

COLLOQUIUM ON CANCEL CULTURE
Institute of Advanced Study, Durham University
26 February 2025

- 09.30-09.45 Welcome, introductions, opening remarks
- 09.45-11.15 *Session I: The Culture of Cancel*
Helen Fenwick (Durham University)
Dennis Hayes (University of Derby)
Dimitrios Kagiarios (Durham University)
- Chair: Peter Coe (University of Birmingham)
- 11.15-11.30 Break
- 11.30-13.00 *Session II: Cancelling*
Paul Wragg (University of Leeds)
Amy Goode and Stephanie Anderson (University of Glasgow)
Emily McTernan (University of London)
- Chair: Gretchen Larsen (University of Durham)
- 13.00-13.45 Lunch
- 13.45-15.50 *Session III: Cancelled*
Fiona Brimblecombe (University of Manchester)
Ian Pace (City, University of London)
(5-minute break)
Pauline Maclaran (Royal Holloway, University of London)
Patrick Zuk (Durham University)
- Chair: Rille Raaper (Durham University)
- 15.50-16.00 Break
- 16.00-16.30 Closing plenary discussion
- 16.30 END

ABSTRACTS

"Maybe I'd be cancelled myself": Moral Dilemmas of Performative Cancellation

Stephanie Anderson and Amy Goode (University of Glasgow)

Digitally empowered consumers express their disapproval by cancelling brands, influencers and public figures. Existing research often theorises cancelling behaviours as a form of consumer activism that signifies a unified consumer voice and moral consciousness. However, treating cancellations as one coherent discourse risks oversimplifying consumer intentions and cancelling behaviours. Using qualitative in-depth interviews with Gen Z consumers, this research examines the moral dilemmas consumers experience when participating in cancel culture. This research advances current understandings of cancel culture by demonstrating the ambiguous and often contradictory character of consumer cancellations. We introduce the notion of performative cancelling which refers to a safeguarding practice consumers use to protect and build moral capital during identity work. This highlights a broader range of motivations that drive cancellations that are underpinned by a perceived obligation to publicly support cancel culture movements. Findings highlight three strategies that consumers use to navigate moral dilemmas encountered by performative cancelling; reckoning, decoupling and humanising. Consumers do not use these strategies to resolve moral dilemmas, and instead occupy a state of stasis that embraces ambiguity.

Cancelled: can defamation law protect you?

Fiona Brimblecombe (University of Manchester)

Picture the scene: you wake up to a number of posts 'cancelling' you on X that have gathered traction overnight, with many thousands of reposts, responses and views. Your business partners have been in touch and no longer want to work with you, and family and friends are looking at you differently. Can English defamation law help?

The aged law of defamation is designed to protect one's reputation, and ultimately one's personal dignity. However, obtaining redress for public humiliation online through defamation law is far from straightforward. There are a number of hurdles that claimants must overcome in order to successfully action in defamation. Firstly, there has to be a defamatory statement that meets the (not insubstantial) serious harm threshold under s.1(1) of the Defamation Act 2013, which 'raised the bar' from the previous common law position. Secondly, there has to be reference to you in the posts complained of, and sufficient publication/communication. Finally, there are a number of defences available for those who have posted the information. If the information is (substantially) true and can be proved such, your action will fall at this stage. Secondly, the posts may be subject to the defence of honest opinion. There is also the defence of publication on a matter of public interest (formerly the 'Reynolds defence') which covers pieces attracting the public interest that cannot be conclusively be shown to be true. Finally, there is the defence for operators of websites in s.5 Defamation Act 2013 which may shield X from liability as a 'host' website, in the event one wishes to bring an action against X. With online defamation on the rise, it will be argued that English defamation law is not doing enough to protect those with their reputations unfairly tarnished online.

Successfully navigating a path between the demands of free speech and of protection from offence on campus in the UK?

Helen Fenwick (Durham University)

This paper will set out to scrutinise closely the phenomenon of so-called ‘cancel culture’ in the UK in the campus context, a matter that has not so far been the subject of a sustained academic examination. The contested idea that a person can be ‘cancelled’, their views excluded or expunged from public platforms, or from an employment context, has polarised debate. A number of advocates of free speech, in some instances arguing from a right-wing perspective, are currently arguing that Universities have allowed so-called ‘cancel culture’ to stifle free expression. It has been argued that some institutions are far too prompt to accept curbs on expression or expressive acts in relation to issues such as transgender rights, racism, feminism, religious extremism. Such curbs tend to be aimed at offence-avoidance; as a result some free speech advocates are arguing that debate on these and cognate issues is in some instances being silenced by an illiberal left that refuses to allow for space in which to hear divergent points of view. But other voices, associated more with the left, oppose that view, criticising the very use of the term ‘cancel culture’ as disingenuous, and as referring to a manufactured phenomenon. They argue that merely allowing the airing of all sorts of views offensive to some, sometimes by powerful public figures with ready access to public platforms, facilitates intolerance, intimidates or silences minorities and opposes equal dignity. The introduction of the Higher Education (Freedom of speech) Act 2023 by a Conservative government, but then its pausing/abandonment by the current Labour government, is illustrative of the tensions at stake. (The Secretary of State for Education announced in July that the Act would not come into force as planned on 1 August 2024. The statement said: ‘Due to concerns from vulnerable groups about how the rules might harm student welfare, we are stopping the implementation of the Act.’)

Universities are required, pursuant to various legal duties, to support critical thinking and plural debate on moral, religious and political issues. Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, applicable to Universities under section 6 Human Rights Act, can readily be found to promote such debate, although the jurisprudence as specifically applying to Universities is relatively undeveloped. But at the same time Universities also have duties, arising from various legal demands, and reflected in codes of practice, to promote non-discrimination, and to safeguard persons, including students, from intimidation or harassment. Arguably, on-campus expression is caught between conflicting duties and conflicting views as to what the protection of free speech on campus requires. This paper will interrogate notions of ‘cancel culture’ in the campus context and consider the abilities Universities have shown, as far as that can be ascertained, to navigate a path effectively between the tensions created by the different duties at stake.

Who gets cancelled in therapy culture?

Dennis Hayes (University of Buckingham)

Academics For Academic Freedom (AFAF) has been monitoring the cancellation, and attempted cancellation, of speakers for almost two decades. Drawing on [The Banned List](#) our research and extensive case work we can identify three distinct, but overlapping, periods of ‘cancel’ culture. The first is period is a political one, that was followed by a searching or directionless period, culminating in a therapeutic or victimhood period. Our case work has taught us that the current ‘therapeutic’ phase of cancel culture the most difficult to challenge. Despite high profile cases of harassment and victimisation most universities (and other institutions) persist in ignoring them and continue to promote what they claim to be ‘caring’ ‘respectful’ and ‘safe’ environments. In a therapeutic culture

anyone expressing an opinion or belief can be reported as breaching guidelines because they are uncaring, or disrespectful, or hurtful. The consequence, in what we call the 'secret university', is that they will then be quietly cancelled. Never has cancel culture been so kindly.

Counter-speech, 'cancel culture' and protections for freedom of expression under Article 10 ECHR

Dimitrios Kagiarios (Durham University)

'Cancel culture' is a 'catch-all' term that has been defined as encompassing "collective strategies by activists using social pressures to achieve cultural ostracism of targets (someone or something) accused of offensive words or deeds" (Norris, 2021). A key component of 'cancel culture' discourse is that cancel culture is presented as having the effect of limiting the freedom of expression of the person who is 'cancelled'. Based on this assumption, I am keen firstly, to distinguish 'cancel culture' from legitimate counter-speech, and secondly, to identify which aspects of 'cancel culture' are legally significant from a FoE perspective - namely, to determine which activities usually associated with 'cancel culture' (such as 'silencing', 'no-platforming', loss of employment or earnings, content being removed from platforms) amount to an interference with free speech, and under which circumstances. I will be using Article 10 ECHR and the jurisprudence of the ECtHR as the basis for this analysis. The overall aim is to argue that the impact of cancel culture on freedom of expression (in the legal sense) is, perhaps, overstated.

Cancel Culture Contagion: Prince Andrew and the British Royal Family Brand

Pauline Maclaran (Royal Holloway, University of London)

This presentation revisits the Prince Andrew scandal and his subsequent cancelling, stemming from his relationship with convicted paedophile, Jeffrey Epstein, and the allegations brought against him by victim Virginia Guiffre. Using social contagion theory to understand the various influences underpinning Andrew's downfall, I map out the important crisis points that led to his cancelling. As part of this analysis, I also identify the strategic responses made by the royal family brand to avoid being contaminated or "infected" by the cancel culture contagion surrounding Andrew.

Don't Google Me: The Right to an Open Future

Emily McTernan (UCL)

A tattoo parlour in the USA offers free cover-ups to former white supremacists to 'erase the hate' etched onto their bodies. Uncovered, these tattoos represent a hatred that they no longer feel and mean they get read as still white supremacists, shaping other's impressions of them before they even speak. But we don't need to have our former beliefs and values tattooed on our skins for them to hinder the ways we want, now, to be seen. Even those of us with less dramatic pasts can find that our previous selves limit our opportunities and plans for the future. The internet creates a permanent record of remarks, jokes, acts or ideas at a previous point in time. Employers trawl people's internet histories on social media before offering jobs and people have lost out on appointments when a statement they've made in the past comes to light. This instinct to check the details of others' pasts isn't restricted to the internet: newspapers publish photos of people dressed in inappropriate fancy dress costumes at college, and university essays are unearthed to check politicians' political

commitments, decades on. Yet, for how long, and in what ways, ought we be held to account for our former selves?

The philosopher Joel Feinberg proposes that *children* have a right to an open future. Once grown, they ought to have enough options left open to freely form and shape their own lives. Yet I suggest that we don't only need to have the ability to freely shape our lives, just the once, on reaching adulthood. To live what the philosophers call autonomous lives – lives we get to shape and decide – we need to be able to start afresh, to begin anew. Certain acts of sufficient gravity might be reason to deny a person a right to an open future: you cannot start afresh if you murder, torture, or rape. But I will propose that it is only acts of such gravity that should block our right to an open future: for the rest of us, even if we have sinned, we need a culture of reputation management that lets us leave the past behind. Permanent records, easily brought to light, or the details of our previous selves, frustrate our exercise of that right.

There is some popular acceptance of the idea that we can leave our pasts behind, in the right to be forgotten. We can have bits of our internet histories hidden from search engines, so that it isn't constantly brought up and into the present. But I argue that far more is needed beyond this law. To secure an open future, we need a social ethic to guide what we do in face of the possibility of endlessly dragging up past indiscretions and deviations. I propose a duty to take people as they are, now, and so to restrain ourselves from hunting through the minutiae of their pasts without good reason.

Academic Mobbing as the Highest Form of Cancel Culture in Universities

Ian Pace (City, University of London)

'Cancel culture' in an academic context is often associated strongly with the concept of *bullying*. But as Janice Harper (2013, rev. 2016) has argued cogently, this concept and much associated literature and guidance for those who believe themselves to be suffering from it is insufficient and can be counterproductive. In this paper, which draws extensively on my article 'Academic mobbing: What university management needs to know', *Sex Matters*, May 2024, at <https://sex-matters.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/Ian-Pace-on-academic-mobbing.pdf>), I outline instead the concept of *academic mobbing*, drawing upon a wide range of literature (much of it in languages other than English, as the concept has been more extensively developed outside of the Anglophone world), from the pioneering work on mobbing in general by Heinz Leymann, who has provided workable definitions, further developed by German, Scandinavian and some American scholars, and then the vital work on this in an academic context by Kenneth Westhues, beginning with his dark 1998 satire *Eliminating Professors: A Guide to the Dismissal Process* (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1998). Westhues identifies key stages in the process, of which some may not be aware until too late. I also mention briefly developments and modifications of Westhues's theories from Thomas E. Hecker, Piper Fogg, Loreleigh Keashly and Joel H. Neuman and others, culminating in the collection of essays edited by Caroline M. Crawford, *Confronting Academic Mobbing in Higher Education: Personal Accounts and Administrative actions* (New York et al: IGI Global, 2020), and also briefly allude to other work on *Groupthink* in academia, in particular the major study by Daniel B. Klein and Charlotta Stern, 'Groupthink in Academia: Majoritarian Departmental Politics and the Professional Pyramid', *The Independent Review* (2009).

Throughout this, I will make reference to actual cases of mobbing, including recent events involving professors Jo Phoenix and Kathleen Stock. I identify warning signs that this is taking place, steps which can be taken in such an event, and mention the criminalisation of such behaviour in several countries, something I advocate should also be implemented in the UK.

Cancel the Public Interest Defence: Is s 4 Defamation Act 2013 Justifiable?

Paul Wragg (University of Leeds)

'Cancelling' is a term open to wide interpretation. Because it is so general, some care is needed in making generalisations about it. Clearly, it concerns a response, amongst an audience, to a person (or an institution) following information revealed by a third party, usually a journalist but not necessarily. That information may reveal a previously unknown (and unappealing) character trait, or a forgotten one, or a known one that speaks to some character flaw that, the third party will say, should not be tolerated. There are (at least) two parts: there is the campaign to invite the response and there is the outcome of that response. A successful 'cancellation' one might say is the revelation of information that leads to the impugned person being punished for their actions, either by way of law (as when, say, Harvey Weinstein was imprisoned) or by social consequences (as when, say, Mason Greenwood was sold at an undervalue by Manchester United or Philip Schofield was sacked from his daytime TV role).

Conceptually, 'cancelling' is not new – newspapers have been cancelling for years. Sociologically, though, it may be that the combination of social media and 24 hr news culture has enhanced the prospects of a successful cancellation by which campaigns to cancel can dominate news cycles more effectively and so achieve greater results. One wonders if the 1992 motion, led by Labour, by which the House expressed its 'profound disgust' concerning Sean Connery's advocacy of violence against women would have achieved greater success if those two phenomena existed then. Certainly, libel law is more generous toward public interest debate now than it was then due to the introduction of s 4, Defamation Act 2013, which strengthened the common law's position after *Reynolds v Times Newspapers Ltd* [2001] 2 AC 127. The question explored in this paper, though, is whether s 4, as interpreted by the courts, including the Supreme Court in *Serafin v Malkiewicz* [2020] UKSC 23, has gone too far in protecting that debate. Specifically, it asks whether the apparent inconsistency of s 4 with other defamation defences renders s 4 both unjustified and unjustifiable conceptually (though not doctrinally) as a matter of free speech.

Cancel culture in historical perspective

Patrick Zuk (Durham University)

It has often been remarked that the underlying motivations and behaviours characteristic of 'cancel culture' are not intrinsically new, and comparable phenomena can be observed throughout history. Commentators concerned about its potentially adverse effects often invoke parallels with episodes such as the so-called 'Cultural Revolution' in the Soviet Union after Joseph Stalin's accession to supreme power in the late 1920s, when Communist activists aggressively sought to crush dissent and impose strict conformity to Marxist-Leninist doctrine across all artistic and intellectual domains. While the validity of such parallels is debateable (not least, because of the very different circumstances obtaining in repressive political regimes), I will argue that an awareness of the deleterious consequences of the tactics employed to punish perceived ideological deviance in the USSR and former Eastern bloc remains crucially relevant to contemporary discussions about the limits of freedom of expression in contemporary Western democracies.

BIOGRAPHIES

Stephanie Anderson is a Senior Lecturer in Marketing at the University of Glasgow. Stephanie's research examines consumer heritage, ritual work and digital consumption. Stephanie has published in *Journal of Consumer Research* and *Marketing Theory*.

Fiona Brimblecombe is Lecturer in Law at the University of Manchester. Primarily a tort and media lawyer, her research focuses on personality rights in the internet age, including the 'right to erasure' in the GDPR, misuse of private information and defamation. She has published in international journals that specialise in internet law as well as legal generalists, such as the *Law Quarterly Review* and *Northern Ireland Legal Quarterly*. Her current research interest is defamation in the age of the internet and she is writing a monograph on this topic for Bristol University Press, in BUP's distinguished '[Shorts](#)' series. Fiona is an Associate Scholar of the [Law and the Inner Self Project](#) based out of University College Cork and funded by the Irish Research Council, and an Editorial Board Member of the [Journal of Economic Criminology](#).

Peter Coe is an Associate Professor in Law at Birmingham Law School, University of Birmingham. His research interests fall within the broad field of Media Law. A primary theme within his research agenda is the changing nature of journalism, and what this means, both normatively and theoretically, for free speech, press freedom and regulation. He is particularly interested in how the development of the internet, and the ascendancy of social media platforms, have altered the press industry and our media and communication ecology more broadly, and how this has led to significant transformative effects on the public sphere by changing the way we generate, publish, and consume information, and how we engage in public discourse generally. Dr Coe has also written widely on defamation law, the protection of reputation and privacy. His work in these areas has been published in leading international journals, and his monograph, *Media Freedom in the Age of Citizen Journalism*, was published by Edward Elgar in 2021. He is also the co-editor, with Professor Paul Wragg, of *Landmark Cases in Privacy Law*, which was published by Hart in 2023. Dr Coe's research has led to several external appointments. For example, in 2024 he was an Institute of Advanced Study Fellow at Durham University. In 2022 he was appointed by the Council of Europe as an independent member of the Council's Expert Committee on Strategic Lawsuits against Public Participation (SLAPPs). In the same year, he was appointed as a Senior Visiting Research Fellow at the School of Law, University of Reading, and in 2021 he was invited to join the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies and Information Law and Policy Centre as an Associate Research Fellow. His work on citizen journalism, press freedom and regulation led to him being invited to join the Impress Code Committee, and between October 2021 and January 2022 he was engaged by Impress to draft its new Standards Code. During 2021-2022, upon invitation from the International Academy of Comparative Law and British Association of Comparative Law, Dr Coe acted as the UK's National Rapporteur on Freedom of Speech and the Regulation of Fake News.

Helen Fenwick is a Professor of Human Rights Law at Durham University; her experience includes: work for the UN and the Council of Europe, acting as the Director of the Human Rights and Public Law Centre in the Law School, Durham University, Convenor of the SLS Civil Liberties and Human Rights Group. She is a Human Rights Consultant to Doughty Street Chambers in London, one of a group of Chambers specialising in human rights litigation. She is author of: *Civil Rights: New Labour, Freedom and the Human Rights Act* (2000, Longmans/Pearson), *Media Freedom under the Human Rights Act* (2006, OUP, with G Phillipson) and of Fenwick on *Civil Liberties and Human Rights* (latest edn 2017, Routledge); she is General Editor and an author for *Judicial Review* (7th edn, LexisNexis, 2024) ISBN

978-1-4743-1351-3) and Consultant editor for: Halsbury's Laws, Contempt (Lexis-Nexis, publication 2025). She has also published a range of articles on human rights matters in *Modern Law Review*, *Public Law*, *Cambridge Law Journal*, *Common Market Law Review*, *European Public Law*, *Criminal Law Review*, *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, *Law Quarterly Review*.

Amy Goode is a Lecturer in Marketing at the University of Glasgow. Amy's research interests are in digital marketing and consumer culture. Amy has published her work in the *European Journal of Marketing* and *Journal of Services Marketing*.

Dennis Hayes is the director of the influential campaign group [Academics For Academic Freedom](#) (AFAF). He is a visiting Professor at the University of Buckingham and an Emeritus Professor of Education at the University of Derby. He is the author of several books on education, including two edited books on the McDonaldisation of Higher Education. His controversial co-authored book *The Dangerous Rise of Therapeutic Education* (2019 [2008]) has been described as 'one of the most important books to have been written in at least the last twenty years in that crucial area where philosophy, policy and practice coincide'. His latest book is *The Death of Academic Freedom? Free speech and censorship on campus* (forthcoming 2025). Twitter: @ProfDHayes

Dimitrios Kagiros joined Durham Law School as an Assistant Professor in Public Law and Human Rights in 2020, having previously been a Lecturer in Law (Education & Research) at the University of Exeter and a Teaching Fellow in Public Law and Human Rights at the University of Edinburgh, School of Law. He holds an LLB in Law from the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, School of Law and an LLM in International Human Rights Law from Brunel University in London. He completed his PhD at the University of Hull, focusing on whistleblower protection in the European Court of Human Rights. His research interests include the European Convention system of human rights protection, the impact of the European sovereign debt crisis on human rights, and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights in relation to Freedom of Expression. Dimitrios serves as a member of the editorial board of *The European Convention on Human Rights Law Review*.

Gretchen Larsen is a Professor of Marketing at Durham University, UK and Co-Director of the Institute of Advanced Study. Her expertise is in interpretive and critical consumer research. She is particularly interested in the relationship between consumption, marketplace cultures, and arts and culture. Much of her work focuses on identity and its relationship to consumption, and more recently it has begun to address affective and embodied responses to sonic phenomena. An increasingly important motivation for her work is to examine those consumers and areas of consumption that have been marginalised, stigmatised and/or excluded in consumer society and in consumer research.

Pauline Maclaran is Professor of Marketing & Consumer Research in the School of Business and Management at Royal Holloway University of London, UK. Her research interests focus on cultural aspects of contemporary consumption, particularly in relation to gender issues. She recently co-authored *Gendered Marketing* (Edward Elgar 2022).

Emily McTernan is an Associate Professor in Political Philosophy, at the Department of Political Science and School of Public Policy, University College London. Her work defends the deep significance of the social realm for ethics and politics: our social norms, social emotions, and, in particular, the details of our social interactions. Her monograph, *On Taking Offence* (OUP, 2023), offers a moral and political defence of this much criticised – but, she argues, socially valuable – emotion. Her next project is a book on our reputations in the face of cancel culture.

Ian Pace is a pianist, musicologist and writer, and is Professor of Music, Culture and Society and University Advisor – Interdisciplinarity at City St George’s, University of London. He has published four books and many scholarly articles; his scholarly work interacts with musicology, culture, history, sociology, politics and education. He has also written frequently for wider publications including *Times Higher Education*, *London Review of Books*, *The Spectator* and *The Critic*. His areas of expertise include music and modernism, especially in Germany, historical and contemporary performance, music historiography, music in education, music analysis and critical musicology, whilst he has also extensively researched abuse and mobbing in education. As a pianist he has given well over 300 world premieres, played in 28 countries (including recent tours in Brazil and Japan), recorded over 40 CDs, and worked with many leading contemporary composers. Notable events include two series of the complete works of Michael Finnissy, in 1996 and 2016, and in 2022 a series of the nine symphonies of Beethoven as transcribed by Liszt. He is co-convenor of City Academics for Academic Freedom, a founding member and Secretary of the London Universities’ Council for Academic Freedom, and a trustee of and Awards Officer for the Society for Music Analysis.

Rille Raaper Associate Professor and the Director of Research in the School of Education at Durham University. Rille’s research interests lie in the sociology of higher education. Her research is primarily concerned with how marketisation of higher education, and the particular implications market forces have on current and future students. Her most recent monograph [‘Student Identity and Political Agency: Activism, Representation and Consumer Rights’](#) (Routledge, 2023) examines the intersections of education, sociology and politics to provide a unique account of the contemporary student identity and political agency in market-driven higher education. Rille’s further research projects build on this, exploring students in a variety of new and altered settings: student influencers on social media platforms such as TikTok (PI, IAS major project 2023 [‘Risks to Youth and Studenthood in Digital Spaces’](#)) and students as complaint-makers in consumerist higher education. Rille is regularly invited to share her research and expertise with various academic and public audiences. Recent examples include: [Teacher Talk Radio](#), the [Mahindra Humanities Centre at Harvard University](#), and the Centre for Studies in Higher Education at UC Berkeley. She also publishes her research findings with [Wonkhe](#) and the [Higher Education Policy Institute](#). Since 2019, Rille is an editor of the journal *Critical Studies in Education*. She is also an associate editor of the journal *Teaching in Higher Education*.

Paul Wragg is Professor of Media Law at the University of Leeds. He is known for his research on aspects of privacy law, press regulation, and free speech, including as it relates to the workplace. He has published in leading journals in the UK and abroad. He is the author of two monographs — *A Free and Regulated Press: Defending Coercive Independent Press Regulation* was published by Hart Publishing Ltd in 2020 whilst his latest *Free Speech Theory: A Radical Restatement* will be published by Hart Publishing Ltd in late Spring. He was part of the original Code Committee at Impress, the UK’s only recognised independent press regulator. He is an Associate Fellow of the Inner Temple and a director of the campaign group Hacked Off.

Patrick Zuk is Professor of Russian Cultural Studies and Music at Durham University, and Co-Director of Institute of Advanced Study. A specialist in Russian and Soviet music and European cultural history, his publications include [Nikolay Myaskovsky: A Composer and His Times](#), which won a CHOICE Outstanding Academic Title award for 2022, and the co-edited collection (with Marina Frolova-

Walker) *Russian Music Since 1917*, which was issued in the Proceedings of the British Academy series published by Oxford University Press. His research has been funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, the British Academy, and the Wellcome Trust. He is currently writing a monograph exploring the role of traumatic experience in shaping the styles and aesthetic orientations of musical modernism, and has recently been awarded a two-year Leverhulme Research Fellowship to support a research project entitled 'The composer in the European imagination: 1830-1970'. In October 2024, Professor Zuk was conferred with an honorary doctorate by the National University of Music, Bucharest for his contribution to the discipline of musicology.