

КАНСЕЛЛИНГ КАК СОЦИАЛЬНЫЙ ФЕНОМЕН: ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЙ АСПЕКТ

В. А. СИМХОВИЧ¹⁾, Д. И. НАУМОВ²⁾

¹⁾Белорусский государственный экономический университет,
пр. Партизанский, 26, 220070, г. Минск, Беларусь

²⁾Белорусская государственная академия связи, ул. Ф. Скорины, 8/2, корп. 1, г. Минск, Беларусь

Рассматривается канселлинг, представляющий собой совокупность социальных практик, посредством которых общество или его часть оказывают социальное давление на индивида, группу или организацию. Показываются основные формы и цели канселлинга в разных сферах, обосновывается необходимость его междисциплинарного исследования. Феномен канселлинга изучается в разных теоретических рамках. Конфликтологическая трактовка канселлинга делает акцент на борьбе акторов за материальные и нематериальные ресурсы, преимущественно в нелегальных формах. Отмечается потенциальная опасность данного явления для экономических и трудовых отношений. В политико-дискурсивном аспекте канселлинг рассматривается с точки зрения культурного сопротивления маргинальных групп структурному насилию, когда сложно призвать к ответственности представителей элиты в силу их привилегированного положения. Демонстрируются особенности развития канселлинга в современном обществе: нормативная размытость его практик, отсутствие инновационного потенциала и возможности радикально изменить социальные отношения в современном обществе, невысокая результативность и имитационный характер; перенос нормативных оснований социальных практик меньшинств в универсалистский контекст и установление привилегий для представителей отдельных сообществ, социальная избирательность и экономическая мотивированность. Делается вывод о том, что следствием экспансии канселлинга в экономическую, политическую и культурную сферы современного общества становится инициирование процессов, опасных для социального развития. Отмечается, что практики канселлинга не только формируют пространство возможностей и социокультурных инноваций для человека, но и создают существенные препятствия для его профессиональной и иной деятельности. Для общества канселлинг становится источником конфликтогенных процессов. Вместо борьбы с реальными причинами и факторами социального угнетения он создает новые идеологические основания и механизмы дискриминации.

Ключевые слова: канселлинг; социальные практики; объекты канселлинга; социальное давление; социальные медиа.

Образец цитирования:

Симхович ВА, Наумов ДИ. Канселлинг как социальный феномен: теоретический аспект. *Журнал Белорусского государственного университета. Социология*. 2022;4:71–79 (на англ.).
<https://doi.org/10.33581/2521-6821-2022-4-71-79>

For citation:

Simkhovich VA, Naumau DI. Cancelling as a social phenomenon: theoretical aspect. *Journal of the Belarusian State University. Sociology*. 2022;4:71–79.
<https://doi.org/10.33581/2521-6821-2022-4-71-79>

Авторы:

Валентина Александровна Симхович – доктор социальных наук, профессор; профессор кафедры экономической социологии и психологии предпринимательской деятельности Института социально-гуманитарного образования.

Дмитрий Иванович Наумов – кандидат социологических наук, доцент; ученый секретарь.

Authors:

Valentina A. Simkhovich, doctor of science (sociology), full professor; professor at the department of economic sociology and psychology of entrepreneurship, Institute of Social Science and Humanities Education.

simkhovich_v@mail.ru

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3831-6118>

Dzmitry I. Naumau, PhD (sociology), docent; scientific secretary.

cedrus2014@mail.ru

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2508-0361>

CANCELLING AS A SOCIAL PHENOMENON: THEORETICAL ASPECT

V. A. SIMKHOVICH^a, D. I. NAUMAU^b

^aBelarus State Economic University, 26 Partyzanski Avenue, Minsk 220070, Belarus

^bBelarus State Academy of Communications, 8/2 F. Skaryna Street, 1 building, Minsk 220076, Belarus

Corresponding author: V. A. Simkhovich (simkhovich_v@mail.ru)

Cancelling is considered as a totality of social practices used by the society or its part to force social pressure on an individual, group, community or organisation. The main forms and goals of cancelling in various spheres of society are identified, the need for its interdisciplinary research on the methodological basis is given grounds for. The phenomenon of cancelling is considered in different theoretical frameworks. The conflictological interpretation of cancelling focuses on the actors' struggle for material and non-material resources that unfolds mainly in illegal forms. Due to its great destructive potential cancelling is highlighted as a potential danger to economic and labour relations. The political-discursive interpretation considers the phenomenon from the viewpoint of cultural resistance to structural violence undertaken by the marginal groups when it is difficult to call the representatives of elite groups to account due to their privileged position. Designated are some features of development of the phenomenon of cancelling in a modern society: normative blurring of cancelling practices, lack of innovative potential and ability to radically change social relations in a modern society, low efficiency and imitative nature of cancelling practices, transfer of the normative foundations of the minorities' social practices into a universalist context and establishment of privileges for representatives of certain communities, social selectivity and economic motivation of cancelling with the representatives of elite communities. It is recognised that cancelling expansion into the economic, political and cultural spheres of a modern society results in initiating the processes which can be dangerous for its development. Cancelling practices do not only create opportunities and socio-cultural innovations for an individual, but also cause significant problems and obstacles for his professional and other activities. For the society as a whole, cancelling is becoming a source of conflict processes that, instead of fighting the real causes and factors of social oppression, creates new ideological grounds and mechanisms for discrimination.

Keywords: cancelling; social practices; objects of cancelling; social pressure; social media.

Introduction

From the societal perspective, globalisation is a factor of generating qualitatively new social phenomena, institutions and social practices. Their timely theoretical reflection and correct conceptualisation represent a certain intellectual challenge for modern social and humanitarian knowledge. Cancel culture is one of such phenomena, and the practice of cancelling is its mode of expression in the system of social relations. The contradictory and conflicting nature of the given phenomenon makes it relevant and interesting as the object of research both in applied and theoretical aspects.

In the applied aspect, the main problem of cancelling is its instrumentalisation to achieve certain goals and promote group interests in the political, socio-cultural, marketing and media spheres. For a modern society, the consequences of instrumentalisation of the phenomenon are of contradictory significance, because they do not only create socio-cultural innovations, but also generate risks and challenges for its institutional and regulatory framework. As the Polish sociologist M. Krajewski notes, the main danger resulted from the ideological disputes over cancelling lies in creating a situation of sustainable conflict, culture war over the interpretation of fundamental meanings and values [1, s. 203].

In the political sphere, cancelling serves chiefly an implicit ideological rationale of liberal nature which is

used to politically mobilise a certain part of the country's population. As the latest political practice shows, such an ideological discourse is popular mainly among the supporters of various versions of liberalism. Cancelling is made use of both during national or regional electoral campaigns, and as a component of political pressure on opponents or various elite groups in a broader socio-political context.

As for the marketing field, cancelling is applied to segment the consumer audience. On the one hand, it can be implemented by designing the fashion and manipulative imposing of certain brands, groups of goods or types of services on consumers. Under a modern global society, their public and articulated consumption becomes an element of an individual lifestyle and a component of the individual's social status who claims or actually occupies a high position in the social stratification pyramid. On the other hand, cancelling can serve an instrument of unfair competition which is used to boycott certain producers of goods and services and related products.

In the media space, cancelling is used to manipulate the audience, drawing the viewers' attention to a particular public person or social process. It can provide not only a decrease, but also an increase in the rating of a particular TV-program, Internet resource or media publication which determines the cost of advertising

and, accordingly, their financial profit from activities in the media sphere. Personalised cancelling enables to draw attention to the famous figures in a modern show business, popular culture, political and economic establishment. Thus, for media characters, spontaneous or intentional victimisation implemented within the semantic and value framework of cancelling can be an element of an individual PR-strategy. The strategy can be realised to increase their symbolic capital in the mode of media fame, even scandalous, with its subsequent conversion into financial or political capital. An example is «cancellation» of the American rapper K. West, who was «cancelled» by the audience in 2018. The reason for it was his photo in a cap with the inscription «Make America Great Again» published on *Twitter* and the fact that he called D. Trump his brother. As D. Trump's activities were controversially assessed both in the United States of America and abroad, such an emphatically public step resulted in K. West' losing about 9 mln followers on *Twitter* who unsubscribed from the rapper. Another example is «cancellation» of the Russian TV host and blogger R. Todorenko. Once she said that she did not understand women who publicly talk about their experiences of domestic violence. Several brands broke off advertising contracts with R. Todorenko. But when the wave of outrage subsided, it turned out that the number of R. Todorenko's subscribers increased by half a million that is known to increase the blogger's income.

In the socio-cultural space, cancelling acts as a source of generation of cultural meanings, moral norms and

imperatives that claim to be universal for the entire human civilisation. This cultural and axiological complex is perceived as a fashionable mainstream by mass culture industry, therefore it is actively replicated and popularised by the media. In the global urbanised world, they actually constitute the framework for the group and individual life of a contemporary inhabitant.

In the theoretical aspect, of interest is conceptualisation of cancelling by creating a theoretical framework that can reliably and adequately describe both the social phenomenon and its development trends. This scheme should be based on rational methodological principles and theoretical methods. It involves defining of common and distinctive conceptual features, their relationship, and analytical describing within certain epistemological frameworks. On the one hand, all this should make it possible to effectively structure the empirical information, create epistemological conditions for its correct theoretical interpretation and integration into the system of modern social and humanitarian knowledge. On the other hand, such a methodological procedure explicates the possible parameters and socio-cultural mechanisms for changing the reference field of social communities which made use of cancelling in their own interests.

The purpose of the article is to analytically describe the social phenomenon of cancelling, identify and characterise the mechanisms for promoting the discourse of cancel culture and practices of cancelling in a modern society.

Materials and methods of research

Recently, cancel culture has become a regular object of study for Western researchers, but it is out of the native scientists' focus yet. The latter is due to some reasons: novelty of the phenomenon for the post-Soviet space, unclear nature and mechanism of its origin, complex and contradictory nature of the empirical material, politicisation of cancelling in socio-political relations etc. Understanding of cancelling as a product of a global urbanised society requires the construction of a heuristic analytical model that should reveal the sources, factors and mechanism of its development. Specificity of the object under study implies a task to systematise theoretical ideas about cancelling and analytically describe social practices corresponding to it. Constructing of such a model determines the relevance and scientific novelty of the given research.

Its theoretical framework is the conception of social practices as being treated in versions by H. Garfinkel, P. Bourdieu and A. Giddens, and conception of social capital by P. Bourdieu. Taken together, they provide the methodological principles, a categorical apparatus and schemes of theoretical analysis enabling to structure heterogeneous empirical material and create a scientific picture of cancelling as the phenomenon.

From an epistemological point of view, social practices are a concept that reveals a post-non-classical understanding of sociality and identifies the fundamental role of unconscious knowledge and routine acts of human activity in maintaining the social life, order and stability in a modern society. Currently, in socio-humanitarian knowledge there are three main theories wherein social practices are considered as a basic research tool to study modern social processes and phenomena: ethnomethodology by H. Garfinkel, structuralist constructivism by P. Bourdieu, and structuration theory by A. Giddens.

In the ethno-methodological theoretical scheme by H. Garfinkel social practices are considered as a totality of specific ordinary recurred actions of individuals and groups. In the society they ensure both stability, reproduction, mass character and normativity of the role models of behaviour, and sustainable functioning of the social institutions. Social practices are open, observable, interconnected and reflexive, when «the activities whereby members produce and manage settings of organised everyday affairs are identical with members' procedures for making those settings «accountable»» [2, p. 1]. H. Garfinkel continues that «such practices consist of an endless, ongoing, contingent

accomplishment; that they are carried on under the auspices of, and are made to happen as events in the same ordinary affairs that in organising they describe; that the practices are done by parties to those settings whose skill with, knowledge of, and entitlement to the detailed work of that accomplishment – whose competence – they obstinately depend upon, recognise, use, and take for granted; and that they take their competence for granted itself furnishes parties with a setting's distinguishing and particular features, and of course it furnishes them as well as resources, troubles, projects, and the rest» [2, p. 1–2]. In the functional aspect, social practices form the activity basis of the social order and act as a kind of markers outlining the space of an individual's life activity and his resource base.

In the theory of structuralist constructivism by P. Bourdieu social practices are considered as automated interpretive mechanisms that characterise the ability of social actors to correlate their own behavioural acts with the dominant public ideas about the surrounding reality. Therefore, to a certain extent, they determine the way of thinking and behaviour of individuals, who in their life should be guided by the normative requirements for role models of behaviour and account for their own resource endowment. On the one hand, individuals' conscious and expedient actions aimed at transforming the social world or their own lives act as social practices. To a certain extent, they determine the direction of social change, quality and intensity of transformation of the social structures and social life. On the other hand, everyday automated routine actions that are not reflected by the individual can also act as social practices that automatically reproduce the normative order of the society. From P. Bourdieu's viewpoint, for understanding social practices *habitus* are of particular importance. He interprets them as the systems of stable and transferable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, i. e. as the principles that generate and arrange practices and ideas. They can be objectively adapted to their goal but without a manifested focus on it and without the indispensable mastery of the operations needed to achieve it [3, p. 102–103]. At the same time, one should not only take into account the functional significance of *habitus* that forms the agent's multiple practices as his mechanisms of adaptation to the system of social relations of a particular society. *Habitus* can also have a socially constructive significance which means that members of a particular community have a common *habitus* as a system of dispositions common to all outcomes of the same determinations. P. Bourdieu believes that social practices have a dual structure because they are not only determined by the social environment but also directly affect this environment, changing its structure [4, p. 30–31].

In the theory of structuration by A. Giddens, social practices in a modern society act as the grounds for both the actor's activity and parameters of the social

objects' functioning and development. In the sociologist's opinion, social practices are individuals' typical expectations in relation to each other which are arranged in a social space and time, related to a certain socio-cultural context. They are not created by social actors but are only continually recreated by them via the very means whereby they express themselves as actors, or integral components of some social structures. It enables A. Giddens to assert that «the basic domain of study of social sciences... is neither the experience of an individual actor, nor the existence of any form of societal totality, but social practices ordered across space and time» [5, p. 36]. The world of everyday life is defined in this sense by a totality of generally accepted social practices that are considered as normative models of individuals' behaviour and basis of their daily activities. Social practices explicate the individuals' dominant ideas about the principles and normative patterns which the existing social order is based on.

Thus, the scientific construct «social practices» can identify the role of implicit knowledge and routine actions in people's daily lives both in formation and transformation of the social order. In modern socio-humanitarian discourse, there are three main ways of changing social practices: articulation, reconfiguration, and borrowing. Articulation focuses public attention on a certain social phenomenon that enables to give it a certain name and characteristics. Due to this, its normative expression and dissemination in society becomes possible. Reconfiguration enables to change the socio-cultural status of a phenomenon, legitimise marginal practices and, in fact, give them a generally recognised value. Borrowing characterises the transfer of social practices to a new context with giving them other names and a new functional [6, p. 23–24]. At the same time, the scientific construct «social practices» shows the possibilities of managing the process of social construction via various social technologies. These technologies are used to change the system of the individual's value orientations that is a necessary condition for a significant change in the individual behaviour. Such a theoretical framework enables to explicate the social mechanisms of generating cancelling, predict its trends and prospects for its development, identify and evaluate the risks and challenges generated by this phenomenon for the whole society.

In turn, the conception of social capital by P. Bourdieu enables to identify the role of social ties, constructed and maintained by interpersonal trust as a source of benefits for members of a particular community [3; 7]. In this conception, social capital in the form of real or potential resources is resulted from functioning of a stable network of interpersonal ties which are significant for community members both from a functional and emotional point of view. In the economic aspect, it actually ensures reduction of transaction costs and expansion of the resource basis of the community; in the political aspect, it enables to form a socio-cultural basis

for a collective identity, which via electoral mechanisms and procedures can be converted into a component of the political agenda. The exclusive nature of social capital explicates both the importance of achieving high group homogeneity and role of a selective mechanism in this process, through which the individuals, alien to

the community for various reasons, are discriminated against and not allowed into its social framework and communication networks. Thus, the use of symbolic capital as an analytical tool makes it possible to reveal the role of socio-cultural grounds for establishing or changing the social order.

Research results and discussion

Cancelling is a totality of social practices used by the society or its part to force social pressure on an individual, group, community or organisation. The main means of such pressure is social discrimination established as a regime. The cancellation results in forcible squeezing of the objects, either an individual or organisation, out of the public space, professional or business area. At the same time, their social contacts are restricted, and any positive or neutral references to them are actually tabooed. The basis for boycott or ostracism of media people, companies is their social misconducts or transgressions (real or imaginary ones) which became known via the Internet, social networks or media, but not their committed crimes recorded and established as such by law. The Canadian researcher H. Saint-Louis, defining the essence and content of cancellation, focuses on this characteristic: «Cancel culture is a phenomenon where individuals transgressing norms are called out and ostracised on social media and other venues by members of the public» [8].

As a rule, victims of ostracism or cancellation suffer from the psychological trauma, reputational and economic costs, and violated conditions for professional activity. That is why in the media space and scientific discourse this phenomenon has got not only positive, but also negative connotations articulated in political debates when issues of freedom of speech and censorship are discussed. On the one hand, the USA researcher M. Clark sees cancelling in an explicitly positive aspect, that of actualisation of a person's a priori moral position: «“cancelling” is an expression of agency, a choice to withdraw one's attention from someone or something whose values, (in)action, or speech are so offensive, one no longer wishes to grace them with their presence, time, and money» [9, p. 88]. As a matter of fact, cancelling is a boycott or public condemnation practiced against a certain celebrity, media person or brand for one's socially unacceptable act, an incorrect phrase in an interview, a tweet with a racist or xenophobic joke, physical or psychological violence against someone. For such actions, the transgressor can be at best deprived of a platform for expressing his position on social networks, at worst – such actions can be worth of his professional career and sources of earning money. It is the withdrawal of public support as a basic act of cancel culture that distinguishes cancelling from active bullying or hating.

On the other hand, as A. Dershowitz emphasises, «cancelling actually destroys the principles of the rule

of law and presumption of innocence that underlie both the modern body of human rights and freedoms and the continental and Anglo-Saxon legal systems» [10, p. 41].

Cancelling is assumed to have a socio-cultural connection with certain institutions of the Ancient world, common in Ancient Greek city-states but to consider it as a postmodern form of ostracism would be incorrect for some reasons. First, in the ancient political practice, ostracism was actually an extraordinary event that existed only in some of the largest polities (Athens, Megara, Argos, Miletus, Syracuse, Cyrene and some others). Second, the existing narrative and epigraphic sources enable to reconstruct the historical role of ostracism in the political system and political life of the Greek cities of the classical era – that of formalised institution of direct polis democracy. As I. E. Surikov notes, in the Athenian policy, ostracism was «extrajudicial expulsion of the most influential citizens from the polis for political reasons for a fixed period (in Athens – for 10 years), without loss of civil (including property) rights and with the subsequent full restoration of political rights; it was used for preventive purposes and carried out by voting of the demos in the national assembly» [11, p. 416]. Third, ancient ostracism was implicitly based on the principle of anthropolatry, so it was not only politically motivated but culturally and civilisationally specific, too. In fact, ancient ostracism was limited to the polis borders and did not pretend to serve as normative universalism within the whole mankind.

In a modern Western socio-humanitarian discourse, cancellation as a phenomenon is actually identified with the cancel culture for certain grounds. It is considered in different theoretical frameworks which are determined rather by the scientific interests and political predilections of certain authors than by the needs of scientific objectivity and methodological correctness. There are different theoretical interpretations (gender, social-network, media-cultural etc.) that enable to describe the phenomenon of cancelling quite comprehensively and correctly. To identify the specificity and content of the cancelling practices, the conflictological and political-discursive interpretations are made use of as they highlight the characteristic features of their implementation in social reality.

The conflictological interpretation of cancelling makes emphasis on the actors' struggle for material and non-material resource that mainly unfolds in non-legal frameworks and illegal forms. A merit here is to the American researcher E. Ng who provides a deep

insight into cancel culture. She reveals that cancelling can be put into practice both from below (via online fandoms or social networks) and above when it is used by politicians to promote a certain idea in the society or express a political position through large media. Using the Chinese experience as an example the researcher shows that under mediatisation of politics and urbanised society, cancelling is a fairly effective tool for implicit political mobilisation of the population. It is no coincidence that she interprets it as a totality of practices of economic behaviour managed indirectly via social networks and media by the Chinese authorities who in fact direct the population's social or political discontent against foreign brands, manufacturers or states [12]. In turn, in the world show-business the other practice has become widespread – when advertising or art agencies purposefully disseminate compromising information about actors or musical performers tied by contracts with them. Such manipulations are assumed to minimise the agencies' financial costs and provide control over the behaviour of counterparties. However, cancelling is potentially dangerous for economic and labour relations, as it has got a great destructive potential. This is the reason why the idea of the private owners' right to create organisational structures, corporate space, areas of educational, business and other professional activities that could be fundamentally free from cancelling, is becoming relevant today. At the same time, owners of private organisations are meant rather than their employees when the protection of negative manifestations and consequences from cancelling are spoken about [13].

The political-discursive perspective interprets the phenomenon of cancelling from the viewpoint of cultural resistance to structural violence undertaken by the marginal groups when it is difficult to call the representatives of elite groups to account due to their privileged position and resource capabilities. For the oppressed and marginalised ones, cancelling practice is a form of asymmetric social response, that of construction of a moralised news agenda. From the viewpoint of E. Ng, such a response became possible only due to the intensive development of information and communication technologies and mediatisation of politics in the modern world. Modern information and communicative technologies and media technologies can draw the public attention to a situation of social injustice which is difficult to solve by legal means but possible – by political tools and methods if it is moved to the focus of public discussion [12].

American political scientist P. Norris provides her own understanding of cancelling. She interprets it in the context of E. Noel-Neumann's theoretical ideas about the nature of public opinion and the spiral of silence. The researcher considers cancelling as a tool for the society's ideological polarisation due to which the actual radicalisation of the political process takes place,

rather than a consensus on pressing social problems and ways to solve them is reached [14]. In a modern society, cancelling practices constituted by the ideas of digital activism and expansion of the rights and freedoms of minorities, for some limited time create a situation of reconfiguration of power in the society. But the consumerist and reactive nature of such practices, their personalised focus on certain actors, hypertrophied anti-colonial orientation, dependence on the Internet and the media question their effectiveness to address real social problems.

In the context of the theory of practices, the analysis of the phenomenon of cancelling viewed as a manifestation of human activity in a modern global urbanised world reveals some features of its development.

First, the normative blurring of cancelling practices should be noted when articulation is applied to create a modern interpretation of moral norms and moral imperatives. They claim to be the normative regulation of individual and collective behaviour but without regard to the cultural and historical determination of social behaviour. In the socio-cultural aspect, cancelling can be viewed as a tool for constructing a secular version of a quasi-religious cult with its own saints and rituals. It is embodied in a certain lifestyle imposed by minorities on the rest of humanity via the media and social networks. At the same time, its supporters, organised into fairly homogeneous groups according to the criteria of similar value orientations and lifestyle, build their online and offline communication in the format that is based on the logic of exclusion. On the one hand, such a group establishes the content and boundaries of a new norm imposed on the society, and, on the other hand, it nominates itself for the status of the exclusive bearer and defender of the given norm, so, by default, all the rest become transgressors of the new normative order and public peace. The outrageous and aggressive nature of cancelling seems to consider this social phenomenon as a nonconformist phenomenon of a temporary nature.

Second, in terms of content, it is difficult to talk about the innovative potential and ability of the cancelling practices to radically change social relations in a modern society. Often, the social basis of cancellation is various minorities which by reconfiguration are trying to improve their socio-cultural status, legitimise their lifestyle and, in fact, give it a recognised value. Naturally, the performative and outrageous nature of such practices, especially if they relate to sensitive gender, racial and ethnic cases of human rights' violations, enables to draw the public attention to the problem but this does not destroy the real socio-economic mechanisms which generate and steadily reproduce the problem field.

Third, it is difficult to talk about the social success of cancelling practices because their effectiveness is achieved not by dismantling the real social mecha-

nisms of discrimination and oppression of minorities but by creating a media picture of their virtual defragmentation. Social media plays a significant role in this process. The Indonesian researchers M. S. Waani and J. A. Wempi note that using of social media for social movement has proven to be very effective, especially on *Twitter*, and cite *#MeToo* and *#BlackLivesMatter* as examples. They highlight that cancel culture activities are massive and add that «even though the result of this case did not match the audience's expectations, but they have tried their best to try and reach their purpose» [15, p. 269–270].

Fourth, although cancelling claims to modernise legal norms, in reality created are the socio-cultural conditions that actually destroy the normative foundations of the existing system of human rights and freedoms. It is done in two main ways. The first one is borrowing of the normative grounds for the minorities' social practices to transfer them into a universal context that results in making such practices legalised and legitimised. The second one is establishing privileges for the representatives of certain communities (for example, quotas or positive discrimination) which are characterised by dubious historical justification and absence of formal legal grounds for making this step.

Fifth, cancelling practices almost always involve actors with high status positions and significant resources, i. e. celebrities, those who belong to various elite groups. At the same time, public discrimination of an individual does not occur immediately after the fact of his statement or action that violates someone's rights, but after a certain period. This retrospective orientation enables to suggest that the focus is not on the victim of cancellation but on the groups with their own corporate interests affiliated with the victim.

In the context of the conception of social capital, of interest is the practice when supporters of cancellation create a stable network of interpersonal relations based on general normative-value regulators of social activity and intrinsic value of the emotional attitude towards it. The network can be created both in the real world and social media. To achieve a certain degree of homogeneity of the created community, a selective mechanism is used to discriminate against those who are ideologically, politically and psychologically alien to the community, and keep them out of its social boun-

daries and communication networks. In the political aspect, such a communicative network of cancelling supporters forms a socio-cultural basis for collective identity, which, via civic initiatives, activities of social movements, electoral mechanisms and procedures, is constantly being converted into a component of the national political agenda or even directly into political power.

However, it is necessary to recognise that expansion of cancelling into the economic, political and cultural spheres of a modern society results in initiating of the processes which are dangerous for its development. First, the sphere of public communication is being transformed – from an open space in which a comprehensive and critical discussion of problematic processes and phenomena is a priori possible, towards establishing of hierarchical relations between actors. As a result, they develop a closed communicative space in which it is difficult to identify and adequately assess the social problems, and political communication becomes imperative, dogmatic and manipulative.

Second, a reduction mechanism is developed which is applied to make the ideas about complex socio-political and economic processes significantly simplified in public opinion and assess the parameters and results of these processes exclusively in the moral plane. As a result, the individual's moral position and moral justification of his social activity become more important than arrangement and results of this activity in the economic, political or cultural aspects.

Third, stigmatisation of public actors creates social pressure not only on certain creative figures, representatives of the media or business, but also on the elite groups in general. As a result, in order to protect their own corporate positions and interests the elite mobilises resources that are directed to solving market situations rather than real social problems.

In general, the conversion of symbolic capital into a political one by supporters of the cancelling ideology, if to actualise functioning of the democratic political system, ultimately expands the range of options and directions of socio-political development which are significant for a modern society. However, it is worth of a sharp increase in the conflict potential of political and electoral processes, decrease in quality of the managerial decisions, and ideological polarisation of society.

Conclusion

Thus, cancelling is a complex social phenomenon, the social practices and discourses of which both expand and complicate the economic, political and cultural processes in a modern society. However, such practices do not only form a space of opportunities and socio-cultural innovations for an individual, but

also cause significant problems and obstacles for his professional and business activities. For the society as a whole, cancelling seems to become a source of conflict processes that, instead of fighting the real causes and factors of social oppression, creates new ideological grounds and mechanisms of discrimination. It should

be emphasised that due to the novelty and controversial nature of the phenomenon, the analytical description of cancelling in a modern socio-humanitarian discourse can hardly be called exhaustive and heuristic by now so the given issue still remains relevant and requires its further theoretical development.

Библиографические ссылки

1. Krajewski M. Cancel culture: unieważniając unieważnianie. *Przegląd socjologiczny*. 2022;71(1):185–206. DOI: 10.26485/PS/2022/71.8.
2. Garfinkel H. *Studies in ethnomethodology* [Internet]. 1967 [cited 2022 August 9]. 288 p. Available from: https://monoskop.org/images/0/0c/Garfinkel_Harold_Studies_in_Ethnomethodology.pdf.
3. Бурдые П. *Практический смысл*. Бикбов АТ, Вознесенская КД, Зенкин СН, Шматко НА, переводчики; Шматко НА, редактор. Санкт-Петербург: Алетейя; 2001. 562 с.
4. Качанов ЮЛ, Шматко НА. «Габитус» вместо «сознания»: теория и эксперимент. *Социология: методология, методы, математические модели*. 2000;12:25–39.
5. Giddens A. *The constitution of society: outline of the theory of structuration* [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2022 August 9]. 473 p. Available from: https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=YD87I8uPvnUC&pg=GBS.PT35.w.1.0.71_185&hl=ru&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_atb.
6. Волков В, Хархордин О. *Теория практик*. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство Европейского университета в Санкт-Петербурге; 2008. 298 с. (Прагматический поворот; Выпуск 2).
7. Бурдые П. *Начала. Choses dites*. Шматко НА, переводчик. Москва: Socio-Logos; 1994. 288 с.
8. Saint-Louis H. Understanding cancel culture: normative and unequal sanctioning. *First Monday* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 August 16];26(7). Available from: <https://journals.uic.edu/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/10891>. DOI: 10.5210/fm.v26i7.10891.
9. Clark MD. Drag them: a brief etymology of so-called «cancel culture». *Communication and the Public* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2022 August 15];5(3–4):88–92. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2057047320961562>. DOI: 10.1177/2057047320961562.
10. Dershowitz A. *Cancel culture: the latest attack on free speech and due process*. New York: Hot Books; 2020. 168 p.
11. Суриков ИЕ. *Остракизм в Афинах*. Москва: Языки славянских культур; 2006. 640 с.
12. Ng E. *Cancel culture. A critical analysis* [Internet]. London: Palgrave Macmillan; 2022 [cited 2022 August 16]. 153 p. Available from: <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-97374-2>. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-97374-2.13.
13. Bagus Ph, Daumann F, Follert F. Cancel culture, safe spaces, and academic freedom: a private property rights perspective. *SSRN Electronic Journal* [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 August 16]. Available from: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4153396>. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.4153396.
14. Norris P. Cancel culture: myth or reality? *Political Studies* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 August 7]. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00323217211037023>. DOI: 10.1177/00323217211037023.
15. Waani MS, Wempi JA. Cancel culture as a new social movement. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 August 16];5(7):266–270. Available from: <https://www.ajhssr.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/ZF2157266270.pdf>.

References

1. Krajewski M. Cancel culture: unieważniając unieważnianie. *Przegląd socjologiczny*. 2022;71(1):185–206. DOI: 10.26485/PS/2022/71.8.
2. Garfinkel H. *Studies in ethnomethodology* [Internet]. 1967 [cited 2022 August 9]. 288 p. Available from: https://monoskop.org/images/0/0c/Garfinkel_Harold_Studies_in_Ethnomethodology.pdf.
3. Bourdieu P. *Prakticheskiy smysl* [Practical sense]. Bikbov AT, Voznesenskaya KD, Zenkin SN, Shmatko NA, translators; Shmatko NA, editor. Saint Petersburg: Aleteiya; 2001. 562 p. Russian.
4. Kachanov YuL, Shmatko NA. [«Habitус» instead of «consciousness»: theory and experiment]. *Sociology: Methodology, Methods, Mathematical Models*. 2000;12:25–39. Russian.
5. Giddens A. *The constitution of society: outline of the theory of structuration* [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2022 August 9]. 473 p. Available from: https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=YD87I8uPvnUC&pg=GBS.PT35.w.1.0.71_185&hl=ru&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_atb.
6. Volkov V, Khakhordin O. *Teoriya praktik* [Theory of practices]. Saint Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Evropeiskogo universiteta v Sankt-Peterburge; 2008. 298 p. (Pragmatic Turn; Issue 2). Russian.
7. Bourdieu P. *Choses dites*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit; 1987. 228 p.
Russian edition: Bourdieu P. *Nachala. Choses dites*. Shmatko NA, translator. Moscow: Socio-Logos; 1994. 288 p.
8. Saint-Louis H. Understanding cancel culture: normative and unequal sanctioning. *First Monday* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 August 16];26(7). Available from: <https://journals.uic.edu/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/10891>. DOI: 10.5210/fm.v26i7.10891.
9. Clark MD. Drag them: a brief etymology of so-called «cancel culture». *Communication and the Public* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2022 August 15];5(3–4):88–92. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2057047320961562>. DOI: 10.1177/2057047320961562.
10. Dershowitz A. *Cancel culture: the latest attack on free speech and due process*. New York: Hot Books; 2020. 168 p.
11. Surikov IE. *Ostrakizm v Afinakh* [Ostracism in Athens]. Moscow: Languages of Slavic cultures; 2006. 640 p. Russian.

12. Ng E. *Cancel culture. A critical analysis* [Internet]. London: Palgrave Macmillan; 2022 [cited 2022 August 16]. 153 p. Available from: <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-97374-2>. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-97374-2.13.
13. Bagus Ph, Daumann F, Follert F. Cancel culture, safe spaces, and academic freedom: a private property rights perspective. *SSRN Electronic Journal* [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 August 16]. Available from: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4153396>. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.4153396.
14. Norris P. Cancel culture: myth or reality? *Political Studies* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 August 7]. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00323217211037023>. DOI: 10.1177/00323217211037023.
15. Waani MS, Wempi JA. Cancel culture as a new social movement. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 August 16];5(7):266–270. Available from: <https://www.ajhssr.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/ZF2157266270.pdf>.

Received by editorial board 05.09.2022.