Collective Memory in Ukraine as a Factor in Identity Formation in the Context of Postmodernity

Andrii Vitov (ORCID 0009-0007-1863-9215)
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University (Ukraine)

Halyna Tymofieieva (ORCID 0000-0001-9224-1116)
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University (Ukraine)

This article explores the problem of collective memory as a foundation for the construction of Ukrainian collective identity. The authors argue that identity formation in the postmodern era is characterized by personalization, flexibility, and the ambivalent influence of globalization. The study demonstrates that Ukrainian collective memory represents a polyphony of interpretations rather than a homogeneous reflection of the past. Its competitive and composite nature is conceptualized not as a weakness, but as a source of pluralism, adaptability, and potential for critical re-evaluation. Accordingly, memory politics in Ukraine is presented as an active process of shaping a desired society. The article emphasizes that in the context of postmodernity and the Russian-Ukrainian war, collective identity in Ukraine is transforming into a dynamic, flexible, and personalized project. This process strongly correlates with Michel Foucault's concepts of the "technologies of the self," which in the Ukrainian context evolve into ethical, cultural, and historical practices, shaping collective identity as a reflexive and open construction. Through war, memory, and solidarity, Ukrainian society not only defends its statehood but also creates a new moral and symbolic reality, where the personal and national, ethical and aesthetic, private and political are inextricably intertwined. The construction of a distinct national narrative and Ukraine's postcolonial awakening are shown to be accompanied by the formation of unique historical conceptions, the affirmation of the Ukrainian language, the emphasis on European values, and the deconstruction of shared Russian-Ukrainian myths.

Introduction

Contemporary Ukrainian society is undergoing profound civilizational and cultural transformations, driven simultaneously by globalization, war, digital technologies, and the crisis of liberal humanism. Within this context, the problem of collective memory emerges as particularly salient, serving as a foundation for the construction of collective identity. Collective memory is commonly understood as a mechanism for preserving social experience that ensures generational continuity. This approach is exemplified in the works of Maurice Halbwachs, who argued that memory exists only within social groups that structure perceptions of the past (*Halbwachs, 1950*). Building on his ideas, Paul Ricoeur likewise emphasized in *La mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli* (*2000*) that memory plays a role in shaping personal identity only within the framework of a specific community.

However, in the postmodern era, this role has undergone significant reinterpretation. According to another leading scholar in the field, Aleida Assmann, collective memory is not merely the preservation of the past but also its selection and interpretation – transforming it into a site of symbolic struggle. In his work *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization* (2011), Assmann asserts: "Memory is not a representation of reality, but its reconstruction shaped by social challenge." (*Assmann, 2011*). Thus, memory becomes a political instrument aimed not only at the preservation of facts, but at their redefinition in accordance with the needs of the present.

This process becomes especially relevant in the context of armed conflicts and information wars, where various social groups struggle for the right to define their own interpretation of historical events. In this regard, memory is transformed into a field of political competition, in which "desirable" images of the past are selected, new narratives legitimized, and "undesirable" elements consigned to oblivion. This approach to memory is characteristic of Pierre Nora's concept of lieux de mémoire ("sites of memory"), in which he notes: "We do not remember everything, only what is capable of mobilizing the imagination and identity of a community." (*Nora, 1997*)

In an age of fragmentation brought about by postmodernity, Ukrainian society faces the necessity of synthesizing new models of identity that take into account multiple local, ethnic, religious, and even archetypal memories.

The challenge of national construction as a product of modernity was authoritatively articulated by historian Yaroslav Hrytsak, who emphasized that the Ukrainian nation emerged belatedly – precisely at a time when classical modernist narratives in the West were already beginning to

✉ advitov.fshn22@kubg.edu.ua
h.tymofieieva@ kubg.edu.ua

disintegrate. That is, while France, the United States, the United Kingdom, and Germany were actively discussing the crisis of identity, postnationalism, multiculturalism, and the reevaluation of the modern subject, Ukrainian society was only beginning to enter the stage of national project formation. "We do not have a shared history as the English or the French do; our history is marked by ruptures, fragments, and at times even incompatible representations." (*Hrytsak, 2011: 12*). In other words, we attempted to build a modern nation at a moment when modernity itself was already under critique.

The construction of collective identity in the postmodern era is associated with a range of challenges, including personalization, flexibility of identity, and the ambivalent influence of globalization. Zygmunt Bauman, for instance, points to the personalized nature of identity: in postmodern society, identity is no longer imposed from the outside but is constructed by the individual, in accordance with their internal aspirations, lived experience, and unique self-perception. This process is more creative than normative in nature, thereby offering the individual a space for self-expression and personal realization. Identity thus becomes an individual project – free of rigid boundaries and oriented not toward a universal, but toward a personal ideal (*Bauman, 2004*).

Another defining feature of postmodern identity is its variability and adaptability. According to Stuart Hall, individuals not only have the capacity to shape their own identities, but can also revise them in response to changing conditions, interests, or environments. In contrast to the modernist ideal of the fully developed individual standardized by the demands of societal progress, postmodernism allows each person to chart their own course, based on their unique potential (*Hall, 1996*). As Anthony Giddens aptly notes, the primary task of the individual today is not to attain a generally accepted ideal, but to discover a personal one – through self-realization, self-affirmation, and the recognition of one's uniqueness (*Giddens, 1991*).

As we can observe, collective identity in its national expression can now become a more voluntary and consciously chosen element of individual self-definition, integrating into one's personal project of self-determination. At the same time, the erosion of traditional boundaries and the risk of axiological ruptures necessitate the continual rethinking and active construction of identity as a collective narrative – one capable of uniting individual aspirations against the backdrop of global challenges and historical disruptions. Within this process, a key task becomes the search for new means of preserving cultural continuity and values in a constantly changing world.

Research methods

In examining the Ukrainian social context through the lens of collective memory, we draw primarily on the classical theories of collective memory developed by Maurice Halbwachs and Aleida Assmann, who laid the groundwork for understanding the social frameworks and forms of memory. In addition, we rely on the perspectives of contemporary Ukrainian and international scholars who conceptualize collective memory as both collected (O. Aleksandrova, Yu. Omelchenko) and competitive (A. Chyk, K. Dzihora, J. Young). We interpret postmodern identity as a dynamic and reflexive project constructed by the individual through interaction with social norms and personal self-understandings. Our analysis involves a comparative approach between modern (rigid, institutionally imposed forms of identity) and postmodern (voluntary, personalized

participation) models of collective identity formation, reflecting a critical and reflexive attitude toward the very concept of identity.

To trace how individual practices of self-construction are transformed into collective ones and acquire a national dimension within Ukrainian society, we apply a conceptual analysis of Michel Foucault's ideas, particularly his categories of the "technologies of the self": care of the self, aesthetics of existence, and gnōthi seauton (know thyself).

In the selection and analysis of empirical material, we employ the comparative-historical method (to examine transformations in the narratives of the Holodomor and the Revolution of Dignity); the case study method (to illustrate and support theoretical arguments regarding the competitive nature of collective memory and its formation); and both cultural and symbolic analysis, which emphasize the role of language as a powerful symbolic element of collective memory. We also examine cultural archetypes (for instance, the image of the Berehynia) within the context of their connection to European values, while accounting for their constructed nature.

Results and Discussion

Conceptualizing Collective Memory in the Ukrainian Context

Ukrainian scholar A. Chyk defines collective memory as a foundation of social existence, emphasizing that this form of preserving socially significant information enables the very continuity of society (*Chyk, 2016*). The social frameworks of memory were previously outlined by Maurice Halbwachs in his work *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire (2011)*, and later further developed by Aleida Assmann, who – building on Halbwachs's ideas – introduced a classification of collective memory, distinguishing two key forms:

1. ***Communicative memory***: a type of memory that exists within the span of three to four generations. It lacks institutional reinforcement and circulates within families, everyday life, and social groups. It is based on oral transmission and emotional recollection, remains unstable, and is subject to constant change.

2. ***Cultural memory***: institutionalized and recorded in texts, symbols, rituals, monuments, and traditions. It has a long temporal range—spanning centuries or even millennia—and constitutes the symbolic foundation of national identity (*Assmann, 2011*).

According to these frameworks, memory is not the preservation of an "objective" history but rather a social construction of the past that reflects present-day needs. A resonant idea is found in the work of K. Dzihora, who argues that collective historical memory is a dynamic and subjective construct, continuously adapting to shifting societal perspectives and demands:

> Historical memory can contain truth only within the individual perceptions of its bearers, but that truth evaporates the moment those perceptions change… The absence of truth in historical memory is not inherently destructive. Over time, a shared consensus may emerge within a community that could be loosely defined as a local truth. Yet the very lack of fixed truth allows memories that fall outside current frameworks to persist (*Dzihora, 2024: 42*).

This perspective is echoed by American scholar James Young, who stresses that national memory is never monolithic but rather collected – the result of an ongoing interaction between multiple, often competing, narratives, each seeking to dominate public discourse:

Collective Memory in Ukraine as a Factor in Identity Formation in the Context of Postmodernity
Колективна пам'ять в Україні як чинник формування ідентичності в умовах постмодерну

45

National memory is always collected from many, often competing, memories of a nation's past rather than a monolithic, unified one. (Young, 1993: 6).

This approach is especially relevant to Ukraine – a country located at the intersection of diverse colonial experiences and whose regionalization tends more toward competition than consensus. Within this paradigm, we do not speak of a singular collective memory, but rather of a composite competitive memory, the various strands of which vie for recognition in the public sphere.

A prime example of this is the Holodomor, one of the most contested episodes in Ukrainian memory culture. For decades, it was either silenced (within the Soviet narrative) or framed as an economic tragedy caused by poor harvests, rather than as a political crime. Since the 1990s, a narrative has taken shape in Ukraine presenting the Holodomor as a genocide of the Ukrainian people – highlighting Stalin's intention to crush the resistance of the Ukrainian peasantry and to destroy national identity.

This narrative gradually became institutionalized, largely due to the memory politics of President Viktor Yushchenko: the erection of monuments and memorials (including the Holodomor Memorial in Kyiv), incorporation into school curricula, the establishment of a National Day of Remembrance in November, and international campaigns for the recognition of the genocide. However, in certain regions – particularly in southeastern Ukraine prior to 2014 – an alternative interpretation persisted, framing the Holodomor as a "shared tragedy of Soviet peoples," thereby denationalizing the event (*Marples, 2007*). As a result, while a composite collective image of the Holodomor and a general narrative are present in Ukrainian public memory, their interpretation continues to differ – at least among different generations of contemporary Ukrainians.

Another illustrative case is the Revolution of Dignity, which rapidly became a symbol of Ukraine's democratic transformation. Dominant images in the official narrative include dignity, solidarity, and resistance to autocracy. Central to this narrative is the idea of the Maidan as a moral event, a community of free citizens, and the heroization of the "Heavenly Hundred." At the same time, as T. Zhurzhenko notes, the narrative of the Revolution of Dignity was not accepted by all sectors of society—particularly in Crimea and the Donbas, where it was interpreted as a Western conspiracy, a "coup" orchestrated by the United States (*Zhurzhenko, 2014*).

We concur with Zhurzhenko's assertion that such a viewpoint was indeed deeply integrated into the regional collective consciousness of eastern Ukraine. However, it was not universally accepted by all residents of the Donbas, as evidenced by the large-scale pro-Ukrainian demonstrations in Donetsk and Luhansk during that period. One must also take into account the power of Russian propaganda, which ultimately prevailed in this memory conflict—one that was later strategically instrumentalized by the Russian Federation.

The Russian invasion of February 24, 2022, became a powerful marker of collective memory that consolidated Ukrainian society. A new heroic narrative has emerged – resistance, sacrifice, defense of home, volunteerism, and the army – all of which have crystallized into a living mnemonic structure. This structure is reproduced in daily life and is already being documented through films, commemorations, and museum initiatives. Yet even within this apparent consensus, multiple interpretative layers persist: between "national," "civic," and "local" patriotisms, or between military heroism and humanitarian resistance.

At the same time, memetic memory images have begun to take shape – for example, "Bayraktar," the "Ghost of Kyiv," or "Palyanytsia." These operate as new symbols capable of uniting generations. However, some scholars (e.g., O. Stasevska, O. Kis, Yu. Buyskikh) have already warned against the risks of uncritical myth-making, in which memory becomes emotionally catalytic but lacks analytical depth (*Yekelchyk, 2023*).

Thus, the Ukrainian discourse on collective memory clearly demonstrates that memory is not a homogeneous reflection of the past but rather a polyphony of competing interpretations vying for the status of "truth." In the context of a complex history, regional fragmentation, and external pressures, a composite and competitive memory is not a sign of weakness, but rather a source of pluralism, flexibility, and potential for critical re-evaluation of the past. In this light, memory politics in Ukraine is not merely about what and how we remember, but fundamentally about who we are as a society – or more precisely, who we aspire to become.

Postmodern Challenges to Collective Identity

The realization that postmodernity brings about fundamental shifts in the perception of identity—particularly in its national dimension – such as **personalization** and **flexibility**, can be demonstrated through Michel Foucault's concepts of "self-construction" and "care of the self". In the third volume of *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault describes the "technologies of the self" – practices through which individuals can "perform operations on their own bodies, souls, thoughts, and way of life" in order to transform themselves in accordance with certain internal ideals: wisdom, happiness, spiritual perfection, or moral purity (*Foucault, 1988: 18*).

This approach emphasizes that identity in postmodern society is not a fixed entity given once and for all, but rather a dynamic, reflexive project created through interaction with social norms, power structures, and personal visions of the "good life." Such an "aesthetic self-practice" becomes a response to the fragmentation and pluralism of postmodernity: the subject turns their life into a work of art – constantly edited and reshaped. As Foucault writes, "care of the self [...] is not narcissism; it is a principle of action that forms the human being as a subject." (*Foucault, 1988: 22*).

Accordingly, personalized and flexible identity in the postmodern condition is realized through ongoing work on the self – cultural, ethical, corporeal, and aesthetic.

In striving to be an ethical subject, the individual engages in certain practices. These practices are not limited to internal reflection but include public actions, interactions, and lifestyle choices. In the case of collective identity, the "technologies of the self" become practices that—though carried out individually – generate collective resonance and contribute to the formation of a shared field of meaning. In contrast to modern societies, where collective identity was often imposed through rigid institutions (state propaganda, compulsory education), postmodern identity formation in Ukraine – including national identity – tends to emerge through voluntary, personalized civic engagement. Each individual chooses their own way of "being Ukrainian," their interpretation of history, their mode of expressing patriotism.

For example, Foucault's ethical practice of "care of the self", oriented toward self-perfection, is reinterpreted as a collective practice of "caring for the nation" – as embodied in **volunteerism**. A compelling case is the work of the

Come Back Alive foundation, one of the most effective volunteer organizations in Ukraine, which since 2014 has supported the Ukrainian Armed Forces not only materially, but also through analytical and psychological services. Volunteer practices, once viewed as supplementary to state efforts, have become the ethical core of a new civic identity: in helping others, one is not merely "doing good," but transforming one's existence into a political and moral act. That is, Foucault's "care of the self" is transformed into a practice of caring for the collective, for the nation – thereby shaping a new ethical norm of collective coexistence.

Another important Foucauldian category – the ***aesthetics of existence*** (l'esthétique de l'existence) – entails transforming life into a "work of art" shaped not by the state, but by the subject themselves. In contemporary Ukrainian culture, this practice manifests in the aestheticization of patriotism, which has taken on vivid visual forms: national symbols in clothing, accessories, tattoos, graffiti, architectural decor, mobile app interfaces, and stickers.

Vyshyvankas, military-style patches, blue-and-yellow bracelets, "Palyanytsia" T-shirts, patriotic tattoos – all have become markers of a new corporeal identity. These elements may, at times, be encouraged from above, but they are freely and personally chosen as declarations of belonging to a collective. Self-expression through appearance becomes a form of "care for the nation" via the aesthetics of the "care of the self". In this aestheticization, Foucault's idea of freely shaping the self is projected onto the body as a carrier of political meaning. Here, the nation is not merely a matter of legal citizenship, but emerges as an aesthetic image – one that is embodied in outward appearance, everyday objects, and symbolic gestures.

A third Foucauldian element that acquires unexpectedly relevant significance in the Ukrainian context is ***gnōthi seauton*** – the call to "know thyself," which Foucault interprets as a reflexive practice of subject-formation. In Ukraine, this practice has transformed into a widespread rediscovery of historical consciousness, encompassing both private and public dimensions. During the war, but already since the Revolution of Dignity, there has been a growing tendency toward the "remembrance" of history, which includes:

a) the exploration of the "blank spots" in national history – such as the Holodomor, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), and Soviet repressions – which were for decades silenced or interpreted externally;

b) the critique and rejection of Soviet and Russian grand narratives that fail to resonate with personal or familial experiences;

c) the search for familial history – recovering memories of grandfathers in the Red Army or UPA, deportations, and forgotten tragedies. Family archives, research via the Memorial Database, and platforms like "Living Memory" are all examples of personalized historiography.

Active participation in public discourse – on social media, blogs, and podcasts – has become a space for alternative historiography, where people debate, reinterpret, and reassemble memory as an open, collective process free from centralized censorship.

This may be described as a personalized deconstruction of master narratives and the construction of an individual relationship to the past. The individual is no longer merely the object of history, but increasingly its subject – one who shapes, represents, and produces historical meaning. Thus, the Foucauldian "technologies of the self" – care of the self, aestheticization of existence, and gnōthi seauton – are transformed within the Ukrainian experience into ethical, cultural, and historical practices that shape collective identity not as a fixed canon, but as a dynamic, reflexive, and open-ended construction. In this process, volunteerism, visual representations, and personalized historiography become tools not only of self-identification, but also of political and cultural self-assertion.

Through war, memory, and solidarity, Ukrainian society is not only defending its statehood, but also creating a new moral and symbolic reality in which the personal and the national, the ethical and the aesthetic, the private and the political are no longer separate.

We now turn to an examination of which elements of collective memory are being mobilized to underscore Ukraine's uniqueness and difference from other cultural spheres. This issue is of particular relevance to the process through which Ukraine is asserting itself as a sovereign subject with a distinct identity – one that is no longer derivative of the Russian imperial narrative. The foundations of this new sovereign identity rest on elements of collective memory (historical events, cultural phenomena, symbols) that affirm the uniqueness of Ukraine's historical trajectory, signal a rupture with imperial-colonial pasts, and consolidate society in the face of external threats.

In this regard, Immanuel Wallerstein's insight into history as a modern construction, expressed in his writings on Indian historiography, is especially illuminating. He argues that history is not a mere compilation of facts but an interpreted composition shaped by the historian's perspective: "You cannot gather 'facts' and get 'history'... The historian creates history just as the artist creates a painting." (*Wallerstein, 1986*) This view challenges the notion of historical memory as a transparent mirror of the past and emphasizes that memory-making is neither absolute nor unidirectional. Just as the painter chooses their palette, the historian incorporates facts into a socially meaningful narrative. In this sense, history is an act of interpretation, not a transmission of reality.

A similarly nuanced definition of collective memory is offered by Pierre Nora, who emphasizes its selective nature: "Collective memory is what remains of the past in the living consciousness of groups, or what these groups do with the past."

Ukrainian collective memory, like its Indian counterpart, is experiencing a postcolonial awakening. For centuries, it was shaped by imperial discourses that marginalized local narratives and constructed a "proper" historical vision in which the Ukrainian subject was either voiceless or portrayed as historically incapacitated. The reactivation of a sovereign Ukrainian memory is now manifesting through ongoing socio-informational processes, including:

1. the formation of autonomous historical narratives—such as Ukraine's millennium-long state-building tradition (as heir to Kyivan Rus), its continuous struggle for freedom (from Cossack uprisings to 20th-century independence movements and the present-day Revolution of Dignity and war against Russia), the interpretation of the Holodomor as genocide (emphasizing the specificity of Ukrainian suffering under Soviet policies), and the reframing of the full-scale invasion as a continuation of centuries of imperial aggression by Russia;

2. the framing of language as one of the most powerful symbolic elements of collective memory—affirming the uniqueness of the national experience through folk wisdom (proverbs, idioms), oral history (myths, legends, tales), and specialized knowledge that encodes traditional practices and technologies;

Collective Memory in Ukraine as a Factor in Identity Formation in the Context of Postmodernity
Колективна пам'ять в Україні як чинник формування ідентичності в умовах постмодерну

47

3. the emphasis on Ukraine's historic ties to Europe—demonstrated by the presence of Magdeburg Law in major cities in central and western Ukraine (14th–18th centuries), or the reception of European baroque traditions in Ukrainian art and the emergence of a distinctive Ukrainian baroque style;

4. the affirmation of Ukraine's unique cultural code—perhaps best embodied by the image of the Berehynia, a symbol whose eclectic nature underscores the constructed nature of memory. On one hand, she represents a collective archetype: a maternal, protective figure offering symbolic support in times of war and existential anxiety (*Voitovych, 2002*). On the other, as noted by scholar Yulia Buyskikh, the Berehynia is less an authentic remnant of ancient mythology than an invention of the national revival movement: "This image is more the result of intellectual construction than a representation of historical memory." (*Buyskikh, 2022*). In this context, the Berehynia is not heritage, but project: a desperate attempt to create a symbol capable of unifying identity in times of profound instability;

5. the deconstruction of shared Russian-Ukrainian myths formed during the imperial and Soviet periods—such as the myth of "brotherhood" or the narrative of a "common victory" in World War II.

Conclusion

In the contemporary Ukrainian context, collective memory emerges not as a monolithic or static phenomenon, but rather as a dynamic, composite, and competitive construction that is continuously shaped and reinterpreted. Classical theories of collective memory present it as a foundational component of social existence, manifesting in two key forms: communicative memory (oral, everyday, short-term) and cultural memory (institutionalized, symbolically fixed, long-term). Ukraine's historical experience – marked by centuries of colonial domination and pronounced regional specificities – strongly supports the notion of national memory as "collected memory", in which different, often conflicting, narratives compete for dominance in the public sphere. The cases of the Holodomor and the Revolution of Dignity illustrate how historical events are subject to multiple, sometimes conflicting, interpretations across regions and generations – often exploited by external aggressors for political purposes.

While the Russian-Ukrainian war has consolidated society around a new heroic narrative, expressed across diverse cultural forms (including new modes such as memetic imagery), this process also presents the risk of mythmaking – detachment from historical reality, manipulations, and the stifling of critical social development.

Within the framework of postmodernity and in response to the war, Ukrainian collective identity has transformed into a dynamic, flexible, and personalized project, actively constructed by individuals themselves. This process is deeply aligned with Michel Foucault's concept of "technologies of the self." The "care of the self", for instance, is reinterpreted as collective care for the nation, most vividly expressed in the phenomenon of mass volunteerism. Volunteering becomes not merely assistance, but the ethical core of a new civic identity – where personal action acquires political and moral significance, establishing a new norm of collective co-existence.

Foucault's notion of the "aesthetics of existence" finds expression in the aestheticization of patriotism. National symbols and cultural elements are embedded into everyday appearance and objects, becoming visual markers of embodied identity. This points to the free and personal choice to belong to the nation – turning the body into a bearer of political meaning and transforming national identity into an aesthetic form.

The call to gnōthi seauton – "know thyself" — is actualized through widespread and often personalized efforts to rediscover history. This reflexive practice includes the investigation of historical "blank spots," the critique of Soviet and Russian grand narratives, and the active recovery of familial memory. Social networks and blogs serve as platforms for the deconstruction of dominant narratives and the formation of an open, pluralistic, and composite memory.

Ukraine's postcolonial awakening and the construction of a sovereign national narrative have been accompanied by interrelated processes, including:

1. the development of autonomous historical narratives that emphasize millennia of statehood, continuous struggle for freedom, and the recognition of the Holodomor as genocide;

2. the positioning of language as a potent symbolic element of memory—embodying national experience, folk wisdom, oral history, and culturally embedded knowledge;

3. the articulation of Ukraine's historical connection with Europe through shared traditions and cultural influences (e.g., Magdeburg Law, Ukrainian Baroque), reinforcing a European identity;

4. the affirmation of a distinct cultural code through figures such as the Berehynia. Even when these are modern constructs, their symbolic function during crises of identity remains significant. As research has shown, the Berehynia is not a direct inheritance of ancient mythology but an intellectual creation – yet one that fulfills the need for a unifying symbolic image;

5. the deconstruction of Russian-Ukrainian myths, including the narrative of "brotherhood" and the "common victory" in World War II, which is essential for a final rupture with colonial dependency.

Thus, the construction of Ukrainian collective memory constitutes an active act of cultural and political self-assertion – emphasizing its uniqueness and difference from other cultural spheres. Far from being a fixed canon, Ukrainian memory is a dynamic configuration that allows society to resist external threats and to consciously define its place in the world based on sovereign interpretations of the past.

REFERENCES

Aleksandrova, O., & Omelchenko, Y. (2024). Dialogue as an Educational Principle in the "Philosophy of History" Course to Overcome Conflicts of Historical Memory in the Context of Ukraine's Humanitarian Security. *Skhid*, 6(4), 69–75. https://doi.org/10.21847/2411-3093.2024.6412

Assmann, A. (2011). *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives*. Cambridge University Press

Bauman, Z. (2004). *Identity: Conversations with Benedetto Vecchi*. Polity Press.

Buyskykh, Yu. (2018, 24 Mai). "Berehynya": sproba dekonstruktsiyi odnoho "kabinetnoho" mifa. *Ukrayina Moderna*. Retrieved from http://resource.history.org.ua/cgi-bin/eiu/history.exe?C21COM=2&I21DBN=ELIB&P21DBN=ELIB&Image_file_name=book/0013838.pdf&IMAGE_FILE_DOWNLOAD=0

Chyk, A. (2016). Kolektyvna pamyat' yak osnova konsolidatsiyi ukrayinstva. *Visnyk Kyyivskoho natsionalnoho*

universytetu imeni Tarasa Shevchenka. Ukrayi-noznavstvo. Issue 1, 61-63. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/VKNU_ukr_2016_1_19 (In Ukrainian)

Dzihora, K. (2024). Istorychna pamyat u dzerkali post-modernoyi metodolohiyi. *Humanities Studies*, 19 (96), 40-48. https://doi.org/10.32782/hst-2024-19-96-04 (In Ukrainian)

Foucault, M. (1988). *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 3: The Care of the Self* (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York, Vintage Books

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age.* Stanford University Press.

Halbwachs, M. (1967). *La mémoire collective.* Deuxième édition revue et augmentée. Paris, Les Presses univer-sitaires de France.

Hall, S. (1996). Who Needs 'Identity'? In: Hall, S., & du Gay, P. (Eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity*, pp. 1–17. SAGE Publications.

Hrytsak, Ya. (2011). *Narysy z istoriyi Ukrayiny: formu-vannya modernoyi natsiyi.* Kyïv, Krytyka. (In Ukrainian)

Marples, D. (2007). *Heroes and Villains: Creating National History in Contemporary Ukraine.* CEU Press.

Marutyan, R. R. (2017). Smyslovi viyny suchasnosti: ukrayins'kyy vymir *Matrix*-divergent. 13.03.2017. http://matrix-info.com/2017/03/13/ROSIYA-GOTUYETSYA-DO-VELYKOYIVIJNY-TU

Nora, P. (ed.) (1997). *Les lieux de mémoire.* 3 volumes. Collection Quarto, Gallimard.

Ricoeur, P. (2000). *La Mémoire, l'Histoire, l'Oubli.* Paris, Seuil.

Voytovych, V. (2002). *Ukrayinska mifolohiya.* Kyiv, Lybid. (In Ukrainian)

Wallerstein, I. (1986). Incorporation of Indian Subcontinent into Capitalist World-Economy. *Economic and Political Weekly,* 21 (4), pp. PE28-PE39 https://www.jstor.org/stable/4375250

Yekelchyk, S. (2023). *Ukraine: What Everyone Needs to Know.* Oxford University Press.

Young, J. E. (1993). *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning.* Yale University Press.

Zhurzhenko, T. (2014). A Divided Nation? Reconsidering the Role of Identity Politics in the Ukraine Crisis. *Studies in East European Thought*, 66(1–2), 237–262.

Колективна пам'ять в Україні як чинник формування ідентичності в умовах постмодерну

Андрій Вітов (ORCID 0009-0007-1863-9215)
Київський столичний університет імені Бориса Грінченка (Україна)

Галина Тимофєєва (ORCID 0000-0001-9224-1116)
Київський столичний університет імені Бориса Грінченка (Україна)

У статті досліджується проблема колективної пам'яті як основи формування української колективної ідентич-ності. Автори виходять з того, що конструювання ідентичності в епоху постмодерну пов'язане з персоналізацією, гнучкістю та амбівалентним впливом глобалізації. Дослідження показує, що українська колективна пам'ять є полі-фонією інтерпретацій, а не однорідним відображенням минулого. Обґрунтовано її конкурентний, збірний характер, який розглядається не як слабкість, а як джерело плюралізму, гнучкості та потенціалу для критичного переосмис-лення. Таким чином, політика пам'яті в Україні є активним процесом формування бажаного суспільства. Акценто-вано увагу на тому, що в контексті постмодернізму та російсько-української війни колективна ідентичність в Україні трансформується в динамічний, гнучкий та персоналізований проєкт. Цей процес тісно корелює з концепціями Мішеля Фуко про "технології себе", які в українському контексті переростають в етичні, культурні та історичні прак-тики, формуючи колективну ідентичність як рефлексивну та відкриту конструкцію. У процесі війни, пам'яті та солі-дарності українське суспільство не лише захищає свою державність, а й створює нову моральну та символічну реальність, де особисте, національне, етичне, естетичне, приватне та політичне нерозривно переплітаються. Ви-значено, що конструювання власного наративу та постколоніальне пробудження України супроводжуються тво-ренням унікальних історичних концепцій, утвердженням української мови, акцентуванням європейських цінностей та деконструкцією спільних російсько-українських міфів.

Ключові слова: колективна пам'ять, колективна ідентичність, постмодерн, конкурентний характер колективної пам'яті, персоналізація ідентичності, український історичний наратив, символічна реальність.