

Examining the Impact of Cancel Culture and Culture Wars on Social Media

Erik Ardiyanto¹, Atika Budhi Utami², Mila Falma Masful³

^{1,2,3} Paramadina University, Jakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Social media has become a significant platform for public communication, providing users with the freedom to express their opinions and engage in discussions. Through platforms like Twitter, individuals can easily access information and share their perspectives, leading to the rise of "Woke Culture" and, consequently, the emergence of "Cancel Culture." The term "cancel culture" refers to the act of publicly boycotting or shunning individuals or entities, particularly influencers and institutions, accused of violating societal norms or committing inappropriate actions. This phenomenon has been notably linked to allegations such as sexual harassment and ethical misconduct. Cancel culture operates within social media, where users mobilize to hold individuals accountable by condemning their actions. This research examines how cancel culture operates on social media platforms, particularly in Indonesia, and its impact on influencers and government institutions. Using a qualitative approach and critical discourse analysis, this study investigates the conversations and interactions surrounding cancel culture on social media. The findings reveal that while culture can foster social change and emancipation, it can also have divisive implications, fueling cultural conflicts and class antagonisms that contribute to the broader phenomenon of culture wars within society.

KEYWORDS
Social media;
Work culture;
Cancel culture;
Culture war;
Critique

INTRODUCTION

Twitter has become one of the favourite social media platforms among young Indonesians. With a unique and brief character that only displays 180-280 letters, it makes it easier for people to express their opinions and opinions. In 2009-2010, Twitter became a platform for users to discuss life anxiety, write short poems, and share humorous jokes. However, it has now become a social media platform used to provoke social issues and opinions. An issue quickly goes viral, beginning with a conversation on Twitter, and then receives greater attention from the mainstream media.

Social media platforms offer different communication affordances that shape how younger users participate in public discussion and activism. Survey evidence shows that younger adults tend to be heavy users of multiple platforms, particularly visually oriented platforms such as Instagram and TikTok, while X (formerly Twitter) also remains an important site for news and public conversation, including political talk (Pew Research

Center, 2025a; Pew Research Center, 2025b). In activist settings, X/Twitter is frequently discussed as a “digital public square,” where hashtag practices help consolidate conversations and support mobilization dynamics (Estrella-Ramón et al., 2024; Obia, 2025). Research on political communication on Twitter/X similarly highlights how these platforms facilitate reciprocal exchanges and deliberative interaction, making them suitable for extended debate and public argumentation (Ackland, 2023; Naranjo-Vinueza et al., 2025).

By contrast, Instagram is widely associated with visual communication and image-based sharing, which shape how users present information and interact through visuals. TikTok, meanwhile, is strongly identified with short-form video formats and algorithmic feeds that structure engagement through rapid, sequential content consumption (Roberts et al., 2025). These differences do not mean that Instagram or TikTok are “not critical”; rather, their dominant formats (visual and short-form video) tend to encourage different styles of expression compared to Twitter/X’s more text-forward environment, where users can develop longer arguments through features such as threads (Skogerbø, 2021).

More broadly, a defining distinction between legacy media and internet-based new media is the accelerated speed of information circulation. Because digital media are networked and cross-platform, information can spread within seconds or minutes and move rapidly across platforms (Connolly, 2025). Decades earlier, Canadian media theorist Marshall McLuhan anticipated this shift through the concept of the “global village,” arguing that electric (and later digital) media compress distance and time and intensify interconnectedness (McLuhan, 1964). This condition is increasingly evident today, as internet-integrated media enable audiences to learn about international events and conflicts in near real time through globally networked communication channels.

The distribution process in legacy media is often lengthy because both production and dissemination involve multiple stages. In print journalism, for instance, reporters first gather information in the field, write the news, and submit the draft to editors and the layout team. Afterward, printing and physical distribution to newsagents require additional time, so news may reach readers only within two to three days. A similar time-consuming process also applies to broadcast media. Journalists must conduct field reporting, deliver materials to the studio, and go through editing before the news script is read by a news anchor. Moreover, delivering broadcast news to audiences depends on broadcasting stations and satellite technology, which can take up to one day to reach certain areas.

In contrast, information disseminated through social media can reach audiences within minutes. This immediacy enables internet users to access information more rapidly, potentially increasing their knowledge and fostering greater critical awareness. The growth of critical consciousness among individuals and groups has even been associated with the emergence of an “Enlightenment Society,” echoing similar social developments in earlier periods (Ardiyanto & Narawayha, 2019).

The dark era was succeeded by the Enlightenment (the Renaissance), which spread throughout Europe. The era of enlightenment recurred through digital media,

with different people but the same pattern, and then spread massively on social media. We often observe that today's young generation is developing a critical awareness of sensitive issues, such as human rights, climate change, gender justice, racism, poverty, and equality. Issues that were previously considered taboo and unpopular among young people are now widely discussed, in conversations between individuals and groups, and on social media.

The heightened critical awareness among younger generations, amplified by social media, is often discussed as "woke culture" (Sobande et al., 2022). The term woke originated in African American English and is commonly defined as being alert to racial prejudice and, more broadly, to social discrimination and injustice (Time, 2017). In contemporary public discourse, woke is frequently associated with progressive social-justice activism, including concerns related to equality, gender, environmental justice, and other political issues, although its meanings and uses are highly contested (Merriam-Webster, 2025).

Within this context, social media activism often takes the form of call-out practices, in which individuals publicly criticize individuals or institutions perceived as responsible for wrongdoing or norm violations (Herbison & Podosky, 2024). Call-out culture commonly involves expressing dissatisfaction, disappointment, or frustration by naming and challenging those seen as accountable through social media platforms (Pane, 2024). Among younger users, call-outs are frequently mobilized to protest against public figures or institutions accused of violating societal norms, such as in cases involving sexual harassment, fraud, and discrimination.

The implications of woke culture on social media are twofold: cancel culture and culture wars. Initially, cancel culture targeted a single object; however, because it was facilitated by Twitter, it expanded into collective boycotts and the withdrawal of support for public figures and celebrities, contributing to incivility in online spaces (Dershowitz, 2020). The act of cancellation is a collective practice undertaken by social media users that often overlooks potential consequences for the person being cancelled, both for their career and social life. The term "cancel culture" has become popular on social media and is now an integral part of online discourse among Indonesians. Although scholarly discussion of the implications of cancel culture remains limited, it is often associated with the perceived fear of being cancelled when one's opinion runs counter to dominant social media discourse (Velasco, 2020).

As heightened public awareness grows on social media, public figures and political influencers with millions of followers have increasingly emerged and use Twitter/X to disseminate ideas and opinions to wider audiences (Riedl et al., 2023; Casero-Ripollés, 2021). In the past, opinion control largely came from editorial offices or mainstream media gatekeepers; however, the rise of social media has enabled a more disintermediated information flow in which ordinary users can also act as their own gatekeepers and participate in agenda-setting dynamics (Gainous & Wagner, 2014). Consequently, many public figures and political influencers now circulate political views through social media, yet digital political communication can also involve manipulation and deceptive messaging for short-term political interests, including organized

disinformation and coordinated amplification campaigns (Bradshaw & Howard, 2021). In this environment, online "culture wars" can intensify ideological contestation and harden antagonistic camps, often escalating into polarization and hostility in everyday interactions (Johansen, 2024; Kubin & von Sikorski, 2021; Esteve-Del-Valle & Borge-Bravo, 2022).

In Indonesia's context, these dynamics are frequently discussed as clashes between groups labeled "SJWs" and organized "buzzers" on Twitter/X, where buzzer networks may amplify divisive narratives, circulate misleading information, and contribute to social and political polarization (Halimatus'diyah & Adam, 2024; Herman & Romadhony, 2024). This study analyzes critical discourse on the implications of "woke culture," which has given rise to cancel culture and the culture war on Indonesian social media.

METHOD

This research employs qualitative methods to interpret phenomena occurring on social media, as qualitative inquiry is particularly useful for understanding meanings, experiences, and interpretations within social contexts (Neuman, 2000). The term discourse analysis is widely used across disciplines: in sociology, it generally refers to language-in-use within social interaction, whereas in linguistics it commonly denotes units of language beyond the sentence level. In this study, discourse analysis is operationalized through three interrelated concepts, text, context, and discourse, where text includes not only written words but also spoken language and multimodal forms of communication, context refers to the situational and socio-cultural conditions surrounding how a text is produced and interpreted, and discourse is understood as meaning-making that emerges from the interplay between text and context (Eriyanto, 2011).

Meanwhile, within the critical paradigm, discourse analysis emphasizes how meaning is produced and reproduced through social structures and practices. Language is not treated as a neutral medium; rather, it is viewed as a form of social practice that is closely tied to power relations. Accordingly, critical discourse analysis is used to reveal how texts may construct particular subjects and issues, legitimize or challenge domination, and shape the boundaries of what can be said, thereby making visible the relationship between discourse and power (Supriyadi, 2015).

The data in the research were obtained through observation and documentation. The research examined emerging issues in issues by analyzing several related phenomena: woke culture, cancel culture, and the culture war among Indonesian netizens on social media. Documentation data are used to support the collection of social media data. Documentation data are obtained by searching for and re-examining information on social media. The data are then processed to classify the effects of social media issues and are presented interpretively and descriptively. Thus, the data analyzed

not only informs general discourse but also critically elucidates its context. Researchers critically examine the text's reality to draw comprehensive conclusions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Cancel Culture learned from the cases of KPI, Saipul Jamil, and Gofar Hilman

Social media is often filled with instances of the term "cancel culture" directed at public figures, politicians, influencers, or institutions deemed to have made mistakes. The use of cancel culture is familiar when many cases of sexual harassment are committed by public figures who are known to many netizens. Public figures who have been involved in sexual harassment are widely rejected by society. They were prohibited from appearing in public until some of their works were finally rejected by the public. Netizens often engage in cancel culture by creating threads that are widely shared, retweeted, and liked until they go viral on social media (Vogels, 2021). If a public institution is cancelled, a request for rejection is typically submitted via social media via change.or.id.

Cancel culture is part of a woke culture that began with the widespread use of social media by younger generations during the digital era. The implication is that young people are becoming more critical of societal issues. A person or institution that receives a cancellation will be unfollowed on their own social media or official government accounts. Its existence is no longer wanted, the product is boycotted, and the platform is installed. Their work was then rejected, resulting in informal social sanctions in cyberspace (Koh, 2022). The effects of cancel culture are very diverse, starting from actors being refused to appear on a television station, cancellation of advertising that has been agreed at the beginning, cancellation of an existing work contract, in the form of termination of employment relations with employees, and up to demands for the dissolution of the relevant institution. As an example of what happened to MS at KPI, the Saipul Jamil and Gofar Hilman cases are.

As reported by BBC News Indonesia 2021, the case of MS, a Broadcasting Commission (KPI) employee, who became a victim of bullying and sexual harassment. The MS case is a series of cases of sexual violence that occurred within government institutions without any room for complaints. This polemic began when a KPI employee with the initials MS wrote an open letter to the public regarding bullying and sexual harassment perpetrated by his colleagues on social media. MS admitted that he had experienced sexual harassment since he started working at KPI in 2011. He received unpleasant treatment from his co-workers, ranging from being harassed, beaten, cursed at, and bullied several times without being able to fight back. Then, in 2015, the incident happened again, his office mates grabbed his head, hands, and feet, hugged and stripped him until he was harassed by scribbling on his testicles with a marker. Although MS reported the incident to the police, the report was not followed up on. Finally, he decided to write an open letter and to publish it on Twitter, which went viral.



Figure 1. Tread on Social Media

Source: Twitter and Kompas

MS received substantial public attention and support, particularly among Twitter/X users, as evidenced by the high volume of posts mentioning the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI) account and calling for stronger institutional protection for victims, as well as sustained oversight until the case was resolved (Darmawan, 2022). The decision to speak out was also publicly endorsed by activists, reflecting broader concerns that survivors of sexual violence often face structural disadvantages and social stigma that discourage disclosure and reporting (World Health Organization, 2021). In the Indonesian context, public discussions similarly emphasize that many survivors require a prolonged period before they feel safe to report, due to social pressures, legal concerns, and fear of secondary victimization (Antara News, 2024). Consistent with these concerns, the KPI case illustrates the complexity of institutional responses: the employment contracts of eight alleged perpetrators were reportedly not renewed, while MS's contract status was maintained, and the victim was temporarily placed in the Ministry of Communication and Informatics as part of recovery support (Antara News, 2022; Darmawan, 2022).

Then the second case was about sexual harassment committed by Saipul Jamil. As we know, the dangdut singer Saipul Jamil has committed sexual crimes against minors. He was found guilty of molesting a minor and received a sentence of 3 years in prison. He was then charged with bribing the court clerk with 250 million from the prosecutor's office, and his sentence was ultimately increased to 5 years. Cancel culture against Saipul Jamil began when he was released from prison and was greeted as a hero who had won the Olympics. Saipul Jamil was even paraded by his friends in an open car, wearing a flower necklace around his neck. Saipul Jamil was immediately invited to serve as a guest star on a private television station.

This invitation angered the public because it had allocated special space to Saiful Jamil. The news that Saipul Jamil had been released from prison and had immediately received an invitation from a television station was widely discussed and went viral on Twitter. Activists, public figures, or the community rejected Saipul Jamil's return to one of the television stations. They regret the actions of television stations that provide a platform for perpetrators of sexual crimes and do not side with the perpetrators. As reported by Tempo since Friday, September 3, 2021, a petition circulating that invites people to boycott Saipul Jamil for appearing on television and YouTube, using the keyword "Boycott Saipul Jamil," has become a trending topic on Twitter. The petition is addressed to the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission, or KPI, to ban the station. The petition was addressed to the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission, requesting that television stations be prohibited from inviting Saipul Jamil. The petition has been signed by 209,000 people on social media since its creation.

BOIKOT SAIPUL JAMIL MANTAN NARAPIDANA PEDOFILIA, TAMPIL DI TELEVISI NASIONAL DAN YOUTUBE



Figure 2. Petitions Boycott on Media

Source: Kompas

What the television station has done by amplifying and glorifying Saipul Jamil as a news commodity is truly very unfortunate. Instead of providing critical input to the audience, television allocates airtime to Saiful Jamil solely to increase ratings. They violate the broadcasting code of ethics by failing to support victims of harassment. Although the television station finally apologized to the public, this episode demonstrates that the short logic of treating ratings as a reporting ideology continues to operate at television stations. On the one hand, the media are required to be idealistic and to serve as educators, so that the audience adopts a critical, independent attitude and demonstrates depth of thought. But in practice, the capitalist mass-media economy forces the adoption of a fashion logic that is spectacular, sensational, and superficial (Haryatmoko, 2007). Television stations welcomed Saipul Jamil enthusiastically, who must be immediately given space to broadcast. In fact, television stations have an obligation to broadcast high-quality and educational programs to the public. Television stations broadcast on public frequencies.

Subsequently, the case of cancel culture on social media also involved the public figure host Gofar Hilman. Initially, the account owner @quweenjojo uploaded a response to the tweet asking, "Come on, who have you been notified of? By answering that you have experienced sexual harassment in a public place. This incident left him traumatized and emotional when he saw the actor on the television station. Then he created a thread on Twitter and explained that he had experienced sexual harassment on August 8 2018, by Gofar Hilman when he came to an event in Malang.

Initially, after the music event, he approached Gofar at the front of the event to take pictures for an Instagram story. Then Gofar grabbed him and hugged him, until that point, he still thought okay, I think he's humble. After taking the video, Gofar's hands suddenly hugged him from behind tightly and put both hands in and rubbed his sensitive parts. The woman was surprised and shocked by the lack of help from those around her. In fact, I heard the answer "it's okay, I don't want to."



Figure 3. Clarification on Twitter

Source: Twitter

After his name was widely discussed on social media and became a trending topic on Twitter, Goffar responded to the accusations against him. In his thread, he said;

"Regarding the harassment accusation, I am sure that I did not do that; there were two people accompanying me at that time, 1 female committee member and 1 male assistant, who accompanied me until I got into the car at the end of the event. To ensure both parties are satisfied, I am prepared to resolve this matter legally. However, if there are other proposals, I am ready to discuss them, as they involve defaming my name here."

The case implies that several employment contracts must be terminated. PT Lawless Jakarta, Indonesia, and Lawless Burger Asia also removed Gofar from management positions, which resulted in a feud between him and his friends at the company. Then Gofar Hilman also reported the problem to the police under charge of defamation, with police number LP/B/461/VIII/2021/SPKT/BARESKRIM POLRI, on August 4 2021. The defamation referred to is through electronic media, as in article 27 paragraph (3) in conjunction with article 45 paragraph (3) and/or article 310 of the Criminal Code and/or article 311 of the Criminal Code.

The case then ended peacefully, mediated by the police between Gofar Hilman, the reporter, and Syerin, the reported party, on February 10 2020. Through a video uploaded with her father and mother, Sherin asked Gofar Hilman and his extended family and wider community to retweet my June 8, 2021, upload on the Twitter account @quweenjojo, who has accused Gofar Hilman of sexually harassing her. It is a false accusation made based on imagination. In fact, there was no incident of harassment on August 19, 2018, and he was drunk and under the influence of alcohol. Syerin did not anticipate that her tweet on Twitter would elicit such a significant public response. At the end of the statement, he apologized and acknowledged that he had learned a great deal in this case. Gofar Hilman, through his attorney, decided not to take this case to court and accepted Sherin's apology. Meanwhile, the Legal Aid Institute "LBH APIK", which has been assisting in this case, received a report on February 10, 2022, regarding Sherin's request to revoke legal representation.

Many believe that Syerin's apology was made under police pressure during mediation. To date, this case has not been proven, and Gofar Hilman has been disadvantaged by this accusation. Not only is the mental burden affected, but the implication is that parents and younger siblings are also involved in this problem. Many jobs have finally stopped, and social problems have not yet recovered. Rejection of Gofar Hilman still occurred when Prambors FM Radio welcomed him back with the hashtag #PramborsMorningShowwith, but what happened was that the public actually reacted negatively on social media until there was a petition on Change.org with the title "Dear Prambors, why Gofar?". Because he received a negative reaction from netizens, Gofar Hilman decided not to pursue the second chance offered by Prambors FM.

Social media, especially Twitter, is the most effective medium for encouraging cancel culture against public figures or institutions deemed detrimental to society. The three events discussed above demonstrate that netizens' power to amplify issues on Twitter is strong. Learn from the case of Media Trans TV, the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission, a government institution, and Saiful Jamil, who was the target of criticism by social media users. Now the media, government, and public figures can no longer carry out arbitrary actions against the public because their behavior is monitored by the public (public surveillance) on social media. Even though netizens have not met public figures in person or know the relevant institutions, a single piece of information considered detrimental to the public can prompt them to immediately spread actions detrimental to the public on social media. On the one hand, this proves that society is increasingly critical

and starting to dare to speak out on social issues such as sexual harassment, bullying, and domestic violence. But it becomes dangerous when they don't check the truth of stories about sexual harassment cases on social media. Cancel culture can undermine a person's dignity without prioritizing the principle of the presumption of innocence. As experienced by Gofar Hilman, who was not proven to have committed sexual harassment but still received a cancellation from netizens on social media. This demonstrates that people experience cancel culture on social media even when they have not been proven to have committed the alleged offense; rejection of such accusations cannot simply be dismissed.

Culture War between Buzzers, Ideological Buzzers, and SJWs on social media

The implications of cancel culture also extend to a broader culture war on social media. In dictionary terms, a culture war refers to strong cultural conflict or disagreement between social groups, often rooted in competing values, beliefs, and practices that each side seeks to assert in public life (Oxford Learner's Dictionaries, n.d.; Collins Dictionary, n.d 2021.). In the modern era, these culture wars are amplified by digital ecosystems, where value- and ideology-based disputes circulate rapidly and become more visible through interactions between traditional media narratives and social media debates (Smith et al., 2023). In England, such dynamics have been discussed in relation to the deteriorating relationship between sections of the national press and the Labour Party, including during Jeremy Corbyn's leadership, which has shaped public discourse through highly contested framing of political values and identities (Curran et al., 2018). Supporting this trend, Bobby Duffy noted an "extraordinary increase" in media attention to culture-war terms in the UK, which aligns with shifting public perceptions and growing feelings of national division (King's College London, 2022). More broadly, this is consistent with agenda-setting research suggesting that sustained media emphasis can shape what people perceive as salient in public life, thereby influencing public opinion.

The culture war not only occurred in England but also in Indonesia. Like the debate that has occurred between Buzzer Politics and Social Justice Warrior on Twitter. In fact, the term "buzzer" refers to an individual or account that can amplify messages by attracting attention or initiating conversations with various motives. Usually, a buzzer has a broad network and can create content at a medium or massive scale, in a persuasive manner, with a specific motive. In short, a buzzer is someone who buzzes and makes noises like the buzzing of bees.

Over the last 3 years, the term "buzzer" has changed in meaning, as have their behavior and actions on social media, as seen during the 2019 Presidential Election. The use of buzzers in the presidential election campaign was evident on both sides of the contest. They are buzzers who spread rumors without disclosing their identities, or sometimes use bot accounts to spread hoaxes and propaganda on social media.

Generally, buzzers have two motives: the first is to gain personal financial gain, known as "BuzzerRP"; the second is "Buzzer Khilafah," to support an extreme-right ideology during the 2019 election. Firstly, Buzzer has an economic motive, as evidenced by the narrative form on Twitter: they support one candidate without assuming any right

or wrong. This buzzer's working pattern first receives a brief from a lead buzzer to simultaneously raise an issue or launch a black campaign against opponents or other candidates on Twitter. The aim is to initiate discourse on social media to influence public opinion first. They also collaborate with and pay influencers or public figures to engage with the campaign agenda. In our next election, it is difficult to distinguish between buzzers and influencers; they are united by their economic motives for supporting presidential candidates. In fact, some openly admitted that he was paid monthly to carry out the campaign of one of the presidential candidates. The goal is to control public opinion on social media and make the narrative a trending topic on Twitter. Without ever considering that the implications of his actions had sharpened polarization, society was divided by politics.

The second is the buzzers who are ideologically motivated; the pattern is almost the same, but the motive differs. This buzzer has the aim of spreading the ideology of extreme right religious teachings that spread hatred and say heresy towards those who are different from it. They claim that the religion they promote is the most correct compared to other religions and promotes the ideology of the caliphate as an alternative path to liberal democracy and Pancasila as the state ideology. This buzzer accuses governments that do not use the caliphate system of being considered an idol. The discourse and issues framed on Twitter are wrapped in religious narratives, such as anti-Christian, anti-foreigner narratives, racism, and ultimately calls for supporting the ideology of the caliphate. They do not hesitate to disbelieve those of a different religion. This issue was amplified by both AFA Korea accounts, which simultaneously distributed discourse by retweeting and liking on Twitter. Thus, netizens can perceive this issue as a wave of snow-related effects on social media. This movement is supported by conservative political actors, conservative preachers, and migrant celebrities who have helped clarify the issue on social media. Moreover, this movement holds a special place among many urbanites who are new to the study of religion. The existence of ideological buzzers offers a glimmer of hope amid the existential crisis of the urban middle class, which is often mired in career stereotypes, marriage, and class conflicts created by social media.

Meanwhile, Social Justice Warrior (SJW) is commonly used, often in a derogatory or mocking sense, to describe individuals who actively voice or campaign for progressive social-justice causes (e.g., human rights, feminism, equality, and identity-based issues), particularly through online commentary and activism (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.; Dictionary.com, n.d.; Merriam-Webster, 2018). In Indonesia, the term is frequently deployed as a pejorative label in online discourse, where people can be quickly branded "SJW" for expressing views perceived as opposing dominant political narratives; in practice, this labeling may function to dismiss or minimize the substance of the issues being advocated and can escalate into public shaming that targets personal life (Hartanto et al., 2020). At the same time, SJWs are also criticized for perceived moral absolutism, for emphasizing criticism without proposing solutions, and for forms of performative or "narcissistic" activism that are amplified on social media but weak in offline practice, reflected in the emergence of negative variants such as "paper SJW" or "plastic SJW" in

public discourse (Hartanto et al., 2020). Despite these controversies, advocacy-oriented actors can play an important watchdog role in a democratic public sphere by pressuring institutions to respond more seriously to social problems and improve policy outcomes.

In relation to culture wars on social media, we often see buzzers engaging in satirical debates with SJWs. Buzzers often label SJWs as people who are most holy and righteous, and others who are full of sin. This term indirectly shows that SJWs can only criticize without presenting solutions. On the other hand, SJWs attacked the buzzers with the term buzzerRP. They were accused of defending power without paying attention to the facts that occur in society. They always defend donors' interests, even when it is not appropriate. It is this basic financial instinct that drives their logic, which SJWs nickname them BuzzerRP. Meanwhile, Buzzerkhilafah, with their ideological motives, does not care about the debate between buzzerRP and SJW, but instead plays their role in mitigating the issues of both if they feel it can benefit their interests and existence. The chaotic situation arose from the debate over the three's opinions on Twitter, which left society divided and provoked. Others choose to remain silent and observe because they do not want to be swept up in a prolonged culture war.

Table 1. Culture War Motifs on Social Media

Buzzer RP	Buzzer Ideologi	SJW
Supports the Money motive	Supports ideological motives	Fighter for justice and equality
Against Identity Politics	Creating identity politics narratives	Pro Human Rights
Actors can be influencers	Actors can be robot accounts run by certain interests	Actors usually work in NGOs or NGOs
Contra to the erroneous narrative	Supporting Identity Politics	Contra to Identity politics
Anti-Caliphate	Pro – Caliphate	Supporter of Feminism

Source: Narrative Analysis on Social Media Processed from research data

Today, social media has become a pillar of democracy, where individuals are free to express their opinions. This condition certainly deserves to be maintained and celebrated, but the consequences of this situation make it possible for the existence of SJW and Buzzer to continue because they are also part of citizen participation. It is even possible that, in the future, new forms of culture wars on social media will continue to create conflict and polarization in society. Prolonged conflict and political polarization will certainly drain substantial energy and reduce political stability in society. Political instability will have adverse effects on society, with implications for the economy, law, culture, and education. Moreover, this year Indonesia is entering a political year in which we will hold the presidential and legislative elections simultaneously on February 14, 2024.

Culture wars on social media can be mitigated by increasing digital literacy. At the very least, they must be able to distinguish between opinion and disinformation. Most importantly, netizens must be able and capable of distinguishing between opinions and disinformation on social media. Then, which ones are in the form of advertising campaigns, and which are campaigns that contain incitement to hatred, which ones are in the form of information priming, framing, and which ones are in the form of propaganda. From there, it is hoped that the public will not be easily provoked, whether by buzzers with financial motives, buzzers with ideological motives, or SJWs with donor motives, so that they remain logical in their political choices.

CONCLUSION

The speed of information on social media allows people to access it quickly. People who were awakened by this information became critical and dared to speak out on social media. This has implications for the presence of cancel cultures and culture wars on social media. Long debates about the merits and drawbacks of cancel culture and the culture wars continue on social media to this day. The good and bad of cancel culture and culture wars ultimately stem from individuals' initial intention to cancel or boycott public figures or related institutions. Cancel culture, in the form of activism on social media, helps netizens or the public participate in public social media spaces. People can boycott public figures or institutions that are deemed to have minimal capacity for improvement and change. However, if cancel culture is not targeted and is forced or manipulated, it can become social judgment. Meanwhile, the proliferation of culture wars on social media has exacerbated political polarization and societal division. Because the public can be easily incited by information that does not prioritize facts or group-interest narratives, which are dangerous to the unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia. For this reason, society must be equipped with greater social media literacy to prevent social divisions.

REFERENCES

Ackland, R. (2023). Reciprocal communication and political deliberation on Twitter. *Social Sciences*, 13(1), 5. <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-0760/13/1/5>

Antara News. (2022, January 7). *KPI akhiri kontrak kerja delapan terduga pelaku perundungan*. ANTARA News.

Antara News. (2024, February 28). *Banyak korban kekerasan seksual butuh waktu lama melapor*. ANTARA News.

Ardiyanto, E. & Narawaya, T.G. (2019). *Spektrum Kritik Nalar Komunikasi (dari epistemologi, demokrasi dan determinasi pasar digital)*. Intrans Publishing.

BBC News. (2021, September 10). Victims of Alleged Harassment at KPI, repeated cases at state institutions 'we are just busy like firefighters.

Bradshaw, S., & Howard, P. N. (2020). *The global disinformation order: 2020 global inventory of organised social media manipulation*. Oxford Internet Institute, University of Oxford.

Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d.). *Social justice warrior*. In *Cambridge Dictionary*. Retrieved February 10, 2026.

Casero-Ripollés, A. (2021). Influencers in the political conversation on Twitter: Identifying digital authority. *Sustainability*, 13(5), 2851. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052851>

Collins Dictionary. (n.d.). *Culture war*. In *Collins English Dictionary*. Retrieved February 10, 2026.

Connolly, E., et al. (2025). How does social media content go viral across platforms? *Journal of Political Marketing*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19331681.2025.2519052>

Curran, J., Gaber, I., & Petley, J. (2018). *Culture wars: The media and the British left* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Darmawan, R. A. (2022, January 7). *Korban pelecehan diperpanjang kontrak KPI tapi dipindah ke Kominfo*. detikNews.

Dershowitz, A. (2020). *Cancel culture: The latest attack on free speech and due process*. Hot Books.

Dictionary.com. (n.d.). *Social justice warrior*. In *Dictionary.com*. Retrieved February 10, 2026.

Eriyanto. (2001). *Discourse analysis: Introduction to Media Text Analysis*. Yogyakarta LKIS

Esteve-Del-Valle, M., & Borge-Bravo, R. (2022). Homophily and polarization in Twitter political networks. *Media and Communication*, 10(2), 90–103.

Estrella-Ramón, A., et al. (2024). Hashtag activism on Twitter: The effects of who, what, when... *Social Media + Society*. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/20570473241279330>

Gainous, J., & Wagner, K. M. (2014). *Tweeting to power: The social media revolution in American politics*. Oxford University Press.

Halimatusa'diyah, I., & Adam, R. (2024). *Political buzzer networks as threat to Indonesian democracy* (ISEAS Perspective 2024/66). ISEAS–Yusof Ishak Institute.

Hartanto, H., Subandi, & Pavlova, O. (2020). Progressive view on social justice: Netizen opinions about social justice warrior. *Psikohumaniora: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi*, 5(2).

Haryatmoko. (2007). *Etika komunikasi: Manipulasi media, kekerasan, dan pornografi*. Kanisius.

Herbison, K., & Podosky, P.-M. C. (2024). Call-outs and call-ins. *Journal of the American Philosophical Association*, 10(4), 655–674. <https://doi.org/10.1017/apa.2023.29>

Herman, F. R., & Romadhony, A. (2024). Buzzer account detection in political hate tweets: Case study of the Indonesian Presidential Election 2024. *Indonesian Journal of Information and Communications Technology (IJOICT)*.

Johansen, M. B. (2024). Culture war complexity: How contaminated words and labels polarize public debates. *Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-024-09479-0>

King's College London. (2022, May 12). *Woke, cancel culture and white privilege – how the UK's culture war debate is evolving*.

Koh, S. A. (2022). Prosecution and Polarization. *Fordham Urb. LJ*, 50, 1117.

Kubin, E., & von Sikorski, C. (2021). The role of (social) media in political polarization: A systematic review. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 45(3), 188–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2021.1976070>

McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. McGraw-Hill. (See widely cited passage on the “global village.”)

Merriam-Webster. (2018, September 11). *What does “social justice warrior” mean? Merriam-Webster (Wordplay)*.

Merriam-Webster. (2025, May 19). *What does “woke” mean? Merriam-Webster Wordplay*.

Naranjo-Vinueza, A., et al. (2025). From tweets to power: An integrative thematic review of political communication and platform governance on Twitter/X (2009–2024). *Frontiers in Political Science*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/political-science/articles/10.3389/fpos.2025.1666104/full>

Newman, Lawrence W. (2002). *Social Research Methods*. London: Allyn and Bacon

Obia, V. (2025). *Twitter activism* (working paper / manuscript). White Rose ePrints. <https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/220542/1/Twitter%20Activism.pdf>

Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. (n.d.). *Culture war*. In *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Retrieved February 10, 2026.

Pane, E. H. S. (2024). Media sosial, call out culture, generasi Z, Instagram. *Indonesian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*.

Pew Research Center. (2025a, November 20). *Americans' social media use 2025*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2025/11/20/americans-social-media-use-2025/>

Pew Research Center. (2025b, September 25). *Social media and news fact sheet*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/fact-sheet/social-media-and-news-fact-sheet/>

Riedl, M. J., Lukito, J., & Woolley, S. C. (2023). Political influencers on social media: An introduction. *Social Media + Society*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051231177938>

Roberts, J. A., et al. (2025). An investigation of TikTok, Instagram Reels, and YouTube Shorts: Short-form video (SFV) as a social media development. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1089/cyber.2024.0338>

Skogerbø, E., & Krumsvik, A. H. (2021). Comparing Twitter and Instagram as platforms for politicians: How platform features shape interaction. *First Monday*. <https://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/10638/10243>

Smith, D. S., Boag, L., Keegan, C., & Butler-Warke, A. (2023). Land of woke and glory? The conceptualisation and framing of “wokeness” in UK media and public discourses. *Javnost – The Public*, 30(4), 513–533. doi:10.1080/13183222.2023.2273656

Sobande, F., Kanai, A., & Zeng, N. (2022). The hypervisibility and discourses of “wokeness” in digital culture. *Media, Culture & Society*, 44(8), 1576–1587. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437221117490>

Supriyadi. (2017). Critical Discourse Analysis: Concept and Function for Society. *Journal FKIP. Unila*. <http://jurnal.fkip.unila.ac.id/index.php/aksara/article/view/12173>

Tempo. (2021, September 10). Saipul Jamil Boycott Petition Signed by 150 thousand people. Ask for Television Education KPIs. <https://seleb.tempo.co/read/1502277/petisi-boikot-saipul-jamil-diteken-150-ribu-orang-minta-kpi-edukasi-televi>

Time. (2017, June). The Oxford English Dictionary just added “woke.” *Time*.

University of Oxford. (2021, January 13). *Social media manipulation by political actors an industrial scale problem – Oxford report*. University of Oxford News.

Velasco, J. C. (2020). You are cancelled: Virtual collective consciousness and the emergence of cancel culture as ideological purging. *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 12(5), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v12n5.rioc1s21n2>

Vogels, E. A. (2021). *The state of online harassment* (Vol. 13, p. 625). Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.

World Health Organization. (2021, March 9). *Devastatingly pervasive: 1 in 3 women globally experience violence*. WHO.