

*Nataliia Khoma**

Lviv Polytechnic National University

Crowdfunding and Fundraising in the Peacebuilding System: Ukraine's Case

The purpose of the article is to determine the role of co-financing technologies (crowdfunding, fundraising) under the conditions of war and post-war reconstruction. The basis of the study is the case analysis of international support to Ukraine to counter Russian aggression. The central issue of the article is to clarify the acceptability, effectiveness, as well as problems of applying co-financing technologies to solve the problems caused by the war. The existing global experience of using co-financing technologies during wars was studied, the peculiarities of the Ukrainian case were revealed. The advantages, problems and risks of using crowdfunding and fundraising during a full-scale war are identified. The motivation of the public of other states to co-finance the solution or mitigation of the problems caused by Russia's aggression on the territory of Ukraine is ascertained. The research is based on the analysis of projects supporting Ukraine and Ukrainians during the days of the Russian aggression on leading crowdfunding platforms, as well as through fundraising. Crowdfunding and fundraising are considered as forms of remote involvement, elements of digital action repertoires, which are used by the democratic public from all over the world (and in the case of Ukraine, also by government institutions) to convey their position on war and mitigate its consequences. It is concluded that modern technologies of co-financing enable remote involvement of citizens of different states in international conflicts and humanitarian crises caused by these conflicts and wars. The dependence of the use of crowdfunding and fundraising technologies on the type of political regime and the characteristics of political culture of the dominant part of the population is proven.

Introduction

The role, peculiarities of application, effectiveness, risks of co-financing technologies (crowdfunding, fundraising) with a view to mitigate the problems caused by war are a new area of scientific re-

* *Nataliia Khoma*, A Professor at the Department of Political Science and International Relations, Lviv Polytechnic National University. Address: 5 Mytropolyta Andreia St., Room 314, Lviv, Ukraine; tel: +38 096 911 27 79, e-mail: nataliia.m.khoma@lpnu.ua.

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2507-5741>.

<https://doi.org/10.47459/lasr.2023.20.3>

© Nataliia Khoma, 2023

© Military Academy of Lithuania, 2023

search. The purpose of the article is to clarify the role of co-financing technologies (crowdfunding, fundraising) under the conditions of full-scale war. The application of co-financing technologies during Russia's full-scale war on the territory of Ukraine has not been investigated due to the novelty of the problem. In the first months of this armed aggression, a considerable amount of empirical material appeared for conducting such a study. The objects of study are: 1) projects to support the defence and reconstruction of Ukraine in war conditions, which were placed on global crowdfunding and fundraising platforms; 2) other (outside the platforms) methods of co-financing, which were practiced against the background of Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine.

Crowdfunding and fundraising technologies to support the Ukrainian army and the civilian population (internally displaced persons) have been used since 2014, when Crimea was annexed and hostilities began in Donbas. However, in 2022, the appeal for co-financing had a rapid upward trend. The reason for this was the need to find resources as soon as possible in an attempt to strengthen resistance to the Russian aggression, help the civilian population, and prevent the aggressors from achieving their goals.

State institutions in Ukraine make great efforts to oppose the aggressor, support citizens and reconstruct the liberated territories. Nonetheless, a whole system of new problems became an incredible challenge for Ukraine. It is referred to offence and defence in different directions of the front, mine clearing, liquidation of the consequences of military actions and immediate restoration of the infrastructure of the de-occupied territories, provision of all kinds of assistance to the civilian population, etc. Obviously, without support from outside, as well as from its own citizens, Ukraine would not be able to hold the line and simultaneously respond to a large number of requests from the army, healthcare and social protection systems, internally displaced persons, etc.

Ukraine during full-scale Russian invasion is a unique case for scientific analysis, because never before in international practice has resistance to external aggression been financed with such involvement of foreign aid – from partner states, businesses, and the democratic public. This can be seen as the first example in history when defence, aid to the civilian population, reconstruction of the de-occupied territories of the state, as well as a number of other tasks caused by the war, were carried out with the large-scale support of democratic states, the

tertiary sector, caring Ukrainians and the public of other countries of the world. The amount of aid collected in the first months of the war by means of co-financing suggests the significant role played by non-governmental institutions and citizens in the processes of the struggle for peace, as well as the notable ability of governments to contribute to the mobilization of resources.

In the course of the study, the task was set to find out, first of all: 1) how co-financing technologies (non-commercial crowdfunding and fundraising) can be used to support the state and its citizens under conditions of external armed aggression; 2) what the existing global experience of applying crowdfunding and fundraising technologies is and what way the Ukrainian case is special; 3) what advantages, problems and risks emerge during the application of these technologies; 4) what the motivation of the public of other states to co-finance the defence of Ukraine, humanitarian problems, reconstruction of de-occupied territories is, etc.

The reason that crowdfunding and fundraising gained such social importance in wartime is the fact that the defence budget of Ukraine is much smaller than the budget of the Russian Federation. In 2021, according to Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, Ukraine spent 5.9 billion dollars on the army, while Russia spent 65.9 billion dollars. (Marksteiner, Liang, Lopes da Silva, Tian, & Béraud-Sudreau, 2022). Unlike Russia, Ukraine did not plan to fight and did not accumulate resources for it.

Although the range of problems of socio-political crowdfunding and fundraising are not new, the set of issues associated with the use of co-financing technologies during war remains practically unexamined. Our working hypothesis is based on the thesis about the significant role of the public, NGO in peacebuilding by the method of co-financing. The armed aggression against a European state, which is built on democratic principles and has an active civil society, created a unique situation. The issue is that defence against an aggressor, humanitarian and other support in war conditions have become objects of co-financing on a global scale. So far, during wars and conflicts in different parts of the planet, such a scale of public solidarity has not been observed. Therefore, these processes require scientific understanding.

1. The Theoretical and Methodological Fundamentals of Research

Research on co-financing technologies was focused on entrepreneurial crowdfunding, which involved rewarding donors. Most of the studies were conducted within the framework of economic sciences. They were started even before the acquisition of the current scale by various technologies of co-financing (Andreoni, 1989, 1990; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011; Vesterlund, 2006). The motivation of people to support socially significant causes by the method of co-financing was studied (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011; Vesterlund, 2006). In the context of co-financing the consequences of war, research related to empathic concern, indifference, and solidarity is of great importance (Davis, 1994; Mesch, Brown, Moore, & Hayat, 2011; Paulin, Ferguson, Schattke & Jost, 2014; Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010; Boulianne, Minaker & Haney, 2018). Researchers also pointed to various risks associated with ethical and legal problems of the practical application of co-financing technologies (Blanchard & Sabuncu, 2016; Snyder, Mathers, & Crooks, 2016; Hossain & Oparaocha, 2017).

At the same time, interest in civil (Stiver, Barroca, & Minocha, 2015) and political crowdfunding (Selander & Jarvenpaa, 2016; González-Cacheda & Cancela Outeda, 2021) has grown in the last decade. There are currently no studies on the possibilities of crowdfunding and fundraising during the acute phase of war and during post-war reconstruction. Nevertheless, these technologies are included in the digital action repertoires of the social and political life. With their help, the public from different parts of the world, united by common values, accumulates resources for responding to a certain socio-political conflict (even on such a scale as war) and for mitigating its social consequences. This actualizes the study of the role of co-financing technologies under the conditions of war and post-war reconstruction.

Researchers (Boichak, 2017; Boichak & Asmolov, 2021) point to the growing scale of digital participation in a wide range of war-related issues. Considering the co-financing technologies, remote involvement in one or another aspect of the war and its consequences are meant. The concept of 'participative war' (Merrin, 2019) actually refers to the latest forms of remote participation of the democratic public in armed conflicts and wars in any corner of the world thanks to the advanced digital technologies. The technologies of co-financing the war and all the processes connected with it become a way to express one's attitude to these events, to show solidarity with the victims of the war, etc.

Crowdfunding and fundraising are remote forms of involving wide

circles of the public in the resolution of an armed conflict, in the mitigation of its consequences, post-war reconstruction. Thanks to the latest technologies, the two fronts of the war are combined – physical and digital. It is about the fact that nowadays one can be involved in a war, struggle for certain values, support of the civilian population, etc. despite the geographical distance. This is a manifestation of remote solidarity with the population of the country that was subjected to aggression. Co-financing technologies demonstrate how war can be waged not only in the real, but also in the virtual dimension (digital war), as well as how the course of events can be changed owing to co-financing. According to our hypotheses, crowdfunding and fundraising are able to influence the course of armed actions, as well as accelerate post-war recovery.

The research methodology is based on the analysis of support projects for Ukraine and Ukrainians during the days of the Russian aggression, which were organized on leading crowdfunding platforms, as well as by the fundraising method. Empirical material was collected and analysed regarding the crowdfunding projects that were placed during the full-scale military aggression of Russia against Ukraine on platforms Patreon, GoFundMe, Crowdfunder, Indiegogo, Kickstarter. The time frame for the study was the first six months after Russia's full-scale invasion (February – August 2022); it was a very intensive period in co-financing as a response to the war. The platforms that are the largest on a global scale for hosting social, political, human rights, and humanitarian projects were chosen for the investigation. An analysis of which projects received the expected support and which were not financed was carried out. Particular attention was paid to studying the effectiveness of the global fundraising platform United24, as well as other successful fundraising projects in support of Ukraine. During the analysis, attention was focused not only on the speed and volume of the collected assistance, but also on what technologies and tools made specific projects effective.

The study concentrates on the issue of the economic dimension of conflicts and wars. At present, such problems are extremely insufficiently developed, and the Russian-Ukrainian war has actualized their study. The scientific novelty of the conducted research lies in the fact that so far wars have been very limitedly studied in the context of involvement of the general public in their financing. The case of Russian aggression against Ukraine launched the process of expanding the repertoire of collective actions through non-commercial crowdfunding and fundraising. That was the contribution of the democratic public to the peacebuilding process, and the article draws attention to this issue.

2. The World Experience of Co-Financing under the Conditions of War and the Peculiarities of the Ukrainian Case

The involvement of external financing during armed conflicts and wars has been known for a long time. Remote humanitarian participation in response to disasters and conflicts has a rich history that dates back at least a hundred years (Boichak & Asmolov, 2021). Here are some examples. During the Polish-Soviet war of 1919-1920, Polish immigrants donated funds to defeat the Soviet army. American citizens provided funds during the Spanish Civil War of the 1930s.

However, it is in the Ukrainian version that crowdfunding and fundraising: 1) reached substantial dimensions; 2) used a wide range of constantly updated ways to provide support (donations through platforms, cryptocurrency transfers, PayPal, etc.); 3) received great support from the authorities, which also actively promoted their own fundraising projects; 4) really strengthened the stability of the Ukrainian state in countering the external aggression.

In order to show the uniqueness of the Ukrainian case, the world experience of using co-financing technologies in wartime conditions must be considered. Note that there are few such examples. They are by no means on the same scale as the Ukrainian case. However, by mentioning them, we wanted to indicate the presence of such co-financing in a global format.

Hence, some examples can be found in Syria, but the application of co-financing technologies is limited there due to the sanctions of democratic states. Examples include the fund-raising initiative by doctors from the destroyed city of Aleppo. Crowdfunding was the main source of funding for building the children's Hope hospital, near Jarabulus in northern Syria. Crowdfunding was sought by the Avicenna women and children's hospital in Idlib City to complete building works (Beals, 2017).

In 2015, the United Nations World Food Program used crowdfunding tools to finance the feeding of 20,000 Syrian children who found refuge in Jordan. A special Share the Meal mobile application was launched for this purpose. The recourse to co-financing instruments was a consequence of the fact that other UN resources were insufficient in view of the number of refugees from Syria. Crowdfunding was also used to implement educational projects for Syrian children.

Crowdfunding was practiced not so much for the implementation of projects inside Syria, but primarily outside its borders to support Syrian

refugees. In particular, many initiatives for Syria were funded through the activities of the British CanDo platform, created in response to the situation in that country. The GoGetFunding platform accumulates funds for starting schools, reuniting Syrian families, supporting refugees in camps outside of Syria, buying clothes and basic necessities, financing educational projects for Syrian adults, etc. Syrian students turn to the edSeed platform to find funding for higher education.

Our appeal to the case of Syria is explained by the fact that the example of this state very well illustrates the influence of the political regime on the effectiveness of the application of various co-financing technologies. Therefore, if to compare the cases of Syria and Ukraine in terms of the use of co-financing instruments, fundamental differences are obvious. Most of the projects for Syrians, which are based on co-financing, were aimed at their support already outside Syria, for example, in refugee camps in Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey. The Syrian authorities do not show interest in any forms of support for their citizens by the forces of the progressive public of other states. Instead, the situation is radically opposite in Ukraine, because most of the projects concern the support of state institutions and citizens who are in Ukraine. Particular projects are aimed at supporting those who are forced to leave the country. Also, the Ukrainian authorities fully approve various public initiatives based on co-financing, and initiate them themselves. The Ukrainian authorities clearly express their gratitude to everyone who provides support in the emergency situation caused by Russia's aggression.

Differences in the use of co-financing technologies in Ukraine and Russia must also be pointed out. If in Ukraine co-financing has become an important resource of the state for conducting military operations, this cannot be said about Russia, where the army is dependent on the resources of the state. Actually, Russia wages a war at the expense of the state, and in fact at the expense of taxpayers. The culture of non-commercial crowdfunding and fundraising is not developed there, although some politically neutral projects were implemented through co-financing. In Russia, attempts to involve the population in financing the army, "special military operation", fight against "Ukrainian fascists and NATO", etc. have no support. The reasons for the underdevelopment of the culture of co-financing in the Russian society can be seen in the peculiarities of the political regime of Russia and the dominant subject political culture of the population.

The not numerous examples given prove that co-financing is encouraged and has the potential, first of all in the conditions of a democratic state. On the other hand, in the states with non-democratic regimes, the implementation of various co-financing projects is perceived as a threat to the ruling regime. Neo-

authoritarian regimes are hostile to the network society, horizontal interactions of the public of different countries, *grassroots initiatives*, which is what non-profit crowdfunding and fundraising are actually based on.

3. The Role of Crowdfunding Campaigns for the Defence and Restoration of the De-Occupied Territories of Ukraine

Non-commercial projects, associated with armed conflicts and their consequences, were infrequently presented on crowdfunding platforms until 2022. Crowdfunding primarily helped implement projects related to new technologies, small businesses, fashion, music, cinema, etc. Unfortunately, the Russian aggression against Ukraine led to the active use of crowdfunding to co-finance wartime needs and reconstruct the de-occupied territories. The war in Ukraine took crowdfunding campaigns to a new level, where millions of dollars/euros/pounds were raised in a matter of hours. In the case of supporting Ukraine and Ukrainians, donation-based crowdfunding dominates. Rewards-based crowdfunding occurs, but extremely rarely, when backers are thanked with some symbolic item related to Ukraine.

For the tenth year now, Ukraine has been withstanding Russia in the eastern territories of Ukraine, and over the years crowdfunding has been used repeatedly. Many subjects of civil society gained experience in collecting funds for the needs caused by external aggression. However, after Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine crowdfunding (similarly to fundraising) proved itself to be another powerful weapon.

In the system of civic crowdfunding, peacebuilding crowdfunding can be distinguished as a separate subtype. Fundraising projects related to military aggression have the ultimate goal of establishing peace and post-war reconstruction, although they are aimed at the implementation of more specific tasks – the purchase of helmets, medicines, humanitarian aid for refugees, etc.

Crowdfunding under wartime conditions serves to fulfil many tasks – related both to the assistance to the army and purely civilian tasks. The analysis of projects posted on crowdfunding and fundraising platforms in support of Ukraine demonstrated a broad range of projects of various scales. There are multimillion-dollar financial charges for unmanned combat aerial vehicles, radars, etc. Nevertheless, projects with less funding are more represented – for vehicles, generators, mobile field hospitals, modular houses for displaced

persons, rehabilitation of soldiers and civilians, etc. The absolute majority of co-financing projects are grassroots initiatives, but there are also initiatives from government structures (mainly Ukrainian).

Thanks to the funds collected through crowdfunding for the needs primarily related to defence the movement towards peace and sustainability of democratic values is possible. However, most crowdfunding platforms declare the inadmissibility of collecting funds for projects connected with possible violence (during the resistance to the army of the aggressor state). In 2022, many platforms focused on this. Actually, the war in Ukraine became a new challenge for the platforms, because previously funding was not raised for some of the declared needs. Here are the two examples that are associated with the Patreon and GoFundMe platforms.

1. The case “Patreon – Come Back Alive”. The Ukrainian Come Back Alive foundation has been operating to support the Ukrainian army since 2014. For all the years of its operation, the foundation saw its mission in the supply of technologies and equipment to the military, their training, rehabilitation, etc. Through crowdfunding, the organization purchased thermal imaging cameras, unmanned aerial vehicles, tablets with Armor software, and more. Global public support for the fund’s goals grew as tensions in Russian-Ukrainian relations escalated. For example, if in January 2022 the Come Back Alive page on Patreon platform had only 936 visitors, then in February 2022 it already had more than 14,000 supporters. On the very first day of the invasion of the Russian army, Come Back Alive announced new needs that corresponded to the current moment and concerned the financing of the purchase of weapons. In response to the change of tasks of Come Back Alive, the Patreon platform without warning blocked the page of the fund, which at that time had about 250 thousand dollars. The reason for the blocking was the ban on using donations to purchase military equipment. “We don’t allow Patreon to be used for funding weapons or military activity. It is a violation of our policies” (On the removal of Come Back Alive, 2022).

It should be noted that the Come Back Alive foundation did not stop its work after leaving the Patreon crowdfunding platform, but on the contrary intensified it under war conditions. However, the collection is not conducted by the crowdfunding method, but by fundraising. Various money transfer systems are used, including bank cards, SWIFT transfers, Bitcoin, etc. As far as the Patreon platform is concerned, after the removal of the account of the Come Back Alive foundation, other projects in support of Ukraine are implemented here. The analysis of the content of the projects presented in 2022 showed that the greatest support from the beginning of the acute phase of the Russian aggression in Ukraine was given to the initiatives aimed at rehabilitating the

military, supporting independent journalism in wartime, documenting war crimes, rescuing animals, etc.

2. The GoFundMe platform also blocked any fundraising that could contribute to the financing of weapons, supplies to soldiers, and propaganda (GoFundMe, 2022). At the same time, in response to the Russian aggression the GoFundMe platform launched a centralized hub for verified fundraisers looking to raise money for humanitarian aid in Ukraine. The main projects are aimed at helping the victims of war, ranging from support when crossing the state border to living arrangements at the new location, integration into the community of the host country.

The projects that were implemented thanks to crowdfunding during the war in Ukraine have their characteristics. Some of these are:

1) wartime crowdfunding projects, unlike other types of crowdfunding, do not provide for backers' rewards. This is exclusively donation-based crowdfunding;

2) the collected funds, which are transformed into something important for the army or the civilian population, can either be effective in opposing the enemy or fail to bring benefit. For example, an unmanned combat aerial vehicle can destroy many enemy targets, and can be shot down on the first launch. Humanitarian aid may save the civilian population, or it may not reach the recipients and be appropriated by the enemy. Such risks distinguish wartime crowdfunding projects from peacetime projects;

3) the purpose of co-financing the needs caused by war is always a certain social idea, for example, the struggle for peace, democratic values, etc. Therefore, for backers who live even in the other hemisphere of the Earth, crowdfunding is not perceived as sponsoring the war, armed violence, but rather as a contribution to the struggle for certain democratic values, to the prevention of an increase in the scope of war;

4) collective support of various wartime projects raises more ethical issues than other co-financing projects. Many active citizens, who have a developed tradition of social support and experience in co-financing, are morally not ready to financially support those projects that can potentially lead to bloodshed and new victims. In contrast, humanitarian projects do not cause reservations. It is likely that projects for the post-war reconstruction of Ukraine will also be supported.

Crowdfunding to support projects caused by the war in Ukraine has a source of funds not only from citizens of foreign countries, the Ukrainian diaspora, but also from those Ukrainians who remained in their homeland during the war, or emigrated and joined the processes of helping Ukraine.

The disadvantage of crowdfunding is that the rules of operation of

most crowdfunding platforms provide for the return of their donations to the backers if the project does not collect the full amount within the specified time. Also, crowdfunding platforms charge a commission (mostly 3-5% of the project amount) for their services. It is important to note that certain platforms during the war refused their commission as a sign of solidarity with Ukraine, and also extended the deadline for fundraising.

The main crowdfunding platforms (GoFundMe, Crowdfunder, Indiegogo, Kickstarter) were analysed for the purpose of presenting projects there to help Ukraine and Ukrainians under the conditions of the Russian aggression.

The largest number of crowdfunding initiatives in support of Ukraine and Ukrainians were placed on the GoFundMe platform. During the Revolution of Dignity and subsequent tragic events in Ukraine (annexation of Crimea, hostilities in Donbas), this platform was successfully used. Not only were the most projects registered on GoFundMe, but also a significant number of them collected the stated amount. The presented projects were not related to armaments and were not even indirectly aimed at supporting the military. Nevertheless, they covered no less important humanitarian problems: assistance to internally displaced persons within Ukraine; arrangement of temporary shelters for Ukrainians outside of Ukraine; support of media under wartime conditions; provision of medical needs caused by the war; organization of veterinary care, rescue of abandoned animals, etc. Here are some examples:

– the initiative of film actors M. Kunis and A. Kutcher. In March – October 2022, 36.8 million dollars were collected from over 76,000 backers. The main amount was raised in the first days of the project. The funds were transferred to the Flexport organization (delivery of humanitarian aid to refugee locations in Poland, Romania, Hungary, Slovakia and Moldova) and Airbnb (provision of short-term free housing for refugees from Ukraine). This case is an example of a correlation between the success of a crowdfunding project and the personal popularity of those who initiated it, high public trust in them;

– the project of the Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain “Help Ukraine Emergency Appeal”. It is aimed at arranging shelters for displaced persons, food, hygiene products, medicines, organization of counselling and support in crisis situations, etc. More than 2.7 million pounds were raised from almost 40,000 donors.

The Crowdfunder platform even brought the appeal “You are not powerless. You can help the people of Ukraine” to the main page of their site at the beginning of hostilities, and later bookmarked “Donate or fundraise

for Ukraine". By the middle of 2022, 1.7 million pounds were raised for such projects. This platform gained popularity because it supported non-commercial projects without taking commissions. The main directions for raising funds were: purchase of medical equipment; support of persons who crossed the border of Ukraine; funding animal shelters. Crowdfunder registered projects from non-governmental organizations, volunteer structures, and individual citizens who asked for support specifically for their family (the requests concerned mostly the financing of the emigration and settlement of the family in a new country).

According to the estimates, GoFundMe and Crowdfunder became the main crowdfunding platforms where projects in support of Ukraine and Ukrainians were registered. Alternatively, on other platforms, such as Indiegogo, Kickstarter, a few projects related to the war in Ukraine were presented, but most of them did not receive sufficient support. On the Indiegogo platform, projects with a small budget were mainly supported, for example, those aimed at helping animals that lost their owners under war conditions. The Kickstarter platform is focused on artistic, publishing, educational projects, crafts development, and apparently that was the reason why projects related to the war in Ukraine were few and the absolute majority of them did not raise the required amount.

The projects registered by citizens of other states or non-governmental organizations from outside Ukraine were noticed to receive more support on crowdfunding platforms. It is possible that the key factors here are the issues of trust in the organizer of the crowdfunding project. Such conclusions are drawn from the analysis within the same platform of the projects that are very similar in terms of goals, but some of them receive support, while others do not. This allows us to talk about the crucial role not only of foreign activists and famous personalities, but also of the Ukrainian diaspora, which has the potential to effectively implement crowdfunding projects in support of Ukraine.

4. The Use of Fundraising Technology under the Conditions of War and Post-War Reconstruction

While crowdfunding campaigns have a fixed duration (usually 30-45 days), fundraising campaigns can last indefinitely – as long as there is a problem that needs to be funded. The latter is especially important in the case of financing problems of such a scale as the ones caused by war.

Technology made fundraising quick and easy. Cryptocurrency transfers became popular because such transactions take seconds, while international bank payments take days. Applications such as Apple Pay, Venmo, etc. also simplified the sending of funds. Modern banking services make it possible to provide financial support in minutes (Hill, 2022).

Fundraising does not provide for the return of funds to backers if the declared amount has not been collected, but sends assistance in the amount that is available. This can be seen as an obvious advantage over crowdfunding. However, projects presented on large crowdfunding platforms are presented to a large number of citizens of different countries. In the case of fundraising, a special strategy should be developed so that potential donors learn about the project and consider it expedient to financially support it. Therefore, representation of the idea and the organizer, presence of a financial team, active development of relationships based on trust, creation of fundraising events, etc. are important for fundraising. In the case of crowdfunding, the project is represented by a platform.

Traditionally, fundraising projects are initiated by non-governmental organizations and private individuals. But Ukraine during the war showed how state institutions can apply fundraising. The greatest example is the launch of the global fundraising platform United24 by the President of Ukraine V. Zelenskyy. Donations are collected in three main directions: defence and demining; medical aid; rebuild Ukraine. Such an appeal by the authorities, as well as feedback from the world community were evoked by the incredible challenge to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine caused by the Russian invasion. 300 million dollars were received from citizens of 90 countries in the first ten months of operation of the United24 platform.

The success of the United24 platform can be explained by the following facts: 1) it is an official state fundraising platform initiated by the President of Ukraine, which increases trust in it; 2) successful, well-known public figures are involved as ambassadors (athletes, representatives of fashion houses, singers, film directors, famous public personalities, etc.); 3) constant updating of records, demonstration of specific financed needs; 4) broad media and very active advertising support of the platform in countries where the culture of co-financing is developed. It should be noted that we are not aware of other examples where co-financing platforms were created and promoted by heads of state and governments. Obviously, the war in Ukraine is starting many new trends.

Diplomatic institutions of Ukraine actively voiced calls to co-finance the struggle of Ukrainians against the aggressor state. For example, the Embassy of Ukraine to the Czech Republic opened a charity account for the purchase

of military equipment and in the first three weeks of the Russian invasion collected about 30 million dollars from 100,000 donors in different countries. The Embassy of Ukraine to the United Kingdom initiated the creation and administration of the fundraising platform WithUkraine. During the four months of the war, for more than 30 million raised pounds the necessary things (armoured ambulances, industrial electricity generators, first aid kits, etc.) were purchased and transferred to Ukraine for the army and the civilian population. These are only a few examples when Ukrainian government officials turned to fundraising during the war. In general, Ukrainian diplomats demonstrated many innovative approaches, which were generated by the military aggression against Ukraine.

Ukraine attracted large resources in cryptocurrency to fight against the Russian aggression. The request for the donation of crypto-assets came from the Ukrainian government and was announced via Twitter almost immediately after the Russian invasion (Ukraine government organization, 2022). Ukraine demonstrated that both the public and state institutions can be initiators of fundraising. The most ambitious initiatives regarding financial and other support of Ukraine during the war came from the state institutions (the United24 platform, the National Bank of Ukraine, etc.). This in no way underestimates the efforts of the public, but only proves the emergence of co-financing technologies at the state level. Hence, the Ukrainian authorities resorted to co-financing technologies, which previously were usually practiced by actors of civil society and individual citizens to mobilize resources for various types of needs.

From the first day of the war, non-governmental foundations, non-governmental organizations, both Ukrainian and foreign, joined the processes of collecting financial, humanitarian and other assistance to the army and the civilian population. The sums that were accumulated for the fight against the aggressor indicate the great influence and social role of fundraising for the support of Ukraine. It is noteworthy that large inflows of funds became a serious test for the initiators, because it was important not only to accumulate funds, but also to promptly purchase and deliver everything necessary. The most notable are the Ukrainian charitable foundations Come Back Alive, Charity foundation of Serhiy Prytula, Kyiv School of Economics Foundation, People's Project, American foundation Razom, non-governmental organization Nova Ukraine and others. Collection of funds is carried out through SWIFT transfers in various currencies, Bitcoin wallet, direct transfers in the national currency of Ukraine, etc. The collected funds are primarily intended for military hospitals, the purchase of thermal imaging cameras, vehicles, unmanned aerial vehicles, copters, assault landing equipment, etc.

After the end of the Russo-Ukrainian War, there will be a need for huge resources to reconstruct the country. The donor conferences held during the war were the first steps in the long-term process of restoring Ukraine. For example, during the high-level international donor conference (Warsaw, May 5, 2022) on fundraising for Ukraine, 6.5 billion dollars were raised. This is only one of the examples that can be seen as co-financing organized not at the private level, but at the highest public level. These co-financing formats arise as a response to the scale of the problem, which the democratic world has not encountered yet.

Note that non-commercial crowdfunding and fundraising are not the only technologies for co-financing the struggle for peace and values of democracy. There are other ways of accumulating resources with their subsequent transfer to the needs of the army, the affected civilian population, etc. Various auctions, charity evenings, marathons, etc. – everything was subordinated to the task of collecting financial and other assistance to Ukraine. For instance, in March 2022, a unique anti-war painting by the British underground artist Banksy, provided by an anonymous donor, was sold at an auction in London for 81,000 pounds, and the proceeds were donated to the Ohmatdyt Children's Hospital. There are many other examples: athletes auction their awards and ammunition, artists – their paintings, authors of famous literary works – autographed books, President V. Zelenskyy – his embroidered shirt and the clothes in which he met B. Johnson, etc. Boxing belts, balls and football boots, meetings with famous personalities, items with autographs of popular singers, etc. – these are typical lots, with the help of which funds are accumulated. Even the Ukrainian public procurement platform Prozorro+ is used to conduct charity auctions in support of the army and for the humanitarian needs of Ukrainians. State institutions, creative industry, influencers, etc. make enormous efforts to maintain support for Ukraine.

5. The Motivational Component of the Implementation of Co-Financing Technologies under the Conditions of Armed Aggression in Ukraine

Talking about the co-financing technologies used to support Ukraine, both support from outside and from within the state are meant. In the case of Ukrainians, the motivation to invest in the stability of the state is clear – to defend independence, to protect the native land. The result of such a serious motivation is that, despite the war with its devastating social consequences,

Ukrainians allocate financial and other resources to the needs of the army and those who are forced to leave their place of residence due to armed actions. It is enough to mention the all-Ukrainian project “People’s Bayraktar”, when 600 million hryvnias were collected in a few days for the purchase of four Bayraktar TB2 unmanned combat aerial vehicles. The largest fundraisers were held under slogans such as “revenge” and were a reaction to some high-profile event, such as a massive rocket attack with numerous civilian casualties and destruction of critical infrastructure. But, if Lithuanians, Poles, Canadians, Norwegians, etc. raise money for the same drone for Ukraine, the motivation is different here.

When it comes to co-financing of start-ups and business initiatives, the level of trust in those seeking funds and the reputational capital accumulated by them are important in such projects (Ottoni-Wilhelm, Vesterlund, & Xie, 2017; Vesterlund 2006). However, war creates a different reality where there is a different motivation for providing support. It is primarily in the plane of values and solidarity. Citizens from different countries who donated in one way or another to support Ukraine and Ukrainians explain their actions differently. For some, it is an investment in the security of their state, for others, it is an opportunity to protest against Russia’s actions, for the third – to show their solidarity with the people of Ukraine.

The readiness of citizens from various states to support Ukraine in its armed resistance to Russia is also based on hypotheses about the possible expansion of the Russian aggression beyond the borders of Ukraine. Consequently, investment in Ukraine’s struggle becomes a way to prevent the expansion of Russia’s imperial ambitions. It is about investing in peace and solving other important issues, such as: the food crisis, rising prices for oil and gas resources, declining incomes, ecocide, the threat to use nuclear weapons, etc. Generally, it is referred to investing in security, stability and democratic values, which are currently very vulnerable. The world community looks comprehensively at all the destructive consequences that the Russo-Ukrainian War has for the planet.

The degree of remote involvement of the public in the processes of peacebuilding and support for war victims and post-war reconstruction is determined by various factors. For example, these are personal ties, remote suffering, and identity and expressions of patriotism. In this context, the question of whether compassion goes viral is relevant (Boulianne et al., 2018). It can be assumed that those who donate have a strong conviction that their actions contribute to something faithful and in such a remote way they resist injustice and possible new threats. Their actions are actually one of the newest forms of manifesting their identity.

Any armed conflicts are widely covered in the media and cause a powerful response. The reaction to this can be a wide range of emotions of the public and depends on the system of values, the level of social capital. Thanks to donations, citizens form or confirm the identity of a “caring citizen” who replies to someone else’s need. War, genocide, waves of refugees, massive violations of human rights, etc. create a background when even territorially very distant communities of people demonstrate care and support. In the context of the above, it is important to deepen the study of the identity of a “caring citizen” and the factors that influence the formation of this identity.

What can motivate to be indifferent to the problems that arise in another state? Obviously, it is about the values that form a culture of donating. Any form of co-financing, charity under the conditions of conflicts and wars is based on empathy and care. Empathic concern is a manifestation of affection and compassion in response to the needs of others. The principle of care is related to the moral obligation to help others in need.

The war and a wide range of its consequences (humanitarian, economic, geopolitical, etc.) are the triggers of people’s reactions to these events, particularly in terms of financial assistance. The picture of the war broadcast by the media and social networks causes a strong emotional outburst, activates manifestations of empathy and solidarity, including in regard to financial support.

Although Ukraine receives huge military, humanitarian, etc. assistance from the governments of democratic states from all over the world, various co-financing campaigns at the public level strengthen the resilience of Ukraine and Ukrainians. This is a manifestation of democratic solidarity, when communities in different corners of the world understand the nature of armed aggression, its consequences not only for an individual state, but also on a global scale.

The main assistance to Ukraine and Ukrainians came from the states and their citizens, where a democratic regime functions, a high level of activist political culture, various social interactions are widely practiced, etc. Consequently, first of all, North America, EU countries, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan implement various strategies of co-financing the struggle for peace. Meanwhile, the states and the public of other regions of the planet remained practically aloof or latently/openly took a pro-Russian position. Co-financing technologies clearly marked the fault line between the world of democracy and the world based on neo-authoritarian/neo-totalitarian values. Communities with a weak civil society, undeveloped activist type of political culture do not turn to technologies of co-financing the socio-political projects.

Note that despite the great motivation of Ukrainians, their ability to support various projects declines with each subsequent month of the war. The prerequisites are the decrease or loss of income during the war, which was preceded by a prolonged economic downturn under the conditions of the coronavirus pandemic. This results in the fact that the subjects of crowdfunding and fundraising are more and more often foreign backers, and the Ukrainian public places more emphasis on volunteering.

6. Risks of Non-Commercial Crowdfunding and Fundraising

The collection of funds from all over the world for the needs of Ukraine sharpened attention to the security aspect of such assistance. Fake aid collections, various frauds, embezzlement of humanitarian aid followed by its sale, etc., were recorded. Although such crimes are not massive, but are isolated, it is important to talk about them and develop effective countermeasures at the level of state institutions and society. A timely response to various types of dishonesty will increase the credibility of co-financing technologies.

On the one hand, supporting a country that opposes the external aggression is crucial for improving the quality of democracy and consolidating the public around progressive values. On the other hand, an emergency situation (war) increases various risks in the course of using the co-financing technologies. It primarily refers to the guarantees of integrity of those who initiate the collection of aid. Questions arise as to how responsible the initiators of aid collection are, how transparent their reporting will be, etc. Obviously, it is impossible to completely ensure that the collected resources will not be used for dishonest purposes.

The war on the territory of Ukraine brought many actors to the dimension of non-commercial crowdfunding and fundraising. The reputation of many was unformed due to the recent appearance, already after the open invasion of the Russian army into Ukraine. At the same time, since 2014, Ukrainians used crowdfunding and fundraising tools to support the army and internally displaced persons. Since that time, various foundations, non-governmental organizations have been functioning, which have accumulated reputational capital through transparent activities in the areas of helping the army, displaced persons, etc. For example, the Come Back Alive foundation and the public initiative Army SOS have been operating continuously since 2014.

Still, some projects that are placed on fundraising platforms cause concern. For example, on the Crowdfunder platform, funds were raised for an inflatable boat that a young man from Ukraine could use to cross the border to Moldova (Crowdfunder, 2022). Taking into account the fact that the martial law is in force in Ukraine, the departure of men over 60 years of age is prohibited, except for a few reasons. Therefore, such a project contradicted the legislation of Ukraine and probably contributed to the commission of an illegal act. This type of initiative on various platforms is not unique and platforms should be more careful about the legality of the projects that will be placed on them.

Conclusions

After February 24, 2022, the fragility and vulnerability of peace became evident to citizens of democratic states, the absolute majority of whom lived their whole lives under conditions of peace. This resulted in the democratic community's awareness of the need to fight for peace and invest in it. With the Russian invasion of Ukraine, the financing of defence issues and a wide range of problems caused by the war reached a new level – with the involvement of many states, organizations and the democratic public, Ukraine has become a platform where, under the conditions of a bloody confrontation between democracy and authoritarianism, new formats of international interactions are quickly tested. Crowdfunding and fundraising have become one of the pillars on which the defence of Ukraine, assistance to the army and the civilian population rest.

The topic of co-financing the peacebuilding was intensified after Russia's open military invasion of Ukraine. Until now, other armed conflicts in different parts of the world and even the situation in Ukraine in 2014-2021 have not received such a reaction from governments and the public. The main reasons for this are: 1) there has been no armed conflict of this scale in democratic states for a long time, and the military invasion of Russia caused a great shock, and then empathy; 2) Ukrainians made great efforts to mobilize the world community for their support; 3) nowadays technologies have reached such a level that it is very easy to provide financial support if desired; as a result, the presence of motivation comes to the fore.

The Ukrainian case of anti-war, peacebuilding crowdfunding and fundraising is unique. Its peculiarity is that the initiative to collect funding comes not only from socially active citizens and non-governmental organizations, but also from the state, its institutions (head of state, government institutions,

diplomatic institutions, etc.), local self-government bodies, etc.

The case of supporting Ukraine proves that despite the obvious problems with the quality of democracy, the value of peace is very significant for the public, and the culture of public activism is strengthening. Digital communication technologies have made it possible for every concerned citizen to express their position on a particular armed conflict. Obviously, a new model of participation of the democratic public in the struggle for peace and democracy is being formed.

The main directions of supporting Ukraine and Ukrainians through crowdfunding and fundraising during the war were:

- 1) assistance to the army and territorial defence forces: equipment, ammunition, medicines, vehicles, drones, radars, demining equipment, etc.;
- 2) humanitarian aid to those who were forced to leave the territory of Ukraine or moved to relatively safe regions within the state: food, transportation, hygiene products, temporary housing, medicines, modular houses, rehabilitation of victims, animal feed, etc.;
- 3) humanitarian supplies to the civilian population that remained in the areas of hostilities, financial and logistical assistance in evacuation;
- 4) support projects for Ukrainians who applied for temporary protection in other states: organization of language courses, projects aimed at integration into the social environment of other states, etc.;
- 5) infrastructural reconstruction of liberated territories, housing, communication systems, restoration of destroyed power grids, bridges, etc.;
- 6) financing the arrangement of specialized rehabilitation centres for soldiers and civilians affected by the war.

The mentioned directions are far from representing the whole range of projects, the emergence of which was caused by the war. Co-financing has become one of the most efficient ways to resolve one or another urgent problem, since it is impossible to solve so many new problems at the same time with state funds under the conditions of war.

The co-financing of the struggle of Ukraine and Ukrainians against the Russian aggressor can be considered as a contribution of governments and the public of various states to their security. This is an opportunity to prevent the acceleration of inflation, the aggravation of the food problem, to reduce the burden caused by refugees and those seeking temporary protection, etc. through collective efforts. In fact, financial and other support for Ukraine and Ukrainians is a contribution of citizens of democratic states to their secure future.

Reward for those who co-finance the projects to help Ukraine is non-materialized: a peaceful sky, the opportunity to travel freely, loved ones

without bodily injuries and psycho-emotional trauma, life without air alarms, etc. Of course, this can also be given a materialized form: intact housing, a functioning office, an active sports club, airports with regular flights, functioning institutions of education, culture and health care, etc. These are the usual characteristics of the life of a modern person, which are taken away by the aggressor state at one point, and their defence takes place in various ways, including co-financing the fight against the aggressor states.

The Russian aggression activated many processes – geopolitical, socio-cultural, economic, etc. Solidarity or consolidation of the democratic public in counteracting the new non-democratic challenges, including through the co-financing technologies, became one of the consequences. There is an expectation that this will positively affect the quality of democracy.

References

Andreoni, J. (1989). Giving with Impure Altruism: Applications to Charity and Ricardian Equivalence. *Journal of Political Economy*, 97(6), 1447-1458.

Andreoni, J. (1990). Impure Altruism and Donations to Public Goods: A Theory of Warm-glow Giving. *The Economic Journal*, 100(401), 464-477. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2234133>.

Beals, E. (2017, May 11). Doctors Resort to Crowdfunding Syrian Hospitals as Red Tape Locks Aid Money. *The Guardian*.

Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). A Literature Review of Empirical Studies of Philanthropy: Eight Mechanisms That Drive Charitable Giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(5), 924-973. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764010380927>.

Blanchard, A., & Sabuncu, E. (2016). Recommendations of the Ethics Committee of the French Research Institute for Development on Crowdfunding: Potential and Limits. *Natures Sciences Sociétés*, 24(2), 154-159. <https://doi.org/10.1051/nss/2016015>.

Boichak, O. (2017). Battlefield Volunteers: Mapping and Deconstructing Civilian Resilience Networks in Ukraine. In 8th International Conference on Social Media and Society. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3097286.3097289>.

Boichak, O., & Asmolov, G. (2021). Crowdfunding in Remote Conflicts: Bounding the Hyperconnected Battlefields. In 22nd AoIR Selected Papers of Internet Research. [https://doi: 10.5210/spir.v2021i0.12147](https://doi:10.5210/spir.v2021i0.12147).

Boulianne, S., Minaker, J., & Haney, T. J. (2018). Does Compassion Go Viral? Social Media, Caring, and the Fort McMurray Wildfire. *Information, Communication & Society*, 21(5), 697-711. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2018.1428651>.

Davis, M. H. (1994). *Empathy: A Social Psychological Approach*. Brown & Benchmark Publishers.

GoFundMe (2022). Answering Your Questions on How to Fundraise for Ukraine Relief. <https://www.gofundme.com/en-ie/c/blog/answering-your-questions-on-how-to-fundraise-for-ukraine-relief>.

González-Cacheda, B., & Cancela Outeda, C. (2021). Political crowdfunding and resource mobilization for collective action: The keys to success. *Technology in Society*, 67, <https://doi:10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101743>.

Gooch, D., Kellyc, R.M., Stivera, A. et al. (2020). The Benefits and Challenges of Using Crowdfunding to Facilitate Community-led Projects in the Context of Digital Civics. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 134, 33-43. <https://doi:10.1016/j.ijhcs.2019.10.005>.

Crowdfunder (2022). Save Vlad's family. <https://www.crowdfunder.co.uk/p/save-vlads-family>

Hill, A. (2022, March 10). Ukraine Humanitarian Crisis: What is the Most Effective Way to Help? *The Guardian*.

Hossain, M., & Oparaocha, G.O. (2017). Crowdfunding: Motives, Definitions, Typology and Ethical Challenges. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 7(2). <https://doi:10.1515/erj-2015-0045>.

Khoma, N. (2015). Technologies of Political (Socio-political) Crowdsourcing and Crowdfunding: World Experience and Steps Towards Implementation in Ukraine. *Torun International Studies*, 1(8), 49-60. <https://doi.org/10.12775/TIS.2015.005>.

Khoma, N. (2017). Revolutionary and Military Crowd-sourcing and Crowd-funding Practices of Social Political Activism (Based on the Ukraine's Example of 2014-2016). *Studium Europy Srodkowej i Wschodniej*, 8, 84-100.

Khoma, N., & Vdovychyn, I. (2022). Socio-Political Crowdfunding as the Latest Philosophy of Cooperation and Solidarity. *Modern Historical and Political*, 45, 186-192. <https://doi:10.31861/mhpi2022.45.186-192>.

Khurana, I. (2021). Legitimacy and Reciprocal Altruism in Donation-Based Crowdfunding: Evidence from India. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 14(5), 194. <https://doi:10.3390/jrfm14050194>.

Mancini, F. (ed.) (2013). *New Technology and the Prevention of Violence and Conflict*. New York: International Peace Institute.

Marksteiner, A., Liang, X., Lopes da Silva, D., Tian, N., & Béraud-Sudreau, L. (2021). Trends in World Military Expenditure, 2021. SIPRI. <https://>

doi.org/10.55163/DZJD8826.

McCarthy, J., & Zald, M. (1977). Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82 (6), 1212-1241.

Merrin, W. (2018). *Digital War: A Critical Introduction*. Routledge.

Mesch, D. J., Brown, M. S., Moore, Z. I., & Hayat, A. D. (2011). Gender Differences in Charitable Giving. *International Journal of Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 16(4), 342-355. <https://doi: 10.1002/nvsm.432>.

Ottoni-Wilhelm, M., Vesterlund, L., & Xie, H. (2017). Why Do People Give? Testing Pure and Impure Altruism. *American Economic Review*, 107(11), 3617-3633. <https://doi: 10.1257/aer.20141222>.

Paulin, M., Ferguson, R. J., Schattke, K., & Jost, N. (2014). Millennials, Social Media, Prosocial Emotions, and Charitable Causes: The Paradox of Gender Differences. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 26, 335-353. <https://doi: 10.1080/10495142.2014.965069>.

Selander, L., & Jarvenpaa, S. (2016). Digital action repertoires and transforming a social movement organization. *MIS Quarterly*, 40(2), 331-352. <https://doi: 10.25300/MISQ/2016/40.2.03>.

Snyder, J., Mathers, A., & Crooks, V.A. (2016). Fund My Treatment! A Call for Ethics-Focused Social Science Research into the Use of Crowdfunding for Medical Care. *Social Science & Medicine*, 169, 27-30. <https://doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.09.024>.

Sommerfeldt, E. J. (2013). Online power resource management: activist resource mobilization, communication strategy, and organizational structure. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 25 (4), 347-367. <https://doi:10.1080/1062726X.2013.806871>.

Stiver, A., Barroca, L., Minocha, S. et al. (2015). Civic Crowdfunding Research: Challenges, Opportunities, and Future Agenda. *New Media & Society*, 17(2), 249-271. <https://doi: a10.1177/1461444814558914>.

Ukraine government organization [@Ukraine]. (2022, February 26). Stand with the people of Ukraine. Now accepting cryptocurrency donations. [Tweet]. Twitter. Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/Ukraine/status/1497594592438497282>.

Vesterlund, L. (2006). Why Do People Give? In W. W. Powell, & R. Steinberg (Eds.), *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook* (2nd ed., pp. 568-587). Yale University Press.

Wilhelm, M.O., & Bekkers, R. (2010). Helping Behavior, Dispositional Empathic Concern, and the Principle of Care. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 73(1), 11-32. <https://doi: 10.1177/0190272510361435>.