

METAMODERN ETHICS AND THE FORMATION OF A EUROPEAN CULTURE OF TOLERANCE: CONTEMPORARY UKRAINIAN CULTURE IN A POST-TRAUMATIC CONTEXT¹

Iryna Bondarenko

Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of Slavic Philology,
Zaporizhzhia National University, Ukraine
e-mail: lystopad.iryana@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0001-8945-986X

Yuliia Kurylova

Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of Ukrainian Literature,
Zaporizhzhia National University, Ukraine
e-mail: triks@ukr.net, orcid.org/0000-0002-3475-3858

Summary

This article examines the transformation of humanistic values in contemporary Ukrainian culture through the lens of the metamodern paradigm and contemporary European studies of tolerance. The relevance of the study stems from the urgent need to reconsider traditional models of tolerance in the context of Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine, post-traumatic social transformations, the decolonization of cultural space, and Ukraine's integration into the European humanitarian community. The study aims to identify the conceptual foundations of metamodern ethics as one of the key mechanisms for shaping a new model of tolerance within contemporary Ukrainian culture.

The research is based on an interdisciplinary methodology that combines hermeneutic, cultural-historical, comparative-typological, and axiological approaches with the theoretical frameworks of postcolonial studies, metamodernism, and contemporary European theories of tolerance. The article traces the evolution of European models of tolerance and demonstrates their methodological affinity with the principles of metamodern culture. It identifies the principal cultural markers of metamodern ethics in contemporary Ukrainian culture, including new sincerity, the ethics of care, social solidarity, post-traumatic embodiment, the decolonization of cultural memory, inclusiveness, responsibility, and critical hope.

Using Iryna Tsilyk's poem *Hamam* as a case study, the article explores a literary model of negotiating the boundaries of tolerance, responsibility, memory, and encounters with the Other in the context of wartime experience. The scholarly novelty of the study lies in its proposed conceptual synthesis of metamodern theory and contemporary European studies of tolerance as an interpretative framework for contemporary Ukrainian culture. The findings demonstrate that Ukrainian cultural experience not only contributes to Ukraine's integration into the European humanitarian space but also actively expands contemporary understandings of democratic values, responsible coexistence, and humanistic practices of post-war recovery.

Key words: humanistic paradigm; decolonization; European values; culture of equality; metamodernism; non-discrimination; zero tolerance; post-traumatic society; social solidarity; literary discourse, Erasmus+ Jean Monnet project.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/7607>

¹ This publication is done within the project EUROTOLERCULTURE «The European experience of forming a culture of tolerance in the Ukrainian perspective: media, education, art» (project No. 101127848 ERASMUS-JMO-2023-HEITCH-RSCH) under Jean Monnet Modules Action. The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

1. Introduction

The beginning of the twenty-first century has been marked by profound transformations in Europe's security architecture, cultural landscape, and value system. Russia's full-scale aggression against Ukraine has brought to the forefront issues that, until recently, were addressed primarily within the fields of political theory and international law, including the resilience of democratic institutions, the protection of human rights, mechanisms of social cohesion, intercultural dialogue, and the culture of tolerance. At the same time, the war has demonstrated that tolerance cannot be reduced to a normative declaration or a legal principle alone. Within contemporary European discourse, it is increasingly understood as a complex sociocultural practice shaped by collective experience, historical memory, ethical responsibility, and the capacity for dialogue.

For Ukraine, these issues have acquired particular significance. European integration is no longer perceived merely as a geopolitical choice or a foreign policy objective. Rather, it increasingly represents a process of returning to the common European cultural space of which Ukrainian culture has historically been an integral part, although it remained marginalized for centuries as a consequence of the colonial policies pursued by the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union. Consequently, Ukraine's contemporary integration into the European Union should not be understood as the construction of an entirely new identity, but rather as the restoration of interrupted historical, cultural, and axiological connections that were distorted through centuries of imperial domination.

At the same time, this process of "return" cannot be regarded as either linear or conflict-free. Ukrainian society enters the European space burdened by profound historical traumas, collective psychological legacies, the experience of colonial subjugation, and multiple forms of social polarization. To the consequences of prolonged colonial domination are now added the recent traumatic experiences caused by war, including mass displacement, the destruction of local communities, human losses, occupation, wartime violence, the transformation of everyday life, and the reconfiguration of collective memory. Together, these factors have created a complex post-traumatic sociocultural landscape in which rebuilding mutual trust and fostering a culture of tolerance have become among the most pressing societal challenges.

Particular attention should be paid to the fact that the current war did not create social intolerance; rather, it exposed contradictions that had accumulated over decades, if not centuries. Even before 2022, Ukraine's public sphere remained characterized by regional, linguistic, historical, and political divisions, many of which were reinforced by external information influence and enduring colonial patterns of thought. In the post-war perspective, these divisions are further complicated by new lines of social tension: between military personnel and civilians, veterans and broader society, internally displaced persons and host communities, as well as between those who remained in Ukraine and those who were forced to seek refuge abroad. These developments underscore the necessity of reconsidering tolerance not as an abstract moral virtue but as a mechanism of social integration capable of responding to multiple post-traumatic experiences.

The international dimension of these processes is equally complex. Despite the unprecedented level of support provided to Ukraine by European states, historical memory continues to shape contemporary forms of interstate and intercultural dialogue. Ukrainian-Polish relations, in particular, demonstrate that even strategic partnership cannot automatically eliminate tensions rooted in competing historical memories, national narratives, and the politics of victimhood. Such circumstances highlight the need to move beyond a politics of mutual accusations

toward a culture of responsible dialogue based not on the suppression of traumatic experience but on its reciprocal recognition and critical reflection.

An additional layer of complexity is introduced by the phenomenon of ambicoloniality, which has recently attracted increasing scholarly attention (*Biedarieva, 2024*). Ukraine emerges as a space where multiple imperial legacies and memories intersect, producing often contradictory patterns of self-identification, cultural reception, and historical self-understanding. This condition not only complicates the process of decolonization but also creates an urgent need for a new ethics of interaction capable of accommodating multiple historical experiences without reproducing hierarchical models of cultural domination.

In this context, the issue of «zero tolerance» acquires particular significance. Under war-time conditions, the principle of zero tolerance is justifiably directed against aggression, collaboration, war crimes, the propaganda of violence, and imperial practices that pose a direct threat to the democratic development of society. At the same time, principled intolerance toward the aggressor cannot automatically be extended to all forms of social communication. Ukraine's post-war recovery will require society to distinguish between moral accountability for crimes and the willingness to restore horizontal social ties within its own political nation. Consequently, a culture of tolerance should not be understood as a compromise with violence but rather as the capacity to sustain democratic forms of coexistence in a deeply traumatized society.

Against this backdrop, the metamodern paradigm has gained increasing heuristic value by offering an alternative to both the modernist belief in universal projects and the postmodern logic of total deconstruction. Metamodernism is grounded in the principle of oscillation between opposing worldviews: trauma and hope, critique and trust, irony and new sincerity, individual experience and collective responsibility. This ability to sustain productive tension between seemingly contradictory modes of understanding the world creates new possibilities for rethinking ethics within post-traumatic societies.

These developments are particularly evident in contemporary Ukrainian culture. Literature, theatre, cinema, visual arts, and digital media increasingly move beyond representing war solely as a space of destruction, instead producing narratives centered on empathy, solidarity, responsibility, and care. In this sense, culture emerges as one of the principal arenas for developing new modes of coexistence, where tolerance is understood not as the passive acceptance of difference but as an active practice of ethical engagement.

Accordingly, the study of metamodern ethics in relation to the formation of a culture of tolerance is relevant from both theoretical and practical perspectives. It provides an opportunity to conceptualize contemporary Ukrainian culture as a space in which new models of social cohesion are being developed through the integration of European values, decolonial processes, post-traumatic experience, and the ethics of care. Within this framework, culture functions not merely as a means of representing social transformation but also as one of its principal humanistic driving forces. This perspective fully corresponds to the objectives of the EUROTOLER-CULTURE project.

The practical foundation of this study is the experience gained through the implementation of the Erasmus+ Jean Monnet Module «European Experience of Forming a Culture of Tolerance in Ukrainian Perspective: Education, Media, Art» (EUROTOLERCULTURE). The project is aimed at integrating European values into Ukraine's contemporary educational and cultural environment. Its conceptual framework is based on an interdisciplinary synthesis of approaches drawn from the humanities, education, law, and cultural studies, treating the culture of tolerance as an essential prerequisite for democratic development. Particular attention is devoted to understanding tolerance not merely as a legal or political principle but as an

everyday cultural practice shaped through education, artistic production, media communication, and public dialogue.

Throughout the implementation of the project, a comprehensive set of educational and methodological resources was developed to integrate European approaches to fostering a culture of tolerance into the Ukrainian higher education system. These include a university course, thematic teaching modules, practical case studies, interactive learning activities, methodological guidelines, and digital educational resources addressing human rights, intercultural communication, non-discrimination, gender equality, media literacy, and the role of the arts in cultivating democratic culture. An important component of the project also consisted of public lectures, webinars, a round table, and an international conference, which facilitated interdisciplinary dialogue among scholars, educators, representatives of civil society, and university students.

One of the project's most significant outcomes has been the recognition that, under the conditions of Russia's full-scale invasion, conventional approaches to interpreting tolerance require substantial reconsideration. Educational practices developed and tested within the Jean Monnet module have demonstrated that the effective cultivation of a culture of tolerance is impossible without acknowledging the post-traumatic experience of society, ongoing processes of decolonization, the reconfiguration of historical memory, and the development of an ethics of mutual care. These challenges have gradually highlighted the necessity of adopting a metamodern methodological framework capable of bringing together the European humanistic tradition and the realities of contemporary Ukrainian culture.

Despite the rapid development of scholarship on metamodernism (T. Vermeulen, R. van den Akker, L. Turner, A. Gibbons, among others), European studies of tolerance (R. Forst, A. E. Galeotti), the ethics of care (C. Gilligan, J. Tronto, N. Noddings), and postcolonial studies, the relationship between metamodern ethics and the formation of a culture of tolerance in contemporary Ukrainian culture has not yet been the subject of comprehensive interdisciplinary inquiry. In particular, the role of artistic culture as a space for developing new models of tolerance under conditions of war, decolonization, and post-traumatic societal recovery remains insufficiently explored. The present study seeks to address this research gap by integrating contemporary metamodern theory into the European discourse on tolerance and by conceptualizing Ukrainian cultural experience as part of the broader transformation of humanistic values in contemporary Europe.

The aim of this article is to examine metamodern ethics as one of the conceptual mechanisms underlying the formation of a culture of tolerance in contemporary Ukrainian post-traumatic culture and to assess its correspondence with contemporary European models of tolerance.

To achieve this aim, the study pursues the following research objectives:

- to trace selected aspects of the evolution of European concepts of tolerance and evaluate their contemporary axiological significance;

- to identify the principal characteristics of metamodernism as a cultural paradigm and to conceptualize the notion of metamodern ethics;

- to determine the points of convergence between metamodern ethics and contemporary European approaches to the culture of tolerance;

- to identify the principal cultural markers of metamodern ethics in contemporary Ukrainian culture;

- to apply the proposed analytical framework of the cultural projections of metamodern ethics to a representative literary case study that explores the boundaries of tolerance;

- to examine the contribution of contemporary Ukrainian culture to the development of the European discourse on tolerance in the context of war and post-war recovery.

The study adopts an interdisciplinary methodological framework, combining approaches from literary studies, cultural studies, ethics, philosophy, postcolonial studies, and contemporary European scholarship on tolerance.

The analysis employs hermeneutic interpretation to examine literary texts; a comparative-typological approach to relate Ukrainian cultural experience to contemporary European models of tolerance; axiological analysis to identify the dominant value orientations of contemporary Ukrainian culture; and interdisciplinary synthesis, which enables the integration of literary, cultural, philosophical, and socio-political perspectives in interpreting the culture of tolerance.

The logic of the study proceeds from the theoretical conceptualization of the problem toward its cultural and literary representation. Such an approach makes it possible to integrate theoretical, cultural, and literary perspectives and to demonstrate that contemporary Ukrainian culture not only adopts European values but also actively contributes to their reinterpretation by proposing new ethical models of coexistence under conditions of war, decolonization, and post-war reconstruction.

Accordingly, the present article represents not only a theoretical engagement with contemporary humanities scholarship but also a synthesis of the practical experience gained through the implementation of the EUROTOLERCULTURE project. By combining European educational approaches with an analysis of contemporary Ukrainian culture, the study argues that metamodern ethics constitutes one of the most promising conceptual frameworks for fostering a culture of tolerance in post-traumatic societies. In this capacity, it provides a productive basis for reconciling the processes of decolonization, social cohesion, and European integration while contributing to the renewal of contemporary European humanistic thought.

2. Metamodernism and Metamodern Ethics in the Context of European Studies of Tolerance

Metamodernism should be understood not as a coherent philosophical system with a clearly defined conceptual apparatus but rather as a theoretical framework that captures the emergence of a new cultural sensibility characteristic of the early twenty-first century. Its emergence is closely associated with the exhaustion of the postmodern paradigm, which was grounded in pervasive irony, relativism, skepticism toward universal values, and the deconstruction of grand narratives. In their seminal article *Notes on Metamodernism*, Timotheus Vermeulen and Robin van den Akker conceptualize metamodernism as a new «structure of feeling» that develops in the aftermath of postmodernism without rejecting its critical legacy. Rather than advocating a simple return to the modernist confidence in progress, rationality, and universal truth, metamodernism seeks to restore the possibility of collective action, hope, and shared values while remaining fully aware of their historical contingency and inherent fragility (Vermeulen & van den Akker, 2010).

The central mechanism underlying metamodern sensibility is oscillation – a continuous movement between positions that both modernist and postmodernist logic would normally regard as mutually exclusive. Metamodern culture oscillates between hope and melancholy, sincerity and irony, wholeness and fragmentation, universality and locality, empathy and critical distance. Importantly, this oscillation does not culminate in a final synthesis. Instead, it preserves the productive tension between opposing poles, transforming this dynamic into a source of ethical reflection and creative agency. In *The Metamodernist Manifesto*, Luke Turner likewise identifies oscillation as the defining condition of the contemporary world and as a

means of overcoming both the ideological naivety of modernity and the cynical inertia inherited from postmodernism (Turner, 2011).

The concept of oscillation proves particularly productive for contemporary studies of tolerance. Tolerance presupposes the capacity to sustain the tension between disagreement with another person's beliefs, identity, or way of life and the recognition of that person's equal right to existence, self-expression, and human dignity. Rather than eliminating conflict, tolerance establishes ethical and legal conditions for coexistence within it. For this reason, Rainer Forst conceptualizes tolerance as a normative principle that enables conflicting convictions and forms of life to coexist while preventing them from developing into relations of domination, coercion, or exclusion (Forst, 2013). From this perspective, metamodern oscillation may be interpreted as the cultural and psychological counterpart of the capacity to remain within unresolved differences without resorting to violence or the denial of the Other.

Another defining characteristic of metamodernism is the renewed emphasis on affect, depth, historicity, and personal engagement. In the collective volume *Metamodernism: Historicity, Affect, and Depth after Postmodernism*, contemporary cultural transformations are examined through the revival of emotional experience, temporality, subjectivity, and meaning-making across literature, cinema, visual arts, and television. Following the postmodern privileging of quotation, simulation, playfulness, and surface aesthetics, contemporary culture has once again turned toward lived experience, memory, responsibility, and the search for authentic human connection (van den Akker, Gibbons, & Vermeulen, 2017).

Within literary studies, metamodernism manifests itself through the combination of self-reflexivity and emotional authenticity, irony and compassion, fragmentation and the aspiration to restore narrative coherence. The metamodern text acknowledges the contingency of every narrative while refusing to abandon storytelling itself. It recognizes the instability of the subject yet restores its ethical agency; it questions the possibility of absolute truth without reducing all interpretations to moral equivalence. Vermeulen and van den Akker describe this cultural disposition as a synthesis of «informed naivety» and «pragmatic idealism»: the subject continues to act as though understanding, justice, and solidarity remain attainable while fully recognizing that none of these ideals can ever be guaranteed in absolute terms (Vermeulen & van den Akker, 2010).

In this sense, it becomes possible to speak of metamodern ethics. It does not constitute an established branch of normative ethics comparable to deontology, utilitarianism, or virtue ethics. Rather, within the framework of the present study, the concept of metamodern ethics is employed as an analytical category referring to a constellation of value orientations emerging from metamodern cultural sensibility. These include responsible sincerity, empathy, solidarity, care, openness to dialogue, critical hope, and a willingness to act despite the absence of absolute certainty. Such an ethical orientation neither rejects the postmodern critique of power, dominant discourses, and hidden hierarchies nor remains confined to perpetual critique. Instead, it seeks to move beyond deconstruction toward the constructive formation of relationships, communities, and shared forms of social life.

Metamodern ethics thus emerges at the intersection of two distinct intellectual traditions. From modernity, it inherits a commitment to human dignity, freedom, universal rights, justice, and the possibility of social progress. From postmodernism, it adopts a heightened sensitivity to difference, plurality, marginalized voices, discursive power, and the dangers of universalism when it conceals the experience of dominant groups. Its distinctive feature lies in refusing to privilege either of these paradigms exclusively. Instead, metamodern ethics seeks to reconcile normative commitment with critical self-reflection: to defend universal human rights without

reducing universalism to cultural homogenization, and to acknowledge difference without lapsing into a relativism that would render moral judgement – particularly with regard to violence – impossible.

This understanding of metamodern ethics closely corresponds to the historical evolution of European theories of tolerance. During the first, early modern stage, tolerance developed primarily as a response to religious wars and confessional violence. In the works of John Locke, Pierre Bayle (*Forst, 2026*), and other seventeenth-century thinkers, tolerance referred principally to limiting the authority of the state or the established church to interfere in matters of individual religious belief. Within this framework, tolerance functioned primarily as permission: political authorities or dominant social groups agreed to endure the beliefs of minorities without recognizing them as equal. Rainer Forst characterizes this model as the «permission conception» of tolerance, emphasizing that it preserves the asymmetrical relationship between those who tolerate and those who are merely tolerated (*Forst, 2013*).

The second stage is associated with the European Enlightenment, the critique of absolutism, and the gradual recognition of freedom of conscience as an inalienable right. In the writings of Voltaire, tolerance appears not only as a practical means of ending religious persecution but also as a defining characteristic of a rational and civilized society. Enlightenment thought universalized the subject of tolerance by subordinating religious differences to the ideals of common humanity and universal reason. Its major historical achievement lay in shifting the discourse of tolerance from the sphere of sovereign benevolence to that of individual liberty. At the same time, however, this model remained limited by its tendency to equate universality with the normative figure of the rational European subject.

The third stage unfolded within the liberal-democratic tradition of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Here, tolerance became closely associated with freedom of belief, individual autonomy, legal equality, and the neutrality of the state toward competing conceptions of the good life. Relations between majorities and minorities gradually shifted from the asymmetrical logic of permission toward the ideal of equal civic coexistence. Nevertheless, the classical liberal model often assumed that social actors already occupied formally equal positions and that non-interference alone would suffice to ensure justice. Consequently, it frequently overlooked structural inequalities, symbolic exclusion, cultural invisibility, and the unequal capacity of different groups to participate in public representation.

Critiques of these limitations gave rise to a fourth stage, commonly described as tolerance as recognition. Anna Elisabetta Galeotti argues that contemporary conflicts surrounding tolerance concern not only differences in beliefs or values but also the unequal social status of particular groups. Mere non-interference fails to eliminate stigmatization, since minorities may formally enjoy freedom while continuing to experience cultural marginalization and social invisibility. Tolerance understood as recognition therefore requires the public affirmation of the equal dignity of diverse groups and the legitimacy of their presence within the public sphere (*Galeotti, 2002*).

Rainer Forst further develops this discussion by distinguishing several conceptions of tolerance, including the permission, coexistence, respect, and esteem conceptions. Of particular importance for democratic societies is the respect conception, according to which individuals may fundamentally disagree about religion, morality, historical memory, or ways of life while nevertheless recognizing one another as equal moral and political agents. The limits of tolerance are therefore determined not by the arbitrary will of the majority but by the principles of reciprocity and generality: the norms governing social coexistence must be justifiable to all those who are subject to them. Consequently, tolerance does not preclude critical judgement;

rather, it prohibits transforming disagreement into grounds for denying others equal moral and political standing (Forst, 2013).

The next stage in the evolution of European conceptions of tolerance is associated with its institutionalization in European and international law following the Second World War. The UNESCO Declaration of Principles on Tolerance moves beyond the notion of passive forbearance by defining tolerance in terms of respect, acceptance, and appreciation of the rich diversity of the world's cultures, forms of expression, and ways of being human (*Declaration of Principles on Tolerance*, 1995). The Declaration emphasizes that tolerance should not be understood as concession, condescension, or indifference, nor can it serve to justify violations of human rights. Instead, it identifies education, culture, science, and communication as the principal means of fostering tolerance – precisely the fields that constitute the thematic foundation of the EUROTOLERCULTURE project.

Within the legal framework of the European Union, tolerance is embedded in a broader system of interconnected democratic values. Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union identifies human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law, and respect for human rights as the fundamental values upon which the Union is founded (*Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union: Article 2*, 2012). Within this normative framework, tolerance functions alongside pluralism, non-discrimination, justice, solidarity, and equality between women and men. Accordingly, the European approach does not permit tolerance to be separated from the principle of legal equality: forms of tolerance that preserve discriminatory structures or undermine human dignity are incompatible with the value system of the European Union.

This normative framework is further elaborated in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. Article 21 establishes a comprehensive prohibition of discrimination on a wide range of grounds, including sex, racial or ethnic origin, language, religion or belief, disability, age, and sexual orientation (*Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union: Article 21 – Non-discrimination*, 2016), while Article 22 requires the Union to respect cultural, religious, and linguistic diversity (*Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union: Article 22 – Cultural, religious and linguistic diversity*, 2016). Tolerance thus acquires a dual dimension: a negative dimension, which prohibits discrimination and exclusion, and a positive dimension, which requires the creation of conditions enabling the participation, visibility, and self-expression of diverse cultural communities.

The sixth stage in the evolution of the European understanding of tolerance may be associated with the transition from multicultural coexistence to intercultural dialogue. The Council of Europe's White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue: Living Together as Equals in Dignity (*White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue: Living Together as Equals in Dignity*, 2008) identifies dialogue as a key instrument for managing cultural diversity, strengthening democratic stability and social cohesion, and preventing conflict. Within this framework, the peaceful coexistence of separate cultural communities is no longer considered sufficient. Rather, effective intercultural dialogue requires interaction, mutual learning, openness to revising one's own perspectives, and shared participation in democratic public life.

The intercultural model brings the theory of tolerance closer to metamodern ethics, as both are oriented not toward eliminating differences but toward sustaining a productive engagement with them. At the same time, however, the limitations of a purely procedural understanding of dialogue must also be acknowledged. Formal openness to communication cannot guarantee justice where participants possess unequal resources, differing degrees of public visibility, or unequal influence over the public agenda. Interpreted through the lens of the ethics of care, the Council of Europe's White Paper demonstrates that meaningful intercultural dialogue requires

sustained attention to vulnerability, interdependence, lived experience, and structural asymmetries of power rather than relying solely on abstract declarations of equality (*Bozalek & Zembylas, 2011*).

For this reason, metamodern ethics can be productively aligned with the ethics of care, as developed by Carol Gilligan (*Gilligan, 1982*) and Joan Tronto (*Tronto, 1993*). Within this framework, tolerance ceases to be understood as the minimal obligation of non-interference and instead assumes a fundamentally relational character. It entails attentiveness to the vulnerability of others, openness to experiences that differ from one's own, responsibility for the social consequences of collective decisions, and active participation in safeguarding human dignity. Rather than replacing the principles of rights and justice, the ethics of care complements and concretizes them by translating abstract normative commitments into everyday social relationships, educational practices, cultural representation, and civic engagement.

Such a model is particularly significant in post-traumatic societies, where collective trauma frequently generates social polarization, erodes trust, narrows the boundaries of the moral community, and reinforces binary distinctions between unequivocal «insiders» and «outsiders». Metamodern ethics neither requires abandoning the moral distinction between aggressor and victim nor reduces tolerance to reconciliation with violence. On the contrary, its normative boundaries remain firmly grounded in respect for human dignity, the protection of human rights, and the rejection of any legitimization of aggression. At the same time, within a democratic community, it enables critical distinctions to be drawn between disagreement and hostility, responsibility and collective stigmatization, as well as between legitimate self-defence and processes of dehumanization.

From this perspective, metamodern ethics may be understood as an ethics of critical hope. It neither denies trauma nor advocates premature reconciliation, nor does it conceal conflict beneath an optimistic rhetoric. Instead, its hope is fundamentally informed – emerging only after experiences of destruction, the collapse of universalist promises, and the recognition of the fragility of democratic institutions. Precisely for this reason, however, it assumes a profoundly practical orientation, encouraging the reconstruction of trust, social relationships, and a culture of dialogue even where complete reconciliation appears unattainable.

Viewed through this lens, the metamodern perspective reveals the contemporary evolution of European theories of tolerance as a transition from forbearance to respect, from non-interference to recognition, from formal equality to attentiveness to vulnerability, and from parallel coexistence to intercultural dialogue. Its distinctive contribution lies in reconciling the legal universalism that underpins the European Union with postmodern sensitivity to difference and with an ethics grounded in concrete interpersonal relationships. Within this framework, tolerance is understood not as a fixed social condition but as a continuous practice of negotiating freedom, dignity, diversity, justice, and solidarity.

In the Ukrainian context, this model possesses not only theoretical significance but also considerable practical relevance. Integration into the European community requires more than the formal adoption of the declarative language of tolerance; it demands the development of a culture capable of affirming its own decolonized subjectivity while simultaneously recognizing the plurality of experiences within society itself. Contemporary Ukrainian literature, theatre, cinema, visual arts, media, and education constitute particularly important spaces in which such a metamodern ethics may be cultivated. These cultural spheres preserve the memory of trauma without reducing identity to victimhood, critically deconstruct imperial narratives while simultaneously generating affirmative representations of solidarity, care, responsibility, and a shared European future.

Accordingly, integrating metamodern theory with contemporary European approaches to tolerance makes it possible to propose a comprehensive conceptual model in which tolerance is understood simultaneously as a legal principle, a cultural competence, an ethical orientation, and a dynamic practice of social interaction. Rather than replacing earlier conceptions of tolerance, metamodern ethics critically incorporates their most valuable achievements: the protection of freedom of conscience characteristic of early liberalism, the universalist aspirations of the Enlightenment, the principle of legal equality, the politics of recognition, intercultural dialogue, and the ethics of care. It is precisely this multidimensional framework that corresponds to the objectives of the EUROTOLERCULTURE project, enabling education, media, and the arts to be understood as interconnected environments for fostering a European culture of tolerance in contemporary Ukraine.

3. Projections and Markers of Metamodern Ethics in Ukraine's Sociocultural Space: Towards the Formation of a Culture of Tolerance

Having outlined the theoretical foundations of metamodern ethics, it is now appropriate to turn to contemporary Ukrainian culture as a space in which these principles acquire concrete artistic, social, and civic expression. Whereas postmodern culture was primarily concerned with the deconstruction of grand narratives, contemporary Ukrainian culture increasingly demonstrates a commitment to their ethical reconfiguration. Its defining characteristic is not a return to modernist normativity but the development of new models of coexistence grounded in empathy, mutual responsibility, and solidarity. These characteristics may therefore be regarded as the principal markers of metamodern ethics within the broader process of fostering a culture of tolerance.

The first of these markers is new sincerity, which replaces the ironic distance characteristic of postmodernism. In contemporary Ukrainian culture, the experience of war has profoundly transformed artistic expression. Instead of engaging in the play of simulacra and intertextual irony, literature and the arts increasingly seek to facilitate honest conversations about loss, fear, responsibility, and human dignity. This tendency extends beyond literature to documentary theatre, photography, cinema, music, and documentary art. Within this context, sincerity ceases to signify naïveté and instead becomes an ethical position that creates the conditions for mutual understanding among individuals whose experiences of trauma differ significantly.

The second marker is the ethics of care understood as a cultural practice. Prior to 2022, volunteer initiatives in Ukraine were largely interpreted as expressions of civic engagement. Since the beginning of the full-scale invasion, however, they have evolved into one of the defining cultural codes of Ukrainian society. Care now extends far beyond the sphere of private morality and is embodied in the activities of charitable organizations, artistic residencies, cultural centres, libraries, museums, and independent theatres that continue to operate even in frontline regions. It is precisely this everyday practice of mutual support that provides the foundation for rebuilding social trust, one of the essential preconditions for cultivating a culture of tolerance.

A third marker is the emergence of a culture of solidarity, which fundamentally differs from the modernist ideal of collectivism. Rather than subordinating the individual to the collective, this model is based on the voluntary formation of communities united by shared values and a common sense of responsibility. Following the outbreak of Russia's full-scale invasion, numerous cultural institutions reoriented their activities toward supporting local communities, internally displaced persons, military personnel, children, and artists who had lost the opportunity to continue their professional work. In 2024, UNESCO, in cooperation with Ukrainian

partners, launched a new series of cultural initiatives (*UNESCO funds 14 new projects to support creativity in Ukraine* ²⁰²⁴) across different regions of Ukraine, recognizing artistic projects as vital instruments for preserving cultural life, strengthening social interaction, and protecting the cultural rights of citizens.

Another important manifestation of metamodern ethics is the renewal of a culture of dialogue. Within the Ukrainian context, this implies a gradual movement beyond the binary opposition of «us» versus «them» toward a more nuanced understanding of internal diversity. Such an approach does not entail relativizing the responsibility of the aggressor. Rather, it emphasizes the capacity to sustain dialogue within the democratic community itself: between military personnel and civilians, veterans and younger generations, internally displaced persons and host communities, as well as individuals representing different regional, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds. This understanding closely corresponds to the contemporary European conception of intercultural dialogue as one of the principal foundations of democratic coexistence.

A fifth marker is decolonization understood not merely as a policy of renaming public spaces or dismantling imperial monuments but as a fundamentally ethical process. Contemporary Ukrainian culture increasingly seeks not simply to reject the colonial legacy but to articulate its own affirmative cultural narrative. This process encompasses literature, museums, memory practices, education, and cultural diplomacy. Significantly, recent international recommendations on the decolonization of Ukrainian museums, developed with the participation of the British Council Ukraine (*Supporting Decolonisation in Museums: Focus on Ukraine*, 2025), emphasize that decolonization should not consist in replacing one canonical narrative with another. Instead, they advocate the development of inclusive curatorial practices, the critical reassessment of imperial narratives, and the representation of the plurality of Ukrainian cultural experiences.

A sixth marker of metamodern ethics is the rehabilitation of cultural memory. Whereas postmodern culture often dissolved history into a network of textual interpretations, contemporary Ukrainian culture restores memory to the realm of moral responsibility. This is particularly evident in artistic engagements with the Holodomor, the Holocaust, the deportation of the Crimean Tatars, Soviet political repression, the war in Donbas, and Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine. At the same time, memory is no longer conceived solely as a resource for national mobilization; increasingly, it functions as a space for dialogue among diverse experiences of suffering, reflecting contemporary European approaches to cultural memory and heritage.

Particular attention should also be given to the reinterpretation of intangible cultural heritage. Ukrainian traditional culture no longer functions merely as a museum artifact or a romanticized form of folklore. The traditions of pysanka decoration, the kobzar musical heritage, Kosiv painted ceramics, the culture of Ukrainian borshch, and other elements of intangible heritage are increasingly integrated into contemporary artistic practices, educational initiatives, and international cultural projects. UNESCO consistently emphasizes that safeguarding intangible cultural heritage must be based on mutual respect, dialogue among communities, and the active participation of tradition bearers – principles that directly correspond to the foundations of a culture of tolerance (*Ethics and Intangible Cultural Heritage*, n.d.).

An eighth marker is the growing inclusiveness of the cultural space. Contemporary Ukrainian artistic projects increasingly give voice to social groups that previously remained underrepresented, including veterans, persons with disabilities, internally displaced persons, Crimean Tatars, and representatives of diverse ethnic and religious communities. Such cultural polyphony does not weaken a shared Ukrainian identity; rather, it demonstrates its openness and its capacity to integrate diverse experiences without compromising its own subjectivity.

A ninth manifestation of metamodern ethics is the reconceptualization of art as a social institution. Contemporary artistic practice increasingly performs not only aesthetic but also therapeutic, communicative, and educational functions. Theatre, literature, music, cinema, and exhibition projects have become important platforms for public dialogue on trauma, memory, loss, and responsibility. Consequently, international programmes supporting Ukrainian culture – particularly those implemented under the auspices of UNESCO (*Ukraine: Nearly 30 States pledge to support UNESCO's efforts in the recovery of the cultural sector*, 2024) – increasingly recognize artistic creativity as a crucial instrument of post-war recovery, social resilience, and democratic cohesion.

A tenth marker is the ethics of responsibility for cultural heritage. Under conditions in which museums, theatres, libraries, archives, and historical monuments are systematically targeted and destroyed, the protection of cultural heritage can no longer be regarded solely as the professional responsibility of museum specialists or archivists. Instead, it has become a form of civic responsibility and cultural resistance. The Council of Europe emphasizes that safeguarding Ukraine's cultural heritage constitutes an essential prerequisite for democratic recovery, since culture ensures the continuity of historical memory, local identities, and social trust (*Council of Europe Congress calls for partnerships to protect Ukraine's cultural heritage*, 2024).

An eleventh marker is the expansion of the ethical boundaries of citizenship. Contemporary Ukrainian culture increasingly conceptualizes civic community not merely as a legal affiliation with the state but as a network of mutual care and shared responsibility. Volunteer initiatives, community-based artistic projects, collaborative memorialization practices, educational programmes, and cultural festivals create horizontal networks of social interaction in which solidarity becomes an everyday civic practice. This emerging model may be described as empathetic citizenship, grounded in a willingness to assume responsibility for the common good regardless of social, regional, cultural, or linguistic differences.

Finally, the twelfth – and perhaps the most significant – marker of metamodern ethics is critical hope. Contemporary Ukrainian culture neither denies the scale of destruction, romanticizes war, nor offers simplistic narratives of reconciliation. Instead, it consistently articulates a vision of the future grounded in human dignity, mutual respect, cultural diversity, and European democratic values. In our view, this capacity to preserve the memory of trauma while simultaneously imagining a shared future constitutes the defining characteristic of metamodern ethics in contemporary Ukrainian culture.

Taken together, these markers – new sincerity, the ethics of care, solidarity, a culture of dialogue, decolonization, memory politics, the revitalization of intangible cultural heritage, inclusiveness, the renewed social role of art, responsibility for cultural heritage, empathetic citizenship, and critical hope – form a coherent system of the cultural manifestations of metamodern ethics. Their distinctive feature lies in their ability to combine European principles of human rights, equality, intercultural dialogue, and democratic participation with Ukraine's lived experience of war, decolonization, and post-traumatic recovery. For this reason, contemporary Ukrainian culture may be regarded as one of the most compelling examples of the emergence of a metamodern culture of tolerance in contemporary Europe.

4. Metamodern Ethics and the Limits of Tolerance in Iryna Tsilyk's Poem Hamam

Iryna Tsilyk's poem *Hamam* (2023) represents one of the most characteristic manifestations of metamodern culture, in which war ceases to function merely as a historical event and instead becomes a fundamental mode of experiencing reality (*Tsilyk*, 2025). Rather than

depicting direct military action, the poem reveals how war permeates everyday life, intimate experience, and even moments traditionally associated with leisure and restoration. It is precisely this sphere of everyday existence that becomes the principal site where ethics, memory, and the culture of tolerance intersect.

From its opening lines, the poem is structured according to the principle of metamodern oscillation: «Once we travelled to Istanbul, / as if there were no war at all». Peace and war coexist simultaneously within the same experiential horizon. The lyrical speaker consciously enters a space that offers the temporary illusion of normality – seagulls, the magnetic call of the muezzins, olives, the sea, and intimacy. Yet this normality remains fragile from the very beginning. The phrase «as if» prevents both the speaker and the reader from believing in the possibility of a complete return to pre-war life. Such dual vision perfectly exemplifies metamodern oscillation: the subject experiences beauty and loss, tranquillity and latent anxiety at one and the same time.

A second marker of metamodern ethics is new sincerity, expressed through the poem's almost documentary tone. Tsilyk neither constructs a heroic narrative of war nor resorts to rhetorical pathos. Instead, she enumerates ordinary bodily pleasures – food, love, the warmth of the bathhouse – thereby restoring their legitimacy even under wartime conditions. This poetic strategy dismantles the traditional opposition between the heroic and the private. The human need for rest is no longer presented as a sign of moral weakness but rather as an essential practice of psychological and physical resilience. Within contemporary Ukrainian society, the question of what remains morally permissible during wartime has become the subject of intense public reflection and widespread debate, particularly across social media.

The representation of the body is especially revealing. Inside the hamam, all the women are equally naked, stripped of their social roles, professional status, national symbols, and even clothing as a cultural marker. The poet deliberately focuses the speaker's gaze on breasts, skin tones, and the physicality of the female body. At this stage, corporeality has not yet acquired political significance. Instead, it affirms a universal condition of human vulnerability.

For precisely this reason, the question posed by the poem's antagonist acquires exceptional force: «Are you from Ru-ussia too?». This seemingly casual inquiry marks the collapse of a neutral humanistic space. Until that moment, the women existed simply as vulnerable human bodies; from that instant onward, they become political subjects. Iryna Tsilyk demonstrates with remarkable precision that contemporary war begins not only on the battlefield but also within the ordinary interactions of everyday life. A single sentence abruptly returns the lyrical speaker to the traumatic reality from which she had hoped to distance herself, if only for a brief moment.

This episode also offers a particularly vivid representation of post-traumatic embodiment. The speaker's reaction is conveyed not through psychological terminology but through physical sensation: «the ceiling suddenly pressed down upon my shoulders». War is thus experienced through the body itself. Trauma literally transforms spatial perception and bodily awareness. At the same time, this corporeal response does not develop into panic or aggression. Instead, it culminates in a brief internal struggle that ultimately results in an ethical decision.

The climactic moment is the declaration: "I am from Ukraine." This statement is far more than an answer concerning national origin; it constitutes an act of decolonizing speech. Within previous imperial frameworks, the Ukrainian subject was habitually defined through Russia – as its province, extension, or cultural periphery. Iryna Tsilyk decisively dismantles this colonial logic. Ukraine is named on its own terms, requiring neither explanation nor qualification. Significantly, the firmness of this declaration is said to «crack the marble». Marble has long symbolized imperial monumentality, permanence, and historical authority. Within Tsilyk's

poetic universe, however, the voice of a Ukrainian woman proves more powerful than stone itself. This metaphor transforms language into an instrument of ethical and political agency, demonstrating that decolonization begins not only through institutional change but also through the reclamation of one's own voice and the refusal to accept imposed identities.

Particular attention should be paid to the image of the "four pink snails without shells." This is one of the most striking metaphors in contemporary Ukrainian poetry. It combines two seemingly incompatible qualities. On the one hand, the snail symbolizes extreme vulnerability, bodily exposure, and human fragility. On the other hand, the absence of a shell – or, in the poem's wording, being «without armour» – renders all the women fundamentally equal. In the face of war, death, and the vulnerability of the human body, no privileges remain.

Importantly, Iryna Tsilyk does not romanticize the idea of universal sisterhood. She does not suggest that shared female corporeality is sufficient to overcome political conflict. On the contrary, nudity only intensifies the awareness of irreconcilable differences. All the women are equally vulnerable, yet this shared vulnerability does not eliminate moral responsibility for war. The poem therefore rejects both biological essentialism and sentimental universalism, insisting instead that ethical judgement cannot be suspended in the name of a generalized human solidarity.

Iryna Tsilyk's metamodern ethics thus differs fundamentally from the liberal notion of unlimited tolerance. Rather than advocating unconditional acceptance, the poem proposes an ethics of responsible distinction. The lyrical speaker neither humiliates the other women nor responds with verbal aggression or acts of dehumanization. At the same time, she refuses to erase political reality for the sake of personal comfort or a superficial humanitarianism. Within this ethical framework, tolerance possesses clearly defined moral limits: it cannot extend to the denial of another nation's right to exist.

Particularly significant is the poem's use of the Russian lullaby. Here, the lullaby functions as a powerful deconstruction of imperial cultural memory. Traditionally associated with maternal care, childhood, and security, it is transformed into an instrument symbolically expelling the aggressor from the shared cultural space. Culture, therefore, no longer appears as a politically neutral domain; rather, it emerges as a bearer of historical responsibility and ethical memory.

At the same time, Iryna Tsilyk carefully avoids dehumanization. The Russian women are not portrayed as monsters or caricatured enemies. They remain ordinary human beings who, like the speaker herself, experience the heat of the bathhouse, discomfort, embarrassment, and vulnerability. It is precisely this refusal to deny the humanity of the Other that distinguishes metamodern ethics from the language of hatred. The Other does not cease to be human; yet this recognition does not imply automatic moral reconciliation or the suspension of ethical judgement.

The key turning point is the Russian woman's final response, expressed through the expletive «Oh, for fuck's sake». This utterance may be interpreted as the moment when imperial self-assurance begins to collapse. For the first time, the speaker confronts not an abstract geopolitical construct called Ukraine but a concrete Ukrainian woman who refuses to be subsumed within the Russian cultural and political imagination. In this sense, the conflict unfolds not merely between two states but between two fundamentally different models of subjectivity and historical agency.

The conclusion of the poem is particularly revealing. After the Russian women leave, the speaker quietly remarks: «At least now I can finally wash myself. There's still so much work to do». This ending constitutes one of the clearest manifestations of the metamodern ethics of care. The poem concludes neither with hatred, revenge, nor triumph. Instead, it returns to the bodily

practice of cleansing, which simultaneously acquires a profound symbolic dimension. Washing is no longer an escape from war but a brief act of restoration before returning to responsibility.

The poem's final words «There's still so much work to do» – ultimately reveal its central ethical message. Self-care is not presented as an alternative to civic responsibility but as one of its necessary conditions. The restoration of one's own physical and emotional strength becomes a prerequisite for continuing the work required by the nation and the democratic community. In this way, Iryna Tsilyk proposes a fundamentally new ethical model in which the private and the public no longer exist in opposition but instead become mutually sustaining dimensions of responsible citizenship.

Consequently, Hamam embodies nearly all of the principal markers of metamodern ethics identified in the present study: oscillation between peace and war; new sincerity; post-traumatic embodiment; the decolonization of language; the rejection of a universalist humanism that ignores violence; the delineation of the moral limits of tolerance; the distinction between universal human dignity and political responsibility; and the integration of self-care with responsibility toward the broader community. For these reasons, the poem may be interpreted as a literary model of a European culture of tolerance under wartime conditions, in which tolerance no longer signifies moral indifference or the erasure of difference but rather emerges as an ethical practice grounded in truth, responsibility, the protection of human dignity, and respect for the sovereignty of the Other. In doing so, Iryna Tsilyk demonstrates that contemporary Ukrainian culture does not abandon European humanistic values; instead, it critically reinterprets them through the lived experience of war, decolonization, and the necessity of defining the moral boundaries of democratic coexistence.

5. Conclusions

The findings of this study demonstrate that contemporary Ukrainian culture is developing a qualitatively new model of understanding tolerance that extends beyond the classical liberal conception of forbearance and moves toward a metamodern understanding of ethics as a dynamic practice of coexistence, responsibility, and mutual care. Russia's full-scale invasion has not only fundamentally transformed the sociocultural context within which humanistic values operate but has also highlighted the need to reconsider the very nature of tolerance, its moral boundaries, and the mechanisms through which it can be realized in a post-traumatic society.

The study confirms that the contemporary European concept of tolerance has undergone a long process of historical evolution – from the early modern model of passive forbearance and freedom of conscience to contemporary conceptions based on mutual respect, recognition, intercultural dialogue, social inclusion, and the ethics of responsibility. It is this most recent stage in the development of European humanitarian thought that demonstrates the greatest methodological affinity with the principles of metamodern culture, since both frameworks seek not to eliminate conflict but to develop mechanisms for responsible coexistence within societies characterized by multiple identities, diverse experiences, and persistent value pluralism.

The article argues that metamodern ethics should not be understood as an autonomous normative ethical theory but rather as an integrative cultural framework that combines the critical reflexivity of postmodernism with the humanistic aspirations of modernity. Its defining characteristics include oscillation between hope and trauma, new sincerity, empathy, the ethics of care, responsibility, critical hope, openness to dialogue, and a willingness to recognize the autonomy of the Other. Together, these principles provide the conceptual foundation for a new culture of tolerance capable of responding to the challenges of post-traumatic societies.

The analysis of contemporary Ukrainian culture has identified the principal cultural manifestations of metamodern ethics, including new sincerity, a culture of care, solidarity, post-traumatic embodiment, the decolonization of cultural memory, inclusiveness, the reinterpretation of historical experience, responsibility for cultural heritage, the development of empathetic citizenship, and an orientation toward critical hope as a strategy of post-war social recovery. Collectively, these characteristics demonstrate that Ukrainian culture is already developing its own model of humanistic transformation, one that is organically embedded within the contemporary European value system while simultaneously enriching it through the specific historical experience of war and decolonization.

The literary analysis further confirms the explanatory potential of the proposed methodological framework. Iryna Tsilyk's poem *Hamam* represents a mature model of metamodern ethics in which decolonization, the responsible delineation of the moral limits of tolerance, post-traumatic embodiment, new sincerity, and the preservation of human dignity are brought together within the context of an ongoing military conflict. The poem demonstrates that tolerance should not be understood as the unconditional acceptance of every position or worldview but rather as a complex ethical practice grounded in respect for human dignity, responsibility, and a critical refusal to legitimize violence.

An important outcome of this research is the conclusion that contemporary Ukrainian culture not only adapts existing European conceptions of tolerance but also actively contributes to their further development. The experiences of war, decolonization, and post-traumatic recovery have foregrounded dimensions of humanistic ethics that remained comparatively marginal within classical theories of tolerance, particularly the ethics of care, practices of social solidarity, cultural memory, mutual responsibility, and the everyday forms of democratic coexistence. In this sense, contemporary Ukrainian culture should be understood not merely as an object to which European humanitarian models are applied but as an active participant in their ongoing transformation.

The scientific novelty of this study lies in the conceptual integration of metamodern theory with contemporary European studies of tolerance as a unified methodological framework for interpreting contemporary Ukrainian culture. This interdisciplinary approach demonstrates that metamodern ethics provides an effective analytical model for explaining the transformation of humanistic values under conditions of war, decolonization, and post-traumatic reconstruction.

The practical significance of the research consists in the possibility of applying its findings within higher education, cultural policy, museum and heritage studies, civic education, and international projects aimed at promoting democratic values, intercultural dialogue, and social cohesion. The proposed conceptual framework may also serve as a methodological basis for the further development of educational programmes, cultural initiatives, and public policies implemented within the context of Ukraine's European integration and post-war recovery.

The prospects for further research include expanding the corpus of literary and artistic texts examined through the lens of metamodern ethics, undertaking comparative analyses of Ukrainian and European cultural responses to war and collective trauma, and exploring the role of metamodern ethical paradigms in shaping democratic resilience and the culture of tolerance in post-conflict societies. Such research will contribute to a deeper understanding of the evolving relationship between culture, ethics, and democracy in contemporary Europe while further highlighting the significance of Ukraine's cultural experience for the development of European humanitarian thought.

The scientific novelty of this study lies in its proposed conceptual integration of metamodern theory, contemporary European studies of tolerance, the ethics of care, and the analysis of Ukrainian wartime culture. This interdisciplinary synthesis has made it possible to introduce

the concept of a «metamodern culture of tolerance» as an integrative model of humanistic interaction that combines the principles of human rights, democratic values, intercultural dialogue, ethical responsibility, empathy, and critical hope. The proposed framework may serve as a theoretical foundation for future interdisciplinary research in the fields of contemporary culture, education, memory studies, and democratic transformation.

The practical significance of the findings lies in their potential application to the development of educational programmes aimed at fostering a culture of tolerance, European studies curricula, and university courses in cultural studies, literary studies, media education, and civic education. The results may also contribute to the preparation of teaching and methodological materials for Erasmus+ Jean Monnet projects promoting European values, human rights, non-discrimination, intercultural dialogue, and democratic citizenship.

Directions for future research include further development of the proposed concept of the metamodern culture of tolerance in several complementary directions. First, comparative analyses of Ukrainian and other European literary and cultural responses to war, forced migration, collective trauma, and post-conflict reconstruction appear particularly promising. Second, further research is needed into the relationship between metamodern ethics and contemporary practices of cultural diplomacy, museum and heritage studies, theatre, cinema, and digital culture. Third, considerable scholarly potential lies in investigating the mechanisms through which a culture of tolerance can be fostered within higher education and civil society by means of artistic and cultural practices. Such research may become an important avenue for the further development of contemporary European humanities and for the implementation of international educational initiatives supporting democratic development and Ukraine's post-war recovery.

In conclusion, Ukraine's integration into the European humanitarian space should not be understood as a one-sided process of adopting already established European values. Rather, it represents a process of mutual enrichment within a shared cultural and intellectual space. The experience of contemporary Ukrainian culture – shaped by war, decolonization, and post-traumatic reconstruction – expands the contemporary European understanding of tolerance by incorporating the ethics of care, critical hope, responsible delineation of moral boundaries, and practices of social solidarity. In this respect, contemporary Ukraine contributes not only to the defence of European democratic values but also to their ongoing reinterpretation. This, we argue, constitutes one of Ukraine's most significant humanitarian contributions to the development of a contemporary European culture of tolerance and, more broadly, to the renewal of the European humanistic project.

References

1. Biedarieva, S. (2024). *Ambicoloniality and War: The Ukrainian-Russian Case*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-74077-0>
2. Council of Europe. (2008). *White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue: Living Together as Equals in Dignity*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/intercultural/source/pub_white_paper/white%20paper_final_revised_en.pdf
3. Council of Europe. (2024, October 15). *Council of Europe Congress calls for partnerships to protect Ukraine's cultural heritage*. URL: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/kyiv/-/council-of-europe-congress-calls-for-partnerships-to-protect-ukraine-s-cultural-heritage>
4. European Union. (2012). *Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union: Article 2*. Official Journal of the European Union, C 326, 17. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/treaty/teu_2012/art_2/oj

5. European Union. (2016). *Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union: Article 22 – Cultural, religious and linguistic diversity*. Official Journal of the European Union, C 202, 398. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/treaty/char_2016/art_22/oj
6. European Union. (2016). *Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union: Article 21 – Non-discrimination*. Official Journal of the European Union, C 202, 398. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/treaty/char_2016/art_21/oj
7. Forst, R. (2013). *Toleration in Conflict: Past and Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139051200>
8. Forst, R. (2026). *Toleration*. In E. N. Zalta & U. Nodelman (Eds.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/toleration/>
9. Galeotti, A. E. (2002). *Toleration as Recognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
11. *Metamodernist // Manifesto* [by Luke Turner, 2011]. URL: <https://www.metamodernism.org/>
12. Tronto, J. C. (1993). *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. New York, NY; London: Routledge.
13. Tsilyk, I. (2025). *Tonkyi lid [Thin Ice]*. Chernivtsi: Meridian Czernowitz.
14. Ukrainian Institute, ICOM UK, ICOM Ukraine, Museums Association, & British Council. (2025). *Supporting Decolonisation in Museums: Focus on Ukraine*. <https://www.britishcouncil.org/ua/en/programmes/arts/ukraine-focused-decolonisation-guide-museums>
15. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (1995, November 16). *Declaration of Principles on Tolerance*. Paris, France. UNESCO Legal Affairs. URL: <https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/declaration-principles-tolerance>
16. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2024, June 7). *Ukraine: Nearly 30 States pledge to support UNESCO's efforts in the recovery of the cultural sector*. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ukraine-nearly-30-states-pledge-support-unescos-efforts-recovery-cultural-sector>
17. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (n.d.). *Ethics and Intangible Cultural Heritage*. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/ethics-and-ich-00866>
18. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2024, February 29). *UNESCO funds 14 new projects to support creativity in Ukraine*. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/unesco-funds-14-new-projects-support-creativity-ukraine>
19. Van den Akker, R., Gibbons, A., & Vermeulen, T. (Eds.). (2017). *Metamodernism: Historicity, Affect, and Depth after Postmodernism*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.
20. Vermeulen, T., & van den Akker, R. (2010). *Notes on metamodernism*. *Journal of Aesthetics & Culture*, 2(1), Article 5677. <https://doi.org/10.3402/jac.v2i0.5677>
21. Zembylas, M., & Bozalek, V. (2011). *The Council of Europe's White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue: An analysis using the ethic of care*. *Policy Futures in Education*, 9(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2011.9.1.13>