» emphasizes: the extraction of data from social life can create a new order of power and dependence, which requires a regulatory and ethical response. For Ukraine, this issue is twofold: on the one hand, the need for rapid digitalization, integration with European markets and standards, and on the other, the risks of external technological dependence and unequal control over data and infrastructure.

**Conclusions.** 1. The digital culture of Ukraine is not a backdrop for modernization, but a field of struggle for subjectivity: it forms new rituals of belonging (digital documents, interaction with services, digital participation), as well as new symbolic codes of resistance (platform campaigns, online communities).

2. Industry 4.0 in the Ukrainian case appears as a socio-technical regime that restructures agency and work, but at the same time is a resource for resilience and state continuity. Digitalization in Ukraine acquires a worldview dimension: it becomes part of the structure of the national idea, as it defines new forms of trust, participation, solidarity, and subjectivity.

3. National identity in digital culture increasingly manifests itself as a practical network of solidarity that supports mobilization and cultural memory; empirical data indicate the significance

of «in-group solidarity» as a digital mechanism of cohesion in war. The Ukrainian case demonstrates a model of digital statehood, where resilience during war is supported not only by centralized infrastructure, but also by the co-production of services and networked interaction of the state and society. The concept of a «digital national idea» must combine dignity, freedom, solidarity, truth and openness, complemented by technological sovereignty and democratic control over data.

4. Ethical risks (inequality of access, institutional mistrust, data vulnerability) require a transition from «digitalization as speed» to «digitalization as responsibility», where «soft ethics», transparency, accountability and inclusive design become key dimensions of policy.

## REFERENCES

Bachmann, S. D. D., Putter D., Duczynski G. (2023). Hybrid warfare and disinformation: A Ukraine war perspective. *Global Policy*, Vol.14, n.5, p.858–869. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.13257>.

Brusyolovska, O. & Maksymenko, I. (2023). Analysis of the media discourse on the 2022 war in Ukraine. *Regional Science Policy & Practice*. Vol. 15, n. 1, p. 222-236. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/rsp3.12579>

Colombo, A. W., Karnouskos S., Hanisch C. (2021). Engineering human-focused Industrial Cyber-Physical Systems in Industry 4.0 context. *Philosophical Transactions. A Math Phys Eng Sci*, 4 October 2021, 379 (2207): 20200366. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2020.0366>.

Couldry, N. & Mejias, U. (2019). Making data colonialism liveable: how might data's social order be regulated? *Internet Policy Review*, 8(2). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.14763/2019.2.1411>.

Cunha, L., Silva, D., & Maggioli, S. (2022). Exploring the status of the human operator in Industry 4.0: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.889129>.

Desai, A., & Manoharan, A. P. (2024). Digital Transformation and Public Administration: The Impacts of India's Digital Public Infrastructure. *International Journal of Public Administration*, n.47(9), p.575–578. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2024.2350762>.

Desoutter, M. (2025). War, social media and gender: visual analysis of TikTok videos depicting Ukrainian soldiers. *Critical Military Studies*, Vol.11, n.3, p.285-311. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23337486.2025.2472100>

Edler, J., Blind, K., Kroll, H. & Schubert, T. (2023). Technology sovereignty as an emerging frame for innovation policy: Defining rationales, ends and means. *Research Policy*, n.52(6), 104765. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2023.104765>

Floridi, L. (2014) *The Fourth Revolution: How the Infosphere is Reshaping Human Reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. 248 p.

Floridi, L. (2018). Soft Ethics and the Governance of the Digital. *Philosophy & Technology*, 31, p.1–8. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-018-0303-9>

Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A Unified Framework of Five Principles for AI in Society. *Harvard Data Science Review*, vol.1, issue 1. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1>.

Geissler, D., Bär, D., Pröllochs, N. (2023). Russian propaganda on social media during the 2022 invasion of Ukraine. *EPJ Data Science*, Vol.12, n.35, p.1-20. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-023-00414-5>.

Gustafsson, M., Matveieva, O., Wihlborg, E., Borodin, Y., Mamatova, T., & Kvitka, S. (2025). Adaptive governance amidst the war: Overcoming challenges and strengthening collaborative digital service provision in Ukraine. *Government Information Quarterly*, Vol.42, n.3, 102056. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2025.102056>.

Harari, Y. N. *21 Lessons for the 21st Century*. London: Jonathan Cape, 2018. 368 p.

Harari, Y. N. *Homo Deus: A Brief History of Tomorrow*. New York: Harvill Secker, 2016. 448 p.

Ivić, S. & Troitino, D. R. (2022). Digital Sovereignty and Identity in the European Union. A Challenge for Building Europe. *European Studies – the Review of European law, Economics and Politics*. 2022, vol. 9, no. 2, p. 80–109. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.2478/eustu-2022-0015>.

Kolodiziev, O., Shcherbak, V., Kostyshyna, T., et al. (2024). Digital transformation as a tool for creating an inclusive economy in Ukraine during wartime. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, n.22(3), p.440–457. Retrieved from: [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.22\(3\).2024.34](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.22(3).2024.34).

Kornieiev, P., Yatskevych, I. (2024). Dūia City: An Innovative Legal Regime. Can Ukraine's Legal Innovation Shape the Global Technological Landscape?. *Financial Law Review*, 2024, p.1-25. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.4467/22996834FLR.24.011.20920>.

Kozachenko, I. (2021). Transformed by contested digital spaces? Social media and diasporic selves in the Ukraine conflict. *Nations and Nationalism*. Vol.27, Issue 2, p.377-392. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12707>.

Kyrychenko, Y., Brik, T., van der Linden, S. & Roozenbeek, J. (2024). Social identity correlates of social media engagement before and after the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine. *Nature Communications*, n.15, 8127, p.1-11. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-52179-8>.

Marushchak, A., Petrov, S., & Khoperiya, A. (2025). Countering AI-powered disinformation through national regulation: learning from the case of Ukraine. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, Vol.7. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2024.1474034>

Matveieva, O., Navumau, V., Gustafsson, M. (2022). Adoption of Public e-services versus Civic Tech Services: On the Issue of Trust and Citizen Participation in Ukraine and Belarus. Janssen, M., et al. *Electronic Government. EGOV 2022. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 13391. Springer, Cham. Retrieved from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15086-9\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-15086-9_2).

Mihelj, S. & Jiménez-Martínez, C. (2021). Digital nationalism: Understanding the role of digital media in the rise of “new” nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism*, Vol.27, n.2, p.331–346. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12685>.

Munk, T. (2025). Digital Defiance: Memetic Warfare and Civic Resistance. *Eur J Crim Policy Res*, n.31, p.501–528. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10610-025-09613-4>

Nieborg, D. B. & Poell, T. (2018). The platformization of cultural production. Theorizing the contingent cultural commodity. *New Media & Society*, 20(11), 4275–4292. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818769694>.

Oleinik, A. (2025). Digital and mass media coverage of Russia's invasion of Ukraine compared: Uniformity within countries and diversity between countries. *SAGE Journals. International Communication Gazette*, Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/17480485251357866>.

Schwab, K. (2016). *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. World Economic Forum. 172 p.

Schwab, K. (2018). *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution: A Guide to Building a Better World*. New York: PF Penguin, 288 p.

Stiegler, B. (2015) *States of Shock: Stupidity and Knowledge in the 21st Century*. Trans. D. Ross. Cambridge-Oxford-Boston-New York: Polity Press. 288 p.

Taranenko, A. (2024). Ensuring information security: Countering Russian disinformation in Ukrainian speeches delivered at the United Nations. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, Vol. 10, 2024, 100987. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssho.2024.100987>.

Twizeyimana, J. D., & Andersson, A. (2019). The public value of E-Government -A literature review. *Government Information Quarterly*, vol.36, n.2, p. 167–178. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.01.001>.

Wu, X. K., Gu, G., Xie, TT. (2024). Unveiling evolving nationalistic discourses on social media. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, n.11, p.1-12, 998. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03425-3>

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: PublicAffairs 704 p.

**Tytar Olena V.**

D.Sc.in Philosophy, Professor of the  
Department of Schad Theory of Culture and Philosophy of Science  
V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University  
4, Svobody sqr., 61022, Kharkiv, Ukraine  
E-mail: lena\_tytar@ukr.net, tytarolena77@gmail.com  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1951-7830>

**Bulgakova Oksana V.**

Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor of Philosophy  
and International Communication Department  
National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine,  
15 Heroiv Oborony Str., Kyiv, 03041, Ukraine  
E-mail: hbulgakovao@ukr.net  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-3860-243X>

**Authors Contribution:** All authors have contributed equally to this work

**Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest

The article was received by the editors 01.09.2025  
The article is recommended for printing 25.10.2025

The article was revised 20.10.2025  
This article published 24.11.2025

---

**ЦИФРОВА КУЛЬТУРА В СУЧASNІЙ УКРАЇНІ: ФІЛОСОФСЬКІ ВИМІРИ  
ЧЕТВЕРТОЇ ПРОМИСЛОВОЇ РЕВОЛЮЦІЇ В КОНТЕКСТІ  
ПРОБЛЕМ НАЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ ІДЕНТИЧНОСТІ**

**Титар Олена Володимирівна**

доктор філософських наук,  
професор кафедри теоретичної і практичної філософії імені професора Й. Б. Шада  
Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна  
майдан Свободи, 4, Харків, 61022, Україна  
E-mail: lena\_tytar@ukr.net, tytarolena77@gmail.com  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1951-7830>

**Булгакова Оксана Володимирівна**

кандидат історичних наук, доцент  
кафедри філософії та міжнародної комунікації  
Національний університет біоресурсів і природокористування України  
вул. Героїв Оборони, 15, м. Київ, 03041, Україна  
E-mail: hbulgakovao@ukr.net  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-3860-243X>

**АНОТАЦІЯ**

Запропоновано новий підхід до аналізу цифрової культури сучасної України як простору перетину технологічної модернізації, зумовленої логікою четвертої промислової революції, та державотворчих практик української національної ідентичності. *Мета* – розгляд філософських вимірів цифрової культури України в логіці четвертої промислової революції через проблему національної ідентичності, зокрема характеристики того, як цифрові інфраструктури трансформують належність, як виникає і в чому полягає цифрова соціальна солідарність, що за етичні виклики супроводжують цей процес. *Методи*: аналітичний метод, синергетичний принцип, голістичний підхід до суспільства, соціально-філософський аналіз, теорії інформації та інформаційного суспільства, елементи дискурс-аналізу цифрових медіа. *Наукова новизна*. Доводиться,

що цифровізація в Україні не може бути зведена до технократичного апгрейду сервісів: вона формує нові модуси належності, солідарності, довіри й автономії, які стають частиною нормативного ядра національної ідеї. Через призму феноменів цифрового націоналізму, даних як ресурсу влади, технологічного суверенітету й інформаційної війни обґрунтовується, що український випадок демонструє особливий тип «цифрової модерності під тиском»: інституційна стійкість і громадянська взаємодія посилюються завдяки цифровим інфраструктурам, але одночасно зростають ризики зовнішньої залежності, «колонізації даними» та алгоритмічної нерівності. На матеріалі новітніх досліджень показано, як цифрові публічні сервіси й спільне виробництво державних послуг у кризі підтримують довіру й суб'єктність громадян; мережеві ідентичності в соціальних медіа під час війни тяжіють до посилення внутрішньогрупової солідарності; інформаційна безпека і регуляція стають елементом політичної етики нації. Запропоновано концепт «цифрової національної ідеї» як поєднання гідності, свободи, солідарності, технологічного суверенітету, правової держави та відкритості. *Висновки.* Пропонується філософська рамка, що поєднує: концепти «цифровізації» та «платформізації» культурного виробництва й медіації соціальних зв'язків; етику цифрового врядування і «м'яку етику» (soft ethics) як інструмент нормування технологічних систем; проблематику цифрового суверенітету й «даних» як ресурсу влади; антропологічні виклики Industry 4.0 (переформатування праці, тілесності, агентності, довіри й солідарності). Україна демонструє особливий тип цифрової модернізації, де війна виступила як «критичний злам» і прискорювач цифрової кооперації між державою, місцевими громадами й громадянським суспільством. Доводиться, що цифрова культура України не зводиться суто до «технічного прогресу», а є полем етичних ідентифікаційних виборів, де національна ідентичність набуває рис мережевої солідарності й символічної оборони.

**Ключові слова:** цифрова культура, Україна, філософія культури, філософська антропологія, національна ідентичність, Industry 4.0, цифровий суверенітет, націоналізм, етика даних, інформаційна війна, довіра.

**Внесок авторів:** всі автори зробили рівний внесок у цю роботу

**Конфлікт інтересів:** автори повідомляють про відсутність конфлікту інтересів

Стаття надійшла до редакції 01.09.2025

Переглянуто 20.10.2025

Стаття рекомендована до друку 25.10.2025

Опубліковано 24.11.2025

**Як цитувати / In cites:** Tytar, O., & Bulgakova, O. (2025). DIGITAL CULTURE IN MODERN UKRAINE: PHILOSOPHICAL DIMENSIONS OF THE FOURTH INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN THE CONTEXT OF NATIONAL IDENTITY PROBLEMS. *The Journal of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Series Philosophy. Philosophical Peripeteias*, (73), 151-160. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2226-0994-2025-73-13>