Philosophy

UDC130.2

DOI https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20524074

Digitalization and Transformation of the Subject in the European and Ukrainian Context: A Philosophical-Anthropological Perspective

Nikita Dronov,
Post-graduated of Theory of Culture and
Philosophy of Science Department,
Educational and Scientific Institute of Philosophy,
Cultural Studies, Political Science
V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University
Ukraine, https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1215-218X

Accepted: 18.05.2026 | Published: 30.05.2026

Abstract. *The article examines the transformation of the human subject in the context of modern digitalization through the prism of philosophical anthropology, phenomenology, digital ethics, and social philosophy.* ***The aim*** *is to study the transformation of the subject in the context of digitalization in the European and Ukrainian contexts from the standpoint of philosophical anthropology and modern digital ethics.*

Methods*. The article uses an interdisciplinary approach that combines phenomenology (Bernhard Waldenfels), concepts of digital ethics (Luciano Floridi), theories of platform society (Jan van Dijk), posthumanist concepts of Rosie Braidotti, and modern studies of digital anthropology.*

Conclusions. *The changes that occur in subjectivity under the influence of*

algorithmization of social practices, artificial intelligence, platform capitalism, and digital networks are analyzed. Special attention is paid to the correlation of the European and Ukrainian contexts of digitalization, in particular the impact of the 2022–2025 war on the formation of new models of digital subjectivity, digital memory and digital citizenship. It is shown that the modern subject increasingly functions as a «network subject», included in the structures of digital control, information overload and algorithmic modeling of behavior. At the same time, digital technologies create new opportunities for self-organization, cultural memory, political mobilization and expansion of communicative horizons.

Results. *The philosophical and anthropological potential of the new digital subject and the ethical consequences of the renewal of subjectivity are determined. It is argued that the Ukrainian experience of digitalization in war conditions demonstrates a specific form of «existential digitalization», in which digital technologies become not only a means of communication, but also a tool for survival, preservation of collective memory and cultural identity.*

Keywords: *digitalization, subject, digital subjectivity, philosophical anthropology, digital ethics, artificial intelligence, Ukraine, Europe, phenomenology, algorithmization.*

Цифровізація і трансформація суб'єкта в європейському та українському контексті: філософсько-антропологічний погляд

Нікіта Романович Дронов,
Аспірант, кафедра теорії культури та
філософії науки ННІ філософії, культурології, політології
Харківський національний університет імені В.Н. Каразіна,
Україна, https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1215-218X

Анотація. *У статті досліджується трансформація людського суб'єкта в умовах сучасної цифровізації крізь призму філософської антропології, феноменології, цифрової етики та соціальної філософії.* ***Мета*** *– дослідження трансформації суб'єкта в умовах цифровізації в європейському та українському контекстах із позицій філософської антропології та сучасної цифрової етики.*

Методи. *У статті використано міждисциплінарний підхід, який поєднує феноменологію (Бернгард Вальденфельс), концепції цифрової етики (Лучано Флоріді), теорії платформенного суспільства (Ян ван Дейк), постгуманістичні концепції Розі Брайдотті та сучасні дослідження цифрової антропології.*

Висновки. *Проаналізовані зміни, які відбуваються із суб'єктивністю під впливом алгоритмізації соціальних практик, штучного інтелекту, платформенного капіталізму та цифрових мереж. Особлива увага приділяється співвідношенню європейського та українського контекстів цифровізації, зокрема впливу війни 2022–2026 років на формування нових моделей цифрової суб'єктивності, цифрової пам'яті та цифрового громадянства. Показано, що сучасний суб'єкт дедалі більше функціонує як «мережевий суб'єкт», включений у структури цифрового контролю, інформаційного перенасичення та алгоритмічного моделювання поведінки. Водночас цифрові технології створюють нові можливості для самоорганізації, культурної пам'яті, політичної мобілізації та розширення комунікативних горизонтів.*

Результати. *Визначено філософсько-антропологічний потенціал нового цифрового суб'єкта та етичні наслідки оновлення суб'єктивності. Аргументовано, що український досвід цифровізації в умовах війни демонструє специфічну форму «екзистенційної цифровізації», у якій цифрові технології стають не лише засобом комунікації, а й інструментом*

 ISSN: 3083-5712

виживання, збереження колективної пам'яті та культурної ідентичності.

Ключові слова: *цифровізація, суб'єкт, цифрова суб'єктивність, філософська антропологія, цифрова етика, штучний інтелект, Україна, Європа, феноменологія, алгоритмізація.*

Problem statement. The digitalization of modern society is not only a technological or economic process, but a fundamental anthropological transformation. In the XXIst century, digital technologies increasingly determine the ways of human thinking, communication, memory, political participation and even bodily experience. Man no longer exists outside of digital infrastructures: smartphones, social networks, algorithmic systems, artificial intelligence and big data form a new configuration of subjectivity.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The European humanitarian discourse of recent years has been actively reflecting on the crisis of the classical modern subject. Theorists of digital culture emphasize [5] that the subject of modernity, built on the ideas of autonomy [16], rationality and individual freedom, is gradually transforming into a «network subject» [14], whose behavior is determined by algorithmic structures and digital platforms [17].

Separately, this problem was also studied in the Ukrainian context, since it acquires particular significance there. The Russian-Ukrainian war of 2022–2026 radically accelerated the processes of digitalization of Ukrainian society [8]. Digital technologies have become a tool for defense, humanitarian coordination, international communication [4], digital diplomacy, and the recording of war crimes. At the same time, the war has exacerbated the issues of information security, digital control, psychological exhaustion, and the transformation of collective memory.

Formulation of the objectives of the article (Problem statement). The purpose of the work is to study the transformation of the subject under digitalization in the European and Ukrainian contexts from the standpoint of philosophical

anthropology and modern digital ethics.

In accordance with the goal, the following tasks have been formulated:

1. To identify the reasons for the transformation of the subject under digitalization

2. To consider the phenomenology of digital changes in society

3. To identify the philosophical and anthropological potential of the new digital subject and the ethical consequences of renewing subjectivity.

Presentation of the main material and results of the study.

The methodological basis of the study is a combination of phenomenological, hermeneutic, socio-philosophical and anthropological approaches. Bernhard Waldenfels' concepts of the phenomenology of the Other and responses to the challenges of modernity are of great importance for our study. In the digital environment, the subject constantly interacts with information flows that disrupt the classical structure of subjectivity.

Also important is the concept of Luciano Floridi, who considers a person as part of the «infosphere» [5]. According to L. Floridi, with whom we join, the digital environment is no longer external to a person in the XXIst century, it becomes the environment of his existence [5]. Stiegler in his work «The Age of Disruption: Technology and Madness in Computational Capitalism» [13] emphasizes that in modern conditions, human identity is formed within the framework of constant interaction with information systems.

Rosie Braidotti, in her concept of posthumanism, rightly emphasizes that the modern subject can no longer be considered as an autonomous humanistic unit [2]. It becomes a hybrid entity that combines biological, technological and informational. In particular, this is discussed in detail in the work of J. van Dijk, T. Poell, M. de Waal «The Platform Society: Public Values in a Connective World» (2021) [15]. These are not only philosophical and anthropological changes, but also a new socio-political atmosphere, which is analyzed by N. Couldry, U. Mejias in the

concepts of the «new colonialism of Big Data» («The Costs of Connection: How Data Is Colonizing Human Life and Appropriating It for Capitalism», 2021) [4]. For example, B.-C. Han defines this «new colonialism» as «Infocracy» [7].

For the analysis of the Ukrainian context, the approaches of digital anthropology and the theory of cultural memory are important. Ukrainian digital culture is formed not only under the influence of global technological modernization, but also in a situation of war, trauma and existential instability.

Digitalization is becoming an anthropological challenge for many societies, since modern digitalization changes not only social institutions, but also the fundamental characteristics of human existence. A person increasingly exists in a state of constant connectivity to digital networks. The phenomenon of «distributed subjectivity» arises, when memory, communication, attention and even emotional reactions are partially delegated to digital systems [18].

Social media algorithms are shaping new modes of attention. The subject is no longer the sole author of his or her own experience [10]. His or her information field is determined by platform algorithms that analyze behavioral patterns, emotional reactions, and communication habits of the user.

In this context, the problem of algorithmic power arises. Algorithms not only predict human behavior, but also actively construct it. This leads to the emergence of a new form of dependence, namely dependence on digital infrastructure.

The modern subject increasingly functions as «a Big Data subject», «datafie subject». His or her actions, movements, interests, and social connections are transformed into digital data. A process of «subjectivity extraction» is taking place, when human experience becomes a resource for digital platforms [18].

This process is especially noticeable in the field of artificial intelligence. Modern AI systems not only analyze information, but also increasingly participate in the formation of decisions, creativity, and communication. Recent research on AI phenomenology highlights that human interaction with artificial intelligence is

already shaping new types of experience and self-perception [9].

The European Union is trying to combine technological development with humanistic values. That is why the concepts of digital ethics, digital rights and ethical AI are actively developing in the European discourse.

The European model of digitalization is largely based on the idea of protecting human autonomy. GDPR, AI Act and other regulations are aimed at limiting algorithmic control and protecting personal data [9].

However, even in the European context, serious anthropological problems arise related to the growth of attention fragmentation and digital exhaustion, as well as the loss of basic bodily experience. This in turn causes algorithmic polarization and various crises of authenticity. J. Baudrillard's world of simulacra reasserts itself when we consider digital self-presentation as a form of simulation [9].

Rainer Mühlhoff rightly emphasizes that digital capitalism actively uses human emotional reactions as an economic resource. As a result, a situation arises where subjectivity becomes an object of economic exploitation [7].

European philosophy is increasingly addressing the problem of the «digital Other». A person interacts not only with other people, but also with algorithms, chatbots and AI systems. This changes the very structure of communication [10].

The Ukrainian experience of digitalization is of a fundamentally different nature. The Ukrainian context of the war allows us to speak of a special «existential digitalization». If in Western Europe digitalization is mostly associated with comfort, economic efficiency and automation, then in Ukraine it often performs an existential function.

After 2022, digital technologies have become part of everyday survival, from air traffic control applications to digital state services, which Ukraine can be proud of in the European context. Intelligence is enhanced by OSINT analytics, and volunteer networks exist on cryptocurrency fees. War significantly changes the most urgent needs, this is the need to record war crimes in digital archives of war and

digital memorials, changes in such traditional institutions as education and medicine, in particular online education in conditions of shelling and the spread of telemedicine [7].

The Ukrainian subject is formed in conditions of constant digital mobilization. A person is forced to simultaneously exist in the physical space of war and in the digital space of information flow.

Social networks play a special role. They have become not only a means of communication, but also an instrument of cultural resistance and international advocacy. Ukrainian digital culture of wartime has created a new form of collective subjectivity, in which individual experience is integrated into global information networks.

At the same time, new anthropological risks arise due to digital overload with traumatic content and emotional burnout, constant anxiety [10]. Researchers note a crisis of privacy and a blurring of the boundaries between the personal and the public [12]. Dependence on the information flow is intensified in conditions of war and danger.

The Ukrainian experience demonstrates that digitalization can be not only a tool of control, but also a mechanism of solidarity and cultural survival.

One of the key characteristics of the modern digital era is the formation of platform capitalism as a new model of socio-economic organization of society [11]. If industrial capitalism was based on the production of material goods, then digital platform capitalism is based on the production, accumulation and monetization of data [18]. In this context, human subjectivity is transformed not only into a participant in economic processes, but also into the main resource of the digital economy.

Platforms (Google, Meta, Amazon, TikTok, Microsoft, OpenAI, and others) are no longer just technical intermediaries. They shape specific modes of perception of reality, communication models, and structures of social behavior [11]. The

modern subject increasingly operates within a platform ecosystem, in which digital algorithms determine the horizons of visibility, attention, and even emotional reactivity.

Nick Couldry and Ulises Mejias characterize this process as the «colonization of human life with data» [4]. Human experience, communication, emotions, and behavioral responses become the object of constant collection and analysis. As a result, a new type of power emerges, «algorithmic power» [4], which spreads its influence imperceptibly but extremely effectively. Its specificity lies in the fact that control is no longer exercised through direct coercion, but rather through the architecture of the digital environment [3; 4].

Shoshana Zuboff defines this model as «surveillance capitalism» [18]. Within its framework, users' behavioral data are transformed into an economic resource for predicting and modifying human behavior. The subject is no longer an autonomous center of volition in the classical modern sense; he increasingly becomes an element of a predicted behavioral system.

The philosophical and anthropological problem is that platform capitalism transforms the very structure of subjectivity [11]. Man begins to exist in a mode of constant digital self-presentation. Social networks stimulate the formation of a «performative subject», for whom the I itself is increasingly constructed through digital visibility, likes, algorithmic approval and audience reactions.

In this context, a radical change in the phenomenology of experience is taking place. If the classical phenomenology of E. Husserl and M. Merleau-Ponty considered the subject as the center of intentional experience of the world, then digital culture creates a situation of fragmented attention and scattered consciousness [12]. A person is in a state of constant information switching, which transforms the structure of memory, perception of time and bodily experience.

The problem of digital labor deserves special attention. In a platform society, the user is both a consumer and a producer of content [18]. A new digital economy

is being built, where each interaction (click, view, reaction, comment) generates economic value for digital platforms. Thus, the phenomenon of «exploitation of subjectivity» arises, when human attention itself becomes a commodity [7].

The European context demonstrates an attempt to limit the expansion of platform capitalism through digital legislation, AI regulation and personal data protection [1]. However, even within the framework of European digital ethics, the question of the possibility of preserving the autonomy of the subject in the conditions of total algorithmization of social life remains open.

The Ukrainian context adds another dimension to this issue. In conditions of war, digital platforms become simultaneously tools of mobilization, humanitarian coordination and information resistance. At the same time, they create new risks, including information overload, digital traumatization and dependence on a constant information flow [4]. The Ukrainian subject in such a situation functions in a situation of double tension, as it is forced to constantly choose between the need for a digital presence and the need to preserve psychological integrity.

Thus, platform capitalism not only transforms economic models, but also radically changes the anthropological status of man [1]. The modern subject is increasingly becoming a «network subject», included in the structures of algorithmic management, digital visibility and data-based sociality.

One of the most influential concepts of modern digital ethics is Luciano Floridi's philosophy of information. In contrast to classical approaches to technology as an external tool for humans, L. Floridi considers the digital environment as a new ontological reality, for which he uses the special concept of «infosphere» [5]. In this perspective, humans no longer exist outside of information processes; they become part of them.

The concept of the infosphere is fundamentally important for modern philosophical anthropology. If the modern humanistic tradition was based on the autonomy of the human subject, L. Floridi [5] shows that the digital age destroys the

boundary between «online» and «offline» existence. Human life is increasingly integrated into digital networks, algorithmic systems and information flows.

In this context, a new type of subject, the "informational self", or information subject, information self [6]. His identity is shaped not only through corporeality or social interactions, but also through digital traces, algorithmic profiles, and informational relationships [3]. Personality increasingly exists in the form of digital representation.

L. Floridi emphasizes that digital ethics should go beyond traditional normative ethics [5]. Classical ethical models (deontology, utilitarianism or virtue ethics) do not sufficiently describe the situation in which autonomous algorithms are able to influence the behavior of millions of people. That is why L. Floridi formulates the concept of «macroethics» [5], a new global ethics of the information society.

One of the central problems of digital ethics is the problem of responsibility. In the digital environment, decisions are often made not by a specific person, but by complex algorithmic systems. This creates the phenomenon of «diffused responsibility», when it is difficult to determine the moral agent, responsibility for the decisions of the AI-system is distributed between the programmer, the corporation, and the user.

This problem becomes especially relevant in the field of military technologies and artificial intelligence. The Ukrainian experience of the war has demonstrated that digital technologies can be both a tool of protection and a source of new ethical risks. Drones, OSINT systems, facial recognition algorithms, digital monitoring and AI analytics are significantly changing the very nature of war.

In L. Floridi's concept, the problem of information dignity also occupies an important place [5]. If in the classical humanistic tradition, dignity was associated with human autonomy and rationality, then digital ethics extends this concept to the sphere of information existence. Violations of privacy, data manipulation or

algorithmic discrimination are considered not only as technical or legal problems, but as forms of anthropological violence.

L. Floridi also emphasizes the need for an ecological approach to the digital environment [5]. The infosphere needs protection just like the natural environment. Information pollution, disinformation, digital aggression and manipulative technologies destroy not only communication, but also the very structure of social trust.

In the European context, the ideas of L. Floridi [5] have significantly influenced the formation of modern EU digital policy, in particular the AI Act and the concept of trustworthy AI. The European model of digitalization seeks to combine technological innovations with the protection of human autonomy and human rights.

The Ukrainian context adds an existential dimension to L. Floridi's digital ethics. In conditions of war, digital technologies become part of daily survival, and digital ethics becomes a question not only of rights, but also of preserving humanity. That is why the Ukrainian experience can be an important contribution to the global philosophy of digital ethics, demonstrating how digital technologies function in a situation of extreme anthropological crisis.

Thus, Luciano Floridi's concept [5] allows us to consider digitalization not only as a technological process, but as a profound transformation of human existence. Digital ethics in this perspective becomes the ethics of a new information civilization, in which the main task is to preserve human dignity, autonomy and responsibility in an algorithmized world.

Artificial intelligence is becoming one of the main factors in the transformation of the modern subject. AI systems are increasingly involved in decision-making, creativity, and communication.

In a philosophical context, a global question arises: does AI change the very structure of human subjectivity, and how exactly does it change it? The modern user

interacts with artificial intelligence not only as a technical tool, but also as a communicative partner [6]. This creates new forms of dependence and new types of emotional connection. Some researchers speak of the formation of «synthetic sociality», in which algorithmic systems increasingly determine the structure of social interactions [3].

In this context, the problem of human autonomy becomes particularly important. If AI begins to shape a person's information field, recommend decisions, and predict behavior, there is a risk of a gradual loss of critical thinking.

At the same time, AI opens up new opportunities both in intellectual support and new forms of expanding access to knowledge, as well as new forms of creativity and new inclusion through revolutionary inclusive technologies and the automation of routine work.

The problem is not in the technology itself, but in the way it is integrated into social structures.

Digitalization is radically changing human corporeality. The COVID-19 pandemic, and later the war in Ukraine, have intensified the trend towards remote existence. Online communication is increasingly replacing physical presence. This leads to the formation of «screen corporeality». A person perceives himself through digital images, video communication and social networks. The structure of self-perception is changing. Memory is also being transformed. Digital archives, cloud technologies and social networks are creating a new form of external memory. Human experience is increasingly stored in digital format.

In the Ukrainian context, digital archives of war have become particularly important. They perform the function of collective memory and documentation of traumatic experience.

Conclusions. Digitalization is not only a technological process, but a fundamental anthropological transformation. The modern subject increasingly functions in an algorithmic environment, platform control, and information

overload.

The European context demonstrates the desire to combine technological development with humanistic values and digital ethics. The Ukrainian context, on the contrary, reveals the existential nature of digitalization, when digital technologies become a tool of survival, memory, and cultural resistance.

The transformation of the subject in the context of digitalization is contradictory. On the one hand, digital technologies open up new opportunities for communication, education, and creativity. On the other hand, they create risks of algorithmic control, loss of autonomy, and fragmentation of human experience; a modern philosopher must look at this issue dialectically.

In the current situation, the formation of digital ethics focused on protecting human dignity, autonomy, and cultural diversity is becoming especially important.

REFERENCE

1. Beer D. *The Data Gaze: Capitalism, Power and Perception*. – London : SAGE, 2019. – 150 p.

2. Braidotti R. *Posthuman Feminism*. Cambridge : Polity Press, 2022. 120 p.

3. Couldry N. *Media: Why It Matters*. – Cambridge : Polity Press, 2019. – 140 p.

4. Couldry N., Mejias U. *The Costs of Connection: How Data Is Colonizing Human Life and Appropriating It for Capitalism*. – Stanford : Stanford University Press, 2019. – 352 p DOI: 10.1515/9781503609754 (accessed 3 May 2026).

5. Floridi L. *The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: Principles, Challenges, and Opportunities.* – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2023. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198883098.001.0001 (accessed 14 May 2026).

6. Frischmann B., Selinger E. *Re-Engineering Humanity. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2018.* – 417 p. DOI: 10.1017/9781316544846.

(accessed 2 May 2026)

7. Han B.-C. *Democracy and Information in the Age of Digitalization. Infocracy: Digitalization and the Crisis of Democracy*. – Cambridge; Medford: Polity Press, 2022. – 66 p. DOI: 10.22034/jpiut.2024.18253 (accessed 3 May 2026).

8. Jelinek T., Glauner P., Graylin A. *The Post-Turing Condition: Conceptualising Artificial Subjectivity and Synthetic Sociality* // arXiv. 2026. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2601.12938. (accessed 2 May 2026).

9. John-Mathews J.-M. *Some Critical and Ethical Perspectives on the Empirical Turn of AI Interpretability.* 2021 // arXiv:2109.09586v1 DOI: https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2109.09586(accessed 3 May 2026).

10. Khan A. A., Badshah S., Liang P. *Ethics of AI: A Systematic Literature Review of Principles and Challenges* // arXiv. 2021. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2109.07906. (accessed 3 May 2026).

11. Lovink G. *Stuck on the Platform: Reclaiming the Internet*. – Amsterdam : Valiz, 2022. – 240 p.

12. Rosa H. *The Uncontrollability of the World.* – Cambridge : Polity Press, 2020. – 140 p.

13. Stiegler B. *The Age of Disruption: Technology and Madness in Computational Capitalism.* – Cambridge : Polity Press, 2021. – 418 p.

14. Taddeo M. *The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in Defence*. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2024. – 298 p. https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=cz0lEQAAQBAJ&pg=PA61&hl=uk&source=gbs_selected_pages&cad=1#v=onepage&q&f=false (accessed 4 May 2026).

15. van Dijck J., Poell T., de Waal M. *The Platform Society: Public Values in a Connective World*. - Oxford, New York : Oxford University Press, 2018. - 240 p. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190889760.001.0001(accessed 4 May 2026).

16. Verbeek P.-P. Values that Matter: A New Method to Design and Assess Moral Mediation of Technology // *Design Issues*. – 2022. – №38 (1). – P. 39–54.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/desi_a_00669(accessed 2 May 2026).

17. Yun B., Taranova E., Feng D. *AI Phenomenology for Understanding Human-AI Experiences Across Eras* // arXiv. 2026. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2603.09020. (accessed 2 May 2026).

18. Zuboff S. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. – New York : Public Affairs, 2019. – 690 p. DOI: 10.12957/rmi.2021.55150(accessed 3 May 2026).