CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE CULTURE OF CANCELLATION

Marijana VUKČEVIĆ

Abstract: In recent times, the "culture of cancellation" has entered the vernacular of digital culture, primarily aimed at public figures who violate loose norms of social acceptability. In particular, a "culture of dismissal" is a form of public humiliation launched on social media to deprive someone of their usual influence or attention in order to make public discourse more diffuse and less monopolized by those in privileged positions. The paper theoretically establishes the concept of "culture of cancellation", its values, analysis and consequences of its social acceptance and application.

Keywords: culture of cancellation, social networks, public humiliation, social norms

INTRODUCTION

Social networking platforms were originally designed to allow individuals to engage in various forms of online interactions. This technology has robustly permeated various aspects of society, evolving into a generic term called "social media". It has become a powerful force in modern life, paving the way for the rise of digital participatory cultures and social movements. Social media has certainly produced a boon in modern life, from the convenience of online shopping to the proliferation of intentional networked misinformation and enabled individuals to be constantly connected despite distance and other physical limitations. However, continuous digital and continuous communication has been introduced. They are all connected to their digital devices, and the division online and in real life is blurred.

Sociologist Manuel Castels sets out important terminologies to critically describe the way in which interaction has taken shape in the digital age. More precisely, he coined the term "hypersociality", which is the transformation of sociability. He argues that an online society is a hypersocial society, not an isolation society. People generally do not fake their identity on the Internet, except for some teenagers who experiment

with their lives. People incorporate technology into their lives, connect virtual and real reality of virtuality, live in various technological forms of communication, articulating them as needed (Castells 2005: 11).

With the existence of hypersociality, the emergence of networked individualism has become more tangible. Castells argues that the emergence of networked individualism, as a social structure and historical evolution, induces the emergence of individualism as the dominant culture of our societies, and new communication technologies fit perfectly into the way of building sociability through self-selected network communication (Castells 2005: 12).

With this development, new forms of collectivity were formed at the intersection of society and technology. Social media has not only become a prism for the exchange of information, but has paved the way for the rise of digital participatory cultures and social movements.

It has become a contested place for competitive forms of knowledge, culture and ideology. The act of firing someone, therefore, is one of those spontaneous collective practices initiated by social network users, without considering the possible consequences. There is no doubt that the "culture of cancellation" has become an integral part of the vernacular of digital culture, primarily directed against public figures who violate loose norms of social acceptability.

Scientific debates about the culture of cancellation have been limited, which can probably be attributed to the fear of cancellation if the arguments were against the dominant currents of certain social movements. The culture of cancellation is a manifestation of "vokeism" which is an ideology that views reality as socially constructed and defined by power, oppression and group identity (Alperstein 2019: 203). Therefore, everyone can be canceled, no one is spared. The culture of cancellation is paradoxical. It is both a form and a threat to freedom of speech. Consequently, the law should not absolutely protect or absolutely suppress it. Instead, the primary role of the law is to nurture a culture that values freedom of speech.

VIRTUAL COLLECTIVE CONSCIOUSNESS AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF CELEBRITY CULTURE

Alperstein (2019) followed the cultural changes that took place as social media became more widespread. It also sets the concept of virtual collective consciousness, where thoughts and beliefs merge on social networks. When thoughts and beliefs merge, it becomes the collective consciousness of similarly disposed individuals. He further explains that one's inner world is turned outwards to become part of the network,

including membership in the crowd. Virtual collective consciousness is to some extent an expression of our wandering inner mind, the flow of consciousness, daydreams and nightmares, turned towards the links, spontaneously, synchronously within the social network, based in part on mediated social connections with celebrities and other people present and active. social network (Alperstein 2019: 204).

As elegant as it sounds, it bears a resemblance to an echo, where people with similar thinking hear only what they want to hear. Anything that could be contrary to their way of thinking and inclinations is considered undesirable. Social media users follow pages that are aligned with their views and do not follow those that seem contrary to their preferences. As one's thoughts and ideas become synchronized with other intermediary links on social networks, it becomes increasingly challenging to adapt ideas contrary to the dominant ideological climate.

This is the current digital social environment to which everyone is exposed. Celebrities, influential people, public figures, as individuals who influence their networks, are strictly against the loose standard of current social acceptability. Hearn and Schoenhof argue that the concept of fame is a very complex entity; it is a form of "constructed subjectivity consisting of different sets of self-referential practices that seek attention and seek the market" (Hearn, Schoenhoff 2015: 196). Celebrities are spectacles that are constantly attacked by various media, which enables permanent public interest. However, that all changed when social media became a platform for self-publishing. Traditional media institutions as gatekeepers have been cut off from the process and celebrities can now access the public directly through the digital networks they have nurtured. Equally, the public can directly reach these individuals through technology. Celebrities who use social media can now be considered influences. Similarly, influences on social media have also become a form of fame (Hearn, Schoenhoff 2015).

As mentioned earlier, there seems to be an indeterminate measure of social acceptability against which public figures are condemned. When public figures such as celebrities and influencers are the subject of scandal, there are usually four possible public reactions: condemnation, indifference, dissatisfaction, and approval (Cashmore 2006). However, events or behaviors that are considered scandalous are also constantly evolving. It is therefore difficult to assess which types of offenses will result in approval or condemnation. As media consumers, scandals attract the public. Decades ago, public figures were able to gracefully endure scandals and come out unscathed. But with the direct connection of these personalities with the public through technology, it is impossible to avoid a careful view of the

public. One wrong word in one of the posts, a statement contrary to the dominant narrative of an "insensitive" joke or even a "problematic" essay will open the way for vitriol from social media users. Public disgrace ensues and the person who published it becomes fired.

1.1. What does "cancellation" mean in the digital world?

Those who were "canceled" violated the line of social acceptability, according to the unmarked and completely ambiguous norm of today's climate on social networks. Bromwich (2018) believes that it is an act of striking out someone whose expression - whether political, artistic or otherwise - used to be welcome or at least tolerated, but is no longer. In addition, it is a tactic of trying to erase someone from public discourse - either by public humiliation, deplatforming or demanding to be fired (Beiner 2020). There is no clear parameter that someone deserves "cancellation". With the ambiguous nature of a "culture of renunciation," a person who undergoes this form of public humiliation also has an extremely vague path to redemption. Some individuals argue that cancel cultura is a manifestation of an agency relationship. Professor Lisa Nakamura of the University of Virginia argues that cancel cultura is the ultimate expression of agency action (Bromwich 2018). This phenomenon is probably one of the greatest indicators of the democratization of discourse.

Natalie Pang from the National University of Singapore claims that marginalized voices are now heard, and the discourse is less dominated by individuals who are in positions of power and privilege (Lim, 2020). Not everyone agrees with the purpose of cancel culture. Walid Jumblat Abdullah believes that the dismissal of someone is ultimately a game of power: that power can be deprived of institutions and formal authority, or just popular opinion (Lim 2020). The problem lies in the lack of understanding of how to deal with it on one's own terms (Beine 2020).

One of the newest figures to be canceled is JK Rowling. On June 6, 2020, JK Rowling tweeted: If sex is not real, there is no same-sex attraction. If sex is not real, the lived reality of women on a global level is erased. I know and love trans people, but erasing the concept of sex removes the ability of many to talk meaningfully about their lives. It is not hate to tell the truth. This seems to have offended the transgender community, leading to its "cancellation". Accordingly, fan sites dedicated to Harry Potter, such as Mugglenet and The Leaky Cauldron, have severed ties with JK Rowling due to her trans-offensive tweet (Luu 2020). Her case is not unique because other famous public figures have been subjected to a culture of cancellation. There is now a push against a powerful force stemming from "cancel

culture". The call for open discussion seems to be the way forward in this extremely complex cultural movement. Walid Jumblat Abdullah warns that the growing trend of "cancellation" is stifling open debate and increasing self-censorship among public figures (Luu 2020). Basically, "cancel culture" has become an apparatus for carrying out ideological purges.

1.2. Freedom of speech and a "culture of cancellation"

Roughly, freedom of speech is the freedom to reach the peak of what we feel, not what we should say (Luu 2020). In our thought and law, freedom of speech rests on several grounds. It promotes the autonomy and self-fulfillment of the individual and the wider culture. It protects the ideas, opinions and speech of minorities from the oppression of the majority or the state. Pluralism, on the other hand, is therefore the cornerstone of freedom and a democratic society. It is further crucial for democracy itself (Bromwich 2018).

Three points require emphasis. First, minority speech is not protected only, or even mostly, because of the minority. It is protected for potential audiences and for society as a whole. It is not easy that most may be wrong. Open dispute is a precondition for the majority's own opinion. Second, freedom of speech is not unlimited. What is important is that restrictions on freedom of speech may be needed to allow freedom of speech. For example, defamation law can be thought of as partially protecting the ability to participate in open debate; without it, it would be enough to irritate a falsely pious man or an irritable fanatic, to have his pen cruelly destroy him (Lim 2020: 55). Third, freedom of speech is as valuable as a legal principle. This value can be undermined by private actors, individually or collectively (Bromwich 2018).

There are three shades. First, "cancel culture" refers to calls and pressures to boycott or "cancel," and not just the acts of boycott, disinvestment, dismissal, or withdrawal that often follow. "Sancel kultura" is thus at the center of a spectrum of private speech control actions, with a "culture of provocation" - publicly condemning perceived offenses without invoking punishment - at one end and advocacy or use of violence at the other. "Sancel kultura" seeks to impose speech norms using social and economic coercion, not persuasion or violence.

Second, the word "culture" is important: "cancel culture" is the systematic and disproportionate use of this tool by one sector of society - reinforced by social media - in a way that undermines pluralism and open debate. Third, today's "cancel culture" wants to protect minorities from the hegemonic order that has long marginalized and silenced their voice. For his defenders, this is all new: for example, the response to Harper's letter

claimed that minorities can now publicly criticize elites and socially hold them accountable; this seems to be the greatest concern of the letter.

However, the force of "cancel culture" stems from the use of culturally prominent accusations (racism, sexism, transphobia, etc.) that allege violations of the essential state values of equality. The state itself imposes far-reaching restrictions on freedom and freedom of speech in order to impose that value. Given this understanding of freedom of speech, how should law and society "undo culture"? Three broad approaches can be sketched (Cashmore 2006). From one point of view, society should promote calls for "cancellation" and protect them by law - either in all cases or, at least, when they claim to justify values supported by the state, such as equality. There are three arguments in favor of this. First, freedom of speech seeks exclusively to protect individuals from state censorship. Calls for abolition and subsequent forms of boycott are part of the freedom of individuals who undertake them. Other, this social censorship is in fact a "market of ideas" that functions properly, suppressing harmful words and actions without the need for state intervention. Third, "cancel culture" helps protected groups to actively participate in public debates on equal terms. Without it, these groups would be prevented from engaging in this debate by speaking in a way that marginalizes and silences them.

Critics of the culture of cancellation rarely struggle with the strength of this case. Calls for a boycott are clearly freedom of speech. Individuals and institutions respond to this social and economic pressure by choosing what to say, what to sell or buy, and when to (re) invite, fire, or hire. This is part of the usual action of individual freedom and, moreover, is an important means of achieving social change. The case, however, is flawed. First, as noted above, tradition does not see the state as the only (or even major) threat to freedom of speech. Nor does it absolutely protect freedom of speech from state interference, and calls for a boycott are no exception. Second, the undoing of the concentration of cultural power is a distortion of the "market of ideas." "Cancel culture" is a forced instrument of intolerance. Its goal is to act, as state censors before it, as "an oligarchy (which would) bring hunger to our minds, when we know nothing but what their thunder measures. " Worse, unlike state censorship, it lacks proper treatment or other protection against untruth, arbitrariness, or disproportion. Third, the fact that the annulment of culture imposes the imposition of state, universally divided opinions makes it more, not less, suspicious. Freedom of speech exists precisely to protect the expression of minorities (Cashmore 2006). Given this, the second approach would reverse the first: the law should prohibit some or all calls for cancellation based on a culture of cancellation. The previous paragraph set

out a theoretical case for this. Legally, it could build on positive human rights obligations to protect individuals from violence, dismissal or eviction due to freedom of speech in certain cases. One could also rely on an attempt to suppress the boycott when it first developed as a political tactic in Ireland in the 1880s. The Crime Prevention Act criminalized the use or incitement to intimidation to detain where they can legally refrain or to refrain from acting where they can legally act. Intimidation meant any spoken word or action taken to intimidate any person into any injury or loss of property, work or livelihood (Hearn, Schoenhoff 2015: 199).

This approach is also flawed. First, it would return the state to the center, controlling in detail which calls for cancellation are allowed and which are not. Instead of expanding to the cacophony of "a lot of arguing, a lot of writing, a lot of thinking," the public square would shrink (Bromwich 2018). By weakening social control over speech, withdrawn legal lines would become a key cornerstone for acceptability. This would undermine autonomy. But it would also call for a growing political and legal challenge to those lines, this time conducted by public rather than private power. Second, this cellular, draconian interference with freedom of speech would obviously violate human rights law. Indeed, our tradition casts doubt on the argument that the state can protect speech by suppressing speech: despite Bailey's quote above, case law holds that freedom of speech collides with other values than itself. Finally, it is unlikely to succeed. The sting of the boycott is their collective nature and the reactions of the institutions to them, and the targeting of individual speech does not speak either. The Irish provision mentioned above was ineffective. Today, it is still less likely that the state could identify and punish any call on social media and private messages for "cancellation" (Bromwich 2018).

THE CULTURE OF "CANCELLATION" AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

The emergence and spread of a culture of cancellation have been some of the most significant trend events on global social media. Although vaguely defined as "the popular practice of canceling support for public figures and companies after they have done or said something deemed inappropriate or offensive", in many sources the culture of cancellation has authoritative power over modern society. The original goal of the public to get involved in the movement to act according to what they think is right, is certainly commendable. However, unlike its intention to form public opinion and take action in favor of the fair side of the argument, the practice

of a culture of cancellation has also brought a number of problems. Issues arising from the excessive "cancellation" of certain public figures and companies due to a less offensive statement,

Economic consequences

The magnitude of the damage received by the victims of cancellation is not statistically measurable. The economic damage from boycotts is the most common, but they vary widely: for example, at the brand or corporation level, when the entire Chinese market "canceled" BTS in October, their company's stock prices fell from 258,000 Korean won to 142,000 Korean won. within two weeks. Damage to individuals is exacerbated because dismissal would result in job loss and reputational degradation. For example, American Amy Cooper was fired in May 2020 after a video showing her submitting a fake police report on a black observer went viral online and she did not regain her job after five months. Cancellation on social media is a companion to internet harassment. Intimidating messages and posts on social networks are posted and sent in huge quantities aimed at insulting the victims. Katy Perry or Gwyneth Paltrow are just a few examples of suffering from depression caused by "cancellations" and malicious comments.

Restriction of freedom of speech

Another problem with the culture of "cancellation" is that it restricts public figures from freely expressing their opinions. The criterion for assessing whether an opinion is inappropriate or not is unclear. It is generally accepted that racist or sexist comments can be considered offensive, some figures are annulled for absurd reasons. For example, the K-pop band BTS was canceled in China after paying tribute to the victims of the Korean War. Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) states that "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; This right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers. "Guaranteeing such a right to public figures is as important as guaranteeing such a result to those who challenge them.

Unjustified accusations

Another major problem with the cancellation culture is that some of the allegations are factually wrong. The most prominent examples are Johnny Depp and Amber Heard. In 2016, Amber accused her husband Johnny Depp of domestic violence and filed for divorce. After the trial, Johnny Depje was

directly "canceled" and asked to give up his role in the film "Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find Them". However, in 2019, Depp sued Amber for defamation. The public "canceled" Amber and launched the hashtag "#Justice For Johnny Depp". Amber, in November 2020, is asking to leave the role in the Hollywood movie "Aquaman". Whether Depp or Hrd really committed violence remains a question. However, it is vital to understand that the public was preparing to mutually influence their "cancellation", without any basis on factual evidence.

Sociological context of the culture of "cancellation"

The culture of cancellation is a very interesting sociological phenomenon in its infancy. It led to the division of society primarily in America, and now this trend has begun to develop in our country as well. The debate on the "culture of cancellation" is at the forefront of the American cultural wars - which is becoming a key theme of the presidential campaign. " A culture of denunciation refers to the public condemnation and punishment of people whose words or deeds are considered immoral or inappropriate. " Viewed through a sociological lens, controversy is an example of social exclusion - a process that limits full participation in society and access to its opportunities, rights and resources - in the service of social inclusion. However, this paradox can only be resolved in a final analysis of deliberately inclusive practices that abolish long-standing institutions of exclusion. The culture of cancellation divides society and creates a gap between nations. "A Politico / Morning Consult poll recently reported that 46 percent of Americans believe the culture of cancellation has gone too far," with 49 percent who believe it has a negative impact on society. More than half of Americans believe that social consequences should be expected due to the expression of unpopular opinions. "(Silver, 2020)

Cancellation is generally a process of social exclusion that takes many known forms. Take gossip, for example. Its actual content is not relevant to its social function of ensuring compliance with group norms. Ostracism, excommunication and avoidance are literally biblical forms of social control. From Hester Prinne's Scarlet Letter to the President's Twitter feed, marking opponents unworthy of community membership has been a centuries-old method of imposing compliance. It is necessary for social life, regardless of one's ideology. Ultimately, social exclusion is forced, ending in imprisonment, exile, and even extermination (Silver 2020). The fact that the exemption procedure is so generic and multidimensional helps to explain the rhetorical connection of the culture of cancellation with many practices like this one. Social exclusion is more effective in changing behavior in certain

circumstances. It is difficult to get away from gross violations of principles that are often shared, not disputed. Similarly, gossip and shame have little effect on those who do not want to belong to the community at all. Cancellation campaigns have more repercussions if they cause significant embarrassment. Even if ordinary people can quit, celebrities, whose position in society largely depends on their reputation, are at greater risk. Efforts on social control such as cancellation become strenuous at a time when the norms they want to enforce are under stress. When social movements demand that our institutions fulfill the promised ideals of equality and social inclusion, there is less forgiveness of intolerant objections. To resolve the paradoxical relationship between the use of exclusive methods to demand inclusive recognition, the change of powerful insiders and the system that benefits them must be allowed. Instead of following a "double closure" - in which opposing communities turn their backs on each other - we need more "invitations" (Silver 2020). practice with ideals. There is reconciliation for criminal behavior, but resolving shame, an essentially social emotion, calls for the re-establishment of social ties. There must be a way back. Abolishing social exclusion does not in itself achieve social inclusion, although these terms sound like logical antonyms. Although the system still has to overcome institutions that exclude social inclusion, it requires the active acceptance of foreigners and positive efforts to close gaps in outcomes.

THE CULTURE OF "CANCELLATION" - TWO WORDS THAT MEAN A LOT

Noam Chomsky, along with dozens of other artists, writers and academics from various fields, recently signed an open letter to Harper's Magazine in the United States, strongly condemning the "culture of cancellation". What is the definition of a cancellation culture? Modern society has established the practice of excluding certain people from public life by a planned boycott, based on a certain series of their biographies, certain unacceptable behavior or other (often incorrect) attitudes. This culture of "cancellation" began with the "#MeToo" movement, which rightly caused a decline in the credibility of some popular individuals. The preservation of the rights of other minority groups continued, and recently there was a discussion about changing the words of the American anthem because they were written by a slave owner in the 18th century. Kevin Hart, Kevin Spacey, Erika Badu, Taylor Swift, Bill Gates, Ryan Adams, Michael Jackson, Woody Allen and others are among the "victims" of the culture of cancellation (May 2020).

Many artists, writers and professors sent that open letter out of concern over the suffocating conversations and public debate, and Chomsky adds that his biggest concern is that the left has taken over the mechanisms of the right and started removing individuals from public life. "The culture of resignation is, in a broader sense, a traditional method, almost a mechanism of the mainstream establishment, which, until the last few years, was barely noticed and which, until the last few years, successfully defended the left to participate in public debates and public life." and why that method was invisible. "It simply came to our notice then. I will add, unfortunately simple. Because in the dominant, main ideology of the center-right, it was considered legitimate to impose boundaries on left-wing ideas and initiatives. " As a result, he argues, even if the method is successful, it will not be useful (Oloko 2019).

The origin of the "culture of cancellation" cannot be dated to a certain period, but the term that is coming to the collective consciousness is a very new phenomenon that dates back to 2017. How recent the phenomenon is will be shown through the following examples (Oloko 2019).

1. In June 2020, Hollywood actor Hartley Savier was fired from the cast of the TV show "The Flash: Season 7" for his insulting tweets from 2013.

2. In October 2020, the K-POP band BTS was canceled in China for paying tribute to Korean war victims, which the Chinese public perceived as an insulting opinion.

3. In July 2020, museum curator Gary Garels of the Museum of Modern Art in San Francisco resigned as a result of a petition accusing him of being racist, claiming that he collected art from white male painters.

4. In 2017, Hollywood star Matt Damon - known for his appearance in the "Jason Borne Series" - was accused of giving "rough" opinions about the Hollywood epidemic of sexual behavior.

5. President of the United States Donald Trump has been banned from using social networks. After repeating the racial curse, the longtime national scientific reporter shamefully resigned.

6. School districts in America are erasing the names of great Americans from school buildings. The congresswoman was reprimanded for propagating conspiracy theories. The buildings, named after historical heroes, including Abraham Lincoln, George Washington and Paul Revere, as well as modern individuals such as California Senator Diana Feinstein, are intended for remodeling.

7. Gina Carano, who plays the beloved character in the series "Star Wars" "Mandalorian", broke up with Disney. The decision was made in response to allegedly provocative statements on social networks about the use of masks and elections.

8. Stream provider HBO Max extracted the movie classic "Gone with the Wind" from its lineup. According to the statement, the 1939 painting reflects the time and shows ethnic and racial biases that were "wrong then, as they are now." The film's premise was set during the American Civil War and received a lot of reactions to how it portrays slavery. HBO issued a comment. Max claims that continuing to show the film without "explanation and isolation" from "racist descriptions" would be "irresponsible".

9. Similar variations can be found in some episodes of the cartoon Tom and Jerry. In addition to the description of the 1941 Dambo animation at the Disney Plus site, there is a disclaimer that certain segments include outdated cultural descriptors (May 2020).

Each of these incidents was presented as evidence of a "culture of failure" - the belief that fiery actors, mostly leftists, aim to suppress the valuation of free expression by permanently embarrassing and removing those suspected of violating them. Both sides of the argument of a culture of denial seem to have endless reserves of new sources of real anger in the national media. Loss of friends and social relationships, termination of work or commercial opportunities and denial of access to a platform from which offensive attitudes could be expressed are all effects of "cancellation" (Oloko 2019). Anger can sometimes be directed against public figures. An occasional individual whose works are broadcast on social networks is occasionally a target. In both circumstances, retaliation can be severe. The "culture of annulment" often has no effect. That word is loosely attributed to a wide range of actions, both online and offline, from vengeful justice to hostile debate, lurking, intimidation and harassment. Those who accept the concept of annulment demand more than apologies and withdrawals, although it is not always obvious whether the purpose is to correct a certain mistake or to eliminate the power imbalance (May 2020).

Examples of the "culture of cancellation" are also present in our country and are increasingly represented in our public life, especially on social media. Danijela Steinfeld, an actress, revealed the identity of the perpetrator of the case, claiming that it was her colleague Branislav Lecic. Such information provoked a public boycott, and Lecic was accused, not directly, but indirectly, by many colleagues who refused to perform with him on the same stage, a phenomenon known as the "culture of cancellation". Daniel was supported by numerous colleagues through social networks, which speaks volumes about their opinion, ie trust in colleagues, which is a great support to every victim.

According to many sociologists, this is the reaction of the actors in the Lecic-Steinfeld case, which is important for the development of a "culture of

cancellation" and raising awareness of this topic in Serbia. YouTuber Bogdan Ilic, better known as Baka Prase, recently published a video in which he explained that he is withdrawing from YouTube for a while, because, as he said, he cannot quarrel with people he does not know. This announcement for his fans comes only a few weeks after accusations of pedophilia due to sex with minors appeared on the account of the popular YouTuber.

CONCLUSION

This paper focuses on the conceptualization of the phenomenon of "culture of cancellation", the values of this culture, the consequences of social acceptance and application, as well as its limitations. The "culture of cancellation" is a very complicated social movement. On the one hand, it is one of the highest indicators of democratization of society and public discourse. In contrast, it is a force for censorship and intolerance of ideas that are contrary to the dominant acceptable social norms. Some people think that there is a better way to draw attention to inappropriate behavior. In this paper, only the case of J.K. Rowling as a celebrity who was "canceled" on social networks due to inappropriate remarks addressed to the public.

"Cancel culture" is moving fast, it is not waiting for anyone and it rarely wants any explanation. The range of things that can be erased varies. At school, a student can say something and insult someone, so a whole group of children decides to "delete" it. In pop culture, it is enough for Taylor Swift to say an ugly thing about Kendall Jenner that another girl adores, and that girl is currently "erasing" that star. A very small thing is enough for someone to be deleted on social networks and in the virtual world, and then in reality. Once a person is erased, it is difficult to return to normal life.

The culture of cancellation is mostly talked about on social networks, where it takes the form of group humiliation of a person or company in focus. In addition, public humiliation is not new and has existed for centuries. History has shown that humanity has devised many creative, and at the same time horrible ways of humiliating an individual due to alleged social and legal violations. The concept of denying someone is similar to the one mentioned, but it is specially designed for the digital age in the midst of hypersociality. As such, the prevalence of a culture of cancellation discourages open debate; it is a form of criticism that is destructive. Perhaps it will further develop into a more constructive form of criticism, focused on action instead of person. As they say, everyone has skeletons in their closets; therefore, everyone can be subjected to a "culture of cancellation".

REFERENCES

Alperstein, Neil M. "Introduction: Mediated Social Connections: Place, Imagination and Togetherness." In *Celebrity and Mediated Social Connections*, pp. 1-29. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, 2019.

Beiner, Alexander. "Sleeping woke: Cancel culture and simulated religion." *Prieiga per internetą: https://medium. com/rebel-wisdom/sleeping-woke-cancel-culture-andsimulated-religion-5f96af2cc107* (2020).

Yar, Sanam, and Jonah Engel Bromwich. "Tales From the teenage cancel culture." *The New York Times* (2019).

Cashmore, Ellis. *Celebrity culture*. Routledge, 2006.

Castells, Manuel, and Gustavo Cardoso. *The network society: From knowledge to policy*. Washington, DC: Center for Transatlantic Relations, Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, 2005.

Blaff, Ari. "The Conflict Over the Conflict: The Israel/Palestine Campus Debate by Kenneth S. Stern." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 52, no. 3 (2020): 151-154.

Hearn, Alison, and Stephanie Schoenhoff. "From celebrity to influencer." *A companion to celebrity* (2016): 194-212..

Lim, Kimberly. "Cancel culture: How Asia's 'woke brigade'became a political force." *South China Morning Post* 19 (2020).

Luu, Christopher. "The Harry Potter fandom officially cancelled JK Rowling." (2020)

Cho, Katherine Soojin. *Responding to campus racism: Analyzing student activism and institutional responses*. University of California, Los Angeles, 2020.

Nayar, Pramod K. *Seeing stars: Spectacle, society and celebrity culture*. SAGE Publications India, 2009.

Velasco, Joseph Ching. "Millennials as digital natives: examining the social media activities of the Philippine Y-generation." *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* 28, no. 3 (2020): 1939-1957.

Oloko, Mariam, The Cancel Culture: Why It Can't Be Canceled. Solutions. Medium, 2019. Available at:medium.com/@adepejumariam/the-cancel-culture-why-it-cant-becancelled-solutions-7e190d9bf6d.

Silver, Hilary, Cancel culture as social exclusion, 2020. Available at: https://thehill.com/opinion/campaign/514231-cancel-culture-as-social-exclusion.

NOTES ON THE AUTHOR
Marijana VUKCEVIC MA,is an English language teacher at the Faculty of Applied Management,Economics and Finance,University Business Academy in Novi Sad,Serbia. E-mail:marijana.vukcevic@mef.edu.rs