

Idols of Goodwill: Caring Stars and the Making of Global Citizens

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BY

Julie Wilson

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Adviser:

Dr. Laurie Ouellette

November 2011

copyright Julie Wilson 2011

## *Acknowledgments*

Laurie Ouellette taught me how to think. Really think. As an adviser, mentor, writing partner, and scholar, she taught me how to dwell in between theory, texts, institutions, history, and existing critical frameworks. Without her clarity of mind, this project would not have been conceptualized, much less realized. Throughout the writing process, Laurie balanced unyielding belief in me and this project with gentle yet persistent challenge to many of its most basic parameters. If I have made a meaningful contribution, it is because of her.

I would have not found my way to this point without the guidance, both professional and intellectual, of Ron Greene. At a crucial moment in my graduate career, Ron stepped in and helped me to find and make a home in Communication Studies, while showing me that the best critical and theoretical work can indeed happen within a discipline. Ron also reintroduced me to Foucault in a way that profoundly impacted this project. For all this, I will long be in his debt.

Gil Rodman, so generous throughout my time at Minnesota, has been and will always be a whisper in my ear, reminding me that the best cultural studies can do is to provide deep and profound knowledge of contexts. I cannot express (though I hope it shows) how much my work has been shaped by this precept.

Mary Vavrus has been more than my teacher and Director of Graduate Studies; she has been a role model and a vision of what an academic life can be.

To my early supporters, mentors, and teachers at Minnesota, including Shevvy Craig, Richard Leppert, Cesare Casarino, and Robin Brown, thank you for helping get to where I needed to go. To Kirt Wilson and Ed Schiappa, thank you for opening your doors to me. All of your warmth and support are things for which I continue to be immensely grateful.

Also, a big thank you to Diane Negra and Graham Knight whose sincere interest in my work has, at crucial times, provided much needed validation and inspiration.

This project has been shaped in specific ways by a few important encounters. Michael Barnett helped me to understand why stars were valuable to global governance. His brief meeting with me in the early phases sent me down a specific path, one that, I believe, made this project particularly innovative. When I defended my prospectus, Lary May encouraged me to be more historical. I hope my readers will recognize the significance of his nudging. At the 2010 Console-ing Passions conference in Eugene, Oregon, I met Stacy Takacs, whose generous feedback to and suggestions for my work are all over Chapter Two and greatly impacted the overall articulation of the project.

Without the support of my colleagues in the Department of Communication Arts at Allegheny College, this project may never have found its current form. Ishita Sinha Roy, Dan Crozier, Mike Keeley, Vesta Silva, Courtney Bailey, Michael Mehler, Jon Weibel, Mark Cosdon, Beth Watkins, and River

Branch: thanks for protecting me, encouraging me, and giving me a beautiful space to think and work. A special thanks to Barbara Shaw for looking out for me and for ever-so gently keeping me on task this past year, and to Emily Yochim, whose mix of sharp mind and warm spirit have meant so much to me already. Thank you for reading my work, thinking with me, and mostly, for being my dear friend. I'm so looking forward to our future collaborations.

As with all dissertations, mine has been enlivened by a series of friendships with fellow graduate students and scholars including Marisol Alvarez, Elizabeth Ault, Stuart Davis, Alicia Gibson, Mickey Greene, Matt Hadley, Thomas Johnson, Rebecca Jurisz, Alice Leppert, Mark Martinez, Matt May, Helen Morgan-Parmett, Pam Nettleton, Tony Nadler, Matt Stoddard, and Emanuelle Wessells.

Ann Wilson, Dana Wilson, John and Cathy Wilson, Orville Baughman, Katie and Paul Barboa, BeJay Gronaur, Deb Tompkins, Bud Tompkins, Patricia Langrek, Terrance Hopson, Eleanor McGough, Gretchen and Kojo McLennan, Bryan Kennedy, Elizabeth Cowan, and the late Hal Janney: thank you for always believing in me, supporting me, and keeping me grounded and sane.

Kathie Smith: you are my best friend and the best person I know. Thanks for sticking with me all these years; your friendship is the biggest gift. Joe Tompkins: you may lived trapped in your head, but I have never been loved and cared for so well.

*for Annie Lafave*

*who taught me so much about the limits and necessity of caring*

*Abstract*

*Idols of Goodwill: Caring Stars and the Making of Global Citizens* provides a new critical, historical perspective on media celebrity by tracing the emergence of stars as icons of global caring and international community. From early UNICEF educational documentaries featuring Danny Kaye to the on-going celebrity efforts to rebuild Haiti, I document how the discourse of stardom emerged as a powerful cultural technology of global governmentality by providing a material base for international regimes of development in Western contexts. Tasked with shaping global citizens responsive to international institutions and the general welfare of the world, caring stars like Angelina Jolie, Bono, and George Clooney are much more than publicity stunts for global charities, media industries, or the stars themselves. Rather, they are harbingers of global liberalism, helping to harvest the political, economic, and cultural conditions for cosmopolitan world order.

# Idols of Goodwill: Caring Stars and the Making of Global Citizens

## *Table of Contents*

*Prologue* Stars in Haiti...1

*Chapter One* Introduction: Stardom, Citizenship, and Governmentality in Global Times...8

The Triumph of Caring Stars...8

Stars: From Meaning to Governmentality...17

Idols of Goodwill and Global Governmentality...26

Star Discourse and the Liberal Arts of Governing...38

Caring Stars and the Making of Global Citizens...49

*Chapter Two* Mr. UNICEF: Celebrity Diplomacy, Sentimental Education, and One World Culture...58

Sentimental Education and One World Culture...61

Celebrity Diplomacy and U.S. Soft Power...72

Celebrity Diplomacy, Sentimental Education, and Global Governmentality...77

Celebrity Diplomacy, Sentimental Education, and Contemporary One  
World Culture...97

*Chapter Three* Bleeding Heart: The “Spirit of Audrey” and the Rise of  
Cosmopolitan Stardom...109

The Spirit of Audrey...109

Cosmopolitan Stardom...111

Global Cinderella...117

UNICEF and the Hepburn Aura...126

Global Melodrama...132

Pastoral Power, Charitable Femininity, and Global Governmentality...137

*Chapter Four* Global Citizen Brand: Angelina Jolie and the Digital Media

Economy of Global Care...144

Brands and Interactivity...149

Jolie and Cultural Powers of Post-Studio Stardom...157

Global Citizen Brand: Jolie and UNHCR...166

Civic Intermediary...176

Mobilizing Digital Care, Building Governing Capital...185

*Chapter Five Conclusion: Cosmopolitan Stars and the Promotional Politics of*

*Global Governing...199*

*Back to Haiti...199*

*Cosmopolitan Stars and Global Governance...204*

*The Promotional Character of Contemporary Global Governing...212*

*Bono and the Liberal Arts of Promotional Politics...220*

*One World Under the Stars...229*

*Epilogue Letter from Jane...236*

*Bibliography...257*

## *Prologue*

### Stars in Haiti

The devastating earthquake in Haiti on January 12, 2010 was immediately a matter of international concern. Humanitarian organizations like the Red Cross, Oxfam, and UNICEF struggled to mobilize resources and deliver care. The Obama administration quickly tapped USAID to coordinate the international relief effort. Past U.S. presidents Bill Clinton (already a special envoy to Haiti) and George W. Bush put aside past political differences and founded the Clinton Bush Haiti Fund. All the while, news reporters from across the globe descended on Port-au-Prince to cover the tragedy. Screens, mobile and static, were riddled with all too familiar images of famines (Biafra 1968, Ethiopia 1984) and hurricanes (New Orleans 2005) past: images of black bodies, wounded, hungry, many on the brink of death, if not already dead.

There were other all too familiar images as well. Images of caring stars and celebrities eager to help the relief effort. George Clooney organized the *Hope for Haiti Now* telethon in partnership with MTV networks which aired globally on January 22, 2010. Hollywood elite (e.g., Jennifer Aniston, Julia Roberts, Robert Pattinson, Taylor Swift, and Steven Spielberg) manned phone lines, while pop stars, from Beyonce to Sting, performed on a sparse stage, careful to respect the somber tone set by the seasoned celebrity carer Clooney, who had previously

undertaken similar humanitarian televisual feats, including *America: A Tribute to Our Heroes* (2001) and *Tsunami Aid: A Concert of Hope* (2004). The *New York Times*' Alessandra Stanley called the event "a study in carefully muted star power," noting that, "Viewers are drawn to famous faces but at the same time turned off by too much piety and self-congratulation."<sup>1</sup> To date, the telethon has worked to bring in over 60 million dollars for relief efforts.<sup>2</sup>

The *Hope for Haiti Now* telethon was the main event in celebrity efforts surrounding Haiti, but there was also much happening behind the scenes, so to speak. On February 1, 2010, a group of over eighty musicians gathered after the 2010 Grammy Awards to record a new, updated version of "We Are the World," entitled "We Are the World 25 for Haiti," whose sale and distribution would benefit Haiti relief. (The original "We Are the World" single was also part of a massive celebrity organizing effort centered on the 1985 famine in Ethiopia.) Airing during the opening ceremonies of the 2010 Winter Olympic games, the new single featured a rap verse about Haiti, as well as an eerie Janet and Michael Jackson duet, where the sister sings alongside tracks recorded by her recently deceased brother 25 years ago as part of the original "We Are the World" production. Music critics, not surprisingly, panned the album on its artistic merits

---

<sup>1</sup> Alessandra Stanley, "Celebrities Go Low-Key, and Sometimes Nameless, in Haiti Telethon," *New York Times*, January 23, 2010, accessed May 6, 2010, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/23/arts/television/23watch.html>

<sup>2</sup> *Hope For Haiti Now* website, accessed August 1, 2011, <http://www.hopeforhaitinow.org/>

(as is often the case with charity rock anthems), but the effort was, nonetheless, a modest commercial/charitable success.<sup>3</sup>

While entertainment figures were banding together to help Haiti, high-profile members of the glitterati were busy making huge personal contributions to relief efforts. For example, Sandra Bullock donated one million to Doctors Without Borders; Model Gisele Bündchen donated \$1.5 million to the American Red Cross; and Madonna donated \$250,000 to Partners in Health.<sup>4</sup> High-profile members of the Twitterati, including Alyssa Milano, Demi Moore, and Ashton Kutcher, sent 140 character appeals to followers to support UNICEF and the Red Cross.

In the most intense show of commitment to the peoples of Haiti, Sean Penn founded the J/P Haitian Relief Organization. In the immediate aftermath of the earthquake, Penn used his star power to mobilize medical supplies and transport, cut through red tape, and assist in the initial emergency relief efforts. Months later, Penn was not only still in Haiti; he was managing a tent camp on the Pétionville golf course that provided shelter to some 55,000 people, working in partnership with established NGOs, military personnel, the U.N., official aid

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, see Jon Pareles, “We are the World 25 for Haiti: Big-Name Karaoke with Good Intentions,” *New York Times*, February 13, 2010, accessed August 1, 2011, <http://artsbeat.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/02/13/we-are-the-world-25-for-haiti-big-name-karaoke-with-good-intentions/>

<sup>4</sup> “Hollywood and Haiti: Who’s Giving What?,” *The Marquee Blog*, CNN Entertainment, January 25, 2010, accessed May 6, 2010, <http://marquee.blogs.cnn.com/2010/01/25/hollywood-and-haiti-whos-giving-what/>

agencies, and community organizations to provide basic social services to Haitians displaced by the earthquake.<sup>5</sup> In an interview with the *Democracy Now's* Amy Goodman, Penn criticized the humanitarian relief and rebuilding efforts, as well as the ways that Haiti had slipped out of the public's consciousness. From Penn's insider point of view, responsible, in-depth media coverage could do more for the Haitian population than an aid agency: "I think that the—you know, your being here, and any time there's media and responsible media here, is virtually more important than any aid organization's presence at all. With that alone, people in the United States would get to know the Haitian people and send the money right into their hands. They'd adopt neighborhoods. They'd adopt schools."<sup>6</sup>

These diverse acts of celebrity caring for the people of Haiti were in many ways expected. After all, entertainment figures have long used their star power to raise funds and consciousness for good causes, from disease (Jerry Lewis's MDS telethons, and more recently, *Stand Up To Cancer; The Show*), child poverty (Sally Struthers' television ads for Christian Children's Fund), and, especially for emergency relief (*Live Aid, Tsunami Aid: A Concert for Hope*). What was unique, however, about the celebrity response to the disaster in Haiti (aside from all the

---

<sup>5</sup> Leona Jane Estes, "Hunkered Down in Haiti with Sean Penn, Humanitarian," *Vanity Fair*, June 3, 2010, accessed July 1, 2010, <http://www.vanityfair.com/online/daily/2010/06/hunkered-down-in-haiti-with-sean-penn-humanitarian.html>

<sup>6</sup> "Sean Penn on Haiti Six Months After the Earthquake, Recovery Efforts, and Why He Decided to Manage a Tent Camp of 55,000 Displaced Persons," *Democracy Now!*, July 13, 2010, accessed July 20, 2010, [http://www.democracynow.org/2010/7/13/sean\\_penn\\_on\\_haiti\\_six\\_months](http://www.democracynow.org/2010/7/13/sean_penn_on_haiti_six_months)

texting and tweeting involved) was that many stars, like Bill Clinton, were *already there before* the disaster.

The glamorous globetrotting duo of Angelina Jolie and Brad Pitt had visited Port-au-Prince in 2006 to help celebrate and promote hip-hopper and Haiti native Wyclef Jean's Yele Haiti.<sup>7</sup> Since founding the organization in 2005, Jean has worked (not without controversy) to increase Haiti's profile on the global stage and to raise funds for the impoverished nation. FINCA (an international microfinance organization with bases in Haiti) Ambassador of Hope Natalie Portman posted a plea for help immediately following the earthquake, speaking of her "special" connection to the embattled nation:

FINCA Haiti has always held a special place in my heart. Small loans make an enormous impact on the lives of Haitian women currently living on less than \$3 a day. And now, more than ever, Haitian women need these capital inputs to help themselves recover from this tragedy in a sustainable way.

As FINCA's Ambassador of Hope, I am asking for your help. Please help FINCA Haiti provide the resources to our Village Banking clients so they can begin to get back on their feet and build anew. There has rarely been a more urgent need for generosity.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Karen Thomas, "Pitt, Jolie In Haiti: 'We plan to be back,'" *USA Today*, January 13, 2006, accessed August 1, 2011, [http://www.usatoday.com/life/people/2006-01-13-pitt-jolie-haiti\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/life/people/2006-01-13-pitt-jolie-haiti_x.htm)

<sup>8</sup> "Urgent Message From FINCA's Ambassador of Hope Natalie Portman about Haiti," FINCA, January 15, 2010, accessed August 1, 2011, <http://www.finca.org/site/apps/nlnet/content2.aspx?c=6fIGIXMFJnJ0H&b=6088875&ct=8442605>

In 2009 *House* star Olivia Wilde co-founded with Academy Award winning writer/director Paul Haggis (*Crash* 2004) the organization Artists for Peace and Justice, whose “immediate goal is to build schools to serve the poorest areas of Haiti.” Inspired by the work of priest-turned-community organizer Rick Frechette, Haggis and Wilde organized a slew of celebrity supporters, including, Ben Stiller, Charlize Theron, Penelope Cruz, Gerard Butler, Oliver Stone, and Clint Eastwood, to name just a few. When the earthquake struck, the organization had volunteers on the ground caught in the rubble. After returning from Haiti on January 14, just days after the quake, Wilde told *Us Magazine*, a popular U.S. celebrity news and gossip outfit:

I am gutted by this catastrophe...The organization I work with, Artists for Peace and Justice, supports the efforts of Fr Rick Frechette...a doctor and priest who has spent more than two decades in Haiti building badly needed hospitals, schools, and orphanages. He is also responsible for distributing the only free clean water in the slums of Port-au-Prince. Right now, their team on the ground needs money desperately to help dig people out of the collapsed hospitals and schools, to buy emergency medicine, to supply badly needed water and food, to help fly in doctors for the wounded children, and so much more...Any amount helps.<sup>9</sup>

While it seemed like nearly all of Tinseltown had lined up to support the victims of the Haiti earthquake and to urge audiences to do the same, a handful of stars were already there, already working to promote economic development and

---

<sup>9</sup> “Olivia Wilde ‘Gutted’ by Haiti Earthquake,” *Us Magazine*, January 14, 2010, accessed August 1, 2011 <http://awards.omg.yahoo.com/news/1525-olivia-wilde-gutted-by-haiti-earthquake>

community empowerment, already working to teach their media audiences back home about the struggles facing Haiti, the on-going efforts to overcome these struggles, and the shared obligation on the part of citizens to help.

We're accustomed to seeing stars step in to prescribe right action (e.g., charity, compassion) when disaster strikes, but the fact that some stars were already in Haiti before the devastating quake suggests something peculiar about stars and their place in these global times. Stars today participate in the promotion of practices of global citizenship and are deeply embroiled in technical and material ways in the work of global governing: more specifically, the care work performed by international institutions like the U.N., Western-led aid and development agencies, and transnational NGOs purporting to tend to the health and welfare of populations in the Global South.

My dissertation traces how this happened, how luminaries from the world of entertainment came to be articulated to discourses of global citizenship and found their way into the fields of global governing. Accordingly, the primary subjects of this study are not the stars of the big screen, television personalities, rock gods, pop stars, or cross-over stars who shuttle in-between the various arms of the culture industry. Rather, my subjects are those cultural figures from the realm of entertainment that have been articulated to the exigencies and aims of the international community, caring stars who have been enlisted-- in many cases, enlisted themselves-- as shapers and makers of global citizens.

## *Chapter One*

### Introduction: Stardom, Citizenship, and Governmentality in Global Times

#### *The Triumph of Caring Stars*

In 1944 Leo Lowenthal lamented “the triumph of mass idols,” that is, the shift in popular biographies away from “idols of production” (political and business elites) to “idols of consumption” (sports and entertainment figures from the world of leisure who do “not belong to vocations which serve society’s basic needs.)”<sup>10</sup> Lowenthal worried: “They seem to lead a dream world of the masses who no longer are capable or willing to conceive of biographies primarily as a means of orientation and education. They receive information not about the agents and methods of social production but about the agents and methods of social and individual consumption.”<sup>11</sup> For Lowenthal the rise of a mass culture dominated by media celebrities represented cultural decline: the replacement of self-made heroes with fabricated stars, of business, politics, civic leadership, and education with the gossipy, hedonistic, morally bankrupt, feminized world of consumer culture. Indeed, echoes of Lowenthal live on in the seemingly ever-present moral panics about celebrity culture and the tabloidization of news, politics, and

---

<sup>10</sup> Leo Lowenthal, “The Triumph of Mass Idols,” in *The Celebrity Culture Reader* ed. P.D. Marshall (London: Routledge, 2006), 130.

<sup>11</sup> Lowenthal, “Mass Idols,” 131.

everyday life that celebrity, consumer culture is imagined to fuel. And while critical cultural work on stars has complicated and challenged prominent narratives of celebrity as cultural decline, stars have, nonetheless, been studied primarily as “idols of consumption,” that is, as media figures implicated in a variety of ways in the emergence and on-going life of consumer culture and capitalism.

My dissertation, however, provides a new cultural history of stardom by tracing the emergence of stars as *idols of goodwill*. As suggested by the diversified and prolific forms of celebrity caring in Haiti, both before and after the earthquake, stars today increasingly step outside the glamorous Hollywood lifestyle in order to participate in the serious stuff of humanitarian and development aid. Stars like Angelina Jolie, George Clooney, and Olivia Wilde are thus much more than hot commodities for the culture industries or hot copy for journalists; they also figure as icons of global care and model world citizens, speaking about and acting out social duties to a broader international community. Representations of caring stars are shot through popular culture via a multiplicity of media forms, from educational documentaries to celebrity gossip, which, among other things, serve as reminders about the plights of those less fortunate populations and of media audiences’ moral obligations to them. In this way, caring stars can certainly be seen as “belonging to vocations which serve [global] society’s basic needs,” and their biographies can be seen as a “means of

orientation and education.” What is more, as idols of goodwill, stars not only mediate ideas about global citizenship; they take their social and political function further by contributing in material and technical ways to global governing, working in the field alongside community activists, aid workers, and policy experts.

I submit that one of the strangest features of contemporary popular media and political contexts is the proliferation of idols of goodwill, stars who have crossed-over from the culture industries to become Goodwill Ambassadors, Messengers of Peace, and celebrity advocates for global governing. Of course, we’ve seen similar cross-over stars before, from Ronald Reagan to Arnold Schwarzenegger, developments undoubtedly tied to the increasing mediation and tabloidization of politics. Lines between entertainment and politics blur, as celebrities move rather seamlessly in and out of the world of statecraft, and politicians are subject to celebrity-style evaluations of their personal life, required to master the art of image-making and management.<sup>12</sup> However, what ultimately distinguishes appointed stars like Jolie and Clooney from elected stars like Reagan and Schwarzenegger is the caring work and global scope that marks these articulations of celebrity and politics. These stars transcend the raucous squabbling associated with national partisan politics, focusing instead on the shared, seemingly apolitical, humanitarian concerns of global governing, from

---

<sup>12</sup> See Darrell M. West and John Orman, *Celebrity Politics* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2003).

emergency relief to economic and community development in poor nations. These stars direct public attention to social concerns beyond the nation-state and thus mobilize media audiences as caring global citizens with social and moral obligations to the international community. Over the past two decades, idols of goodwill have proliferated along with international agencies, as, in the wake of the end of the Cold War, new horizons for global governing have opened up, while the contours of citizenship-- cultural, political, and economic-- are increasingly global. As my dissertation shows, today's caring stars are intimately bound up in these new conceptions of global governing and citizenship. They are the glitterati of an emerging global civil society, helping to harvest the social, political, and cultural conditions for new configurations of global liberalism.

This triumph of caring stars is on full display at the website, *Look to the Stars*, a website that details, tracks, and reports “the world of celebrity giving.” Boasting 2,500 celebrities and nearly 1,700 charities (and counting), the site invites fans to “learn about their favorite stars’ good deeds.”<sup>13</sup> Indeed, the world of celebrity giving is a global one, as well-known international causes and their high-profile celebrity supporters feature most prominently. The caring acts that make up “the world of celebrity giving” are diverse, reflecting various levels of commitment and risk. “Celebrity giving” may include obvious publicity stunts

---

<sup>13</sup> *Look to the Stars: The World of Celebrity Giving*, Steve and Myrliia Purcell, <http://www.looktothestars.org>

(e.g., headlining a charity event, donating an item to a charity auction, or designing consumer goods whose sale will benefit a particular cause); public education (e.g., starring in documentaries, testifying before government committees, penning editorials, giving interviews about a social cause); and field trips to learn firsthand about the challenges of institutions, agencies, and less fortunate populations (e.g., visiting a refugee camp). *New York Times* reporter James Traub dubs this world of generous and caring stars the “celebrity-philanthropy complex.”<sup>14</sup> Comprised not only of stars and charities but also of offices and agencies tasked with managing the relationship between the two, the celebrity-philanthropy complex speaks to larger political economic realities circumscribing contemporary stardom and global governing. On the one hand, stars and their entourages are increasingly responsible for managing their brand and star image in the post-studio Hollywood era,<sup>15</sup> making associations with good causes an expedient means of crafting personae and heightening public regard. On the other hand, global charities, transnational NGOs, and even the U.N. rely heavily on marketing and branding in a context of steepening competition for public funds and attention, making “celebrity giving” a valuable resource.<sup>16</sup> As

---

<sup>14</sup> James Traub, “The Celebrity Solution,” *The New York Times Magazine*, March 9, 2008, 38-43.

<sup>15</sup> See Paul McDonald, “The Star System: The Production of Hollywood Stardom in the Post-Studio Era,” in *The Contemporary Hollywood Film Industry*, eds. Paul McDonald and Janet Wasko (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2008).

<sup>16</sup> Traub, “Celebrity Solution.” See also Jo Littler, “‘I feel your pain’: Cosmopolitan Charity and the Public Fashioning of the Celebrity Soul,” *Social Semiotics* 18:2 (2008): 237-251.

evidenced by *Look to the Stars* and noted by Traub, there is a clear hierarchy at work in the world of celebrity giving, with the biggest stars-- for example, Clooney and Jolie-- seeming to take on the biggest causes (e.g., stopping genocide in Darfur and the global refugee crisis).

Of course, the rise of the celebrity-philanthropy complex is owed to, and takes form, within global neoliberalism. Until the 1970s the international systems of governance largely abided by an “embedded liberal” compromise, where, as David Harvey explains, “market processes and entrepreneurial and corporate activities were surrounded by a web and social and political constraints and a regulatory environment.”<sup>17</sup> As neo-classical economists began to gain power however, the embedded liberal compromise was replaced by neoliberal approaches that advocated the privatization of public resources, the dismantling of social safety nets and state-led social welfare programs, and the freeing up of trade regulations. In turn, citizens were allegedly empowered to care for themselves and to determine their own life conditions without intervention from the state. The “web of social and political constraints” disappeared, while this new consensus-- often referred to as the Washington Consensus-- made vital foreign aid to poor countries contingent on their economic and social restructuring in

---

<sup>17</sup> David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005):11.

accordance with neoliberal doctrine.<sup>18</sup> As states, especially in developing countries, were forced to step back from the direct provision of social welfare for their populations, a host of charitable NGOs, aid agencies, humanitarian outfits, and philanthropic players-- often referred to as global civil society-- stepped in to pick up the slack. And despite their often non-profitable aims, these organizations have increasingly had to play by the rules of free market enterprise in order to better sell their services to private donors, governments, and clients alike.

As Traub's reporting on the celebrity-philanthropy complex suggests, caring stars are crucial branding and revenue generating devices for global governing, not to mention peddlers of privatized, individualized, non-public forms of aid seemingly in step with the global neoliberal imaginary. Yet I want to suggest that the triumph of caring stars is also a longer historical process that predates the rise of global neoliberalism and is bound up with the ways that idols of goodwill have helped to circulate and promote discourses of world government, a prospect championed by internationalists in the wake of World War II and embodied in the founding of the United Nations. Put differently, the triumph of caring stars is also about the cultural life of global governing and global citizenship in the second half of the twentieth century.

---

<sup>18</sup> Harvey, *Brief History*. See also Naomi Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2007): 155-168.

Founded on the promise of global social security, the U.N. is charged with carrying out two primary interrelated aims: first, to facilitate international cooperation among nations while preserving human rights and global peace; and, second, to promote education, health, self-government, and economic advancement in poorer parts of the world.<sup>19</sup> Idols of goodwill are those stars which have clearly been articulated to this conception of the general welfare. Hence, some idols of goodwill, especially those at the top of the celebrity-philanthropy complex, do something more than promote a charitable cause, thereby promoting neoliberalism; they also give global governing a material, cultural base in Western media and political contexts.

Despite the plethora of scholarship devoted to theorizing both neoliberalism and globalization, the proliferation of idols of goodwill has, by and large, received little critical attention from media and cultural studies scholars. More recently, however, critical work has tended to hone in on celebrity-philanthropy, in particular, Bono's infamous RED venture, which empowers consumers to save AIDS victims in Africa by buying RED brand lifestyle products. For example, Lisa Ann Richey and Stephano Ponte published a book on RED which situates the campaign as "the quintessential manifestation of a phenomenon we call 'Brand Aid' that brings consumers and branded corporations

---

<sup>19</sup> Robert Asher et al., *The United Nations and the Promotion of the General Welfare* (Washington DC: The Brookings Institution, 1957): 5.

into international development through celebrity mediation.”<sup>20</sup> At stake is RED’s primary goal: “not to push governments to do their part, but to push consumers to do theirs through exercising their choices.”<sup>21</sup> Indeed, RED is highly indicative of global neoliberalism and the privatization of aid and social welfare, but also, and more specifically, of related trends in business culture and philanthropy (e.g., the rise of corporate social responsibility). With regard to the latter, market logics have been embraced in recent decades on the grounds of efficiency and innovation, while corporate (and star) brands have been afforded prominent roles in philanthropic endeavors to better social worlds.<sup>22</sup>

While RED poses an easy target for critical scholars interested in articulations of celebrity and global politics (in large part because it allows stars to remain “idols of consumption,” yoked to the consumer, capitalist culture that spawned them), my work tells a different story of celebrity mediation and global politics, one that places the caring work of stars in the field of global governmentality. A governmentality framework invites a different sort materialist analysis rooted in the broader governing aims and exigencies that circumscribe idols of goodwill and the international community. Complicating recent

---

<sup>20</sup> Lisa Ann Richey and Stephano Ponte, *Brand Aid: Shopping Well to Save World* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011): 17.

<sup>21</sup> Richey and Ponte, *Brand Aid*, 33.

<sup>22</sup> In addition to Richey and Ponte, see Samantha King, *Pink Ribbons, Inc.: Breast Cancer and the Politics of Philanthropy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006).

influential accounts of celebrity philanthropy and do-gooding, this approach brings theories and histories of liberal governmentality into conversation with those of stardom in order to understand how stars have emerged as key agents in global governing.

*Stars: From Meaning to Governmentality*

Theorizing caring stars as *idols of goodwill*-- strategically bracketing their primary status as “idols of consumption”-- brings new dimension to the star phenomenon and celebrity culture, particularly when it comes to questions of cultural power in global times. Critical media and cultural studies scholars have long sought to understand the cultural power of stars and stardom. From Richard Dyer’s groundbreaking work on “stars as images”<sup>23</sup> to Jackie Stacey’s reception analysis of female fans,<sup>24</sup> scholars have set out to understand how and why stars come to matter culturally and politically through analyses of the interplays between stars and audiences in particular contexts. Here the cultural power attributed to stars is, more often than not, conceptualized from the meanings constructed through processes of mediation and interpreted within a hegemonic or

---

<sup>23</sup> Richard Dyer, “Stars as Images” in *Stars* (London: British Film Institute, 1998).

<sup>24</sup> Jackie Stacey, *Star Gazing: Hollywood Cinema and Female Spectatorship* (London: Routledge, 1993: 126-175).

ideological framework. Alternatively, others such as Joshua Gamson,<sup>25</sup> Graeme Turner,<sup>26</sup> and Barry King<sup>27</sup> have attempted to examine the industrial conditions circumscribing celebrity/star production, paying varying degrees of attention to the more explicitly political economic determinants of stardom and the perceptions of value and power that come to be attributed to it. What holds all these accounts together is a primary concern with mediation: that is, with the meanings generated by stars and/or the processes of cultural and industrial production that enable them. Simply put, stars and their cultural power have been analyzed as the products of meanings generated both on-screen and through ancillary texts.

The questions guiding my research, however, have less to do with the meanings of star/celebrity texts as constructed within and for the benefit of media industries and more to do with how, why, and to what effect stars have increasingly been put to work in the representational and material fields of global governing. Most relevant to this project are then are those critical approaches that explicitly seek to understand stardom's relationship to politics and governing. One important example is the work of John Street, who challenges economic theories

---

<sup>25</sup> Joshua Gamson, *Claims to Fame: Celebrity in Contemporary America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993): 57-108.

<sup>26</sup> Graeme Turner, *Understanding Celebrity* (London: Sage, 2004): 29-70.

<sup>27</sup> Barry King, "Articulating Stardom," in *Stardom: Industry of Desire*, Ed. Christine Gledhill (London: Routledge, 1991):167-182. Also "Embodying an Elastic Self: The Parametrics of Contemporary Stardom," in *Contemporary Hollywood Stardom*, Eds. Thomas Austin and Martin Barker (London: Arnold, 2003): 45-61.

of democracy as marketing to consider what celebrity performance contributes to politics. Street proposes: “But what if the business of politics is not commercial business (i.e. selling oil) so much as show-business (selling people and performances)? What if politics is not understood as purely instrumental, but expressive, as a cultural relationship rather than a market one?”<sup>28</sup> For Street, celebrities have a productive role to play in politics, as “they belong to the field of cultural goods...their value lies in their meaning as texts, rather than their use as commodities.”<sup>29</sup> In other words, celebrities accrue distinctive forms of political capital through performance, that is, through the cultural values and meanings that come to be attributed to their image. Street is building on the influential work of P. David Marshall who argues that, “One of the critical points of convergence of politics and entertainment is their construction of public personalities. In politics a leader must somehow embody the sentiments of the party, the people, and the state. In the realm of entertainment, a celebrity must somehow embody the sentiments of an audience.”<sup>30</sup> Marshall theorizes celebrity’s “affective function”<sup>31</sup> in politics, that is, the ways in which celebrity allows for the channeling of emotion and sentiment towards a particular political agenda.

---

<sup>28</sup> John Street, “The Celebrity Politician: Political Style and Popular Culture” in *The Celebrity Culture Reader*, ed. P.D. Marshall (New York: Routledge, 2006): 363.

<sup>29</sup> Street, “Celebrity Politician,” 365.

<sup>30</sup> P. David Marshall, *Celebrity and Power: Fame in Contemporary Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997): 203.

<sup>31</sup> Marshall, *Celebrity and Power*, 204-205.

While the work of Street and Marshall certainly helps to clarify the connections between celebrity culture and the political realm, and thus to see why and how star discourses emerge as productive political forces, my approach is somewhat different. In order to grapple with the cultural power of idols of goodwill, I adapt a governmentality perspective, taking as my starting point not the processes of celebrity mediation and performance but the incorporation of stars and stardom into a “governing apparatus.”<sup>32</sup> Specifying the technical and practical dimensions of their citizen-shaping work, my dissertation traces how, why, and to what effect stars-- and the discourse of stardom-- have come to play a powerful role in the global governing apparatus that animates the international community, seeking to serve the general welfare of the world by promoting development and humanitarian aid in the Global South. As will become clear, this approach not only pushes at the disciplinary borders of star studies; it also complicates recent work on media, culture and the governing of populations whose focus has been almost exclusively domestic. Broadly speaking then, my project is situated not only within star studies, but also within on-going conversations about liberal governmentality and corresponding modalities of citizenship; furthermore, it is in dialogue with a growing set of scholarly work

---

<sup>32</sup> Ronald Greene, *Malthusian Worlds: U.S. Leadership and the Governing of the Population Crisis* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1999): 3-5.

that parses media culture's role in enabling, sustaining, and extending liberal regimes.

Foucault developed the concept of governmentality in his later work, most forcibly in his lectures delivered at the Collège de France between 1977 and 1979.<sup>33</sup> What Foucault elaborates as a governmentalization of the state refers to an on-going re-conceptualization of the state's power as dispersed and regulatory, concerned with securing and maximizing the well-being of its citizenry. His central claim was that the birth of economic liberalism in the 18<sup>th</sup> century was accompanied by and relied on a new mode of power capable of "governing at a distance" through civil society and the social realm. Of course, state sovereignty did not vanish, but rather took a backseat to a new state form-- a reflexive, technical, governmental one, whose aim was not simply the disciplining of citizens within a geographic territory but rather the on-going activation, maximization, and harnessing of their productive capacities. Within this critical framework, Foucault's primary object of study was the governing rationality; as Colin Gordon explains, "A rationality of government will thus mean a way or system of thinking about the nature and practice of government (who can govern; what governing is; what or who is governed), capable of making some form of that activity thinkable and practicable both to its practitioners and to those upon

---

<sup>33</sup> Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007) and *The Birth of Biopolitics* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

who it was practiced.”<sup>34</sup> Specific to the governmentalized state and particular governing rationalities, power is understood as “the conduct of conduct:” technical and practical activity aimed at shaping and guiding behaviors.<sup>35</sup>

Over the last 15 years, scholars have taken inspiration from Foucault’s work on governmentality, as a group of social and political theorists, including Nikolas Rose and Mitchell Dean, helped to inaugurate what is often referred to as “governmentality studies.” Blending a history of political ideas associated with liberalism, empirical investigation, and discourse analysis, governmentality studies seek to expose how particular governing rationalities and technologies of rule become thinkable and thereby made effective within contexts. Keen to account for historical and political contingencies of power, Dean explains a governmentality perspective in terms of an “analytics of government” that is

distinguished from most theoretical approaches in that it seeks to attend to, rather than efface, the singularity of ways of governing and conducting ourselves. Thus it does not treat particular practices of government as instances of ideal types and concepts. Neither does it regard them as effects of a law-like necessity or treat them as manifestations of a fundamental contradiction. An analytics of government examines the conditions under which regimes of practices come into being, are maintained and are transformed.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Colin Gordon, “Governmental Rationality: an introduction,” in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, eds. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991): 3.

<sup>35</sup> Gordon, “Governmental Rationality,” 2.

<sup>36</sup> Mitchell Dean, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society* (London: Sage, 1999): 21.

Of particular concern to these scholars has been the refashioning of governmentality according to distinctly neoliberal rationalities in recent decades and the concomitant dismantling of the welfare state in post-industrial societies. For example, Nikolas Rose's work reveals the intensified obligations to self-manage, which are placed on citizens by emerging regimes of "governing through freedom."<sup>37</sup> Citizens in neoliberal regimes are ultimately enjoined to become the experts of their selves, managing their own freedom and pursuing self-fulfillment within a social and cultural realm defined primarily by market-based logics and rationales. Graham Burchall has theorized this marketization of the social as the expansion of an "enterprise form" to nearly all domains of private and personal life.<sup>38</sup> According to these thinkers, traditional conceptions of civil society are being displaced by an "enterprise culture," as good citizenship becomes linked to an entrepreneurial vision of the self and social life.

Around the same time these theorists were updating Foucault's concept of governmentality in order to understand the social and political implications associated with the rise of neoliberal regimes, cultural studies scholars had begun to develop their own version of governmentality studies rooted primarily in an interrogation of culture's role in the production of citizens. What separates this

---

<sup>37</sup> Nikolas Rose, *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

<sup>38</sup> Graham Burchell, "Liberal Government and Techniques of the Self," in *Foucault and Political Reason*, eds. Andrew Barry, Thomas Osbourne, and Nikolas Rose (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996): 19-36.

work from other critical studies obviously concerned with similar operations was the re-conceptualization of culture at the heart of these projects. Moving away both from Gramsci and an understanding of cultural power rooted in a theory of hegemony, as well as from Althusser and an ideology-based conception of the subject, scholars like Tony Bennett<sup>39</sup> and Toby Miller<sup>40</sup> attempted to articulate an alternative approach to culture and cultural power by way of Foucault's theories of government. Still concerned primarily with culture, social control, and possibilities for social change, this work advanced the idea that culture is less an amorphous 'whole way of life' expressed in cultural texts and practices and more a distinct, discursively constituted terrain of social management.<sup>41</sup> The key insight shared here was that cultural institutions-- such as public broadcasting institutions<sup>42</sup> and museums-- work to cultivate citizens through specific cultural technologies that provide templates for behavior and find articulation in cultural policies that can be analyzed in relation to broader political rationalities. What's come to be known as "critical cultural policy studies" took cultural policy as "a site for the production of cultural citizens, with the cultural industries providing not only a realm of representations about oneself and others, but a series of

---

<sup>39</sup> Tony Bennett, *Culture: A Reformer's Science* (London: Sage, 1998).

<sup>40</sup> Toby Miller, *Technologies of Truth: Cultural Citizenship and the Popular Media* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998).

<sup>41</sup> Bennett, *Culture*, 60-86.

<sup>42</sup> Laurie Ouellette, *Viewers Like You? How Public TV Failed the People* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002).

rationales for particular types of conduct.”<sup>43</sup> The hope was that, by “putting policy into cultural studies,”<sup>44</sup> critics could more productively and effectively intervene in timely struggles over cultural production.

In just the last few years however, critical media and cultural studies scholars have broadened their version of governmentality studies, moving towards a more rigorous engagement with Foucault’s theories of governmentality and their updating by contemporary thinkers like Rose. Often critical of the reform-minded, consulting role envisioned by cultural studies scholars (and implied by the critical cultural policy approach), recent work has sought to use Foucault’s theories of governmentality to advance a more historical and politicized form of materialist critique capable of analyzing the specific roles that cultural forms, technologies, and institutions play in processes associated with contemporary regimes of liberal governmentality. While *Foucault, Cultural Studies, and Governmentality*<sup>45</sup> represents the first collective attempt at broadening governmentality studies, Laurie Ouellette and James Hay’s *Better Living Through Reality TV*<sup>46</sup> is the first book-length, systematic treatment of Foucault’s ideas on liberal government

---

<sup>43</sup> Justin Lewis and Toby Miller, *Critical Cultural Policy Studies: A Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003):1.

<sup>44</sup> Tony Bennett, “Putting Policy into Cultural Studies,” in *Cultural Studies*. eds. Lawrence Grossberg et al (New York: Routledge, 1992): 23-37.

<sup>45</sup> Jack Bratich, Jeremy Packer, and Cameron McCarthy eds. *Foucault, Cultural Studies, and Governmentality* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003).

<sup>46</sup> Laurie Ouellette and James Hay, *Better Living Through Reality TV* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2008).

within the field of critical media and cultural studies. Tracing the various ways in which reality TV works as a “cultural technology” -- that is, “an object of regulation, policy, and programs designed to nurture citizenship and civil society, and an instrument for educating, improving, and shaping subjects”<sup>47</sup> -- in the post-welfare society envisioned by neoliberalism, Ouellette and Hay analyze how television institutions have become an active partner in government. They explain: “By aligning TV viewers with a proliferating supply of techniques for shaping and guiding themselves and their private associations with others, reality TV has become the quintessential technology of advanced or ‘neo’ liberal citizenship.”<sup>48</sup>

### *Idols of Goodwill and Global Governmentality*

My dissertation steps into these conversations by placing caring stars within an analytics of global governing, bringing a global governmentality perspective to bear on stars, media culture, and their participation in contemporary regimes of governing. While scholars of governmentality have proven adept at translating Foucault’s work into the domestic contexts of post-industrial societies, far less critical attention has been paid to the relationships between governmentality and

---

<sup>47</sup> Ouellette and Hay, *Better Living*, 14.

<sup>48</sup> Ouellette and Hay, *Better Living*, 4.

processes associated with globalization. Despite the plethora of scholarly work devoted to theorizing globalization (from Manuel Castells' optimistic account of "the network society"<sup>49</sup> to Hardt and Negri's analysis of "Empire" and the new imperial right of capital<sup>50</sup>), the widely-discussed links between contemporary global configurations of capitalism and the revitalization of neo-classical economic philosophy, and the massive, multifaceted public outcry against the emerging new world order, governmentality scholars have been slow to engage the problematic of globalization and global neoliberalism (i.e., the shift from a Keynesian inspired embedded liberalism to the Washington Consensus discussed earlier). Rather, Dean argues that governmentality theorists have confined themselves to "a limited region within modern power relations, politics and forms of rule," reducing the field of power relations to the analytics of government and the "conduct on conducts" within national contexts.<sup>51</sup> What falls out of view are questions as to how regimes of governmentality fit within international power/knowledge matrices, such as colonialism, imperialism, or humanitarianism. One notable exception is the work of Ann Laura Stoler, whose book *Race and the Education of Desire* situates Foucault's theories of Victorian subjectivity and discourses of sexuality within a broader imperial and colonial context. She argues:

---

<sup>49</sup> Manuel Castells, *The Rise of the Network Society* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999).

<sup>50</sup> Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000).

<sup>51</sup> Mitchell Dean, *Governing Societies: Political Perspectives on Domestic and International Rule* (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2007): 91.

“In short-circuiting empire, Foucault’s history of European sexuality misses key sites in the production of that discourse, discounts the practices that racialized bodies, and thus elides a field of knowledge that provided the contrasts for what a ‘healthy, vigorous, bourgeois body’ was all about.”<sup>52</sup>

As Stoler and Dean’s work intimates, scholars have largely neglected the degree to which Foucault’s later work on sexuality, the self, and governmentality (the passage from sovereignty and discipline to the arts of liberal government) were always already embedded within an international context; hence, theorizing governmentality as both a global and domestic phenomenon brings into view new histories and fields of power relations. While Dean (and others, including Judith Butler<sup>53</sup>) have theorized the more authoritarian dimensions of global governmentality that come to light when analyzed from a multi-tiered governing perspective (e.g., Guantanamo Bay), my work moves in a different direction, seeking to uncover, more modestly, how caring stars and the media audiences they’re imagined to mobilize as global citizens fit within the political rationalities of global governmentality that animate international institutions and undergird the international community. Thus, my work is indebted to recent literature on global governmentality. Echoing Dean’s worries about potential blind spots of a

---

<sup>52</sup> Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault’s History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995): 7.

<sup>53</sup> Judith Butler, *Prekarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence* (London: Verso, 2004): 50-100.

governmentality framework and the inadequacies of totalizing theories of globalization, this literature offers a set of helpful correctives and provides important contextual clues for clarifying the roles that have been afforded to stars in global governing.

In concert with Dean and against the totalizing accounts of “epochal macro level change,” Wendy Larner and William Walters argue that the discourses of globalization can be understood in terms of governmentality.<sup>54</sup> Thought in this way, globalization becomes a “dispositif” which “focuses attention on the conditions of truth and practice under which the phenomena of globalization acquired its positivity,”<sup>55</sup> and allows critics to “trace the emergence of globalization at the level of forms of knowledge and practice.”<sup>56</sup> Here globalization emerges less as epochal, structural change and more as a transformed set of knowledges, technologies, and strategies for managing international relations between nation-states and their populations. Put differently, globalization thought as governmentality brings to light a set of situated discourses and practices that make globalization “thinkable” and “effective,” as well as corresponding modes of subjectification and practices of subjectivity.

---

<sup>54</sup> Wendy Larner and William Walters, “Globalization as Governmentality,” *Alternatives*, 29 (2004): 495-514.

<sup>55</sup> Larner and Walters, “Globalization,” 499.

<sup>56</sup> Larner and Walters, “Globalization,” 502.

Thought in this way, global governmentality can take many forms. However, I am most interested in how a global governmentality perspective brings into view specific histories and technologies of global liberal governmentality (e.g., global charity and philanthropy, foreign aid practices, international trade policy, and development discourses). Accordingly, throughout this study, I work with a rather circumscribed understanding of global governmentality, defining it as the practical techniques for acting on the conducts and dispositions of citizens, as well as the broader governing/political rationalities undergirding these techniques, deployed in and by international organizations whose primary objective is to promote the general welfare. These include, most importantly, the United Nations, but also the global humanitarian aid and development community. Indeed, this project of global governmentality is liberal at its core, as the U.N. and its partners have worked to “facilitate economic growth and social development, to foster greater respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and to advance dependent people towards self-government.”<sup>57</sup> However, over the past two decades, thanks to the end of the Cold War, theories of liberal governmentality have become ever more relevant, as the international aid and development community has grown exponentially. As Laura Zanotti argues, since the end of the Cold War, the international regime has itself been governmentalized, with the U.N. attempting a

---

<sup>57</sup> Asher et al., *United Nations*, 13.

world-wide development and democratization push designed to lift populations out of poverty through an expansion of the liberal arts of governing at a distance into the developing world.<sup>58</sup>

Despite their global scope and ambitious aims, it is important to see that the power of these organizations as governing institutions committed to promoting the general welfare, is variously limited and highly uneven: in poorer nations with weak or unstable states, the power is potentially very strong; in Western, post-industrial societies, their power is potentially very weak. For example, critical theorists of development like James Ferguson<sup>59</sup> and Arturo Escobar<sup>60</sup> have elaborated the highly problematic powers of development regimes in post-colonial settings when it comes to constituting subjects and governing populations imagined to be in need of modernization and liberal versions of empowerment. However, this study, centered on the figure of the idol of goodwill, is primarily concerned with Western contexts, where the power of international institutions is less relevant to the everyday lives and material possibilities of citizens, as the relatively better-off populations in post-industrial societies are the not primary targets of the international community's social welfare programs. Yet,

---

<sup>58</sup> Laura Zanotti, "Governmentalizing the Post-Cold War International Regime: The UN Debate on Democratization and Good Governance," *Alternatives*, 30 (2005): 461-487.

<sup>59</sup> James Ferguson, *The Anti-Politics Machine: Development, Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994).

<sup>60</sup> Arturo Escobar, *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).

the U.N. and NGOs rely heavily on private donations from these wealthier populations and payments from their governments in order to provide services and continue their work. Crucially, unlike powerful nation-states, these institutions do not have the sovereignty card to play when more congenial approaches to social control and regulation are not enough. Hence, the regulatory powers associated with governing at a distance through civil society, charity, and philanthropy take on heightened significance and expediency-- as well as new form-- for international institutions proposing to serve the general welfare, institutions whose power and legitimacy is backed up primarily by citizen goodwill and the sustained commitment of powerful nations and their populations to working towards international cooperation and global social security. While global governmentality's deployment of idols of goodwill has been a productive force in shaping ideas about and practices of global citizenship, it's important to keep in mind that this apparatus of global governing is tentative and defensive, especially in the U.S. context-- where international institutions like the U.N. tend to be viewed as fragile and ineffective, at best, and communist, at worst. At the same time, critical scholars have tended to view the U.N. rather simply as simply an extension of U.S. hegemony.

Michel Feher has suggested the complexities involved in conceptualizing global governmentality in such a way, especially when it comes to the nongovernmental agencies that proliferate today and work in tandem with the

U.N. to promote the general welfare.<sup>61</sup> According to Feher, these nongovernmental organizations are not exactly apolitical or governmental. They aspire “to be involved in politics without aspiring to govern,”<sup>62</sup> thus extending the domains of both politics and governing into new social realms. On the one hand, these transnational agencies work outside of the parameters of official democratic politics (parties, elections, and representation) in the name of humanitarian justice and human rights, while still aiming to transform the effects of politics on populations. On the other hand, they increasingly take on the actual material work of governing poor and vulnerable populations, while insisting that their actions remain authorized by a higher, moral, universal authority that transcends any government-- an authority, I will show, that is rooted in postwar conceptions of internationalism and cosmopolitanism. Ultimately, these organizations, like the U.N., have to rely on less official, more cultural and social forms of legitimacy that come from citizens acting and feeling as members of a global human community. It is here, in this exigency, that the triumph of caring starts to come to light.

Placing idols of goodwill and their cultural powers within an analytics of global governing demands treating stardom first and foremost as a cultural

---

<sup>61</sup> Michel Feher, “The Governed in Politics,” in *Nongovernmental Politics* ed. Michel Feher (Brooklyn: Zone Books, 2007):12-27.

<sup>62</sup> Feher, “The Governed,” 12.

technology of global governmentality, that is, as a practical attempt to act at a distance upon the dispositions and conducts of Western media audiences in the name of international community, humanitarianism, and the general welfare. From this vantage point, the particular meanings produced around and through stars-- by media texts, industries, or audiences-- figure less centrally than the harnessing of stardom by governing institutions as an expedient resource aimed at working on audiences in particular ways, bringing them into alignment with the projects and rationalities of global governing. Seeing stardom as such does not efface the meaning-making processes enabled by star texts, but rather places the latter in the context of specific governing strategies, global policies, and political rationalities in order to see the ways in which star discourses have been put to work for international regimes.

A global governmentality perspective brings the figure of the caring star into clearer focus by allowing for a specification of the complex set of institutional aims and political rationalities that enliven idols of goodwill and their participation in global governing. In other words, the proliferation of caring stars in recent decades is not solely indicative of shifts in capitalism and processes of accumulation (as suggested by many of the critical scholars mentioned previously) but also, and perhaps more powerfully, of the ways in which international institutions have sought to establish and extend a cultural base in Western contexts with strong and wealthy states through popular media culture, in

particular, through the cultural powers of stardom. As I show, caring stars are deeply embroiled in the technical and material life of international political liberal regimes and have emerged as highly expedient resources for global governmentality primarily for their ability to *leap* national governments and act on the conducts and dispositions of Western citizens at a distance. Stars command attention in Western media and political contexts and connect with their audiences in ways that are non-threatening yet potent, inviting volunteerism, charity, and other acts of global care tied to the programs and rationalities of global governing and the international community.

Yet despite the growing prominence of idols of goodwill in contemporary media and political landscapes, it's important to see that the articulation of celebrities to global governmentality remains a vexed venture, with the wealth, glamour, and mobility of stars standing in stark and problematic contrast to the mundane problems facing those they seek to help. The cultural knowledges and connotations that surround stars and celebrity culture (i.e., excessive consumption, superficiality, narcissism) do not readily collide with the serious, high stakes business of humanitarian relief and development aid, and, as mentioned previously, cultural critics and historians have long been troubled by the phenomenon of Hollywood stardom, the rise of celebrity culture it is imagined to have precipitated, and the moral decay it is alleged to represent. Daniel Boorstin famously declared the celebrity as

*a person who is known for his well-knownness.*

His qualities—or rather his lack of qualities—illustrate our peculiar problems. He is neither good nor bad, great nor petty. He is the human pseudo-event. He has been fabricated on the purpose to satisfy our exaggerated expectations of human greatness. He is morally neutral... His relation to morality and even to reality is highly ambiguous...<sup>63</sup>

The hero was distinguished by his achievement; the celebrity by his image or trademark. The hero created himself; the celebrity is created by the media. The hero was a big man; the celebrity is a big name.<sup>64</sup>

Clearly though, the UN and other international agencies who put stars to work for global governing see caring stars as much different than "morally neutral" "idols of consumption" or "trademarks." For example, currently, the UN defines its Goodwill Ambassadors as

renowned individuals from the arts, music, cinema, sport, literature and the sciences who have been enlisted as advocates of the Organization's causes, to work at international, regional, and national levels in raising public awareness and sometimes also raising funds while drawing public and political attention to the different United Nations programmes in areas such as peace and security, education and culture, health, development, poverty alleviation, hunger eradication, family planning, drug abuse and trafficking, human rights, and women's, children's and refugees' rights.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Daniel Boorstin, "From Hero to Celebrity: The Human Pseudo-Event," in *The Celebrity Culture Reader*, ed. P.D. Marshall (New York: Routledge, 2006): 79.

<sup>64</sup> Boorstin, "From Hero to Celebrity," 81.

<sup>65</sup> Papa Louis Fall and Guangting Tang, "Goodwill Ambassadors in the United Nations System," report by the Joint Inspection Unit (Geneva: United Nations, 2006): 1-2.

Adopted in 2003, the "Guidelines for the designation of Goodwill Ambassadors and Messengers of Peace" represents the institution's first attempt to codify and rationalize the position of Goodwill Ambassador, laying out five selection criteria for its idols of goodwill. They must:

- (a) Possess widely recognized talent in the arts, sciences, literature, entertainment, sport or other fields of public life;
- (b) Be persons of integrity who demonstrate a strong desire to help mobilize public interest in, and support for, the purposes and principles of the United Nations, and who demonstrate the commitment and proven potential to reach out to significant audiences, including decision makers;
- (c) Possess the personality and dignity required for such high level representative capacity;
- (d) Normally be influential beyond their national borders, thus having the ability to promote the values of the United Nations internationally;
- (e) Be knowledgeable about United Nations goals and activities and/or those of the designating U.N. Office, Fund or Programme, and be able to articulate them.<sup>66</sup>

Recognized for their talent and achievements, idols of goodwill are figures who, in addition to caring, demonstrate commitment, integrity, and dignity. Armed with knowledge of U.N. policy and programs— as well as the ability to effectively communicate them— goodwill ambassadors are imagined to carry cultural and

---

<sup>66</sup> "Guidelines for the designation of Goodwill Ambassadors and Messengers of Peace," retrieved from [www.un.org.ua/files/guidelines\\_gwa.pdf](http://www.un.org.ua/files/guidelines_gwa.pdf), accessed on August 1, 2011.

political influence with heads of state, media institutions, and ordinary citizens, thereby winning legitimacy and widespread citizen support for global governing.

I unravel just how and why stars became recognized and enshrined as powerful cultural technologies for global governmentality in spite of the contradictions that circumscribe these articulations of celebrity and citizenship. A key argument undergirding what follows is that star discourse and the particular ways in which it engages audiences make stardom exceptionally well-suited to what Foucault elaborated as the liberal arts of governing at a distance. By this I mean not simply that stardom can be theorized (by scholars) or mobilized (by institutions) as a cultural technology of governmentality, but that the discourse of stardom itself-- its orientation, rules and practices, logic and organization-- fits neatly within liberal political contexts, especially those germane to the international community and global humanitarianism. At its core, stardom is a liberal discourse, and it is this feature that has rendered stardom an advantageous cultural resource and governing technology, particularly for international institutions and their efforts to constitute Western media audiences as caring global citizens.

*Star Discourse and the Liberal Arts of Governing*

As Edgar Morin wrote in one of first book-length studies on the subject of stardom:

The stars endorse everything: toilet articles, make-up, refrigerators, beauty contests, racing competitions, athletic events, six-day bicycle races, benefits for writers at war or for noncombatant writers, charity bazaars, election campaigns. Their photographs are front-page material in newspapers and magazines. Their private life is public; their public life, publicity. The stars play a social and moral role as well; they satisfy the gossip columns of the heart... The star participates in all the world's joys, pities all its misfortunes, intervenes constantly in its destiny.<sup>67</sup>

Both on screen and off, stars promote (and have long promoted) “everything,” from programs to products to politicians. Stars perform important social functions as well, by engaging audiences in the matters of the heart like romance, marriage, and family ties. Richard Dyer suggests that, “Stars matter because they act out aspects of life that matter to us.”<sup>68</sup> On screen stars are often constructed as objects of desire and sites of fantasy; sometimes their crafted star personas embody dominant social types: the tough guy, the pin up, the average Joe, or the girl-next-door. Off screen, in fan magazines and gossip rags and on television talk shows, stars appear more ordinary—glamorous and distant, yet in many ways, “just like us.” In the context of their private lives, stars too wrestle with love and marriage, family and child-rearing, politics and other significant happenings of the day.

---

<sup>67</sup> Edgar Morin, *Stars*, trans. Richard Howard (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005): 3-4.

<sup>68</sup> Richard Dyer, *Heavenly Bodies: Stars and Society* (Hampshire: Macmillan Press, 1986): 19.

Audiences then have been asked to “look to the stars” for a multiplicity of purposes, from what to consume to how to feel, both about the intimate aspects of life as well as the important events of the day.

The cultural phenomenon of stardom then is multifaceted and broad in scope, owed not simply to stars’ economic value to the culture industries but also, and perhaps more fundamentally, to the ways in which stars speak to audiences as individuals, tapping into the desires and concerns that swirl around processes of identity in a given historical context. Put differently, perhaps the most important things that stars promote are not consumer goods or cultural commodities but, rather, diverse processes of audience reflection on and engagement with the self, one’s relationship to others, and one’s social world-- from the mundane concerns of the private sphere that make up everyday life (e.g., consumption, family relationships) to the extraordinary public events that make up history (e.g., the earthquake in Haiti). In this way, stars can certainly be seen as cultural shapers of conducts and dispositions, that is, as cultural technologies of liberal governing at a distance, to the extent that they are prominent and accessible sites for audiences to investigate and evaluate the social and to negotiate one’s relationship with and feelings towards it.

Most obviously, star discourse’s *liberal* character stems from its unretractable relationship to broader discourses of individualism. Dyer begins to theorize this aspect of stardom’s unique and strong connection to liberalism:

Capitalism justifies itself on the basis of the freedom (separateness) of anyone to make money, sell their labor how they will, to be able to express opinions and get them heard (regardless of wealth or social position). The openness of society is assumed by the way that we are addressed as individuals—as consumers (each freely choosing to buy, or watch, what we want), as legal subjects (free and responsible before the law), as political subjects (able to make up our mind who is to run society). Thus even while the notion of the individual is assailed on all sides, it is a necessary fiction for the reproduction of the kind of society we live in.

Stars articulate their ideas of personhood, in measure shoring up the notion of the individual but also at times registering the doubts and anxieties attendant on it. In part, the fact that the star is not just a screen image but a flesh and blood person is liable to work to express the notion of an individual.<sup>69</sup>

For Dyer, stars and the ways in which they appear both as screen images and real people, help sustain a “necessary fiction,” while sometimes “registering doubts and anxieties” about the status of individuals in contemporary times. Dyer continues:

We’re fascinated by stars because they enact ways of making sense of the experience of being a person in a particular kind of social production (capitalism), with its particular organization of life into public and private spheres. We love them because they represent how we think that experience is or how it would be lovely to feel that it is. Stars represent typical ways of behaving, feeling and thinking in contemporary society, ways that have been socially, culturally, historically constructed. Much of the ideological investment of the star phenomenon is in the stars seen as individuals, their qualities seen as natural...what makes them interesting is the way in which they articulate the business of being an individual, something that is, paradoxically, typical, common,

---

<sup>69</sup> Dyer, *Heavenly Bodies*, 10.

since we all in Western society have to cope with particular idea of what we are.<sup>70</sup>

Underlying these insights about star discourse is the idea of stardom as a pedagogical force: representations of stars not only *reflect* dominant conceptions of what it means to be an individual; they teach “the business of being an individual” under liberal capitalist regimes.

For example, Lary May’s work illustrates how on and off-screen discourses surrounding early stars like Mary Pickford and Douglas Fairbanks negotiated new models of gender and citizenship, helping to bring about social transformations in identity that could accommodate the emerging consumer-based economy and the moral reorientation it necessitated. May shows how these stars became exemplars for the “new woman” and “new man, ” replacing large shares of Victorian moral baggage with more modern attitudes towards family, sexuality, women’s work, and class/culture intermingling:<sup>71</sup> “By bringing players such as Sarah Bernhardt, Dustin Farnum, Douglas Fairbanks, and even Mary Pickford from Broadway, Zukor made the film industry a vehicle for fusing high and low culture...and capitalized on the star as a personality who could synthesize moral experimentation with traditional virtues.”<sup>72</sup> As May notes, Pickford in particular

---

<sup>70</sup> Dyer, *Heavenly Bodies*, 17-18.

<sup>71</sup> Lary May, *Screening Out the Past: The Birth of Mass Culture and the Motion Picture Industry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980): 96-146.

<sup>72</sup> May, *Screening Out*, 176.

was careful to temper her status as an emancipated woman with tones of Victorian purity; she “carried the temperance, suffrage, and moral impulses of nineteenth-century women. Her characters were identified with the cult of motherhood and inspired men to exercise Christian stewardship over economic and political life.”<sup>73</sup> In her real life, Pickford supported orphanages and charity, and used her stardom to impart advice to her audiences on issues ranging from how to manage their new social roles as workers to techniques for maintaining an air virtuous youth.

As suggested by Morin, Dyer, and May, stars’ connection to the liberal arts of governing has much to do with the peculiar ways in which these cultural figures straddle public and private spheres, as their private lives-- from shopping habits to love lives to charitable works-- have been constituted in a variety of ways as matters of public concern. Richard deCordova traces the origin of this development back to a shift in the discourses surrounding screen actors that occurred during the 1910s: “The star emerged out of a marked expansion of the type of knowledge that could be produced about the player... With the emergence of the star, the question of the player’s existence outside his or her work in film became the primary focus of discourse.”<sup>74</sup> According to deCordova, the invention

---

<sup>73</sup> May, *Screening Out*, 211.

<sup>74</sup> Richard deCordova, *Picture Personalities: The Emergence of the Star System in America* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001): 98.

of the star worked to engage media audiences in on-going hermeneutic activity as regards the ‘true’ identity of the person behind and apart from the representations of characters, and thus constituted audiences as fans interested and invested in the ‘real’ lives of screen actors.

The star system worked to construct a particular kind of consumer around the star as commodity, what is perhaps most commonly referred to as the fan. Since the player’s identity could not be fully garnered from the individual film, the spectator had to enter into a regular habit of moviegoing to fully experience that identity. The spectator’s activity—decoding meaning—became contingent on a pattern of repetitive consumer behavior that followed the actor’s appearance from film to film.<sup>75</sup>

From the beginning then, stardom was at once a discourse and a technology aimed at increasing the economic viability of the cinema through the constitution of fans and the cultivation of affectively charged and hermeneutically-oriented relationships between audiences and screen actors. In the early 1980s, a rapid generalization of star discourses began with the rise of tabloid news programs like *Entertainment Tonight* and popular magazines like *People*, making the hermeneutic mode of reception inaugurated by early film institutions and fan magazines ever more pervasive in popular media landscapes. Thanks in large part to changing industrial conditions, including deregulation and increased competition for audiences and ad revenues both among and across popular mass mediums, today popular media culture is saturated with celebrity news and

---

<sup>75</sup> deCordova, *Picture Personalities*, 113.

gossip-- from the checkout aisles in grocery stores to the cable airwaves to the blogosphere.

Crucially, the fact that stardom is grounded in the private lives of stars (rendered public by virtue of stars' social and cultural prominence) makes stardom not only a discourse soundly in step with the liberal arts of governing at a distance, but also one that is highly flexible and gendered in particular ways. Stardom is flexible because, as flesh and blood people, stars move through the world in material ways; that cameras should follow and that audiences should care means that star discourses can, rather easily, at least in theory, be articulated to those in other realms of social and political life that are not necessarily connected to the culture industries and consumer culture from whence stars emerge. Yet, most film scholars have approached the cultural powers associated with stardom as a function of their screen personae; while critical work on stardom often acknowledges the role of ancillary or secondary texts like fan magazines and popular biographies in the construction of star images, there has been far less discussion of how star discourse-- centered on the 'real' private lives of stars-- works off-screen-- away from the bright lights of Hollywood-- and links up with divergent discursive formations. Indeed, from World War I onward, stars have often been enlisted to promote government policies, domestic and foreign alike, from avidly supporting Roosevelt's New Deal programs to selling war bonds and

marching in Victory Parades.<sup>76</sup> As I show in the following chapters, U.S. stars have a long history of promoting world government and international community as well.

However, at the same time that stars can materially enter social realms that are not necessarily yoked to commercial media and consumer culture, the fact that star discourse is organized around the private lives of “idols of consumption” means that the orientation and organization of star discourse is itself profoundly gendered, as both consumer culture and the private domestic sphere have been historically constituted as germane to women and women’s culture. Some articulations of celebrity and politics are harder to pull off thanks to stars’--in particular, female stars’-- strong ties to the feminized, “irrational,” and “other” realms of consumption and domesticity, which have long been positioned in sharp contrast to the public spheres of work and politics (home to the rational, self-possessed male subject alleged to ground liberalism’s free market society).<sup>77</sup>

Stardom’s liberalism is thus a funny thing, connected to liberalism’s imagined feminine underbelly of excessive consumption and sentimentalism. Stars “satisfy the gossip columns of the heart,” and, as I show throughout this study, it is precisely this gendered dimension to stardom’s liberalism that makes

---

<sup>76</sup> See Lary May, *The Big Tomorrow: Hollywood and the Politics of the American Way* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

<sup>77</sup> See Don Slater, *Consumer Culture and Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997):54-59.

the discourse productive for international institutions, as the global governing agendas of the international community are primarily articulated in terms of humanitarian care for the world's disadvantaged-- especially women, children, and other vulnerable populations. After all, care work is and remains women's work, something that happens in the private, domestic sphere and continues to stand in opposition to productive labor and real politics. Perhaps the care-oriented politics of global governing and humanitarianism are the feminized Other to the real politics of the sovereign nation-state. Perhaps the dearth of scholarship on caring stars has something to do with the ways in which these highly gendered, extremely vexed, global articulations of celebrity and politics themselves trouble our understandings of what counts as legitimate or meaningful practices of citizenship.

Ultimately, star discourse, centered on the private lives of celebrities and the everyday events of the feminized domestic sphere, lends itself to particular sorts of reflections on and engagements with the self. The consumption of stars-- especially off-screen, ancillary discourses oriented towards stars' 'real' lives and the inner depths-- is often about negotiating personal morality and constructing ethical subjectivity. For example, scholars including Joke Hermes<sup>78</sup> and Elizabeth

---

<sup>78</sup> Joke Hermes, "Reading Gossip Magazines: the Imagined Communities of Gossip and Camp," in *The Celebrity Culture Reader*, ed. P.D. Marshall (London: Routledge, 2006): 291-310.

Bird<sup>79</sup> have shown through audience studies how contemporary star discourses offer readers sites for moral consensus and community building, as audiences were found to use the private lives of stars to construct, speculate about, and reflect on their own identities and the broader social norms and mores impinging upon them. Thus, engaging with star discourse can be conceptualized as what Foucault called “a technology of the self,”<sup>80</sup> “which permit individuals to effect by their own means, or with the help of others, a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection, or immortality.”<sup>81</sup> As many governmentality scholars have argued, technologies of the self are a crucial feature of the liberal arts of governing, as they provide subjects and citizens with means of self-management and regulation, as well as ethical, moral, and/or political templates of right action, thereby helping to ensure the state’s role in governing the individual remains a distant one.<sup>82</sup> In the realm of global governmentality, star discourse and the technologies of self they enable are crucial to the constitution of global citizens in

---

<sup>79</sup> Elizabeth Bird, *For Enquiring Minds: A Cultural Study of Supermarket Tabloids*, (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1992).

<sup>80</sup> Julie Wilson, “Star Testing: The Emerging Politics of Celebrity Gossip,” *Velvet Light Trap*, 75 (2010): 25-38.

<sup>81</sup> Michel Foucault, “Technologies of the Self,” *The Essential Foucault*, eds. Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose (New York, NY: The New Press, 2003):146.

<sup>82</sup> For example, see Burchell, “Liberal Government,” 29-30; see also Ouellette and Hay, *Better Living*, 63-98.

Western contexts, where the charity and other individual acts of global care and compassion of media audiences help to extend a material and cultural base for global governing.

*Caring Stars and the Making of Global Citizens*

In the following chapters, I show how star discourse's liberalism-- including its individualizing structure and ethical/moral orientation-- has been governmentalized, enfolded into the governing logics and practices of global governing. Seeing stars as idols of goodwill and placing them in an analytics of global governing surfaces the surprising and significant ways that caring stars and popular media culture participate in contemporary global politics, as well as the surprising and decisive roles that both have played in shaping our present global context. Through the incorporation of stardom into global governmentality, stars have helped to usher in a host of processes often associated with and attributed to globalization, including, the rise of a highly mediated global civil society, internationalized concepts of social welfare and responsibility, expanded notions of global citizenship and activism, and, ultimately, new visions of global liberalism and economic integration. Larner and Walters suggest that, "Emblematic figures such as cosmopolitans, investors, international students, and entrepreneurs, as well as migrant workers, refugees, and asylum seekers can be

understood not as self-evident categories but, rather, as performances of the global.”<sup>83</sup> My dissertation adds idols of goodwill to this list of emblematic figures associated with the discourses of globalization, treating them as cultural technologies of global governmentality, whose primary aim is (and has long been) the fashioning of global citizens.

More specifically, I situate idols of goodwill as a primary cultural means by which responsibility for social problems has been gradually internationalized, as ordinary citizens have been asked to feel and act on moral obligations to the international community. In this last regard, stars have emerged as highly expedient resources for global governing thanks to their privileged relationship to popular/commercial media culture. Commanding the attention of reporters, marketers, and institutions alike, stars have helped to keep discourses of global governing and citizenship in the public conversation. However, idols of goodwill are, at the same time, much more than publicity stunts; these cultural figures from the world of entertainment are valuable technologies of global governmentality for the ways in which they are able to constitute and direct material practices of global citizenship that extend and buttress the tentative powers of international organizations in Western contexts through the realm of media culture.

The primary thread running throughout what follows is thus the evolution of stardom as a cultural technology of citizen-shaping for global governing. As

---

<sup>83</sup> Larner and Walters, “Globalization,” 507.

Chapter Two documents, Danny Kaye, the first U.N. Goodwill Ambassador, helped to popularize the international mission and aims of the U.N. amidst Cold War tensions through a series of popular educational documentaries which invited film and television audiences to learn more about and support U.N. health and nutrition efforts. While global citizenship was taking on new significance in American culture, with Kaye, the idea that entertainment stars might help to engender emotional bonds between citizens, international institutions, and the populations they serve was born. As Chapter Three argues, however, it was Audrey Hepburn's work for UNICEF in the late 1980s and early 1990s, and the cultural powers associated with her female stardom, that set the stage for our contemporary conjuncture where idols of goodwill proliferate. Through Hepburn, I develop the concept of cosmopolitan stardom, and further clarify how star discourse, especially its moral dimensions, became useful for global governing and constitution of global citizens. Chapter Four-- a case study of Angelina Jolie, today's most prominent U.N. Goodwill Ambassador-- shows how caring stars are put to work within new regimes of global governmentality as global citizen brands. In present day global governing, idols of goodwill operate and take form with interactive, digital media environments, where practices of citizenship are increasingly bound up with logics of branding and marketing. Focusing on the social productivity of branding for global governing, I detail how idols of

goodwill generate forms of social, economic, and cultural value and, at the same time, link audiences to global governing in new and material ways.

Crucially, the global citizens fashioned by idols of goodwill, from Kaye to Jolie, are of a particular ilk, as these modalities of global citizenship, constituted by stars in the realm of media culture, are animated by the principles of cosmopolitanism. Martha Nussbaum traces the cosmopolitan worldview back to the Cynics and Stoics and their conceptualization of world citizenship: “that we should give our first allegiance to no mere form of government, no temporal power, but to the moral community made up by the humanity of all human beings.”<sup>84</sup> Nussbaum writes that, according to Stoic philosophy, “each of us dwells, in effect, in two communities—the local community of our birth, and the community of human argument and aspiration that ‘is truly great and truly common’... It is this community that is, fundamentally, the source our moral obligations.”<sup>85</sup> For Nussbaum, there is a greater moral obligation that supersedes domestic politics and is derived from a sense of a global human community. In Western liberal-democratic contexts, to claim and practice global citizenship thus starts in a feeling, a sentiment, a disposition towards the social world and one’s place in it. Grounded in a ethical and moral feeling about one’s place within and

---

<sup>84</sup> Martha Nussbaum, “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism,” in *For Love of Country* eds. Martha Nussbaum and Joshua Cohen (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996): 7.

<sup>85</sup> Nussbaum, “Patriotism,” 7.

obligations to a global humanity, the practice of global citizenship, like star consumption, can be seen as a technology of the self, an attempt to fashion and transform the self, to reconstitute the self in alignment with ideals of cosmopolitanism. For example, Chapter Three shows how Audrey Hepburn's non-threatening, highly pedagogical female stardom was remarkably poised to engender these cosmopolitan feelings and to offer up global citizenship as a technology of the self. An idol of goodwill *par excellence*, Hepburn's female stardom facilitated deeply emotional relationships between media audiences and the international community, as it was able to embed political rationalities of global governing (humanitarianism, development) within the star's highly personalized, sentimental confessions of caring for the world's children.

While cosmopolitan ideals are nothing new in Western thought, they have taken on increasing and specific significance since World War II. According to Seyla Benhabib, the founding of the U.N. itself represents a shift in international governing towards cosmopolitan norms of justice, where human rights are imagined to accrue to individuals by virtue of their membership in global humanity.<sup>86</sup> Akira Iriye describes this shift in terms of a new internationalism that was being forged by international organizations and was embodied in founding documents of the U.N.:

---

<sup>86</sup> Seyla Benhabib, *Another Cosmopolitanism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006): 13-44.

the very tragedies, because they were truly global in scale, convinced the proponents of international organizations everywhere that if another calamitous war were to be avoided, they would have to redouble their efforts. As they saw it, the war had established connections among different parts of the world that had hitherto remained apart, and even while a full-scale carnage of unprecedented nature had gone on, the awareness of global interconnectedness appeared to have grown. Such awareness could be mobilized to provide the basis for postwar internationalism, a determination to strengthen movements and institutions that would reunify the world.<sup>87</sup>

Whereas the League of Nations had understood peoples *qua* nations, the U.N. charter emphasized the well-being, rights, and interests of peoples *qua* peoples as a matter of international concern. While governments still took the lead in economic policy and social welfare provision, the international community would safeguard individuals and populations through international cooperation and action in the name of the general welfare and individual human rights. Stars like Danny Kaye and Audrey Hepburn helped to bring media audiences, especially those in the U.S., into alignment with these burgeoning political rationalities of global governing by making them *feel* like global citizens and, at the same time, providing them with templates for acting on these feelings in the form of technologies of the self. For example, Kaye's most enduring legacy was the annual Trick-or-Treat for UNICEF campaign (today fronted by Disney Channel star Selena Gomez), while Audrey Hepburn's family and fan community continue

---

<sup>87</sup> Akira Iriye, *Global Community: The Role of International Institutions in the Making of the Contemporary World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002): 41.

to enjoin audiences to follow in the stars' footsteps and get involved with UNICEF's good works. When taken together and considered from the vantage point of global governmentality, these seemingly small acts of celebrity-directed charity emerge as part of a broader historical movement whereby the cosmopolitan norms and political rationalities undergirding the international community and enlivening global governing have been granted a cultural, material base in Western societies.

While it might be tempting to dismiss global citizenship animated by cosmopolitan feelings as, at best, naive and sentimental, and, at worst, elitist and imperial, it's important to see that these affective, individualized practices of global citizenship are in fact today deeply political. Since the end of the Cold War, cosmopolitanism and global citizenship have emerged at the center of new visions of global liberalism which hinge on global citizens acting together in the context of a highly mediated global civil society. Political and social theorist Ulrich Beck, for example, proposes that this global civil society represents the primary "counter-power" to the global neoliberal regime in contemporary world politics.<sup>88</sup> In a similar vein, David Held suggests that a new "global covenant" could emerge to challenge the Washington Consensus and rests on new conceptions of state

---

<sup>88</sup> Ulrich Beck, *Power in the Global Age* (Cambridge: Polity, 2005): 6-7.

power and international governance.<sup>89</sup> Put differently, debates over the meaning and practice of global governing are being revitalized from their post-World War II heyday<sup>90</sup> and feel highly relevant in a global context where the fates of nations and populations are increasingly intertwined and citizens and governments across the globe attempt to wrestle with and address the legacies and devastations of global neoliberalism.

The final two chapters situate contemporary idols of goodwill like Jolie and Bono in this post-Cold War context defined by the expansion of the international community, digital media technologies, and new paradigms of global governing and citizenship. Chapter Four suggests that global citizen brands like Jolie not only produce value for global governing; they also generate what I call governing capital for the (non)governmental, international community, and are thus helping to harvest the conditions for emerging paradigms of global liberalism. Chapter Five interrogates how idols of goodwill figure more broadly in contemporary political struggles over global governing and on these emergent horizons of global liberalism. As I show, in contemporary media and political contexts, global governmentality is an increasingly promotional venture, making cosmopolitan stars ever more expedient cultural and political resources for the

---

<sup>89</sup> David Held, *Global Covenant: The Social Democratic Alternative to the Washington Consensus* (Cambridge, Polity, 2004).

<sup>90</sup> See Luis Cabrera, "World Government: Renewed debate, persistent challenges," *European Journal of International Relations*, 16:3 (2010): 511-530.

agencies of global governing. Crucially, media promotion is no longer simply a technology of global governing at a distance in Western contexts; it is a broader political rationality of global governing that aims to create a cosmopolitan, liberal world order.

## *Chapter Two*

### Mr. UNICEF: Celebrity Diplomacy, Sentimental Education, and One World Culture

For the last decade U2 frontman Bono has been a regular on Capitol Hill and at the White House. Known as “the Pest” in some Republican D.C. circles, the pop star has spent much of his free inter-tour time lobbying Congress on matters of debt relief and foreign aid for developing countries. Perhaps Bono’s most famous political feat in this regard was making Jesse Helms cry. In September 2000, Bono held private talks with the rabidly right-wing, unreconstructed Southern senator from North Carolina, who, at the time, was not only a controversial political figure for his unrelenting stance on civil rights, but also, though not surprisingly, a staunch and vocal opponent of US foreign aid programs, equating the giving of aid to poorer nations with “throwing money down ‘ratholes.’”<sup>91</sup> Bono recalled, “I talked to him about the Biblical origin of the idea of Jubilee Year... He was genuinely moved by the story of the continent of Africa, and he said to me, ‘America needs to do more.’ I think he felt it as a burden on a spiritual level.”<sup>92</sup> Helms explained of Bono, “I was deeply impressed with him. He has depth that I didn’t expect. He is led by the Lord to do something about the

---

<sup>91</sup> Joshua Busby, “Bono Made Jesse Helms Cry: Jubilee 2000, Debt Relief, and Moral Action in International Politics,” *International Studies Quarterly*, 51 (2007): 248.

<sup>92</sup> Susan Dominus, “Relief Pitcher,” *The New York Times Magazine*, October 8, 2000, accessed August 1, 2011, <http://partners.nytimes.com/library/magazine/home/20001008mag-qa-bono.htm>

starving people in Africa.”<sup>93</sup> In 2002, Bono’s pestering of Republicans paid off in the form of an additional 5 billion dollar aid package for the world’s poorest countries with an increased commitment to the Global Fund on the horizon. A shade-wearing, peace-sign waving Bono joined President George W. Bush at the White House to announce the legislation. Calling the deal a “downpayment,” Bono cautioned, “It’s not where we need to be. The administration has now committed itself to an AIDS initiative at some point in the next year. Once my foot is in the door, I’m hard to get out.”<sup>94</sup>

Broadly speaking, scholars have accounted for the rise of celebrity diplomats like Bono, as well as other intersections of celebrity and politics, via broad transformations in media culture: specifically, the increasing spectacularization of politics brought about by the rise of television and the increasing tabloidization of journalism brought about by deregulation and media conglomeration. As a result, lines between entertainment and politics blur: celebrities like Ronald Reagan are able to cross-over into politics, while political actors like Bill Clinton are subject to celebrity-style evaluations of their personal life and forced to master the art of image-making and management. These frameworks, however, tell us little about the *specific* situation described above: an

---

<sup>93</sup> John Wagner, “In Helms, Bono Finds the Ally He’s Looking For,” *Raleigh News and Observer*, September 2, 2000.

<sup>94</sup> Madeleine Bunting and Oliver Burkeman, “Pro Bono,” *The Guardian*, March 18, 2003, accessed August 1, 2011, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/mar/18/usa.debtrelief>

Irish rock star with a long and varied history of global activism lobbying a right-wing U.S. Senator to the benefit of international humanitarian institutions. More specifically, an Irish rock star moving-- through moral sentiment-- a U.S. racist to care for distant, dark others in the Global South.

Rather than situating the phenomenon as an inevitable outgrowth of commercial media culture's encroachment on politics, this chapter offers a more nuanced account of celebrity diplomacy by tracing the institutional aims and political rationalities that initially authorized the celebrity diplomat's presence on the world stage.<sup>95</sup> A governmentality perspective brings to light a strikingly different history of celebrity politics, one that reveals stars' and media culture's instrumental role in popularizing discourses of world government and practices of global citizenship. I show how many contemporary articulations of media celebrity and global citizenship owe their caring tenor and current form to Danny Kaye, the first UN goodwill ambassador, whose work as "Mr. UNICEF" cemented the idea that the liberal discourse of stardom might play a productive role in realizing the aims of the international community and serving the general welfare of the world. More specifically, with Kaye, the idea of stars as sentimental educators for international regimes was born.

---

<sup>95</sup> In a recent issue of *Celebrity Studies*, Mark Wheeler provides a useful history of the United Nations' Goodwill Ambassador program, engaging with Street's theory of celebrity performance and politics. See Mark Wheeler, "Celebrity Diplomacy: The United Nations' Goodwill Ambassadors and Messengers of Peace," *Celebrity Studies*, 2:1 (2010): 6-18.

Our contemporary conjuncture populated by caring stars and idols of goodwill has been a long time in the making. Bono's career as a celebrity diplomat is but one chapter in a longer story that dates back to early cultural diplomacy programs and 'One World' visions that took root in the aftermath of World War II. In this context, new and expanding conceptions of internationalism and citizenship made their way into popular culture via sentimental discourses that emphasized emotional, common bonds between Western citizens and distant others. However, it was Kaye that brought sentimentalism and global citizenship together with the liberal discourse of stardom to great institutional benefit for the U.N.. Bono and the deeply felt, moral imperatives of which he spoke in his wooing of Jessie Helms, are indicative of the specific and practical ways in which Western stars, starting with Kaye, emerged as cultural technologies of global governmentality-- as icons of global community, promoters of global care, and shapers of global citizens.

### *Sentimental Education and One World Culture*

The atrocities and devastation of the World War II and growing public concern over life in the atomic age afforded the principles of international cooperation and a shared, common humanity new cultural significance. Eager to capitalize on

these growing international sensibilities, in the late 1940s, U.S. television networks clamored to broadcast U.N. events in hopes of tapping into an imagined growing public appetite for global affairs. Annoyed at CBS's 1949 "coup"-- that is, its daily broadcasting of General Assembly sessions-- NBC's David Sarnoff complained that his own network "has been made to look disinterested in public service and has been made to appear ridiculous in a competitive commercial sense...CBS, who has done practically nothing for the U.N. in the past, now emerges--by a single gesture--as both enterprising and public spirited!"<sup>96</sup> Early on, television producers were eager to participate in cultivation of 'good' liberal citizens<sup>97</sup> and promoting the U.N. and internationalism was an important facet of postwar conceptions of public interest programming. For example, Anna McCarthy discusses how a short hidden camera film entitled *Children of the U.N.* found its way onto the prestigious arts and culture variety show *Omnibus* in 1954. Produced by *Candid Camera's* Allen Funt, the film observed and interviewed children in a New York international school to honor United Nations Day. *Omnibus* host Allistair Cooke called the film evidence of "a miniature international society...without protocol, and without taboos, but with a pride all its

---

<sup>96</sup> Andrew Falk, *Upstaging the Cold War: American Dissent and Cultural Diplomacy, 1940-1960* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2010): 138.

<sup>97</sup> See Anna McCarthy, *The Citizen Machine: Governing By Television in 1950s America* (New York: The New Press, 2010): 1-28.

own,”<sup>98</sup> while reviewer Ruth Sayers found remarkable the “nice quiet view of one world propaganda.”<sup>99</sup>

As intimated by these instances, the television industry hoped to play a productive role in the postwar era by educating audiences on matters of international concern and their democratic duties as members of a global society. Michael Curtain argues that the rise of globally-oriented documentary programming during this time is indicative not only of market integration and the television’s industry’s own interests in a globalizing cultural economy, but also of the ways in which television, as a potentially global medium, came to participate in promoting the U.S. postwar/Cold War foreign policy agenda both at home and abroad. Documentary programming centered on global affairs was produced in the name of helping U.S. citizens appreciate and embrace their new leadership role in spreading democracy on the international stage, while, at the same time, providing inroads into new cultural markets.<sup>100</sup> Unlike any other mass medium, television-- especially satellite technologies-- carried the potential for global communion: to create what Lisa Parks calls a fantasy of “global presence,”<sup>101</sup> and

---

<sup>98</sup> Anna McCarthy, “‘Stanley Milgram, Allen Funt, and Me:’ Postwar Social Science and the ‘First Wave’ of Reality TV,” in *Reality TV: Remaking Television Culture* Second Edition, eds. Susan Murray and Laurie Ouellette (New York: New York University Press, 2009): 23.

<sup>99</sup> McCarthy, “Stanley Milgram,” 26.

<sup>100</sup> Michael Curtain, *Redeeming the Wasteland: Television Documentary and Cold War Politics* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1995): 60-91.

<sup>101</sup> Lisa Parks, “*Our World*, Satellite Televisuality, and the Fantasy of Global Presence,” in *Planet TV*, eds. Lisa Parks and Shanti Kumar (New York: New York University Press, 2003): 74-93.

thus to engender shared understanding and dialogue between distant populations. As both Curtain and Parks point out, television's approach to global dialogue and communication keenly reflected Western geopolitical interest in development discourse. Parks explains that global televisual events like *Our World* (a 1967 live-via-satellite program designed to connect the ideologically divided East and West and the economically divided North and South) "were indistinguishable from Western discourses of modernization, which classified societies as traditional or modern, called for urbanization and literacy in the developing world, and envisioned mass media as agents of social and economic change."<sup>102</sup> Television's global turn was hence in many ways neatly aligned with the U.S.'s global political agenda, which included expanding U.S. markets coupled with a desire to lift the poor, decolonizing world out of poverty through development aid, all in the name of countering the spread of communism.

Christina Klein shows how the internationalism that marked postwar media culture was animated by two competing-- though not unrelated-- visions of world order, two global imaginaries. On the one hand, containment: anticommunism, world struggle, division, fear. On the other hand, integration: global cooperation, interdependence, internationalism, common bonds.<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> Parks, "*Our World*," 76.

<sup>103</sup> Christina Klein, *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945-1961* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003): 19-60.

Andrew Falk distinguishes what he calls “Two World” and “One World” visions. The debate was not over isolationism vs. internationalism, but rather what sort of internationalism the U.S. would embrace moving out of the war: a Two World scenario rooted in US superiority, unilateralism, and nationalism, or a One World scenario that was utopian and multilateralist in its orientation.<sup>104</sup> While the global imaginary of containment and Two World visions undoubtedly overdetermined U.S. politics in the 1950s, alternative visions of internationalism rooted in global integration and the promises of development also came to permeate the everyday lives of many citizens especially in the realms of media and culture.

The Cold War was not only about containing the communist threat then; it was also about articulating a positive vision of world order rooted in what Klein calls a global imaginary of integration:

Where the global imaginary of containment drew on the residual internationalism of the right, with its vision of bulwarks between nations and a mortal conflict between communism and capitalism, the global imaginary of integration drew on the residual internationalism of the left, which imagined the world in terms of open doors that superseded barriers and created pathways between nations. It constructed a world in which differences could be bridged and transcended. In the political rhetoric of integration, relationships of “cooperation” replaced those of conflict, “mutuality” replaced enmity, and “collective security,” “common bonds,” and “community” became the preferred terms for representing the relationship between the United States and the noncommunist world.<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> Falk, *Upstaging*, 39-62.

<sup>105</sup> Klein, *Cold War Orientalism*, 41.

This global imaginary of integration-- the counterweight to containment-- informed domestic, foreign, and cultural policy alike, and, as a result, ordinary citizens and media audiences were routinely addressed by cultural institutions as citizens with moral and social obligations to distant populations.

One of the most important popularizers of global integrationist ideals was Wendell Willkie, whose 1943 internationally best-selling travelogue *One World* galvanized liberal internationalists, including prominent cultural tastemakers and producers. Willkie was a reformed Democrat who ran for president of the United States as a Republican in 1940 and, in 1942, traveled around the world in fifty days aboard the bomber *Gulliver* as part of a wartime mission. Noteworthy for its sympathetic treatment of Soviet and Chinese peoples, *One World* advocated international cooperation and peace through world government, as well as civil rights and self-determination of peoples both at home and abroad:

When I say that in order to have peace this world must be free, I am only reporting that a great process has started which no man-- certainly not Hitler-- can stop. Men and women all over the world are on the march, physically, intellectually, and spiritually. After centuries of ignorant and dull compliance, hundreds of millions of people in eastern Europe and Asia have opened the books. Old fears no longer frighten them. They are no longer willing to be Eastern slaves for Western profits. They are beginning to know that men's welfare throughout the world is interdependent. They are resolved, as we must be, that there is no more place for imperialism within our own society than in the society of nations.

The big house on the hill surrounded by mud huts has lost its awesome charm.<sup>106</sup>

As Falk explains, the One World vision of universalists like Willkie encompassed “several general principles in foreign and domestic contexts: humane capitalism, anti colonialism, self-determination, civil liberties, and impartiality in dealing with all nations.”<sup>107</sup>

*One World* was widely read and circulated, especially within the cultural industries. In 1943 20<sup>th</sup> Century Fox’s Darryl Zanuck bought the rights to produce a movie version of *One World*, a project that was never completed, and *Wilson (1944)*, a big budget film about the life of President Woodrow Wilson, hero to internationalists. Off-screen, members of the Hollywood Democratic Committee (HDC) rallied anew around Willkie’s principles. Looking for direction after committing the previous years to the war effort, the HDC turned to international issues, lobbying the U.S. government and mobilizing public opinion to support ratification of the United Nations and passage of the Breton Woods trade agreement. For example, the organization sponsored a series of public service radio broadcasts featuring Bette Davis, Walter Huston, Humphrey Bogart, and Olivia De Havilland designed to educate listeners about the new roles of the

---

<sup>106</sup> Wendell Willkie, *One World* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1943): 203-204.

<sup>107</sup> Falk, *Upstaging*, 47.

U.S. and U.S. citizens in the postwar world. *One World* also provided inspiration for many of the writers of television's early anthology dramas.<sup>108</sup>

Willkie's ideas also had a regular home at the *Saturday Review*, thanks to the leadership of Norman Cousins, who became editor of the weekly magazine in 1942 and immediately began to increase the magazine's nonliterary content, broadening the publication's purview to include international affairs like war, famine, travel, and aid. Over his tenure, Cousins greatly expanded the weekly's readership, which consisted primarily of highly educated, middle and upper class readers. Like Willkie, Cousins was a firm believer in world government and the principles of universalism associated with liberal internationalism. As Klein describes,

Cousins regarded the embrace of this universalism as an unavoidable requirement for Americans in the postwar period. In a typical *Saturday Review* editorial from 1952, Cousins bemoaned the "miseducation" he had received growing up, which taught him to focus on the differences among people rather than similarities...If Americans were to move out into the world, both physically and imaginatively, they would need to embrace the idea of a single "human community" that was "greater than the separateness imposed by nations, greater than the divergent faiths and allegiances or the depth of color of varying cultures." Cousins assured his readers that if they took this universalism to heart, they would be able to feel "at home anywhere in the world."<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>108</sup> Falk, *Upstaging*, 134-142.

<sup>109</sup> Klein, *Cold War Orientalism*, 80.

Under Cousins' leadership, the *Saturday Review* not only sought to shape the dispositions and attitudes of its readers by orienting them to the issues of the international community; the magazine also targeted readers' conducts by providing them with opportunities to materialize their global commitments.

*Saturday Review* editors and readers worked together on international humanitarian projects; for example, The Hiroshima Maidens and Ravensbrueck Lapins projects brought women victims of the bombing and Polish victims of Nazi medical experimentation, respectively, to the U.S. for plastic surgery.<sup>110</sup>

More often than not, the utopian, universalist spirit of Willkie's *One World*, and the integrationist imaginary it refracted, were culturally articulated in a sentimental mode. Militating against commonplace interpretations of sentimentalism as shallow or false emotionalism, Klein traces the contours of sentimental discourse in order to show how it was poised to emerge as the predominant one of integrationist, anti conquest, One World visions:

First, sentimental narratives tend to focus not on the lone individual but on the 'self-in-relation'; they uphold human connection as the highest idea and emphasize the forging of bonds and the creation of solidarities among friends, family, and community. Second, a sentimental text explores how these bonds are forged across a divide of difference...the sentimental is thus a universalizing mode that imagines the possibility of transcending particularity by recognizing a common and shared humanity. Third, these sentimental human connections are characterized by reciprocity and exchange...the paired acts of giving and receiving

---

<sup>110</sup> Klein, *Cold War Orientalism*, 83.

serve as the mechanisms through which differences are bridged. Fourth, emotions serve as the means for achieving and maintaining this exchange; the sentimental mode values the intensity of the individual's felt experience, and holds up sympathy—the ability to feel what another person is feeling, especially his suffering—as the most prized. Finally, the violation of these affective bonds... represents the greatest trauma within the sentimental universe.<sup>111</sup>

Sentimental education is thus the term that Klein gives to an array of cultural practices that sought to bring citizens into alignment with the global imaginary of integration through constructing emotional, affective bonds between U.S. citizens and their counterparts in the East and Global South. As Klein explains,

Many Americans in fact believed that differences in race and culture made it unwise for the U.S. to involve itself too deeply in Asian affairs. In an effort to counter this view, U.S. policymakers tried to educate Americans about the bonds that already tied them to the decolonizing world and urged them to recognize that differences of language, religion, history, and race could be bridged.<sup>112</sup>

Sentimental education was thus about “teaching Americans to understand themselves not just citizens of an autonomous nation but as participants in a world system that inextricably embedded them within a network of multinational ties;”<sup>113</sup> it included the pedagogical efforts of the *Saturday Review*, as well as official cultural programs like People-to-People, a 1956 United States Information

---

<sup>111</sup> Klein, *Cold War Orientalism*, 14.

<sup>112</sup> Klein, *Cold War Orientalism*, 46.

<sup>113</sup> Klein, *Cold War Orientalism*, 46.

Agency effort designed to generate public support for foreign aid programs and for internationalism more broadly. On the one hand, People-to-People was directed outwards to an international audience and “sought to counter Soviet propaganda by promoting face-to-face contact between Americans and people in other countries and thereby display what America was ‘really’ like.”<sup>114</sup> At the same time, the program was directed inwards, towards the hearts and conducts of U.S. citizens, serving as a domestic education program. Comprised of forty-two committees that arranged opportunities for Americans to develop bonds around common interests with others from around the world, the program encouraged sympathy and identification that transcended cultural differences, seeking to create emotional ties that could “leap” governments. Designed to give the global imaginary of integration a material, institutional and cultural foundation in the U.S., People-to-People “sought to enlist the public in Washington’s world-ordering project of ‘free world’ integration by turning it into a project in which ordinary Americans could feel a personal stake.”<sup>115</sup> So, while One World visions would be quickly overshadowed by the Two World visions of the Cold Warriors and the global imaginary of containment, the principle of a shared, common humanity and the notion that U.S. citizens had social and moral obligations as members of this global community lived on in varying intensities, particularly in

---

<sup>114</sup> Klein, *Cold War Orientalism*, 50.

<sup>115</sup> Klein, *Cold War Orientalism*, 50.

the heightened cultural diplomacy efforts that marked the postwar and Cold War eras.

*Celebrity Diplomacy and U.S. Soft Power*

Born out of new thinking in Washington about the geopolitical expediency of culture, People-to-People was part of a growing apparatus of cultural diplomacy. Generally speaking, cultural diplomacy involves the exchange of ideas, cultures, and traditions in the name of heightened understanding between nations.

Organized U.S. cultural diplomacy dates back to 1919 and Andrew Carnegie's establishment of the Endowment for International Peace, which emphasized "sponsoring exchanges of professors, students, and publications, stimulating translations and the book trade, and encouraging the teaching of English."<sup>116</sup>

Increasingly, the cultural diplomacy initiatives of the postwar era afforded ordinary citizens important roles to play in international affairs. As Falk explains, "The period from the 1940s onward would see unprecedented public involvement in foreign relations on a daily basis. Whereas diplomacy once engaged a small number of elites operating in secret, wrote Emil Lengyel, by 1945 'the people were to become the craftsmen of the new diplomacy...The dark niches of foreign offices had been flooded with the light of public curiosity. The masses would

---

<sup>116</sup> Naima Prevots, *Dance for Export: Cultural Diplomacy and the Cold War* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1998): 18.

have to become acquainted with the problems of other countries--now their own problems.' A new democratic age of diplomacy was born."<sup>117</sup> The concept of celebrity diplomacy developed within this era of heightened cultural diplomacy.

As mentioned earlier, Hollywood was eager to be an active participant in realizing One World visions. Even before Willkie's influence in Hollywood reached its peak, seeing the potential for expanding cultural markets, Hollywood promoted international cultural exchange in the name of good global citizenship. For example, Zanuck lured Carmen Miranda off Broadway in 1940, putting her to work in films including *Down Argentine Way* and *The Gang's All Here*. Scholars Cynthia Enloe and Shari Roberts have pointed out that these films attempted to capitalize politically and culturally on Miranda's exotic ethnicity and star image as the "Brazilian bombshell." Enloe suggests that, "For many Americans, during the 1940s Carmen Miranda became a guide to Latin culture...Miranda personified a culture full of zest and charm, unclouded by intense emotion or political ambivalence. Like the bananas she wore on her head, Miranda was exotic yet mildly amusing."<sup>118</sup> As Roberts shows, Miranda's films were staged as Fox's and Zanuck's contributions to FDR's foreign policy initiatives. As U.S. political economic interest in Latin America grew, the state sought to temper growing

---

<sup>117</sup> Falk, *Upstaging*, 50.

<sup>118</sup> Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990): 127.

concerns about U.S. imperialism by implementing the Good Neighbor Policy: "In the field of world policy, I would dedicate this nation to the policy of the Good Neighbor, the neighbor who resolutely respects himself, and, because he does so, respects the rights of others; the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of agreements in and with a world of neighbors."<sup>119</sup> For global integrationists, the Good Neighbor Policy represented an important check on U.S. imperialism, and extending the policy remained an important part of the liberal internationalist political platform. Ideologically speaking, Miranda's cheerfully racist embodiment of the "good neighbor" both on and off-screen worked not only to obfuscate U.S. interest in and policy towards Latin America at the time, but also to manage growing anxieties surrounding the U.S.'s pending engagement in the war. But while Miranda fit neatly into the imaginaries of U.S. audiences, her "good neighbor" reception south of the Rio Grande was not so warm or easy, as audiences were put off by Miranda's on-screen shifting ethnicity, as well as the pro-American intervention sentiments and troubling stereotypes of Latinos that enlivened the Fox musicals.<sup>120</sup>

In a later, more coordinated instance of celebrity cultural diplomacy, the State Department sponsored a series of jazz tours that were designed to project an

---

<sup>119</sup> Shari Roberts, "'The Lady in the Tutti-Frutti Hat': Carmen Miranda, Spectacle of Ethnicity," *Cinema Journal*, 32:3 (Spring 1993): 5.

<sup>120</sup> Roberts, "The Lady," 3-23.

image of a free and just America to the decolonizing world. Beginning in 1956 with Dizzie Gillespie's trip to the Middle East, jazz musicians were deployed abroad in the hopes that their music and presence might shore up notions of a U.S. committed to freedom, civil rights, and equality. As Penny Von Eschen describes,

With America in the throes of a political and cultural revolution that had put the black freedom struggle at the center of American and international politics, the prominence of African American jazz artists was critical to the music's potential as a Cold War weapon. In the high-profile tours by Gillespie, Louis Armstrong, Duke Ellington, and many others, U.S. officials pursued a self-conscious campaign against worldwide criticism of U.S. racism, striving to build cordial relations with new African and Asian states. The glaring contradiction in this strategy was that the U.S. promoted black artists as goodwill ambassadors-- symbols of the triumph of American democracy-- when America was still a Jim Crow nation.<sup>121</sup>

A vexed relationship indeed, the jazz culture-State Department partnership was volatile and uneasy. Ultimately though, what the State Department learned was that "the irreverence, egalitarianism, and creative brilliance of the musicians achieved far more in winning friends for America than any sanctimonious pronouncement of American superiority."<sup>122</sup>

As was the case with Miranda, the ethnic cultural capital of the musicians was mobilized and articulated to the exigencies of U.S. foreign policy. As cultural diplomats, these stars peddled and performed what in retrospect looks a lot like

---

<sup>121</sup> Penny Von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows Up the World: Jazz Ambassadors Play the Cold War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004): 4.

<sup>122</sup> Von Eschen, *Satchmo*, 56.

what contemporary political discourses call “soft power.” Joseph Nye coined the term to refer to a historical shift in conceptions and operations of power on the international stage: rather than making hard demands on other nations, soft power involves getting other nations to want to follow.<sup>123</sup> Nye explains,

Parents of teenagers have long known that if they have shaped their child's beliefs and preferences, their power will be greater and more enduring than if they rely only on active control. Similarly, political leaders and philosophizers have long understood the power of attractive ideas or the ability to set the political agenda and determine the framework of debate in a way that shapes others' preferences. The ability to affect what other countries want tends to be associated with intangible power resources such as culture, ideology, and institutions.<sup>124</sup>

As suggested by Nye's reference to methods of family governance that rely on shaping conducts rather than exerting direct social control, soft power can be thought of as a translation of governmentality-- the liberal art of governing actions and conducts at a distance from official centers of power-- to the international realm. Targeting the dispositions of nations and working on imagined relationships between domestic populations, soft power works through the social and cultural realms and can be seen in the heightened cultural diplomacy efforts that have played an increasingly significant role in both U.S. foreign and domestic

---

<sup>123</sup> Joseph Nye, “Soft Power,” *Foreign Policy*, 80 (1990): 153-171.

<sup>124</sup> Nye, “Soft Power,” 166-167.

policy. Without a doubt, as U.S. soft power, celebrity diplomats like Miranda and Gillespie were indicative of an era of rising U.S. global hegemony.

However, as scholarship suggests, these practices of celebrity diplomacy, developed around and out of the specific interests of the U.S., were laden with contradiction that ultimately stemmed from the stars' direct yet fraught ties to the U.S. government and its foreign policies. In other words, celebrity diplomats as instruments of U.S. soft power didn't exactly prove an easy winning strategy, which perhaps explains why these models of celebrity diplomacy failed to proliferate in the same way as others. Put differently, this was *not* the version of celebrity diplomacy that paved the way for Bono and idols of goodwill like George Clooney and Angelina Jolie that populate our contemporary conjuncture. Rather, as suggested previously, that was the work of Danny Kaye.

*Celebrity Diplomacy, Sentimental Education, and Global Governmentality*

Kaye represents the start of an alternative practice of celebrity diplomacy: in this case, the star (and his whiteness) would be mobilized for his imagined sway with Western media audiences and put to work for the UN in hopes of creating sentimental bonds between media audiences, the international community, and those vulnerable populations in the developing, decolonizing world it sought to empower and serve. Literally embodying the spirit of international cooperation

and humanitarian care, Kaye was fashioned as a cultural technology of global governmentality through a series of educational documentaries designed to mobilize media audiences as global citizens with moral and social obligations to the developing world and the apparatus of global governing.

The U.S. government used cultural diplomacy initiatives to materialize integrationist visions germane to its own economic and geopolitical interests, but international institutions actually carrying out the work of world government and global governing were operating with their own set of One World rationalities. While powerful Western states were embracing development aid and modernization as projects key to managing the transition to the post-colonial era and countering the communist threat, the U.N.'s promotion of the general welfare required threading together the competing aims and exigencies of the so-called developed and underdeveloped worlds. According to a 1952 U.N. report,

There has spread among impoverished people of the world an awareness...that higher standards of living not only exist for others, but are possible for themselves. Fatalistic resignation to poverty and disease is giving way to the demand for a better life. The demand is groping and uncertain in direction, charged with conflicting emotions regarding the old and the new, but it is nonetheless a force that is establishing an irreversible trend in history."<sup>125</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup> Asher et al., *The United Nations and the Promotion of the General Welfare* (Washington DC: Brookings Institution, 1957): 33-34.

In order to respond to and harness “the revolution of rising expectations”, the U.N. expanded technical assistance and development programs and put the social welfare of the underdeveloped world, which constituted a majority in the General Assembly, at the forefront of the institution’s work, balancing developed nations’ interest in expanding markets to decolonizing states against underdeveloped countries’ concerns about new forms of Western imperialism— economic and cultural— that would undoubtedly accompany increased private flows of capital.<sup>126</sup> Within this governing context of competing aims and interest that comprised the general welfare of the international community, cultural diplomacy was undoubtedly crucial, though an exceedingly complicated prospect. The might and racism of the industrialized West, the immense social and economic inequalities that marked the global system, and the U.N.’s highly circumscribed and uneven power as a governing institution made cultural and communication policy a key facet of the apparatus of global social security, especially when it came to more powerful states-- in particular, a very powerful U.S. consumed by the Cold War and containment ideologies. In other words, how could the U.N. institute an apparatus of global social security directed towards and responsive to the underdeveloped world, and, at the same time, bring its Western funders and power-brokers, whose interest in development were somewhat different, on board?

---

<sup>126</sup> Asher et al., *United Nations*, 34.

Enter Danny Kaye. When U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld, UNICEF director Maurice Pate, and U.N. General Assembly President Vijaya Lakshmi invited the vaudeville performer, television comedian, and *White Christmas* star to become a goodwill ambassador for UNICEF, a process was set in motion that brought media industries, stars, and the U.N. into a dynamic relationship and birthed a new concept of celebrity diplomacy, as well as a new mode of sentimental education. The pedagogical aim here was not simply to educate U.S. citizens about international affairs and their new role as members of a global community. Instead, this mode of sentimental education pioneered by Kaye's celebrity diplomacy sought to bring media audiences in the U.S. and across the West into the fold of world government itself, albeit in somewhat timid and careful ways. In other words, this version of celebrity diplomacy was not directed at the conduct of decolonizing nations and their populations in hopes of bending them to the American Way, but rather towards Western citizens in hopes of bringing them into relationship with the U.N. and the newly forming apparatus of global social security made up of international institutions and agencies. Urging audiences to practice internationalism through supporting the U.N. and those that it helps, Kaye constituted celebrity diplomacy and sentimental education as practical cultural technologies of global governmentality.

As UNICEF public relations director David Sureck recalled, "The idea was for him to be a kind of spokesperson so that UNICEF would be better known

and the work it did would be better understood.”<sup>127</sup> Crucially, UNICEF was less interested in Kaye serving as an explicit fundraiser than in his ability to attract publicity for UNICEF’s health and nutrition efforts in the Far East; the hope was that these publicity efforts would work circuitously, increasing revenue for the U.N.’s impoverished, little-known organization through heightened public awareness. Already slated to vacation near UNICEF’s service area, Kaye not only readily accepted the invitation to tour their operations but also suggested that he approach Paramount Pictures, with whom he was under contract, about bringing a camera crew along to document his travels. Paramount would underwrite the costs and help produce a documentary for commercial release whose proceeds would be funneled back to UNICEF. Paramount agreed, and upon departure to Asia, Pate dubbed Kaye UNICEF’s Ambassador-at-Large “charged with making known the needs of children throughout the world.”<sup>128</sup>

The result of the public-private partnership between the UN, Paramount, and Kaye was *Assignment: Children*, a twenty-minute documentary released in 1954 that offered an account of Kaye’s seven-week and eleven-country journey for UNICEF.<sup>129</sup> Narrated by a self-deprecating Kaye, the travelogue/documentary

---

<sup>127</sup> Martin Gottfried, *Nobody’s Fool: The Lives of Danny Kaye* (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1994): 18.

<sup>128</sup> Gottfried, *Nobody’s Fool*, 208.

<sup>129</sup> UNICEF, *Assignment: Children (1954; New York: Paramount Pictures, 1954)*, film. DVD copy provided by UNICEF, October 2009.

set out to answer the modest question: “what is UNICEF?” Aligning himself with his viewers, Kaye's voice-over was marked by a sincere naivete, as he positioned himself as someone who too was learning about UNICEF’s good works. After proclaiming himself simply “a sucker for kids,” Kaye implored his audiences not to worry: “Nobody’s going make a sales pitch. Nobody’s going ask you to dig down and shell out even a nickel. I just got so excited about some pictures I took...that I’d like you to see them, pictures that show what this branch of the U.N. means to the kids of the world.” Calling UNICEF “the biggest fight in the world today, a fight for the health and welfare of kids and mothers,” Kaye showed audiences how UNICEF food and nutrition programs were working through mostly cheerful images of thankful kids being served by UNICEF workers. On the journey Kaye was shown with kids, performing comedy routines, leading sing-a-longs, and helping to administer humanitarian aid alongside doctors and relief providers. Throughout the film, Kaye insisted that his own presence as an entertainer was far less important than that of UNICEF’s, and the film concluded by once again extolling the virtues of UNICEF and its mission:

Every kid has a right to be happy. You can help with candy and clowning but unless the little guy’s got a future with a chance in it for him to grow up healthy, part-time remedies. It’s the big-scale, full-time job, like UNICEF’s, that really counts. I’m not in politics...but nobody likes to see kids hungry or sick, especially if UNICEF can help keep them healthy...I just thought more people ought to know about UNICEF.

The film originally aired in U.S. theaters as a supplement to feature presentations with collection cans for UNICEF passed among audience members at the film's conclusion. Paramount also paid to have the film's narration translated into eighteen languages (including Arabic, Hindi, Japanese, and Danish) for global distribution. All in all, *Assignment: Children* is believed to have reached 100 million people and generated impressive revenue streams for the UNICEF.<sup>130</sup> Kaye was given a Special Award at the 1955 Oscar ceremony for these efforts, and the *New York Times* lauded the film, its producers, and their noble aims: "The international effort behind Paramount's achievement deserves everyone's gratitude. Their 'stars' were the children of six Asiatic countries; its crew 'on location' with malaria-control teams and in maternal and child-health centers. Paramount is having it translated into many languages for world distribution, absorbing expenses, and sending all the profits to UNICEF. To which we say, Well done!"<sup>131</sup>

Kaye's efforts to blend his work as an entertainer with his role as UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador did not stop with *Assignment: Children*. In 1956, Kaye pitched another UNICEF project, this time to CBS and Edward Murrow's *See It*

---

<sup>130</sup> "UNICEF People: Danny Kaye," UNICEF, [http://www.UNICEF.org/people/people\\_danny\\_kaye.html](http://www.UNICEF.org/people/people_danny_kaye.html)

<sup>131</sup> "A U.N. Documentary," *New York Times*, March 7, 1955, 26.

*Now* production team. While show producers saw the collaboration with Kaye and UNICEF as a way to secure sponsorship for the new season of the embattled *See It Now* (which it did), both Kaye and Murrow agreed that the production would be modeled around the principles of documentary rather than Kaye's status as an entertainer/performer. There would be no planned shooting schedule, no rehearsals, and no retakes. Kaye explained: "The camera was an onlooker, like the audience... The camera had nothing to do except show my relationship to the audience. This is something different from just 'entertainment.' I couldn't be that free if I was performing to a camera."<sup>132</sup> The 240,000 feet of film shot along the seven-week, thirty-two-thousand-mile itinerary turned into a special 90-minute episode kicking off the new season of *See it Now*. Capitalizing on Kaye's stardom and his recent successful turn as Walter Mitty, producers dubbed the program "The Secret Life of Danny Kaye."<sup>133</sup> The episode garnered not only huge ratings for Murrow's struggling program but also critical acclaim. As *Time* put it: "A Bag of Fruit. The plot of the show was nothing more than Kaye's merry Pied-Piper through the villages, homes and affections of children in 14 countries. There were no obtrusive reminders of UNICEF's constant need for

---

<sup>132</sup> Gottfried, *Nobody's Fool*, 225.

<sup>133</sup> "The Secret Life of Danny Kaye," *See It Now* (New York: CBS, December 2, 1956), television. DVD copy provided by UNICEF, October 2009.

funds...and none of the familiar TV tinsel and dross—but a lot of unfamiliar spontaneity and holiday glow."<sup>134</sup>

This second UNICEF-Kaye documentary was narrated by Murrow and introduced with a black and white line drawing of Kaye rendered as Lemuel Gulliver in Lilliput, a gentle giant hobbled by hundreds of little people. Murrow's opening voiceover explained: "The Secret Life of Danny Kaye is an open covenant secretly arrived at. It is a mutual security pact entered into by Ambassador Kaye and forty million children without veto or a single abstention." Unlike *Assignment: Children*, the *See it Now* episode relied less on narration and explication; instead, the program lingered for long intervals on Kaye's numerous encounters with children across the globe, which included staged shows and "spontaneous" play, as well as his work with UNICEF officials and workers. In Nigeria, images of Kaye dancing exuberantly with leprosy patients were juxtaposed with cold, scientific explanations of the disease; before and after close-ups of young, black bodies were offered to illustrate the disturbing effects of leprosy and the positive impact that UNICEF medications can make in treating the disease. The film concluded with Murrow and Kaye sitting in the chamber of an empty U.N. Security Council. Using the final scene to clarify the aims of the program, as well as Kaye's own involvement with UNICEF, Murrow asked his

---

<sup>134</sup> "Television: the Good Seed," *Time*, December 10, 1956, accessed August 2, 2011, <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,808741,00.html>

star a series of questions regarding his own motivations and his thoughts on what individuals might do to support UNICEF's mission. Highlighting the fact that Kaye waved his salary for the program and the potential for the television to help spread international goodwill, the interview concluded with a gentle plea. Careful not to explicitly dictate what his viewers should do in response to the images encountered, Kaye explained that "If they believed in what UNICEF was doing, they would find a way to best express themselves...their heart and their conscience would dictate exactly what they would have to do."

"The Secret Life of Danny Kaye" cemented Kaye's status as "Mr. UNICEF" and, much like *Assignment: Children* had done, the documentary format worked to make Kaye synonymous with needy children, and needy children synonymous with the U.N., creating a powerful chain of equivalencies that would authorize future celebrity-U.N. collaborations in the decades to come. Kaye was invited to receive the Nobel Peace Prize on behalf of UNICEF in 1965,<sup>135</sup> but perhaps his most lasting popular legacy was the "Trick-or-Treat for UNICEF" campaign, which the *New York Times* described as a "typically American project of spontaneous goodwill."<sup>136</sup> To promote the event, Kaye, the "greatest 'good ghost,'"<sup>137</sup> traversed the globe via plane, talked to church and

---

<sup>135</sup> Andrew Cooper, *Celebrity Diplomacy* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2008): 18.

<sup>136</sup> Howard A. Rusk, M.D., "Good Halloween Ghosts, *New York Times*, October 27, 1958, 58.

<sup>137</sup> Rusk, "Good Ghosts," 58.

school groups, handed out UNICEF canisters and buttons that read “Help Children Help Children,” and, in turn, “converted a day that was often a nuisance into an opportunity for citizenship education through cooperative community-wide support.”<sup>138</sup> The campaign promised citizens that for merely sixty cents they could “provide enough vaccine to protect sixty children in India against tuberculosis” or “cure twelve children in Indonesia of the dreaded tropical disease, yaws.”<sup>139</sup> Widely reported in the mainstream press, the campaign was a publicity success and became an annual happening. Today Trick-or-Treat for UNICEF is fronted by Disney star Selena Gomez and supported by a slew of corporate sponsors.<sup>140</sup>

Kaye’s star image certainly benefited from his status as “Mr. UNICEF,” but the value added to the U.N., both in terms of its own image and revenue, far outpaced any rewards received by Kaye. After all, Kaye’s association with UNICEF came at a time when Two World visions had assumed unquestioned supremacy in U.S. culture and politics. Willkie and FDR had been dead for a decade, and communist paranoia was rife. As a result, Kaye’s status as Mr. UNICEF struck a careful chord. On the one hand, Kaye’s turn to UNICEF

---

<sup>138</sup> Rusk, “Good Ghosts,” 58.

<sup>139</sup> Rusk, “Good Ghosts,” 58.

<sup>140</sup> “UNICEF People: Danny Kaye,” UNICEF, accessed August 2, 2011, [http://www.UNICEF.org/people/people\\_danny\\_kaye.html](http://www.UNICEF.org/people/people_danny_kaye.html); “Trick-or-Treat for UNICEF” accessed August 2, 2011, <http://youth.UNICEFusa.org/trickortreat/About/trick-or-treat-for-UNICEF-60-anniversary.html>

occurred after finding himself loosely embroiled in the HUAC investigations. He and his wife were among five hundred Hollywood names to a high-profile petition condemning the congressional probes, and he had also joined the Democrats Citizen Committee, which came under fire for its alleged leftist agenda. As Gottfried suggests, Kaye was more troubled than incensed about the Red Scare's impact on Hollywood. In turn, it's easy to see how working for UNICEF might have appeared a safer, more appropriate, and less controversial outlet for Kaye's personal, public commitments. Lary May's research suggests that Kaye's personal turn towards the international realm might also be understood as part of a broader shift in American political-- and Hollywood-- culture that began during the war, intensified during the Cold War, and saw class-based politics vilified and replaced by discourses that stressed unity in the face of a common, external enemy.<sup>141</sup> However, Kaye's close relationship to UNICEF during this time was not necessarily hullabaloo-free, as the U.N. itself was thought by hard line Cold Warriors to be infiltrated by communists. When Kaye received his Oscar for *Assignment: Children*, no mention was made of UNICEF, the stark omission likely due to the contentious status of the U.N. in U.S. culture at the time.<sup>142</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> Lary May, *The Big Tomorrow: Hollywood and the Politics of the American Way* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000): 175-213.

<sup>142</sup> Gottfried, *Nobody's Fool*, 215.

On the other hand, the Kaye-UNICEF partnership is also credited with some much-needed alleviation of international tensions. More specifically, it was believed that Kaye's partnerships with UNICEF helped to construct a new humanitarian image of the UN rooted in its work on behalf of children. As Kaye explained in *Assignment: Children*, UNICEF is "one branch of the United Nations where bickerings and rankerings...just don't happen. Nobody tries to make a political football out of sick or hungry kids." UNICEF officials credited Kaye with re-articulating the U.N.'s global mission in terms of advocacy on behalf of needy children and, in doing so, helped to militate against Two World conceptions of the U.N. as a highly dysfunctional, puppet organization and to create an atmosphere of international goodwill that cut across Cold War tensions. In this way, Kaye's performance as "Mr. UNICEF" refracted powerfully postwar conceptions of internationalism rooted in the universalist and cosmopolitan principle of a shared, common, global humanity. Both *Assignment: Children* and "The Secret Life of Danny Kaye" revolved around the star's relationships with the world's children, relationships that allegedly transcended language barriers, national borders, and cultural differences. In these films, UNICEF, now represented by Kaye's relationship to the children, figured as a partner in helping to empower local populations better serve their people and a beacon of hope for a more united and peaceful world. For example, the *New York Times* reported that "Danny Kaye is an international institution who loves children and is, in turn,

loved by them... ‘Children’, says Kaye, ‘are the common denominator of mankind and their welfare is the common concern of all of us.’”<sup>143</sup>

The Kaye-UNICEF projects struck a careful chord in other ways as well. It’s important to see that the peculiar ways in which UNICEF sought to mobilize Kaye’s stardom were reflective of profound tensions springing from the U.N.’s own institutional position as an international governmental organization. In his study of the U.N.’s Department of Public Information, Mark Alleyne shows how the organization’s communication operations have historically been plagued by the problem of propaganda. From early on, the U.N. has sought to differentiate its communication policies from the practices associated with public relations and propaganda, preferring the term public information-- which includes liberal practices like public affairs and education programming-- to describe its information tactics. Distinguishing their own educational campaigns from the practices of governments, corporations, and other agencies whose primary aim is to manipulate public opinion and to influence behavior and attitudes, the U.N. has long sought to avoid the perception that it engages in image-making and other forms of public relations through allegedly impartial, objective, and politically neutral campaigns designed to show the world the U.N.’s good work.<sup>144</sup> In 1946,

---

<sup>143</sup> “U.N. Presents: Danny Kaye,” *New York Times*, July 4, 1954, SM25.

<sup>144</sup> Mark Alleyne, *Global Lies?: Propaganda, the UN, and World Order*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003): 1:27.

when information policy was first being discussed and developed, the Technical Advisory Committee proposed the following recommendation that was later adopted by the General Assembly:

The activities of the Department of Public Information should be so organized and direct to promote to the greatest possible extent an informed understanding of the work and purposes of the United Nations among the peoples of the world. To this end the Department should primarily assist and rely upon the co-operation of the established governmental agencies of information to provide the public with information about the United Nations. The Department of Public Information should not engage in “propaganda”. It should on its own initiative engage in positive informational activities that will supplement the services of existing agencies of information to the extent that these are insufficient to realize the purpose set forth above.<sup>145</sup>

UNICEF's own public education campaigns were not directed by the Department of Public Information. Nonetheless, *Assignment: Children* and “The Secret Life of Danny Kaye” can be seen as cautious negotiations, attempts to fashion supplementary and “positive” representations of the U.N.'s good works. Kaye's paradoxical assertions that he is not prescribing specific courses of action to his audiences (such as donations or other forms of public advocacy) are symptomatic of greater restraints stemming not only from Cold War tensions but also from the U.N.'s on-going struggles over how to best spread the word of its own good works and public mission.

---

<sup>145</sup> Alleyne, *Global Lies*, 4.

Of course, the very existence of these "positive representations" (not to mention the presence of donation canisters at screenings of *Assignment: Children*) troubles the U.N.'s insistence that it is not attempting to influence behaviors or bend public perceptions. However, taking seriously the U.N.'s informational strategies and challenges helps to specify why stardom would emerge as a valuable and viable resource in this context. As valuable commodities of the culture industries, stars command the attention of media institutions and thus are a crucial condition of possibility for the production of "supplementary" informational campaigns and the requisite "co-operation" needed to achieve them, as was the case with CBS and *See It Now*. At the same time, placed in context of an educational, "objective" documentary, Kaye was shown to actually perform the humanitarian work of UNICEF. In turn, the images of the star reading to children or dancing with lepers functioned to promote UNICEF's agenda and contributed to organizational "image-making" while keeping at bay perceptions of blatant propaganda or a publicity stunt. The discourse revolved around Kaye-- around his character and actions-- at the same time that, paradoxically, Kaye as star faded into the background, as his performances were circumscribed by the broader mission and service work of UNICEF. As the *New York Times* proclaimed of *Assignment: Children*: "Their 'stars' were the children of six Asiatic countries."

Specifically, it is the individualizing character of star discourse that was put to work in these representations and helped to negotiate an effective

communication strategy for UNICEF. As explained in the previous chapter, Dyer argues that stars' affective purchase with audiences is owed to the ways in which the discourse of stardom relates to the discourse of individualism: "We are fascinated by stars because they enact ways of making sense of the experience of being a person in a particular kind of social production (capitalism), with its particular organization of life into public and private spheres."<sup>146</sup> What's unique about stardom is the way in which the discourse engages audiences in reflection upon the constraints and promises of individual life in specific historical contexts. Following Dyer's insights, stars are social types that "act out aspects of life that matter to us."<sup>147</sup> Embodying the split between a public and private self, stars dramatize what it means and how it feels to be human in liberal societies where the individual is promoted as the central linchpin of society. As a particular way of speaking about and representing stars, the discourse of stardom hinges on a peculiar form of individualization, where stars are at once an image, a persona-- that is, a conglomeration of fictional characters/ on-screen performances-- and actual flesh and blood beings with private lives and personal commitments. For critics and cultural scholars, this individualizing structure has been theorized as stardom's ideological function, and hence its primary problem: star discourse

---

<sup>146</sup> Richard Dyer, *Heavenly Bodies*: 17

<sup>147</sup> Dyer, *Heavenly Bodies*, 19.

necessarily elevates the individual actions of the star at the expense political and social context and material realities.

In the case of *Assignment: Children* and "The Secret Life of Danny Kaye" however, star discourse and the dynamics enlivening the star phenomenon were put to work in a new fashion: the individualized character of stardom was rendered productive for international regimes by negotiating a communication strategy that accommodated the institutional pressures unique to the U.N.. With Kaye, the liberal discourse of stardom was bent towards international advocacy, as, through these productions, Kaye was fashioned as a new social type-- an idol of goodwill-- who performed the U.N.'s international mission for audiences. As P. David Marshall might put it, the "affective function" of celebrity was, for the first time, deployed in the service of political rationalities of U.N. global governing. Global humanitarian and advocate for children, Kaye was made to embody the governing spirit and rationalities of the UN, elevating the U.N.'s humanitarian mission above domestic politics and the Security Council "rankerings." As played out in the context of these documentaries, Kaye's celebrity diplomacy took the form of sentimental education, whereby the star serves as a cultural relay facilitating emotional bonds of friendship and obligation between audiences and those members of populations in the developing, decolonizing world that the U.N. services. Targeted primarily at Western, wealthier media audiences, the Kaye films used images of playful, grateful children to emphasize the universalist,

sentimental idea of a global humanity held together by common, emotional bonds between individuals. Animating these images were the U.N.'s desire to mobilize Western media audiences as global citizens supportive of the institution and its work promoting the general welfare.

I want to suggest that transforming Kaye and the liberal discourse of stardom into a cultural technology of global governmentality operative in Western contexts worked particularly well for a couple of reasons. First, star-led sentimental education fit comfortably within the discourses of consumer culture, especially those that emphasized self-realization through private acts of consumption. As Colin Campbell has argued, the consumer ethic of modern capitalism is marked by Romanticism's discourse of individualism, desire, and emotional hedonism:<sup>148</sup> subjects (primarily imagined to be female) express individualized identities by fulfilling desires, pursuing passions, and displaying sentiments in and through consumption. Simply put, star-led sentimental education, with its focus on a self-in-relation (the star and her audience) and emotional bonds between distant strangers (between the star, the audience, and the children represented in the film) offered a means of feeling one's identity/fashioning one's self as a caring, global citizen through media consumption. After

---

<sup>148</sup> Colin Campbell, *The Romantic Ethic and the Spirit of Modern Consumerism* (London: Blackwell, 1987).

all, as suggested previously, audiences have long been accustomed to using representations of stars and their private lives in such a way.

Second, this approach to citizen-shaping on the part of the U.N. was also in step with newly emerging individualized concepts of liberal, democratic citizenship. As neo-classical, anti-Keynesian economic philosophies began to seep into public life in the 1950s, citizens and corporations (including media corporations) were called upon to do their part in promoting a version of liberal democracy rooted privatized conceptions of individual freedom, rights, and responsibilities that emphasized a mix a self-responsibility, voluntarism, and entrepreneurialism.<sup>149</sup> The Kaye films, with their careful, cautious address and purportedly modest aims, helped to constitute the U.N. and the apparatus of global social security as an appropriate outlet for practices of liberal citizenship, despite the fact that the One World, cosmopolitan rationalities undergirding the own U.N.'s development agenda were not necessarily neatly aligned with Western economic and geopolitical interests. Striking a delicate balance between the emotion and affect associated with sentimental education and the rationality of the social science discourses undergirding development, the Kaye films addressed audiences as caring, responsible citizens, inviting them ever so gently to support the U.N.'s work. Put a little differently, the flexible, liberal structure of star discourse allowed the One World visions and political rationalities of global

---

<sup>149</sup> McCarthy, *The Citizen Machine*, 3.

governmentality to find a home-- that is, a cultural, material base-- in realms of media and consumer culture.

Ultimately, the models of star-led sentimental education and celebrity diplomacy pioneered by Kaye and rooted in the individualized, liberal structure of star discourse accommodated a double constitution of citizenship that was also highly feminized: through acts of media consumption, care, and charity, subjects were invited to perform templates of good citizenship germane to emerging domestic regimes of governing, and, at the same time, to feel like global citizens, acting as members of broader global community of populations. The significance here cannot be underestimated: the U.N. needs Western countries to support its work and Western citizens to feel connected to the aims and rationalities of world government. Star-led sentimental education can be theorized as the U.N.'s and global governmentality's own version of soft power, one that ultimately targets national governments' behaviors through leaping them and acting on the conducts and dispositions of their citizens.

*Celebrity Diplomacy, Sentimental Education, and Contemporary One World Culture*

Still lionized as the most hard-working and effective goodwill ambassador by the U.N., Kaye's legacy lives on in organization's institutional lore. Upon his death in

1987, the U.N. and UNICEF sought to fill Kaye's shoes, reaching out to a wide array of media celebrities from many different nations, and today the U.N.'s Department of Public Information itself directs a savvy star-studded public education program entitled U.N. Works in which the institutional logics regarding the deployment of celebrities developed around Danny Kaye still operate.

UN Works is an innovative multimedia platform that puts a human face on the work of the UN by exploring global issues through the personal stories of people and their communities. Our goal is to give a voice to ordinary men, women and children and allow them to share their struggles and fears; hopes and aspirations with audiences around the world.

Partnerships with broadcast networks, celebrities, UN agencies, NGOs, educators, foundations and corporations explore the stories of people and their communities. Integrated content includes compelling television, an interactive website, and complementary online educational and advocacy resources.<sup>150</sup>

The centerpiece of the campaign is a documentary series entitled *What's Going On?: Exploring the Struggles of Children*.<sup>151</sup> Produced in partnership with Showtime, marketed as a teaching tool/resource for educators, and updated for circulation in the converged media landscape, the *What's Going On?* programs bear strong resemblance to the early UNICEF-Danny Kaye productions.<sup>152</sup> Stars

---

<sup>150</sup> "UN Works: for People and the Planet," United Nations, <http://www.un.org/works/sub2.asp?lang=en&s=11>

<sup>151</sup> "What's Going On?," The UN Works for People and the Planet, United Nations, <http://www.un.org/works/sub4.asp?lang=en&id=15>

<sup>152</sup> For example see "Refugees in Tanzania" with Angelina Jolie, *What's Going On?* (Culver City, CA: Zenger Media, a division of Social Studies School Service, 2003), 28 minutes, DVD.

including Susan Sarandon and Laurence Fishburne are shown interacting with struggling though cheerful children across the globe, while simultaneously educating their audiences about U.N. efforts on issues ranging from child soldiers in Sierra Leone to child labor in Brazil to poverty in the United States. As suggested in the U.N.'s description of these efforts, and as was seen in the Kaye productions, these educational documentaries use stars to garner public attention and secure cooperation from partners, while simultaneously (and paradoxically) elevating the stories, plights, and voices of children. Like Kaye had done, the caring stars that front the *What's Going On?* episodes consistently downplay their own involvement and presence, striking a self-deprecating tone, and repeatedly extol the need for the U.N. and the international community, as well as the nobility and significance of its humanitarian mission.

Stars visiting with, caring for, and giving voice to children and families in the developing world in hopes that Western citizens back home might feel and act on obligations to global humanity: this version of sentimental education, yoked to the aims and exigencies of global governmentality, not only continues to inform the U.N.'s public education campaigns. Today it figures as a prominent discourse of the broader apparatus of global governing made up of private charities, media advocacy campaigns, NGOs, and other outfits that participate alongside the U.N. in serving the general welfare. Thanks in large part to the proliferation of idols of goodwill in recent decades, One World political rationalities and discourses of

global citizenship occupy an increasingly prominent place in contemporary culture, as today a vast array of stars work on behalf of a vast array international organizations under the banner of a common, global humanity and international cooperation. The Kaye models of celebrity diplomacy and sentimental education have been generalized and now inform a slew of communication practices directed at Western media audiences and aimed at shaping their acts of citizenship. For example, Rosen Publishing Group's "Celebrity Activists" book series features titles such as *Angelina Jolie: Goodwill Ambassador for the United Nations*; *Bono: Fighting World Hunger and Poverty*; and *Leonardo Di Caprio: Environmental Champion*. Designed as resources for elementary school teachers and students, the books explore an individual celebrity's efforts to better the world. The Jolie installment uses the star's personal biography and star image-- from her early film career and Oscar win to her latest international adoption-- as a context for presenting information about UNHCR and its good works on behalf of refugees.<sup>153</sup>

As Klein's theorization of the global imaginary of integration suggests, star-led sentimental education can vary in tenor and tone, drawing from right and left versions of internationalism, that is, from the Christian missionary tradition or global social and economic justice movements surrounding decolonization. Many

---

<sup>153</sup> Laura La Bella, *Angelina Jolie Goodwill Ambassador for the United Nations* (New York: Rosen Publishing Group, 2009).

versions of star-led education have been updated for the enterprise culture associated with neoliberalism, drawing on discourses of entrepreneurialism and individual empowerment, while others remain animated by more traditional discourses of charity and pity. Famously, Sally Struthers starred in an advertising campaign for Christian Children's Fund in the 1980s which offered audiences the opportunity to help a child in need for a modest monthly sum. As Struthers explained in one ad,

Today so many children around the world still need your help and, through Christian Children's Fund, you can reach out to one of them by sharing, well, just a little of your pocket change. It takes so little for you to become a special friend to a child in a developing country, but, boy, the good it can do is worth more than you can imagine.<sup>154</sup>

Linking pity, Christian humanitarianism, and a consumer culture fix, the Struthers ads reflect concepts and histories of global charity rooted in colonial benevolence, as this version of sentimental education commodified the plights of poor children and played to white guilt.

Contrast this last example to Natalie Portman's intensive work with FINCA, a micro-finance organization which empowers private citizens to provide loans and financing to individual entrepreneurs, especially poor women and mothers in the developing world. As the FINCA website explains,

---

<sup>154</sup> Sally Struthers for Christian's Children Fund, 1987, television advertisement, accessed August 2, 2011, [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ePENcrE\\_xcQ](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ePENcrE_xcQ)

We're not a typical charity. We offer loans, not gifts, and we promote financial independence, both among our clients and in our programs. Although we are a nonprofit, we operate using sound business principles and an entrepreneurial spirit.

Our work enables poor families to create their own solutions to poverty. Our Village Banking methodology promotes community and individual development, helping lift entire communities out of poverty.<sup>155</sup>

In an educational video posted to YouTube by FINCA, Portman describes how the best way to help a child in poverty is by giving his or her mother a loan to become self-sufficient: “For a quarter century, FINCA has been providing a hand up, not a hand out for the world’s poor, mostly women.”<sup>156</sup> Portman, in her public appearances on FINCA’s behalf, like most of today’s high-profile idols of goodwill, is careful to remain faithful to the institutional discourses and governing agendas that she represents: community empowerment, personal responsibility, and entrepreneurialism.

While the celebrity-philanthropy complex operates to funnel stars to global charities (and vice versa), in contemporary media culture stars often appear to take a leading role in fashioning and enlisting themselves as sentimental educators for regimes of global governmentality. For example, in addition to

---

<sup>155</sup> “About FINCA,” FINCA, [http://www.finca.org/site/c.6fIGIXMFJnJ0H/b.6088399/k.75E7/ABOUT\\_FINCA.htm](http://www.finca.org/site/c.6fIGIXMFJnJ0H/b.6088399/k.75E7/ABOUT_FINCA.htm)

<sup>156</sup> “Natalie Portman shares how FINCA changes lives,” FINCA International, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dYQeDHZlm4c>

performing her duties as today's most busy, globe-trotting U.N. goodwill ambassador (discussed in Chapter Four), Angelina Jolie starred in, produced, and directed *A Place in Time*, a documentary for school age children to be distributed by the National Education Foundation. Scattering thirty teams of stars and cameras crews across the world (e.g., Anne Hathaway to Cambodia, Colin Farrell to Italy, Ryan Gosling to Chad, Bai Ling to Kosovo) and enjoining them to turn on their cameras at precisely the same moment for three minutes, the experimental film proposed to answer the question: "What if you could look through the eyes of others across the globe at the same moment?"<sup>157</sup>

Undoubtedly, the film represents not only an updating of *Our World/One World* fantasies of global presence for the digital age, but also Jolie's own attempt to concretize in visual form the cosmopolitan concepts of an actually existing international community and a shared, universal humanity that animates her own experiences and practices of global citizenship as a celebrity diplomat and sentimental educator for the U.N.. In his day, Kaye attempted a similar aesthetic feat with his children's book, *Danny Kaye's Around the World Storybook*, which opened like this:

I think I can safely say that I do not know all the stories in the world and that I haven't even come close to meeting all the world's children. But I have, indeed, traveled through almost every

---

<sup>157</sup> Preview uploaded to YouTube by *UNHCR Angelina Jolie* on August 7, 2010, [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y\\_Bec3KaiDY](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y_Bec3KaiDY) No official release date.

country in the world several times and heard quite a few tales-- tall, small and indigenous-- and met quite a few youngsters of every size, shape and state-of-mind; and it was in the course of one of my far-flung junkets for UNICEF that it occurred to me how wonderful it would be if it were possible to introduce all the children in the world to all the stories ever told. It would be almost as wonderful as introducing all the children to one another.

And that's how this book came to be. It came out of a deep and growing conviction that all the world's children are very much alike-- their needs, loves, fears, even their stories. And if these children- the adults of tomorrow-- begin to understand this, even through the simple process of exchanging favorite stories, then perhaps tomorrow will see a world in which similarities rather than differences are emphasized.<sup>158</sup>

Like Danny Kaye today some media celebrities use their leverage with media industries and institutions to promote and participate in the good works of international organizations. Senate staffer turned *West Wing* writer/producer turned MSNBC anchor Lawrence O'Donnell has recently partnered with UNICEF to create K.I.N.D. (Kids in Need of Desks). Moved to action after accessing the state of education firsthand in one of the world's poorest nations, O'Donnell decided to use his primetime political talk show on as a platform for educating media audiences about the elemental struggles facing young learners in Malawi. In a matter of months, O'Donnell raised over two million dollars from his media audiences and delivered thousands of desks, vowing to keep the effort going until

---

<sup>158</sup> *Danny Kaye's Around the World Storybook* (New York: Random House, 1960):5.

the entire country's children were off the schoolroom floor.<sup>159</sup> To his MSNBC audiences, O'Donnell explained that "maybe, just maybe" by providing one kid with a desk in order to better learn, you might be helping to create the next Nelson Mandela.<sup>160</sup>

As will be discussed in Chapters Four and Five, interactive global media advocacy campaigns are central to contemporary rationalities and practices of global governing, and star-led sentimental education is often a key component, if not the animating force, of these promotional discourses. For example, *The Listen Campaign* sends stars like Samuel L. Jackson, Ashley Judd, Goldie Hawn and Kurt Russell, and Natalie Portman into the fields of global governing to "listen" to children and families. Partnering with a host of service providers working on specific development projects across the world, the multimedia global advocacy campaign's primary work consists of creating short videos of caring stars who, after "listening," report back on what they've seen and learned. As the website explains, "Our artists have listened to personal, intimate and heartbreaking stories of some of the world's most disadvantaged children."<sup>161</sup> Made to be distributed and shared by consumers on-line, these short, one-to-five minute films look and feel, in many ways, a lot like the Kaye television documentaries. Stars are shown

---

<sup>159</sup> "K.I.N.D. on *The Last Word*," MSNBC, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/40558738/>

<sup>160</sup> "MSNBC's Lawrence O'Donnell explains the need for school desks in Africa, MSNBC, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/21134540/vp/40711558#40711558>

<sup>161</sup> "Artists Listening," The Listen Charity, <http://www.listencharity.org/listening-to-children.html>

interacting with hopeful yet needy children, while educating their audiences about what they were seeing and learning. In Judd's video documenting her trip to a drop-in facility for homeless youth in Delhi, images of the star talking to the camera are juxtaposed with those of children living on the street and Judd visiting with them at the center. She explains: "I saw exceedingly vulnerable and traumatized, abused children get a little bit of relief, a little bit of hope."<sup>162</sup>

While Bono's RED campaign has commanded the most attention from critical scholars, it is the rock star's other global endeavors that are most indicative of stars' place in contemporary regimes of global governmentality. Earning his stripes as a serious celebrity diplomat with the Jubilee 2000 campaign that demanded debt relief for poor African nations, Bono spent the early part of the new century building media savvy advocacy organizations with the help of mega philanthropists Bill Gates and George Soros (some of today's most powerful articulators of One World visions). DATA (Debt AIDS Trade Africa) not only advocated for African populations on pressing health and economic issues, it also recruited and trained stars and celebrities to be effective lobbyists and respected public educators. Today DATA has joined forces with ONE, Bono's other global advocacy campaign that seeks to end poverty, particularly in Africa, by working to raise public awareness and to hold heads-of- state to account on

---

<sup>162</sup> "Ashley Judd Listening in Delhi," The Listen Charity, <http://www.listencharity.org/ashleyjudd2.html>

their financial commitments to the international community. Boasting an international lobby two million strong and targeted primarily at young adults, ONE actively solicits voices, not money, from the general public.<sup>163</sup> ONE's version of sentimental education is highly pragmatic, focusing on results, solutions, and "living proof," which is also the title of a program/video series that features three-to-five minute films about individuals across the continent who have been helped out of poverty and/or poor health through current health and development initiatives.<sup>164</sup> Unlike more traditional charitable outfits that solicit through invoking white guilt or the U.N.'s cautious tactic of showing good works, ONE's approach to sentimental education, like FINCA's, is animated by the 'can do' spirit of philanthropy and social entrepreneurialism, promising widespread, meaningful social change in exchange for participation in the media-based movement.

When Bono made Jesse Helms 'see the light' on aid to Africa, he was engaging in yet another form of sentimental education, one where stars bring their goodwill with audiences, charisma, and knack for performance to bear in the context of one-on-one diplomacy with heads-of-state. I have suggested these various versions of star-led sentimental education began in 1954 when Danny Kaye agreed to put his goodwill with media audiences in the service of UNICEF,

---

<sup>163</sup> "About," ONE, <http://www.one.org/c/us/about/3782/>

<sup>164</sup> "Living Proof," ONE, <http://www.one.org/livingproof/en/>

the U.N., and apparatus of global social security. The following chapters represent a modest attempt to fill in some of the gaps along the way from Kaye to Bono and to theorize the proliferation of idols of goodwill that marks our contemporary conjuncture. Tracing the evolution of stars and media celebrities as powerful cultural technologies of global governmentality, I look at how stardom's role in international regimes has unfolded and been adjusted to the post-Cold War era, where the rise of global civil society and a digital media culture are redefining the parameters of liberal citizenship and the horizons of global governing.

### *Chapter Three*

## Bleeding Heart: The “Spirit of Audrey” and the Rise of Cosmopolitan Stardom

### *The Spirit of Audrey*

Mahatma Ghandi once said, “Wars cannot be won by bullets, but only with bleeding hearts.” And surely caring is better than killing. We care for our own children, when they go through a crisis. When they have an accident or are stricken by disease. Not only during that moment, but also through what may be a fairly long convalescence. If we can do that for our own children, I certainly think we can do it for all those silent children that I saw yesterday and today. And I firmly believe that those children are our sacred charge.<sup>165</sup>

So explained Audrey Hepburn to members of the international press after a field trip to Ethiopia in 1988. That year the much adored Hollywood icon returned to the limelight as United Nations Goodwill Ambassador for UNICEF. In this latest role, Hepburn, much like Kaye, traversed the globe—from Africa to Latin America to Eastern Europe to Asia and back to Africa— in order to command attention to the plight of needy children. Making much-hyped media appearances on popular talk shows, testifying before congressional committees on behalf of the U.N., launching UNICEF’s annual *State of World’s Children Reports*, and ultimately earning a Presidential Medal of Freedom and an Honorary Oscar for

---

<sup>165</sup> UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador Archive: Audrey Hepburn. Tape 1: 1988-1989, April, 1988. DVD copy provided by UNICEF. Shot lists and scripts available on-line from: [http://origin-www.UNICEF.org/videoaudio/media\\_15904.html](http://origin-www.UNICEF.org/videoaudio/media_15904.html)

her international efforts, Hepburn spent the last years of her life (she died of colon cancer in 1993) teaching love and care for disadvantaged black and brown children.

At the unveiling of the “Spirit of Audrey” Statue at UNICEF headquarters in New York in 2002, Mia Farrow recounted:

As a teenager, I worshipped her. My friends and I simply worshipped her. As an actor, her radiance, I think she touched all her audience in the same way. And then the fact that she went that step further in the consciousness that there were people needing help. That was where she truly, truly inspired me. I never tried to be like her as an actress because she was up there with the gods. Just to be adored and worshipped. But as a human being, that she said “That’s not enough, I have a responsibility to my brothers and sisters all over the world.” And she brought her particular kind of light to the darkest corners of the earth and brought focus there.<sup>166</sup>

Fellow Goodwill Ambassador and long-standing activist Harry Belafonte reflected on Hepburn’s legacy, calling her “one of the great women of the 20<sup>th</sup> century”: “I think what she did with her celebrity, what she did with her art, the way she conducted herself as a human being, is a remarkable example of how the rest of us should really use our lives.”<sup>167</sup> U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan proclaimed Hepburn the epitome of a “new kind of star:” “The kind that shines its light on the hardship and injustices suffered by the children of this world. The

---

<sup>166</sup> UNICEF, *UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador Archive: Audrey Hepburn. Tape 3: 1992-2003*, May 7, 2002. DVD copy provided by UNICEF. Shot lists and scripts available on-line from: [http://origin-www.UNICEF.org/videoaudio/media\\_15904.html](http://origin-www.UNICEF.org/videoaudio/media_15904.html)

<sup>167</sup> UNICEF, *Hepburn Tape 3*, May 7, 2002.

kind that confronts us and melts away our indifference. The kind that forces us to admit that we can and must do something to help.”<sup>168</sup>

While the idea of stars as sentimental educators for international regimes was born with Danny Kaye, it was Hepburn’s goodwill ambassadorship that perfected the concept. This chapter traces how Hepburn not only epitomized “a new kind of star” but also realized a new modality female star power. As UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador, Hepburn refashioned the cultural powers of female stardom, pushing them into the field of global governmentality. With Hepburn, the cultural powers of female stardom were governmentalized: redirected and re-articulated to the international aims, programs, and governing rationalities of the U.N. and the apparatus of global governing. Specifically, it was Hepburn’s authentic, pedagogical femininity that facilitated this redirection and re-articulation of female star power, as Hepburn’s stardom allowed her cultural power to become synonymous with a distinctly cosmopolitan yet highly feminized form of pastoral power rooted in the moral and ethical dimensions of the star phenomenon.

### *Cosmopolitan Stardom*

---

<sup>168</sup> Kofi Annan, UNICEF Goodwill Gala Remarks, Beverly Hills, California, December 3, 2003. Available from :<http://www.unis.unvienna.org/unis/pressrels/2003/sgsm9049.html>

Hepburn's role as UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador helped set the stage for our contemporary conjuncture where Hollywood's brightest leading lights are ever more embroiled in matters of social welfare in the developing world. As Andrew Cooper explains in his book *Celebrity Diplomacy*, "Audrey Hepburn created a model of star power expressed via the U.N. organizational structure that other celebrities could-- and did in quite large numbers-- try to follow. It was a model that allowed celebrities to go global with their enthusiasms. It linked them to U.N. specialized agencies...In this model, glamour worked to enhance the sense of commitment."<sup>169</sup> I want to suggest that Hepburn, as idol of goodwill *par excellence*, ushered in a distinctly cosmopolitan mode of stardom in which stars step outside the representational worlds fabricated by Hollywood and into the fields of humanitarian relief, development aid, and global governing.

While Hollywood stardom has long been infused with cosmopolitan flair, it is important to distinguish what I'm calling cosmopolitan stardom from other forms of global or international stardom. First, cosmopolitan stardom is animated by principles that, as discussed previously, can be traced back to early iterations of world citizenship found in the writings of the Cynics and Stoics that propose membership is the *cosmos*, that is, in the larger global, human community. As Seyla Benhabib describes, in "Perpetual Peace," Kant wrote of a cosmopolitan right, which proposed that strangers were entitled by right to hospitality on

---

<sup>169</sup> Andrew Cooper, *Celebrity Diplomacy* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2008): 20.

foreign lands; “hospitality is a right that belongs to all human beings insofar as we view them as potential participants in a world republic.”<sup>170</sup> In modern discourses, cosmopolitanism primarily figures as an ethical enterprise and political disposition, specifically, one that concerns the relationship between the self and/or the nation and the strangers or others that comprise the global human community.

Philosopher Kwame Anthony Appiah suggests that,

there are two strands that intertwine in the notion of cosmopolitanism. One is the idea that we have obligations to others, obligations that stretch beyond those to whom we are related by the ties of kith and kind, or even the more formal ties of a shared citizenship. The other is that we take seriously the value not just of human life but of particular human lives, which means taking an interest in the practices and beliefs that lend them significance.<sup>171</sup>

Cosmopolitanism is a matter of both personal conviction and political sensibility.

What I’m calling cosmopolitan stardom thus refracts certain moral and social orientations, including, most significantly, a comfort with and obligation to difference-- including the fates and fortunes of distant strangers-- that is imagined to stem from a feeling of membership in and belonging to a broader global humanity. Indeed, the sentimental education led by Danny Kaye, with its images of the star playing with and tending to the welfare of other children, spoke to a cosmopolitan sensibility of a universal humanity that at once embraces and

---

<sup>170</sup> Seyla Benhabib, *Another Cosmopolitanism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006): 22.

<sup>171</sup> Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2006): xv.

transcends particular differences, a sensibility that was at once embodied and performed by the caring star on his documented field trips around the world.

Second, it is important to understand that cosmopolitan stardom is operative and takes form within regimes and practices of global governmentality. Crafted primarily within the institutions, exigencies, and discourses of the U.N. and global governing, cosmopolitan stardom aims to mobilize media audiences as particular sorts of global citizens, that is, citizens who feel (and act on) moral obligations to global humanity, in particular, the general welfare represented by the U.N. and its development programs. Within the parameters of cosmopolitan stardom, a star's own status as a "citizen of the world" takes center-stage: cosmopolitan stars figure as icons of the international community and performers of global commitment and caring whose practical aim is not simply to make money for media industries but rather to bring citizens into alignment with the governing agendas of international institutions in the realm of media culture. Cosmopolitan stardom represents the technologizing of cosmopolitanism as a moral and social disposition; its aim is less to represent or mediate a robust vision of 'authentic' cosmopolitan citizenship and politics and more to harvest a material cultural base for global governing in Western media and political contexts through acting on the conducts and dispositions of citizens at a distance through their relationships and engagements with stars.

Cosmopolitan stardom is marked by a star's deep, long-term commitment to a global cause, as well as its institutional champion (in Hepburn's case, child welfare and UNICEF); documented field trips "to the darkest corners of the earth" which show the star learning about and experiencing firsthand the issues facing the international community; and the star's participation in public education and fundraising efforts (i.e. sentimental education), targeted primarily at Western citizens and designed to engage media audiences on these issues. As Sean Hepburn Ferrer recalls of his mother's UNICEF work,

The schedules were grueling...my mother...would have to make numerous stops on the way to a destination in a developing country.... Subsequently they would travel to developed countries, where she would give interviews, talking about everything she had seen and learned, make appearances, and join in UNICEF's fund-raising efforts. They did this all several times a year, with a few weeks' break to recover from jet lag, and then back on the road.<sup>172</sup>

Whereas today's cosmopolitan stars-- most notably female stars like Ashely Judd, Madonna, and Jolie-- regularly come under fire for their forays into matters of global social welfare, scolded for their allegedly self-serving, misguided, and/or narcissistic attempts to save the world, Hepburn's performance on the world stage as a glamorous advocate for needy children was rarely called into question. As UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador, Hepburn used the fact of her "well-knownness" and her personal biography to educate her audiences about the pressing issues

---

<sup>172</sup> Sean Hepburn Ferrer, *Audrey Hepburn, An Elegant Spirit*, (New York: Atria Books, 2003):146.

facing children and families in the developing world. In her reports to politicians, news outlets, and popular audiences in the developed world, Hepburn not only consistently demonstrated a grasp of the U.N.'s policies on child welfare but also deftly used her own star image to make the moral case for the U.N.'s global governing agenda. For example, during her 1992 visit to Somalia, Hepburn told reporters at one point, “Politics by definition are supposed to be for the people, for the welfare of the people. Humanitarian means human welfare and responding to human suffering, that’s what politics should be, ideally. That’s what I dream about.”<sup>173</sup> Hepburn’s apparently ‘authentic’, pedagogical femininity eased the contradictions associated with transforming glamorous stars (idols of consumption) into icons of global commitment and caring (idols of goodwill), and effectively translated not only the individualized structure of star discourse, but also the moral and ethical dimensions specific to Hepburn’s female stardom into a powerful cultural technology of global governmentality.

Put a little differently, with Hepburn sentimental education became embedded within the dynamics of the star image itself, as, at the center of Hepburn’s success, was not only a instrumentalization of star discourse’s individualizing character but also of its moral and ethical dimensions, specifically of the discourse’s investment in those feminized affairs of the heart. As argued in Chapter One, star participation in global governing is made possible in large part

---

<sup>173</sup> UNICEF, *Hepburn Tape 3*, September 19-24, 1992.

by star discourse's specific codes and conventions, particularly those that constitute stardom's moral dimensions and ethical orientation. Critically, the influential template of cosmopolitan stardom pioneered by Hepburn hinged on these moral and ethical aspects, and the ways in which they allowed for stars to emerge as 'authentic,' legitimate, and thereby powerful cultural technologies for global governing. As I show, Hepburn's female stardom realized the full potentiality of cosmopolitan stardom and star-led sentimental education as a potent instruments of global governing, particularly in Western contexts where the U.N.'s own power remains uncertain at best.

### *Global Cinderella*

Many scholars have sought to understand the cultural appeal of Audrey Hepburn, and there is much consensus, especially among feminist media scholars, that Hepburn's sway and resonance with her female audiences had to do with the Cinderella narratives that shaped her star image early on. Rachel Moseley describes the "Cinderella motif" at work in Hepburn's personae:

This motif can be understood as a historically specific articulation of a discourse about the acquisition of certain kinds of femininity and the potential for upward mobility through work, education and/or marriage. It is a discourse which is also highly visible in women's and film-fan magazines of the mid-1950's to mid-1960's, both in the form of "Cinderella" fiction and also in the form of

advice offered therein on personal style which understands the relationship between dress, self and status to be significant.<sup>174</sup>

Key to this construction were Hepburn's roles in *Sabrina*, *My Fair Lady*, *Breakfast at Tiffany's* and *Funny Face* in which Hepburn played a young woman finding social mobility through dress, education, and romance. Standing in contradistinction to pin-ups like Marilyn Monroe, Hepburn was widely regarded as a woman's star and a new icon of femininity—a heady alternative to what Marjorie Rosen called the “mammary woman” so prominent in the 1950's popular media landscape. Hepburn's ballerina body appeared neither domesticated nor reproduction-ready; rather, she was almost androgynous and pre-pubescent.<sup>175</sup> As Susan Douglas recalls, “Wide-eyed and small breasted...Hepburn seemed, well, not quite pre sexual or asexual but like a fairy or storybook princess, above it all. She made sexual maturity for girls less scary, as if on the other side of puberty you could be child-like and androgynous and still be attractive to men. Beautiful women with boyish bodies and upper-crust accents, women like Hepburn and Jackie Kennedy, were critical icons...for they made being boyish ‘classy’ and very ‘in.’”<sup>176</sup> As the staff of *Cosmopolitan* put it in their tribute to Hepburn after her death: “Her boyish beauty supplanted the standard images of high artifice and

---

<sup>174</sup> Rachel Moseley, *Growing up with Audrey Hepburn* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003):132.

<sup>175</sup> Moseley, *Growing Up*, 54-55.

<sup>176</sup> Susan Douglas, *Where the Girls Are: Growing Up Female with the Mass Media* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 1994): 105.

hourglass figures long associated with high style. She was the real thing—a refined, naturally elegant brunette who exuded a warmth and vulnerability.”<sup>177</sup>

Contrasting Hepburn’s much discussed “funny face” to what he describes as Garbo’s “deified face,” Roland Barthes wrote cryptically, “the face of Audrey Hepburn, for instance, is individualized, not only because of its peculiar thematics (woman as child, woman as kitten) but also because of her person, of an almost unique specification of the face, which has nothing of the essence left in it, but is constituted by an infinite complexity of morphological functions...The face of Garbo is an Idea, that of Hepburn, an Event.”<sup>178</sup> Perhaps what Barthes saw in Hepburn’s face was a re-articulation of the glamour associated with female stardom away from a reified idea of beauty towards a more flexible, practical, and customizable concept. Hepburn’s star image, rooted in Cinderella fantasies of social mobility offered a new conception of beauty and glamour that was allegedly democratic (can be achieved by all) and individual (based on one’s own personality and charm).<sup>179</sup> As *People* magazine recounted in their special tribute to Hepburn upon the heels of her death: “For the actress— ethereal, mischievous and inherently wise—was the princess of all our fairy tales, the deserving Cinderella, the swan who never forgot she was an ugly duckling. Her appeal, of

---

<sup>177</sup> *Cosmopolitan* staff, “Audrey Hepburn: An Intimate Biography.” *Cosmopolitan*, 215:5, (1993): 251-253 and 268-282.

<sup>178</sup> Roland Barthes, “The Face of Garbo,” *Mythologies* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1957):57.

<sup>179</sup> Moseley, *Growing Up*, 51.

course, had something to do with that funny, stunning face of hers, that mercurial loveliness, but even more to do with her ever-startling contradictions.”<sup>180</sup>

Most famously, Hepburn’s stardom is widely credited with creating a specific “look” that, despite the star’s impossibly thin frame, was do-able. As she herself insisted, what made her so compelling to women audiences was that the look she worked hard to create— with the help of Givenchy— was readily achievable. As she told Barbara Walters in an 1989 interview, “My look is attainable. Women can look like Audrey Hepburn by flipping out their hair, buying the large glasses and the little sleeveless dresses.”<sup>181</sup> Put differently, her Cinderella star image, rooted in the promises of self-transformation and social mobility, not only coincided with broader discourses of the times surrounding women’s status in society and consumer culture, but also presented women with what Foucault called technologies of the self, “which permit individuals to effect by their own means, or with the help of others, a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being, so as to transform themselves.”<sup>182</sup> As Jackie Stacey’s work shows, female stars in particular foster a wide array of partial identifications with audiences which function akin to technologies of the self. While cinematic identifications with

---

<sup>180</sup> *People* staff, “Portrait of a Lady,” *People Extra Weekly, A Tribute to Audrey Hepburn* (1993): 6.

<sup>181</sup> *The Barbara Walters Special* (ABC News, March 29, 1989) television.

<sup>182</sup> Michel Foucault, “Technologies of the Self,” in *The Essential Foucault*, eds. Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose (New York: The New Press, 2003):146.

female stars— identifications that take place in the context of cinematic viewing — tend towards fantasy-based relationships constituted by devotion, adoration, transcendence, and aspiration, Stacey coins the term “extra-cinematic identificatory practices” to describe a related though disparate set of audience-star relations that take place outside the cinematic context. “These processes also involve the spectators engaging in some kind of practice of transformation of the self to become more like the star they admire, or to involve others in the recognition of similarity to the star. This transformation does not only take place at the level of fantasy, but also involves activities in which the star becomes part of discourses of the spectator’s identity outside the cinema.”<sup>183</sup> What Stacey’s audience studies reveal are the ways in which audiences make use of star images, incorporating and adjusting star discourses to accommodate their own individualized regimes of living. In Hepburn’s case, it’s safe to say that this interactive dimension of female stardom elaborated by Stacey became more explicit and pronounced, as Hepburn’s Cinderella star image was built on the very notion of self-transformation through self-fashioning. As Moseley’s extensive audience research shows, Hepburn’s do-able look provided women with means of making themselves socially appropriate, negotiating key contradictions for women during this period. Hepburn was classy, not sexy; boyish, yet totally

---

<sup>183</sup> Jackie Stacey, *Star Gazing: Hollywood Cinema and Female Spectatorship* (London: Routledge, 1993):159.

feminine. Moseley finds a discourse of realism at work in women's perceptions of Hepburn's achievable femininity. In contrast to the "frilly" and "fussy" look of other popular female stars, Hepburn's pared-down modern (European) style was a social possibility for young women.

However, Dina Smith argues that the particular Cinderella motif undergirding Hepburn's image was accented by an international sensibility and bore significant ideological baggage when placed in geopolitical context of the postwar era.<sup>184</sup> Through an analysis of *Sabrina* and other key Cinderella films, Smith reveals Hepburn as a uniquely "global Cinderella": "a culturally savvy orphan girl (Europe) in need of a strong rich male (American assistance)."<sup>185</sup> For Smith, *Sabrina* articulated the cultural anxieties and economic imperatives associated with the burgeoning US hegemony on the global stage, as the U.S. committed enormous amounts of aid to rebuild Europe while simultaneously further globalizing its cultural markets. Specifically, film proposed a marriage American might and capital to the feminized, refined culture of Europe through the transformation of Sabrina from "being an awkward, barefoot émigré's daughter to being a foreign-inspired 'American' beauty."<sup>186</sup> Crucially, this marriage was not only made in the diegetic world of the film; it was also realized

---

<sup>184</sup> Dina Smith, "Global Cinderella: *Sabrina* (1954), Hollywood, and Postwar Internationalism, *Cinema Journal*, 41:4 (2002): 27-51.

<sup>185</sup> Smith, "Global Cinderella," 27.

<sup>186</sup> Smith, "Global Cinderella," 41.

in production, as *Sabrina* represents the first major U.S. film project to use European fashions; Hepburn insisted that her favorite French designer Hubert de Givenchy make the costumes (Much has been made of the partnership between the two throughout Hepburn's career). Marking the decline the of the studio era, *Sabrina*, through Hepburn, pioneered a new cosmopolitan aesthetic for Hollywood that itself was intimately bound up in broader international flows. Smith explains that, "Where Marilyn Monroe and Jane Russell are grain-fed, 'booming' beauties, Hepburn's body...is so thin, so 'hungry' looking, as to recall the then-popular image of a ravaged Europe. It also suggests the mannequin's body, the perfect figure for costuming. Hepburn literalizes the department store mannequin look, an apt figuration for postwar consumer logic. Hepburn's body becomes the clothes she wears. Yet her face is unique...reminding us of the distinctiveness of old Europe itself" (43).<sup>187</sup> Ultimately, Smith provides a similar though more specified account of the "event" of Hepburn's face and her startling contradictions: as a Global Cinderella, she is

a blank page, an open script, as she falls or shuttles between cultural/national domains, suggesting the collapsing boundaries after the war... the perfect marriage between French Continental and American mythologies... simultaneously exotic and banal... suggesting a new American persona: homespun/ international, simply/savvy, and hardworking (working class)/leisure oriented.<sup>188</sup>

---

<sup>187</sup> Smith, "Global Cinderella," 43.

<sup>188</sup> Smith, "Global Cinderella," 41.

Hepburn's star image and brand of Hollywood glamour crystallized a particular matrix of cultural and economic discourses at work in the postwar period, and, in doing so, birthed a new concept of female stardom forged from the re-articulation of Hollywood glamour to a new cosmopolitan sensibility rooted in the exigencies of the emerging global order. Taken together, the various accounts discussed above of Hepburn's cultural resonance provide key insight into what made Hepburn's star image a good fit for UNICEF, uniquely qualifying her to play the role of Goodwill Ambassador. As a Global Cinderella, Hepburn had long been an icon not only of a new postwar femininity for young women but also of a budding cultural internationalism. Hepburn's gamine look was connected to her European-ness. The anti-mammary ideal she embodied, the "event" of her "funny" face, as well as their purchase on audiences should not be separated from Hepburn's status as a cultural shuttle or relay between Hollywood and Europe. In Hepburn, the promise of social-- both class and gender-- mobility was tied to a sense of international mobility to be achieved through consumer culture.

Most importantly, Hepburn's star image remained immensely transparent and 'authentic,' as the seemingly comfortable fit between her 'real' life and the characters she portrayed on screen rendered the star a sort of endlessly captivating open book. On the one hand, Hepburn was in fact descended from royalty,

making her turn in *Roman Holiday* all the more compelling; on the other hand, Hepburn had become the star of her own real-life Cinderella story when she was plucked from obscurity off Broadway. Moseley explains:

The transparency of Hepburn's image means that we have a strong sense of familiarity with her which has been key to her appeal. As Dyer has argued, outside 'camp' appreciation, 'authenticity' is necessary to secure star status generally, and also to be a guarantee of other qualities a star might embody. This 'authenticating authenticity', in turn, he argues produces charisma, and in many ways this is Hepburn's defining characteristic.<sup>189</sup>

As producer Jerry Wald recalled of Hepburn on the set of *Sabrina*, "This kid has an inner quality that radiates right through."<sup>190</sup>

While Hepburn's alleged real-life Cinderella fairy tale helped to shape her image early on, at the height of her film career, there was a disconnect between Hepburn's private life and cultural meanings and values attributed to her Cinderella image discussed above. While the star's image visually resisted the mammary ideal, Hepburn herself longed for a quiet, secure domestic life that seemed to elude her with a slew of miscarriages and two failed marriages. Upon getting pregnant in 1954, Hepburn said, "There is nothing more important to me than having given birth. I know there are millions of women-- childless or not-- who have other priorities. But for me, it was never a choice. I wanted to have

---

<sup>189</sup> Moseley, *Growing Up*, 34.

<sup>190</sup> "Hollywood Innocent," *People Extra Weekly, A Tribute to Audrey Hepburn* (1993): 21.

babies more than anything else, and had so much difficulty having them.”<sup>191</sup>

Constantly shying away from the bright and probing Hollywood lights, Hepburn shuttled frequently back to Europe and her home in Switzerland to escape the pressures of her stardom rather than to enhance it. Interestingly, it was this disconnect between Hepburn’s cultural resonance as a Global Cinderella and the personal struggles off-screen that would eventually make her turn as UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador particularly productive for the U.N..

### *UNICEF and the Hepburn Aura*

Hepburn’s return to pop cultural prominence as UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador in 1988 reinvigorated her star image, allowing the cultural powers of her female stardom to be re-articulated and redirected in new ways. Rosemary Coombe suggests that, despite claims that cultural artifacts have lost their aura in what Walter Benjamin described as “the age of mechanical reproduction,” stars are unique in that they maintain an aura by virtue of their status as living, historical beings:

If the work of art’s aura derives from its unique, embodied, or tangible presence in time and space, an individual history, and a situation in a cultural tradition, then it is difficult to deny the aura of the celebrity. However often a celebrity’s likeness is reproduced, there remains a social knowledge of the celebrity as an

---

<sup>191</sup> *Cosmopolitan* staff, “Audrey Hepburn: An Intimate Biography,” *Cosmopolitan*, 215:5 (1993): 274.

individual human being with an unapproachable or distant existence elsewhere, a life history, and a mortal susceptibility to the processes of heartache, injury, illness, aging, and, ultimately, death... Arguably, celebrities evoke the fascination they do because however endlessly their images are reproduced, their substantive duration—that is, their life—never becomes wholly irrelevant. They never lose their autonomy from the objects that circulate in their likeness.<sup>192</sup>

In other words, with stars there exists a permanent reserve of social and cultural resources lodged in off-screen existence that can be tapped into. This reserve makes stars potentially limitless objects of speculation and fascination, giving them a virtual life that extends beyond the mechanisms of the culture industry. As suggested previously, stardom's discursive organization-- fueled by audiences' interpretative efforts as regards the private, personal lives of stars and the 'truth' of their identities and thereby grounded by the star's aura-- makes stardom a highly mobile and flexible discourse, capable of intersecting with disparate discourses at work in a particular context. In Hepburn's case, as the star assumed the role of UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador, she reactivated the social knowledges and cultural resources associated with female stardom, and, at the same time, subtly redirected the hermeneutic mode of reception away from her fashion sense and Cinderella personae towards the international community, the U.N., and the discourses of global governing.

---

<sup>192</sup> Rosemary Coombe, "Author(iz)ing the Celebrity: Engendering Alternative Identities," in *The Celebrity Culture Reader*, ed. P.D. Marshall (New York: Routledge, 2006): 732.

Hepburn's return to public life in 1988 was itself an event, for her quiet, gradual retirement from filmmaking set the stage for a dramatic re-entrance. Hepburn's above mentioned aversion to the press throughout her career meant that there was much still to be learned about the iconic yet reclusive star, so after years away from the bright lights of Hollywood, Hepburn garnered enormous media attention in her new role as UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador. Well aware of these dynamics at play and of the power of her aura, Hepburn explained, "If this career has given me, has left me with something very special, it's the fact that it's left me with this, whatever it is, this voice, this curiosity people have still to see me, to talk to me, which I can use for the good of children."<sup>193</sup>

I knew my role was 'the lure.' Starvation in third-world countries was not hot copy. I think the powers that be rightly thought that I might be able to attract a little attention. All those reclusive years helped too! If I had been seen all over the place—except in my backyard in Switzerland, weeding—I wouldn't be quite the snare. But lying low all those years made me a curiosity.<sup>194</sup>

The "lure" of Hepburn's female stardom worked at many different levels in popular media. On the one hand, her work with UNICEF made her "newsworthy," and Hepburn appeared regularly on nightly news shows across the Western world to report her findings after UNICEF field trips. On the other hand, her UNICEF work became a pretext for talk show hosts and tabloid journalists to

---

<sup>193</sup> *The Barbara Walters Special* (ABC News, March 29, 1989) television

<sup>194</sup> *Cosmopolitan* staff, "Audrey Hepburn: An Intimate Biography," *Cosmopolitan*, 215:5 (1993): 282.

delve back into the star's elusive personal life. Thus Hepburn's Goodwill Ambassadorship played out primarily in the context of much-hyped television interviews with journalists of various stripes, all of whom were eager to get some long-awaited scoop from the recently resurrected female star.

However, Hepburn's status as "hot copy" for journalists-- broadsheet and tabloid alike-- was not all she brought to the table for UNICEF; she also had a personal connection to the organization and its work on behalf of children. At the end of World War II, Hepburn's family received emergency assistance from the then little-known U.N. agency in Holland. In addition, as mentioned previously, Hepburn had experienced her own personal struggles with health and motherhood. As Kul Chandra Gautam (2008), recipient of the 2008 Audrey Hepburn Humanitarian Award explained,

Deep beneath the glamour and glitter, and beauty and pageantry of a Hollywood star, studded with Oscar and Tony, Emmy and Grammy awards; hidden inside the Givenchy clothes and the Ferragamo shoes, Audrey was really a UNICEF poster child. Unlike any other Goodwill Ambassador, Audrey had experienced first -hand exactly the kind of childhood problems that UNICEF has been dealing with everyday for the past 60 years. As a child, she had suffered from hunger and malnutrition. She had been traumatized by war, and abandoned by her father. She had suffered from anemia and whooping cough, and had a near-death experience when she was six weeks old. As an adult, she had 3

painful miscarriages, just like so many mothers today in developing countries.<sup>195</sup>

Fortunately for UNICEF, Hepburn proved incredibly adept at articulating her personal biography to the U.N.'s international aims, at making her star discourse-- organized around the private lives and "real" identities of stars-- accommodate her latest role as UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador. Hepburn had a knack for keeping UNICEF in the conversation: when journalists or audience members wanted to talk about her film career or fashion sense, Hepburn found a way to steer the discussion back to her work on behalf of children.

The apparently easy synergies between Hepburn's personal biography and the broader institutional aims she was enlisted to promote helped to ease the contradictions involved with turning a fashion icon into a serious advocate for impoverished children. In response to CBS's Harry Smith's suggestion that she has lived two distinct lives—one as a glamorous film star and another as global humanitarian, Hepburn replied,

No, Harry, because it really is all one life. And I never led what people think is this glamorous life. I have always been me. I've always been aware of what goes on in the world. And I certainly grew up in a war-ravaged country and I've always known, you know, that I was privileged and many were not. I've always seen

---

<sup>195</sup> Kul Chandra Gautam, Remarks At the Annual Meeting of the US Fund for UNICEF, Atlanta, June 19, 2008, available at: <http://kulgautam.org/website/kuls-speech/kuls-speech-UNICEF/207-audrey-hepburn-humanitarian-award.html>

suffering, known about it, and that hasn't changed. I'm still the same old girl.<sup>196</sup>

What may appear as a preposterous claim actually made perfect sense within the context of Hepburn's transparent brand of female stardom. Echoing the sentiments of directors, designers, and friends of Hepburn, Lawrence Bruce, President of the U.S. Committee for UNICEF explained, "There is no public and private persona. She is what she seems to be. It may sound boring, but Audrey is one of the most special human beings I've ever met in my entire life."<sup>197</sup>

Thanks to her status as an iconic yet reclusive female star who bore a personal connection to her chosen cause, Hepburn's cosmopolitan stardom took the form of a series of confessional interviews. Hepburn used her new platform to reflect upon her personal experiences, framing revelations of her deepest trials and tribulations as an occupation survivor and mother in relationship to UNICEF's on-going work on behalf of children. For example, Hepburn recalled her childhood struggles to adjust to post-liberation life, recounting where her commitment to and passion for children was formed:

I did emerge from the last war, along with hundreds of thousands of other children in Holland, with a very poor health because of years of malnutrition. And UNICEF did come in right after the liberation with food and clothing, and, surely, that's made me a little more aware that some people might not have, what it means to be hungry, deprivation, and so forth. Never do I think of this

---

<sup>196</sup> *CBS This Morning*, June 3, 1991.

<sup>197</sup> Jessica Seigel, "Audrey Hepburn on a Role," *The Chicago Tribune*, January 20, 1992.

when I see a child in Africa who's at death's door, but what I've always had, and maybe that I was born with, was an enormous love of people. Children.<sup>198</sup>

Confessions have long been an important staple of star discourse. As deCordova argues, confessions intensify the hermeneutic star-audience relation, as they offer glimpses into the depths of the star's identity and promise to reveal the secrets of her soul.<sup>199</sup> However, Hepburn's confessions as UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador not only worked to reveal an inner depth or secret truth. Through her highly personalized confessions of caring for the world's children, Hepburn translated the cultural powers of her stardom into the field of global governmentality, offering up her own stardom as a cultural site for audiences to work on their identities as global citizens. In other words, as Hepburn stepped back into the limelight for UNICEF, not only was her aura reactivated; crucially, her female star power was redirected and re-articulated to the governing agenda of the U.N..

### *Global Melodrama*

Christine Gledhill argues that stars are signs of melodrama: that the discourse of stardom works to bring the moral function of melodrama once performed by novels and plays into contemporary visual culture and mass society. "The

---

<sup>198</sup> *Audrey Hepburn Remembered. The Hollywood Collection* (dir. Gene Feldman, Wombat Productions, 1993) DVD.

<sup>199</sup> Richard deCordova, *Picture Personalities: The Emergence of the Star System in America* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990).

construction of stars exhibits many features found in the *dramatis personae* of melodrama. Melodramatic characterization is performed through a process of personification whereby actors—and fictional characters conceived as actors in their diegetic world—*embody* ethical forces.”<sup>200</sup> Like melodrama, stars make legible what Peter Brooks called a “moral occult”: “the continuing operation of a Manichean battle between good and evil which infuses human actions with ethical consequences and therefore with significance.”<sup>201</sup> As UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador, however, Hepburn emerged as a very different sort of sign of melodrama. Through her confessions of caring for the world’s children, Hepburn became a highly instrumental ‘sign of global melodrama,’ by putting the melodramatic/ moral functions of stardom to work for UNICEF.

First, it’s important to see that Hepburn’s cosmopolitan stardom required her to perform peculiar sorts of emotional work. Footage of Hepburn undertaking traditional types of care/women’s work on her field trips-- from nursing and education to nurturing and comforting sick children-- regularly provided context and backdrop for her interviews. Thanks to the particular dynamics undergirding Hepburn’s return to the limelight, these images of Hepburn caring for and playing with black and brown children appeared ‘authentic’ and unproblematic, a genuine

---

<sup>200</sup> Christine Gledhill, “Signs of Melodrama,” in *Stardom: Industry of Desire*, ed. Christine Gledhill (London: Routledge, 1991): 210.

<sup>201</sup> Gledhill, “Signs of Melodrama,” 209.

expression of the star's soul and innate goodness. What's more, they articulated a particular cosmopolitan sensibility germane to the UN's governing agenda.

Hepburn was shown being at home with difference and fulfilling a deeply felt, repeatedly professed moral obligation to the global human community through caring acts for distant strangers.

However, Hepburn was not only asked to perform cosmopolitan care for UNICEF cameras but also -- and crucially -- to offer up her reflections upon these images and experiences to journalists, all the while connecting them to her personal life. For example, in one of Hepburn's final UNICEF interviews with *McNeil/Lehrer NewsHour's* Charlayne Hunter-Gault after her trip to Somalia, a tearful Hepburn recounted her experience of watching a child die at a UNICEF feeding center:

Hepburn: And this boy was sitting with just a bit of cloth around him, rail thin, I mean, really just bones and eyes and absolutely struggling for breath. He obviously had a respiratory infection, and I was suffering so for him because I did have asthma as a child and anemia and edema and all the things that come with first degrees of malnourishment that I remember, remember so this crisis of not being able to breathe and struggling to -- and I just felt I wish I could breathe for him but he literally sort of just lay down while I was there and was gone.

Hunter-Gault: Died?

Hepburn: Mm hmm.

Hunter-Gault: In front of you?

Hepburn: Yes.<sup>202</sup>

---

<sup>202</sup> *McNeil/Lehrer NewsHour*, November 5, 1992.

While Kaye's interactions with children had been primarily playful, Hepburn was often positioned as bearing witness: seeing and testifying to both the deeply felt universal bonds between distant strangers as well as to the unimaginable human suffering experienced by populations amidst civil war and humanitarian disaster. This doubling of emotional work rendered Hepburn's confessions of caring extremely potent, as tears heightened Hepburn's 'authenticity' and depth of feeling at once intensified and redirected the hermeneutic star-audience relationship. In the Hepburn UNICEF interviews, the feminized pleasures of star consumption became one with global governmentality, as sentimental education was firmly embedded within the star image and the hermeneutic star-audience relationship.

Hepburn's visual and spoken confessions of caring doubled as moral authority building for UNICEF and the U.N. while holding at bay accusations of propaganda. As mentioned previously, since its inception, the U.N. has struggled to avoid charges of propaganda, insisting that its communication strategies are no more than non-political, public education campaigns. At the same time, the U.N. needs highly potent cultural means of connecting emotionally with citizens such as sentimental education in order to win support for its governing agenda and institutional aims within Western contexts, where the institution's social health and welfare programs in the developing world get funded and authorized through

not enacted. For example, later on in her interview with Hunter-Gault cited above,

Hepburn argued that

[...] though the UN has been very criticized, they're not to be sneezed at because what other organization has the planes, the people? You know, it has to be done. These are wonderful, the CARE, Red Cross. I don't know if during the first great famines in Bangladesh, during the great famine in the thirties in Russia, during the Irish famine, how much did we do about that? Now we're at least trying, and doing it rather well. But we're impatient, because now we see the children dying right in front of us, for most of us on television. I've seen it happen, and I'm filled with a rage at ourselves. I don't believe in, in collective guilt, but I do believe in collective responsibility. Somalia is our responsibility. It's certainly the British responsibility, the Italians' responsibility, because they colonized that country. And they should be doing more, I think. They have an obligation to those people from whom they benefited for so many years. But it is the international community, and that is the beauty of humanitarian, of relief workers, of humanitarian aid, that regardless of what's going on, of the danger, of the diseases they're getting themselves, they do it, and they don't give up.<sup>203</sup>

What's evident in Hepburn's statement is the extent to which the context and format of the confessional, television interview worked to authorize Hepburn as a powerful advocate for UNICEF, the U.N., and the growing nexus of transnational humanitarian organizations. On the one hand, Hepburn was able to articulate in no uncertain terms the need for the U.N. on the global stage. The relatively open format, designed to illicit Hepburn's deepest feelings, provided ample wiggle-room, allowing the star to contextualize contemporary humanitarian efforts

---

<sup>203</sup> *McNeil/Lehrer NewsHour*, November 5, 1992.

(strikingly, she often noted the legacy of colonialism on the developing world, as well as longer histories of humanitarian disasters) and, at the same time, to elevate/idealize the work of relief workers, the agencies that employ them, and the broader missions they purport to carry out. However, what could arguably be considered as blatant U.N. propaganda became refracted into a highly personalized, individualized, and moral sentiment. Hepburn's bleeding heart-- emotive yet reasoned pleas for collective responsibility and a stronger humanitarian infrastructure-- figured not only as the personal opinions of a popular female star but also, and crucially, as an embodied ethical force. Through reflecting on her role and work with UNICEF, Hepburn became a highly specified, instrumental sign of global melodrama, articulating the melodramatic function of stardom to the global governing agenda of the U.N.. In other words, Hepburn made the moral universe of cosmopolitanism and U.N.-led global governmentality legible by way of her confessions of caring.

*Pastoral Power, Charitable Femininity, and Global Governmentality*

Most significantly perhaps, Hepburn's cosmopolitan stardom carried great potential for cultivating citizens responsive to the international aims and programs of the U.N.. For what was ultimately achieved in Hepburn's UNICEF interviews,

though the doubling of affective labor, was the translation of cosmopolitan citizenship into a technology of the self. As a sign of global melodrama and cultural technology of global governmentality, Hepburn not only made the case for the U.N. and UNICEF, but also implied courses of right action and conduct to her audience. For example, Hepburn often discussed giving and helping as a commonly felt cultural value and practice. As she explained to the *Christian Science Monitor*,

I don't have to tell them what to do because the world is full, I've discovered, of kind people. And I've also discovered once they know, they give, they help. It's not knowing that holds them up. Each country has huge problems of its own, which quite rightly they must take care of - the homeless in America, the poor in every country. But I think there's always enough to give to the countries that are the most needy.<sup>204</sup>

When asked by CBS's Harry Smith, "Is there a point at which our well of compassion might run dry do you think?," Hepburn replied, "Never. I--I don't think that's--it's not in human nature. Giving--giving is like living. I mean if you stop wanting to give, I think you--there's nothing more to live for"<sup>205</sup> (CBS *This Morning* 1991). To her *Donahue* audience, Hepburn explained, "Although I knew about this side of life, I hadn't seen it with my own eyes. Africa, Bangladesh, Latin America. So much suffering and so much poverty. But you deal with it by

---

<sup>204</sup> Robert Press, "A Visit of Compassion to Somalia," *The Christian Science Monitor*, October 5, 1992.

<sup>205</sup> CBS *This Morning*, June 3, 1991.

doing something about it”<sup>206</sup> (*The Phil Donahue Show* 1990). There was a therapeutic tenor enlivening Hepburn's cosmopolitan star discourse, as getting involved with the good works of the U.N. is presented as a way to cope with the knowledge, which as she often pointed out had been with her since her childhood, of the horrible suffering endured by those less fortunate. Assuming her audience will share her personal commitments once they “know,” Hepburn confessions of caring emerged as an invitation for audiences to join her.

Female stars have long offered techniques for self-fashioning and resources for living to their audiences, and Hepburn's Cinderella persona and achievable "look" was perhaps the fullest expression of this dimension of female stardom. As Goodwill Ambassador, Hepburn's highly pedagogical mode of stardom was extended to encompass her maternal goodness, generosity, and caring which became positioned as being potentially as achievable and obtainable as her look. Through awareness, compassion, and giving, media audiences could too partake in the project of helping children and supporting U.N. efforts to ensure global social welfare. In other words, Hepburn's cosmopolitan stardom worked as an opportunity to fashion oneself as a specific sort of global citizen: Hepburn became not only a lesson in how to be glamorous, but also in how to be charitable and good. There is no better evidence of this dynamic than Melissa Hellstern's *How To Be Lovely: The Audrey Hepburn Way of Life*, a self-help

---

<sup>206</sup> *The Phil Donahue Show*, January 26, 1990.

manuel for women based on the teachings of Hepburn's stardom. Hellstren writes in her introduction: "To the world, she represented all that a woman could be, and we wanted in. We still do. By looking at her words from interviews over the years, we may just find a new revelation or two, and certainly some we knew all along."<sup>207</sup> Nearly the entire text of the nearly 200 page book consists of Hepburn quotes organized into themes such as "How to Find Your Bliss," "How to Make Your Mark," "How to be Beautiful," "How to Nurture Your Family," and "How to Change the World." With regard to the latter, Hellstern explains, "[c]hanging the world seems an impossible task. And not one among us can do it. Only when we each commit to small steps forward will we turn it all around."<sup>208</sup> In this section, several lessons are culled from Hepburn's work with UNICEF including: "Think Deeply," "Be Hands-On," and "Inspire." The book ends with Hellstern's plea to her readers to continue Hepburn's legacy by contacting The Audrey Hepburn Memorial Fund of the U.S. Committee for UNICEF: "Changing the world is truly up to us-- one country, one volunteer, and one child at a time."<sup>209</sup>

In the context of Hepburn's UNICEF goodwill ambassadorship, star power became synonymous with a highly feminized form and distinctly cosmopolitan articulation of what Foucault called pastoral power. Foucault argued that one of

---

<sup>207</sup> Melissa Hellstern, *How to be Lovely: The Audrey Hepburn Way of Life* (New York: Dutton, 2004): ix.

<sup>208</sup> Hellstern, *How to be Lovely*, 175.

<sup>209</sup> Hellstern, *How to be Lovely*, 189.

the preeminent modalities of power at work in contemporary societies is pastoral power. Developed initially within the institutions of Christianity, pastoral power (i.e. the spiritual guidance of the pastor) found form in the confession and was premised on “a knowledge of the conscience and an ability to direct.”<sup>210</sup> Pastoral power sought to ensure mass salvation by tending at once to the community at large and the souls of individuals. Foucault showed how modern liberal regimes have adapted the techniques of pastoral power, dislocating them from the church, as well as the moral authority of the pastor, and dispersing them throughout the social realm in the name of promoting the welfare of the population.

Contemporary forms of pastoral power reconstitute the end game of salvation in the next world with salvation in this one, where salvation encompasses a variety of worldly aims (e.g., health, security, rights, wealth). Like earlier forms, modern pastoral power moves outward targeting the population at large, and inward, targeting the dispositions, conducts, and souls of individuals.<sup>211</sup>

Hepburn was the first star to function as an agent of pastoral power in a broader apparatus of global governmentality, an apparatus that must continually try to thread the political might and economic interests of Western nations together with its own political rationalities of promoting the welfare and

---

<sup>210</sup> Michel Foucault, “The Subject and Power,” in *The Essential Foucault*, eds. Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose (New York: The New Press, 2003): 132.

<sup>211</sup> Ronald Greene, “Y Movies: Film and the Modernization of Pastoral Power,” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 2:1 (2003): 20-36.

empowerment of post-colonial states and developing economies. Thanks to her pedagogical and authentic femininity, Hepburn emerged as a cultural site where both functions-- the generalizing (outward) and individualizing (inward)-- of pastoral power could meet in such a way that was highly germane to the institutions of global governing. On the one hand, as a sign of global melodrama and an icon of global caring and commitment, Hepburn tended to the general welfare, particularly populations in developing worlds, while bringing moral authority to the U.N. and the institutions of the international community and global governing. On the other hand, through her own confessions of caring -- that is, by revealing the 'depths of her own soul' to media audiences -- Hepburn worked on dispositions of conducts of individuals, particularly those in the West, converting global citizenship—specifically, acts of supporting the U.N. through caring and charity— into a technology of the self.

Ultimately, the U.N. and regimes of global governmentality need the potent sorts of pastoral, cultural power realized by Hepburn's cosmopolitan stardom. Unlike domestic regimes of governmentality, the U.N. does not have other forms of power (aka sovereign and disciplinary) at its disposal, especially in its dealings with more powerful Western states; instead, the organization must rely heavily, if not totally, on global forms of governing at a distance, winning legitimacy from citizens who feel a moral obligation to and are willing to prioritize and work for the welfare and rights of global humanity represented by

the U.N.. Thus, cosmopolitan stars like Hepburn become expedient resources for their abilities to act on the dispositions and conducts of media audiences: cosmopolitan stars are charged with making global citizens, that is, with bringing Western audiences into alignment with the international aims and governing rationalities of the U.N..

Yet, Hepburn's pastoral, star power was of a distinctive ilk, taking the form of charitable femininity that was specific to Hepburn and realized in the context of her reactivated aura and her pedagogical, 'authentic' star image. So at the same time that Hepburn crystallized the idea of cosmopolitan stardom and registered the significant forms of cultural power stars might bring to global governmentality, she also set a near impossible standard. Indeed, the "Spirit of Audrey" haunts the U.N., as the organization continues to rely on that "particular kind of light" and specific sort of female star power she was able to bring to global governmentality.

## Chapter Four

### Global Citizen Brand: Angelina Jolie and the Digital Media Economy of Global Care

In 2005 Angelina Jolie traveled with global economist Jeffery Sachs to Africa to learn about the deep social problems plaguing the continent and the “simple inventions” needed to fix them. Their travels were documented by MTV cameras and became the subject of an MTV *Diary* episode.<sup>212</sup> In the television documentary, Jolie is presented as Sach’s pupil and mentee, eager to learn from the expert economist. Like Kaye had done long ago, Jolie aligns herself with the film’s imagined viewer, that is, as someone who too is learning about the good works of the U.N.. In the opening sequence, Jolie asks a young boy what he hopes to be when he grows up, to which he answers: “pilot.” The documentary originally aired on September 15, just a couple of months after Live 8, and, like the global rock concert, was designed to promote the U.N.’s Millennium Development Goals which aim to end extreme global poverty by 2015. Jolie explains to viewers, “Rich nations have seen fit to look away from extreme poverty, but did you know we could wipe it off our planet in just twenty years?”

The *Diary* episode was also a part of MTV’s new pro-social on-line initiative called Think MTV, a corporate-sponsored social networking site for

---

<sup>212</sup> Andrew Huang, “The Diary of Angelina Jolie and Dr. Jeffery Sachs in Africa,” *Diary* (New York: MTV Networks, September 15, 2005).

social activists. As the website explains, “ThinkMTV.com is a community site where you can get informed, get heard and take action on the issues that matter to you most.”<sup>213</sup> Ashley from Proctor, Minnesota wrote on Think MTV after watching the Jolie *Diary* episode on-line: “Thanks to Angelina Jolie’s diary, I found out what I can do to help. I didn’t know what I could do to change the world because everything seemed so far fetched. Knowing how big an impact we can make, actually wiping out extreme poverty by 2015, gave me hope. I want to do all I can to contribute to the effort. Thank you for the inspiration.”<sup>214</sup>

Cultural critics of various stripes often scold today’s caring stars for their field trips into the fields of humanitarian relief, development aid, and global governing. For example, Jacob Weisberg writes on *Slate.com*:

And just how saintly are these stars that give so freely of themselves? Cause-driven organizations...want celebrity endorsements for the same reason companies like Nike and Coca-Cola do. Beautiful and famous people get everyone else to look at them. They create positive associations for whatever you’re selling. But our idols seldom act out of selfless motives. Whereas product endorsements pay cash, actors and musicians gain heft and respectability for supporting fashionable crusades...From the cynical celebrity’s point of view, the best causes involve the poor, the sick, children, and animals in faraway places, both because of the telegenic aspect and because they bring no objection from

---

<sup>213</sup> “Think MTV,” MTV, <http://www.mtv.com/thinkmtv/>

<sup>214</sup> Paul Temporal, *The Branding of MTV: Will Internet Kill the Video Star?* (Singapore: John Wiley and Sons, 2008).

fans or employers. If there were endangered baby pandas on the moon, Brad Pitt would be racing Ashley Judd there right now.<sup>215</sup>

In an on-line radio report entitled “Celebrities Seize Africa,” *The Onion* mocked global celebrity do-gooding: “Grim news from Africa, after a brutal coalition of Hollywood A-listers took control of the entire continent. Frustrated by their ineffectual humanitarian gestures, stars...led a rag-tag army of fans, extras, and paparazzi to a bloody overthrow of all 53 sovereign nations.”<sup>216</sup> Adam Elkus uses the term “celebrity colonialism”<sup>217</sup> to explain the efforts and effects of today’s idols of goodwill: “The devout Christian Bono is in many ways a modern version of the starry-eyed missionaries that went to Africa to save souls alongside imperialists who strived for riches. Unlike his forebearers, Bono is not out to spread the cross, but its modern equivalent, liberal capitalism.”<sup>218</sup> He continues:

The 19<sup>th</sup> century missionaries and explorers who established European control over the continent saw it as an exotic and forbidding way land in which a similar kind of personal meaning could be found (or lost)...

---

<sup>215</sup> Jacob Weisberg, “Condi, Hollary, and...Angelina?” *Slate.com*, October 11, 2005, accessed February 11, 2010, <http://www.slate.com/id/2127834/>

<sup>216</sup> “Celebrities Seize Africa,” *The Onion Radio News*, November 22, 2009, <http://www.theonion.com/audio/celebrities-seize-africa.14066/>

<sup>217</sup> Robert Clarke has argued recently for a more nuanced, historical approach to celebrity colonialism. See Robert Clarke, “The Idea of Celebrity Colonialism: An Introduction,” in *Celebrity Colonialism: Fame, Power and Representation in Colonial and Postcolonial Cultures* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009): 1-12.

<sup>218</sup> Adam Elkus, “Celebrity Colonialism: Buying Africa is the Latest Trend Among the Famous,” *Colorlines: News for Action*, March 1, 2007, accessed February 11, 2010, [http://colorlines.com/archives/2007/03/celebrity\\_colonialism.html](http://colorlines.com/archives/2007/03/celebrity_colonialism.html)

Celebrities see Africa in a similar way. Jolie, Madonna, and Moss have convinced themselves that they have some kind of connection to the suffering African masses, despite their immense wealth and fame, and they search for public ways of proving that connection. They confuse wish-fulfillment and fetishization of the exotic for meaningful measures that are actually helping Africans.<sup>219</sup>

Gesturing towards broader economic and geopolitical structures that circumscribe celebrity efforts to save the world, these often playful critiques of caring stars nonetheless turn on a rather simplistic argument about celebrity narcissism: one way or another, stars are in it for themselves. Yet focusing solely on how celebrity displays of global commitment and caring, at best, benefit star images and media industries and, at worst, are symptomatic of deep emotional defect obfuscates the significant technical and practical roles that idols of goodwill play in contemporary regimes of global governmentality. Indeed, while it might be tempting to scoff at “Angelina Jolie and Dr. Jeffery Sachs in Africa,” as well as Ashley’s saccharine reaction to the film, the MTV documentary highlights what is distinctive about contemporary cosmopolitan stardom, as well as current relationships between media/celebrity culture and global governing: circulating on-line images and digital videos of cosmopolitan stars urging care for and connection to distant strangers *link* popular media audiences to the institutions and agencies of global governing in new and material ways in the context of an interactive media culture.

---

<sup>219</sup> Elkus, “Celebrity Colonialism.”

I want to suggest that today's idols of goodwill are not simply icons of global care and commitment; they are global citizen brands, germane to the shifting structures and material practices of global governing. The end of the Cold War, the concomitant rise of global neoliberalism and global civil society, and new practices of global citizenship enabled by digital media technologies have afforded expanded and increasingly mediated roles to idols of goodwill in global governing, as well as their audiences. While the next chapter interrogates the structural place of cosmopolitan stardom within these emerging regimes of global governmentality, this chapter uses Jolie-- today's most (in)famous and hard-working idol of goodwill-- to detail how sentimental education and cosmopolitan stardom work as cultural technologies of global governing in new media contexts defined by the logics and practices of branding. My proposal and use of the concept of global citizen brand is meant to be specific, that is, to account for the discreet sorts of mediated cultural, economic, social, and political work performed by idols of goodwill, as well as the values this work produces for UNHCR and global governing more generally. Ultimately, the constitution of Western media audiences as caring global citizens by idols of goodwill takes on heightened material significance in contemporary global political contexts, where the activities of media audiences are becoming ever more bound up in the international community's attempts to serve the general welfare of the world. Cosmopolitan stars continue to provide a cultural and material base for global

governing in Western contexts, but now it is an interactive, multimedia one that extends more deeply into the everyday lives of citizens, inviting them to become active and empowered participants in global governing through undertaking digital caring acts. What is more, in generating values and mobilizing digital care, idols of goodwill are helping to generate what I call governing capital for global civil society and the international community.

### *Brands and Interactivity*

Since the fall of the Soviet Union, the international community has expanded rapidly. This expansion, most evident in the rising numbers of transnational NGOs, is often referred to as the emergence of a global civil society made up of citizens working together within and across national borders to address a host of social ills, from extreme poverty to environmental concerns to trade issues.

During the 1990s, the number of registered international organizations increased from 6,000 to 26,000.<sup>220</sup> As will be discussed in the following chapter, the U.N. increasingly understands its global governing role in relationship to and in partnership with this global civil society. At the same time, digital media technologies have allowed for new and intensified communication practices by international institutions and agencies. Messages (updates, news alerts,

---

<sup>220</sup> Daniel Bornstein, *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007): 4.

fundraising appeals, educational materials) to supporters and/or potential supporters are tailored for and targeted to citizens in on-line environments, including personal email, organizational websites, YouTube, and social networking platforms. Thus the concept of global civil society is dependent upon media interactivity and digital technologies. On the one hand, what distinguishes Jolie from earlier idols of goodwill like Kaye and Hepburn are the ways in which her cosmopolitan stardom is crafted to be effective within this highly mediated global civil society. On the other hand, Jolie's cosmopolitan stardom takes form within an interactive media culture and is at once animated and circumscribed by the logics and practices of contemporary branding.

In recent decades, broad shifts in capitalism (globalization, post-Fordism, the information economy) have afforded brands and the cultural meanings and values they engender new and expansive social status. As Adam Arvidsson suggests, brands in contemporary media culture are social institutions, providing templates for identity, community, and the practices of everyday life. He explains: "As a sort of virtual real estate they occupy a valuable position in the life-world...of consumers. That position is valuable insofar as it enables a brand to subsume or appropriate what the consumers do *with the brand in mind* as a source of surplus value and profits. Consequently brands work as kind of ubiquitous managerial devices by means of which everyday life is managed..."<sup>221</sup>

---

<sup>221</sup> Adam Arvidsson, *Brands: Meaning and Value in Media Culture* (London: Routledge, 2006):7.

Corporations seek to inspire more than purchases; they also want loyalty and affective investment so that consumers will take on the labor of building, expanding, and managing the brand in the context of their everyday lives and through their practices of identity and community. As a result, processes of capitalist accumulation and valorization produce what Lazzarato calls an ethical surplus: “a social relation, a shared meaning, or a sense of belonging, that was not there before.”<sup>222</sup> In other words, brands are not only productive of surplus (economic) value, but also, and crucially, of social surpluses bound up in and productive of broader social and cultural formations.

The discourses and practices of branding are, in many ways, in tune with those of neoliberal approaches to governing which urge citizens to pursue self-care and empowerment in privatized realms of social and cultural life. Sarah Banet-Weiser and Charlotte Lapsansky argue that contemporary U.S. culture is a “brand culture”:

Any quick glance at cultural, social, and political life in 21st century United States discloses compelling evidence that we organize our lives within brand culture, regardless of identity, or generation, or socio-economic status. While advertising continues to have a dominant presence in both public and private spaces, what characterizes contemporary culture is not so much the ubiquitous ad, but rather the normalization of brand culture, where consumer participation is not simply (or even most importantly) indicated by purchases made, but rather by expressing brand

---

<sup>222</sup> Arvidsson, *Brands*, 10.

loyalty and affiliation As Elizabeth Anne Moore describes it, branding is “the deliberate association of a product not just with a mere name but with an almost spiritual image, an idea”.... The “idea” and “spiritual image” of brands connect them to lifestyles, politics, and even social activism, so that brand culture permeates consumer habits and, more importantly, all forms of political, social, and civic participation.<sup>223</sup>

In brand culture, the logics and practices of branding have seeped into seemingly all spheres of social life, repositioning practices of citizenship and activism within market frameworks, and, as a result, consumer-based models of citizenship proliferate. Of course, stars and celebrities-- as “idols of consumption,” readily accessible, hot commodities for media industries and marketers alike, and potent mobilizers of individual and social identities-- are endemic to brand culture.

Banet-Weiser and Lapsansky take the RED campaign as an exemplary case. RED, a celebrity-fronted, business-friendly endeavor that empowers consumers to save the lives of AIDS victims by purchasing RED brand lifestyle products, is a prime of example of how, within brand culture, the market, often with the help of stars, is continually positioned as the superior approach to social problem solving and offered up as a context for civic participation. RED is also indicative of new and intersecting trends in business culture-- most notably, the rise of corporate social responsibility-- and in philanthropy, where market principles have been embraced on the grounds of innovation and efficiency.

---

<sup>223</sup> Sarah Banet-Weiser and Charlotte Lapsansky, “RED is the New Black: Brand Culture, Consumer Citizenship, and Political Possibility,” *International Journal of Communication*, 2 (2008): 1249.

Richey and Ponte, authors of *Brand Aid*, use RED to theorize a prominent feature of brand culture when it comes to questions of citizenship and activism, what they call “causerism:” “shopping for a better world, effecting change through the marketplace.”<sup>224</sup> In this view, “causer” ventures like RED take the practices associated with what Marx theorized as commodity fetishism to a new level: “What is new...is that RED commodity fetishism conjoins consumption and giving through celebrity mediation and iconic branding. The masking of social relations behind the production of RED products is paired with showing off another set of social relations, in which Western causers save the lives of African AIDS patients.”<sup>225</sup>

While brand culture phenomena like RED invite criticism into changing and often highly problematic politics of consumer citizenship, the participatory character of contemporary media/brand culture has prompted critical media scholars to raise new questions about audience interactivity and its relationship to political citizenship. Brand culture materializes in digital media environments that allow for intensified contact across multiple media platforms, while interactivity promises empowerment and active, on-going participation. Henry Jenkins proposes that the collaborative, collective forms of knowledge production enabled

---

<sup>224</sup> Lisa Ann Richey and Stephano Ponte, *Brand Aid: Shopping Well to Save World* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011): 152.

<sup>225</sup> Richey and Ponte, *Brand Aid*, 153.

by digital technologies and exemplified by on-line fan and brand communities may spill over into politics, paving the way for a democratization of political culture and communication.<sup>226</sup> Considerably less optimistic about the state of interactive media/brand culture, Mark Andrejevic argues that,

The real question that needs to be addressed is how new media technologies are being turned to political ends not in theory, but in practice. And this practice increasingly takes place within a context characterized by the accumulation of control over information facilitated by the digital enclosure. Thus, any consideration of political uses of new media needs to explore not just the capabilities theoretically available to individual users, but the actual application of these capabilities in the age of “digital capitalism.”<sup>227</sup>

Documenting the asymmetrical power-knowledge relationships that undergird media/brand culture, Andrejevic suggests that those activities that pass for on-line democratic participation are mere citizen feedback loops that enable enhanced monitoring and surveillance on the part of corporations and thereby allow political marketers to better customize campaign messages to targeted groups.

Explaining further, Andrejevic writes:

Generating the type of information useful to political parties requires accumulating as much information as possible about voters in order to sift through it and discern reliable patterns of voting behavior that might be exploited by political operatives.

---

<sup>226</sup> Henry Jenkins, *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide* (New York: New York University Press, 2006): 206-239.

<sup>227</sup> Mark Andrejevic, *iSpy: Power and Surveillance in the Interactive Era* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2007): 191-192.

Just as background details like education level, place of residence, and reading habits help predict what type of products a consumer is likely to buy, they can serve as reliable indicators of which hot-button issues voters care about...As the former head of the Republican National Committee put it, “We can tailor our message to people who care about taxes, who care about health care, who care about jobs, who care about regulation-- we can target that way.”<sup>228</sup>

Generally speaking, the question animating both perspectives is whether and to what extent audiences are newly empowered or better exploited/manipulated by digital technologies when it comes to issues of meaningful political participation and citizenship.

Today, the fashioning of global citizens via cosmopolitan stars and sentimental education takes form within this broader context of an interactive media/brand culture. However, my argument is not that global governing has itself been subsumed by the logics and practices of capital (as RED might suggest), but rather, and more modestly, that the social productivity of branding (i.e., the production of an ethical surplus, the facilitation of identity and community in digital media environments, the empowerment of consumers to participate in building and expanding the brand) has come to inform the practices of global governing in Western media and political contexts, particularly the cultural technology of cosmopolitan stardom. In what follows, I show how idols

---

<sup>228</sup> Andrejevic, *iSpy*, 192.

of goodwill like Jolie provide a crucial link between media/brand culture and the media networks of global civil society by theorizing the star as a global citizen brand.

Dispensed across media culture in the hopes of bringing Western citizens into direct and on-going contact with the new media networks of global civil society, Jolie not only creates values (social, cultural and economic) for international organizations like UNHCR, but also constitutes global media citizens by engaging her fans and followers in digital caring acts that are highly technical and specific to the material life and exigencies of global governing. From giving to a cause to becoming a social marketer for a program of the international community, the interactive audience work of global citizens is a crucial feature of contemporary global governing, and cosmopolitan stardom is a primary cultural technology by which digital caring gets solicited and managed.

A global governmentality perspective adds new layers to existing scholarship on brands, citizenship, and interactive media culture, while, at the same time, suggesting that stars' and media/consumer culture's relationship to contemporary aid and development programs is much more vexed than analyses of RED and consumer culture might suggest. What is more, this chapter complicates influential accounts of political citizenship and interactivity by placing audience interactivity in the context of global governing and documenting how audience

interactivity doubles as a new and dispersed form of international community-building work.

*Jolie and the Cultural Powers of Post-Studio Female Stardom*

Before considering how Jolie is put to work in the field of contemporary global governmentality as a global citizen brand, it's important to chart the parameters of her female stardom, as it is undoubtedly her stardom, at least for now, that continues to underwrite her participation on the international stage. In the last chapter, I showed how Hepburn was a particularly good fit for UNICEF thanks to her Global Cinderella star image. However, in contrast to Hepburn's transparent, non-threatening, pedagogical femininity, Jolie is very different brand of female star. As Rachel Clarke of *Premiere* explained, "She has this dangerous element to her. You're never going to be safe when you're with Angelina Jolie, and that's a good thing."<sup>229</sup> Unlike Hepburn's coherent 'authenticity,' Jolie's star image is highly contradictory, turning on opposition: female celebrity/ refugee policy expert; pin up/ mother of six; global humanitarian/ scheming home-wrecker who continues to inflict pain on America's Sweetheart Jennifer Aniston (the ex of Jolie's current partner, Brad Pitt).

While Hepburn was the last female star of the studio system, Jolie's stardom speaks to the realities of what Paul McDonald describes as the post-

---

<sup>229</sup> "Angelina Jolie," *Biography* (A&E Television Networks, 2005).

studio star system.<sup>230</sup> The decline of the studio system in the 1950s paved the way for new practices of star manufacturing in which a host of ancillary players and media outlets took over the labor of crafting and maintaining a star's image. The loss of studio control over star discourse altered the media terrain through which stardom gets made in fundamental ways. As Barry King has suggested, we've entered an era of "autographic" stardom, where stars increasingly "write" themselves.<sup>231</sup> On the one hand, the post-studio star system involves a situation in which stars and their entourages take responsibility for managing the star brand, negotiating the terms of star representation with the press, the tabloids, and production companies in ways that they hope will serve to enhance and buttress the star's brand value. No longer subjects to/beneficiaries of long-term contracts, stars today are forged through careful development of the star's image both on and off screen by the likes of talent agencies, managers, agents, and personal assistants.

On the other hand, the post-studio star system changes the tone and tenor of fan discourses, as celebrity magazines and gossip outlets no longer need to rely on cozy relationships with powerful studios to get the latest scoop on the private

---

<sup>230</sup> Paul McDonald, "The Star System: The Production of Hollywood Stardom in the Post-Studio Era," in *The Contemporary Hollywood Film Industry*, eds. Paul McDonald and Janet Wasko (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2008).

<sup>231</sup> Barry King, "Embodying an Elastic Self: The Parametrics of Contemporary Stardom," in *Contemporary Hollywood Stardom*, Eds. Thomas Austin and Martin Barker (London: Arnold, 2003):52.

lives of Hollywood luminaries. The gossip industry is freed up to bring the stars more forcibly down to earth like the tabloid press has long done to society's elite. These two factors associated with the decline of the studio run star system-- the empowerment of ancillary agents and the unleashing of the tabloid press-- create a volatile media landscape for stars, where they are at once in charge of their image and subject to incessant scrutiny. In recent years the celebrity gossip industry has exploded and is increasingly fueled by snarky outfits like TMZ and Perez Hilton based primarily on-line. Gone are the neat and tidy days when the film commodity and the star image-- both on and off screen-- were carefully aligned to promote the studio system. While shocking goings-on in Tinsel Town have long been a significant feature of star discourse, nowadays, scandal is ordinary— par for the course— as gossip peddlers profit most when they claim good girls (and sometimes boys) have gone bad.

Given this tug-of-war between studios, stars and their entourages, and the tabloid press, it's easy to see how having a charitable cause becomes a sort of job requirement, an expedient way to heighten a star's public regard and brand value amidst an expansive and increasingly snarky celebrity gossip culture. As Jo Litter argues of the rise of celebrity charity:

Charity endorsement can clearly emphasize facets of a celebrity's persona or character...In addition, via charity endorsements, celebrities get wider exposure through an array for different media platforms, as celebrity charity involvement usually generates

“through-the-line” forms of promotion (i.e. associated media coverage via incremental rather than paid-for promotion)...Put crudely, then, if the celebrity is a brand that requires wide exposure through a number of different media in order to maintain its profile and topical currency, then one extremely cost-effective way is to provide endorsements for a humanitarian cause.<sup>232</sup>

As the most bankable star of her generation at the box office, the preferred subject of tabloid speculation since the scandalous start of her relationship with Pitt, and the most prominent idol of goodwill, Jolie epitomizes the realities of post-studio stardom.

In fact, Jolie’s star image is perhaps the most “autographic” of her all her contemporaries. As is regularly reported, Jolie does not employ a publicist; rather, she takes the lead in managing her star image and has proven quite adept at controlling the terms of her representation and that of her personal life in the popular, mainstream press. For example, Jolie works to develop friendly relationships with a handful of reporters and stages her own photo shoots for the paparazzi. As Brooke Barnes of the *New York Times* explains,

Most skillfully, she dictates terms to celebrity magazines involving their coverage of her and her family, editors say, creating an awkward situation for publications that try to abide by strict journalistic standards.

---

<sup>232</sup> Jo Littler, “‘I feel your pain’: Cosmopolitan Charity and the Public Fashioning of the Celebrity Soul,” *Social Semiotics* 18:2 (2008): 241.

Ms. Jolie showed her skill at handling the news media in other negotiations. People magazine bid successfully for photos and an exclusive interview after she gave birth to her first child in 2006. Those pictures sold for an estimated \$4.1 million, a sum that she and Mr. Pitt said they donated to charity.<sup>233</sup>

Until 2008 her philanthropic efforts were managed in conjunction with Trevor Neilson's Global Philanthropy Group, recently dubbed "Charity Fixer to the Stars;" according to Neilson, Jolie "outgrew" his services and now maintains her own relationships with diplomats and global power brokers.<sup>234</sup> Jolie's has in fact "written" her own star so bright that in early 2010 she was dropped from the St. John advertising campaign on the grounds that she "overshadowed the brand."<sup>235</sup>

Some have suggested that Jolie's dual roles as a sexy film star and global humanitarian/international mom and autographic stardom have catapulted her to the status of an archetype for women. For example, Naomi Wolf explains that Jolie's archetypal status is owed to the way in which the star bucks all conventions of femininity, becoming a global icon of female empowerment.

Her persona hits an unprecedented level of global resonance...because she's crafted a life narrative that is not just personal. Rather it is archetypal. And the archetype is one that

---

<sup>233</sup> Brooke Barnes, "Angelina Jolie's Carefully Orchestrated Image," *New York Times*, November 20, 2008, accessed August 2, 2011, <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/21/business/media/21angelina.html>

<sup>234</sup> Laura Holson, "Charity Fixer to the Stars," *New York Times*, December 3, 2010, accessed August 2, 2011, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/05/fashion/05TREVORNEILSON.html>

<sup>235</sup> *Women's Wear Daily* Media, January 7, 2010, accessed August 2, 2011, <http://www.wwd.com/media-news/fashion-memopad/glossy-karlie-vogue-and-lucky-launch-partnerships-new-gravy-train-2405375?full=true>

really, for the first time in modern culture, brings together almost every aspect of female empowerment and liberation.

...she blurs the conventional boundary of what female stars are supposed to do-- look pretty, emote, and wear designer clothes-- by picking up Princess Di's fallen torch and wrapping her elegant bone structure in a shalwar kameez to attend to the suffering of Afghan refugees in Pakistan and putting on jeans to help rebuild the housing of low-income U.S. Citizens wiped out by Hurricane Katrina.

She insists on claiming every role on an operatic scale, making the symbolism as transgressive as possible, and saying, implicitly, "See? It can be done."

So she becomes what psychoanalysts call an "ego ideal" for women-- a kind of dream figure that allows women to access, through fantasies of their own, possibilities for their own heightened empowerment and liberation.<sup>236</sup>

In Wolf's account, Jolie's global cultural resonance, especially among her female fans, is owed to the ways in which she is able to "have it all" -- transgressing all the barriers that have historically been imposed on women, both sexually and professionally. As Wolf's take on the star's cultural power intimates, Jolie's image engages prominent post-feminist discourses that emphasize the new freedoms of women to 'choose' their own individual life path in the spheres of both work and home regardless of race, nationality, or class. Jolie's status as a post-feminist cultural icon is of course further heightened by her penchant for

---

<sup>236</sup> Naomi Wolf, "The Power of Angelina," *Harper's Bazaar*, June 8, 2009, accessed August 2, 2011, <http://www.harpersbazaar.com/magazine/cover/angelina-jolie-essay-0709>

international adoption, globetrotting lifestyle, and the embrace of a post-racial, hip multicultural sensibility they signal.

However, despite the undeniable power of the Jolie star image and her seemingly tight control over it, it's nonetheless important to note that Jolie's cosmopolitan stardom is, in some ways, a more complicated venture than Hepburn's was. Take, for example, *Beyond Borders*, a film where Jolie's work as an actress actually converges with her work as an idol of goodwill for the U.N.. Jolie plays a sheltered beautiful woman who is suddenly made aware of the global refugee crisis and devotes the rest of her life to traversing the globe as a UNHCR aid worker. The introduction to *Newsweek's* interview with Jolie about the film explains:

Now, for the first time, Jolie's roles both on- and off- screen have converged. In *Beyond Borders*, which opened this weekend, Jolie plays a London socialite who abandons the comforts of home to become an international aid worker, traveling to war-ravaged regions around the world...This week, she received a new award to set beside her Oscar, the United Nations' first-ever Citizen of the World Award, for her work to in bringing attention to the plight of the world's 20 million refugees.<sup>237</sup>

Reflecting on how her own experiences with UNHCR impacted her portrayal of her fictional character, Jolie explained: "I added a few things to her naivete in the beginning because there is a real sense of thinking you can change the world.

There's also a lot of me staring at things. But that's what you really end up doing. I

---

<sup>237</sup> *Newsweek* staff, "I Have Found Purpose," *Newsweek*, October 24, 2003, accessed August 2, 2011 <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2003/10/24/q-amp-a-i-have-found-purpose.html>

had to do one scene and I remembered things from my own experience-- you think about that first child you saw die and suddenly you can't stop crying."<sup>238</sup>

Despite Jolie's rising star and her method acting, *Beyond Borders* was a total flop, garnering lukewarm (at best) reviews from critics, disappointing box office returns, and some scathing criticism from within the humanitarian aid community the film was designed to benefit. As Nick Cater reported in *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, the film "resurrects disaster-aid myths by showing Chechens, Cambodians, and others as either passive victims, dependent on white foreigners, or evil incompetents...Other humanitarian experts are worried that the movie make international aid efforts seem worthless and could lead the public to stop supporting relief charities."<sup>239</sup> Quoting Georgetown refugee researcher Steven Hansch: "Beyond Borders portrays aid work as hopeless: well-intentioned but futile, with no resulting impact, no return on investment. In reality, humanitarian aid saves tens of thousands of lives."<sup>240</sup> Despite the monies raised for UNHCR by the film (all proceeds from premieres were donated to the organization) and its star (whose personal contributions to the organization at the time were 3 million and rising), Cater warns the U.N. and other NGOs about the

---

<sup>238</sup> *Newsweek* staff, "I Have Found Purpose"

<sup>239</sup> Nick Cater, "Beyond Reality: the Hollywood Treatment of Humanitarian Aid," *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, November 13, 2003, accessed August 2, 2011, <http://philanthropy.com/article/Beyond-Reality-the-Hollywood/62568/>

<sup>240</sup> Cater, "Beyond Reality"

perils of Hollywood experiments like *Beyond Borders*, particularly the way in which the film turns on Jolie's converging on- and off-screen lives:

But as the actress warned UNHCR before it agreed to appoint her ambassador, the twice-married Ms. Jolie attracts plenty of tabloid headlines about her sex life, tense family relationship, and much else. Regardless of the accuracy of the stories about Ms. Jolie, nonprofit groups associated with her need to be prepared to deal with the controversy she stirs up.

*Beyond Borders* takes these problems to a new level because it closely confuses life and art by setting a love story within the world of humanitarian aid and refugees that Ms. Jolie inhabits in her UN role.<sup>241</sup>

Obviously concerned that her prominence in the ever-expanding world of celebrity gossip threatens to undermine the seriousness of UNHCR's mission, Cater suggests that what makes Jolie a particularly risky venture for international organizations is her status as ubiquitous female star with a seemingly ever more titillating private life, a status that renders her an on-going site of tabloid speculation and controversy. What is more, bringing Jolie's humanitarian work into the context of the Hollywood filmmaking in a way that "closely confuses the life and art" is even more dangerous. To Cater's mind, it is precisely the way that Jolie's stardom encourages reflection on what Dyer called "the business of being an individual" that is a problem. Cater is worried about the perils of identification, troubled that audiences might be "confused" by Jolie's converging roles and thus

---

<sup>241</sup> Cater, "Beyond Reality"

buy into the film's problematic vision of humanitarian aid workers and their constituents.

While snarky cultural commentary, tabloid speculation, and skepticism from within the international community itself may indeed continue to follow Jolie into the fields of global governing, the remainder of this chapter centers on the productive, practical role that Jolie's stratospheric, autographic post-studio female stardom plays within new international regimes. Ultimately, Jolie's cosmopolitan stardom hinges less on the particular dynamics of her mediated star image, as was the case with Hepburn (i.e., Hepburn's non-threatening, pedagogical femininity, reactivated aura, and personal biography), and more on the ways in which it is able to generate cultural, economic, and social value for UNHCR in the dual digital contexts of global civil society and media/brand culture. Jolie's star image is thus the building block of a powerful global citizen brand that works to constitute her fans and followers as active and empowered members of global civil society.

#### *Global Citizen Brand: Jolie and UNHCR*

In many ways, despite their strikingly different brands of femininity, Jolie appears the heir-apparent to Audrey Hepburn. Undertaking grueling missions to war-torn regions, performing care work in service areas for cameras, penning editorials in

national newspapers, lobbying heads of state and policy makers, and offering up her personal reflections and confessions of caring in the context of interviews with journalists like Ann Curry and Anderson Cooper, Jolie's performance as idol of goodwill mimics that of Hepburn's in many ways. Actually, Jolie takes the work of being a popular female cosmopolitan star to a new level, making highly publicized multi-million dollar donations to the U.N. and its NGO partners through her own philanthropic organization, the Jolie-Pitt Foundation and starring in recent U.N. co-productions such as Showtime's *What's Going On?* series. Jolie's extensive and intensive work for UNHCR has earned her multiple humanitarian awards (e.g., The Citizen of the World Award in 2003 and the Global Humanitarian Award in 2005) and landed her a spot on the Council of Foreign Relations, as well as a prominent seat at the table among other high-profile, power-brokers at venues like the Clinton Global Initiative.

Jolie's official appointment as UNHCR Goodwill Ambassador came in July of 2001 at the end of an eleven day mission to Cambodia, only after she had demonstrated her seriousness and commitment to organization officials with hours of studying up on refugee issues and successfully completing a more taxing three-week mission to Sierra Leone earlier that year. On this mission Jolie worked alongside relief workers to provide care for refugees, met with leaders of NGOs to learn about their challenges, and interviewed refugee families about their struggles to survive an on-going brutal civil war. On top of living the sometimes

dangerous and meager life of a humanitarian aid worker, Jolie was charged with chronicling her experiences, offering her personal reflections on what she saw and learned in the field. Jolie published her personal reflections and impressions from early field trips both on-line and in book form as a fundraiser for UNHCR<sup>242</sup>. The on-line publishing of Jolie's journals proved very successful for UNHCR, which saw a substantial up-tick in web traffic upon publication (from 1,000 to 120,000 visitors per day). What's more, since its appointment of Jolie, UNHCR has noted a shift in its donor base to a younger demographic whose on-line contributions averaged \$140 (as opposed to an average of \$27 from mail-in contributions).<sup>243</sup> Coupled with Jolie's personal contributions to the organization, it's safe to say that UNHCR has benefited economically from its most high-profile goodwill ambassador. (As will soon become clear, this financial development should not be overlooked, as UNHCR has faced massive rollbacks in governmental support since 1985 and, like most all humanitarian organizations, must compete for private donors from corporations and individuals in an increasingly crowded field of aid and development agencies.)

At the time of this writing, Jolie has undertaken approximately 35 field trips for UNHCR, visiting over 20 countries-- including 'missions' to Pakistan,

---

<sup>242</sup> Angelina Jolie, *Notes from my Travels* (New York: Pocket Books, 2003).

<sup>243</sup> Stephen Greene, "Star Widens Refugee Group's Appeal," *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, January 15, 2002, 8.

Namibia, Thailand, Kenya, Jordan, Egypt, Sudan, Iraq, Haiti, and Bosnia (to name a few)-- and regularly participates in sentimental education campaigns for the organization. For example, in June of 2009, in honor of World Refugee Day, Jolie and UNHCR co-produced a slick 30-second public service announcement featuring images of refugees from around the world. The video opened with a series of sepia tone historical images, seemingly from refugee crises past; within seconds, Jolie appeared in color, standing in front of the filmic images. "Please don't turn away," she implored viewers in her raspy voice. "Refugees are the most vulnerable people on earth. Every day they are fighting to survive. They deserve our respect." The PSA not only aired on television networks prior to World Refugee Day; it was also shown on hundreds of airport monitors in Amsterdam and Washington D.C. and was distributed on-line by UNHCR, earning 25,000 views when it first appeared on YouTube.<sup>244</sup> Like Hepburn, Jolie has penned op-eds for major publications: in *The Washington Post*, Jolie urged U.S. citizens concerned about the war in Iraq to consider the plight of Iraqi refugees,<sup>245</sup> while,

---

<sup>244</sup> "Angelina Jolie releases new video to draw attention to plight of refugees around the world," UNHCR News, June 16, 2009, <http://www.unhcr.org/4a37a0466.html>

<sup>245</sup> Angelina Jolie, "Staying to Help in Iraq," *The Washington Post*, February 28, 2008, accessed August 2 2011, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/02/27/AR2008022702217.html>

in *Newsweek*, Jolie criticized President Obama for his lack of action on the on-going refugee crisis in Darfur.<sup>246</sup>

UNHCR's extensive deployment of Jolie as a cultural technology of global governing is indicative of "best practices" when it comes to the U.N.'s Goodwill Ambassador Program. Not surprisingly, given the cultural connotations that continue to adhere to celebrity culture, the rapid expansion of idols of goodwill in the U.N. system over the past two decades has been accompanied by growing anxiety about their effectiveness. In 2006 the Joint Inspection Unit conducted the first ever comprehensive, system-wide analysis of the U.N.'s goodwill ambassador programs in order to determine "general guidelines for improvement, rationalization and harmonization of current practices."<sup>247</sup> The report issued a series of recommendations for improving the U.N.'s deployment of celebrities, including more and better guidance for implementing goodwill ambassador programs, better screening of celebrities to ensure that "only highly committed and available personalities of caliber and renown" carry the title of Goodwill Ambassador, and regular systematic evaluations of programs that document "impact and return on investment."<sup>248</sup> Of particular concern were the high

---

<sup>246</sup> Angelina Jolie, "Justice Delayed is not Justice Denied," *Newsweek*, December 9, 2009, accessed August 2, 2010, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2009/12/09/justice-delayed-is-not-justice-denied.html>

<sup>247</sup> Papa Louis Fall and Guangting Tang, "Goodwill Ambassadors in the United Nations System," report by the Joint Inspection Unit (Geneva: United Nations, 2006): 1-2.

<sup>248</sup> Fall and Tang, "Goodwill Ambassadors, vi-vii.

numbers of goodwill ambassadors, their level of commitment, and their potential drain on U.N. resources. Aware that many celebrities are keen to use an association with the U.N. to boost their image, the report suggested that celebrities in the U.N. system be subjected to meticulous evaluation before “contracts” with agencies be extended. As the report notes,

Building a fruitful relationship with celebrities is time-consuming; a lot of time is invested in following their careers, in seeking opportunities for activities and briefings. Therefore, the higher the number of celebrities an organization has to deal with, the less efficiently can the work be performed. If the celebrities do not have the dedication, the availability and the fame to reach big audiences, the effectiveness of their work is diminished.<sup>249</sup>

While the report found well-known U.N. agencies like UNESCO and UNICEF to have bloated and often ineffective/inefficient goodwill ambassador programs, UNHCR was widely praised for its management of stars like Jolie and presented as a model for other agencies:

UNHCR has opted for a reduced number of Goodwill Ambassadors...with a high degree of commitment reflected in the pre-engagement requirements and conditions of service. The title is never offered up front; the celebrities must have a proven commitment to refugees and the ability to work effectively on awareness and fundraising projects...and self-finance their activities.

The inspectors found that UNHCR was the only organization that not only develops an annual work plan for each Goodwill Ambassador but also reviews its implementation prior to

---

<sup>249</sup> Fall and Tang, “Goodwill Ambassadors, 3.

establishing a new action plan for the following year, in collaboration with the celebrity.<sup>250</sup>

As the UNHCR website explains of its program,

UNHCR's high-profile supporters are relatively few in number compared to some other major humanitarian organizations and they come from a wide range of disciplines and backgrounds. But they share a singular determination to help the world's displaced and to help raise world awareness about the suffering and needs of the vulnerable.<sup>251</sup>

However, while the agency's website stresses the awareness building, public education role of Jolie and other ambassadors, UNHCR reported that the primary goal of its program is branding: cosmopolitan stars like Jolie are conceptualized primarily as means to generate meaning and value for the agency within the context of a highly mediated global civil society. As suggested previously, what is distinctive about today's idols of goodwill are the ways in which they are fashioned explicitly as branding devices for global governmentality.

That international agencies and institutions like UNHCR and the U.N. would turn *explicitly* to branding in recent years is not particularly surprising. Non-profit organizations began incorporating marketing principles and practices into their work in the 1970s, as the concept of social marketing took hold within the non-profit community. Social marketing was not simply about raising funds

---

<sup>250</sup> Fall and Tang, "Goodwill Ambassadors," 4.

<sup>251</sup> "With a Little Help From Our Friends," UNHCR People, UNHCR, <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646c3b.html>

in the name of the social good. Rather, it was about applying business techniques and strategies to social change initiatives. Early proponents of the idea, Philip Kotler and Gerald Zaltman, suggested that “social marketing is promising framework for planning and implementing social change...The application of commercial ideas and methods to promote social goals will be seen by many as another example of business’s lack of taste and self-restraint. Yet the application of the logic of marketing to social goals is a natural development and on the whole a promising one.”<sup>252</sup> Indeed, broadly speaking, the concept of social marketing has been fully embraced by the international community/global non-profit sector. In the post-Cold war context, where transnational NGOs have expanded rapidly at the same time that the Washington Consensus and neoliberal ideologies have precipitated devastating rollbacks in public funding for international social welfare programs and projects, competition has steepened even more, making the marketing, selling, and promotion of causes and programs ever more pressing; organizations seeking to serve the general welfare turn to branding to better market themselves to potential donors, governments, and clients alike. As Liz Moor argues, while an increasingly crowded and empowered third sector makes branding a necessary-- and often highly productive-- evil, states and governments also turn to branding in the name of efficiency, “but also

---

<sup>252</sup> Philip Kotler and Gerald Zaltman, “Social Marketing: An Approach to Planned Social Change,” *Journal of Marketing*, 35:3 (1971): 3.

to help inculcate certain types of sentiments and feelings in citizens.”<sup>253</sup> Moor explains:

The word “branding” is often used cautiously in these spheres because of its connotations of manipulation and commercialization, but a range of governmental and quasi-governmental agencies now place a clear emphasis on “design coherence,” on the strategic use of design to achieve a range of outcomes, and on the manipulation of various kinds of feelings, attitudes, experiences, and sentiments. All of these point to the increasing use of branding as a managerial technique for the governance of populations.<sup>254</sup>

As the two previous chapters document, the U.N. has a long history of putting stars to work as cultural technologies of global governmentality— of using stars to articulate cosmopolitan meanings and humanitarian values to the U.N., and to popularize concepts and practices of global citizenship. While marketing guru Mark Gobe<sup>255</sup> recently coined the term “citizen brand” to inspire corporations to put good citizenship at the heart of their brand identity, we might say that the U.N. has long been experimenting with its own concept of citizen branding through its deployment of Danny Kaye and Audrey Hepburn as icons of global care and commitment. These stars helped to recode the institutional identity of U.N. in popular culture and to create emotional, sentimental ties

---

<sup>253</sup> Liz Moor, *The Rise of Brands* (New York: Berg, 2007): 82.

<sup>254</sup> Moor, *Brands*, 82.

<sup>255</sup> Marc Gobe, *Citizen Brand: 10 Commandments for Transforming Brands in a Consumer Democracy* (New York: Allworth Press, 2002).

between citizens and the international community. In other words, early cosmopolitan stars were, in many ways, citizen branding devices, although they weren't explicitly recognized as such. In this early incarnation of global citizen branding, the individualizing and moral structures of star discourse worked to negotiate communication quagmires facing the U.N., especially how to connect affectively with citizens while avoiding perceptions of propaganda. In other words, by presenting stars—in the context of their private lives—as model cosmopolitan citizens, the U.N. created its own brand of global citizenship for media audiences, especially in Western contexts, that was germane to its work promoting the general welfare.

Today's global citizen brands however not only engender meanings and feelings and shape citizen dispositions, but also generate more concrete forms of economic, cultural, and social value for the agencies, programs, and political rationalities of global governing. This newer version of global citizen branding is distinguished by two primary functions. The first is a civic intermediary one, whereby idols of goodwill help to cultivate meanings and values for the international community at large, as well as specific organizations, institutions, or programs in digital media environments. Second, as global citizen brands, cosmopolitan stars help to generate a social or ethical surplus that is put to work, so to speak, as they solicit and direct the digital caring acts of media audiences. These mediated practices of global citizenship and care are increasingly central to

emerging regimes of global governing which rely ever more heavily on the private acts of Western citizens for the funding and promotion that sustains the international community's social welfare programs and development efforts. At the same time, the branding practices that underwrite the fashioning of today's idols of goodwill serve to root caring stars in media/brand culture *and* in global civil society, making them a crucial link between these two seemingly disparate spheres.

### *Civic Intermediary*

My notion of idols of goodwill as civic intermediaries borrows from Bourdieu's conceptualization of cultural intermediaries. As David Hesmondhalgh explains,

For Bourdieu, at the core of the 'new petite bourgeoisie', a new social class with distinctive tastes and cultural practices, are 'all the occupations involving presentation and representation (sales, marketing, advertising, public relations, fashion, decoration and so forth) and in all institutions providing symbolic goods and services'...Bourdieu seems to have intended the term 'new cultural intermediaries' to refer to a particular type of new petit-bourgeois profession, associated with cultural commentary in the mass media, 'the most typical of whom are producers of cultural programmes on TV and radio or the critics of "quality" newspapers and magazines and all the writer-journalists and journalist-writers.'<sup>256</sup>

---

<sup>256</sup> David Hesmondhalgh, "Bourdieu, the Media and Cultural Production," *Media, Culture, & Society*, 28:2 (2006): 226.

The primary social function of cultural intermediaries involves mediating between producers of symbolic goods and services and consumers by creating systems of cultural value (tastes) and ascribing these values to cultural artifacts and practices. Within contemporary global governing, caring stars serve a similar, though decidedly civic, intermediary function, helping to mediate and manage relationships between Western global citizens and the agencies of the international community by assigning meanings and values (cultural, social, and economic) to particular outfits and causes in a variety of ways. Obviously, such symbolic activity is crucial in a crowded field with limited resources. While discourses surrounding the international community and global civil society stress interdependence and cooperation, it's important to keep in mind that, as mentioned previously, agencies like UNHCR are a perpetual struggle to fund their work and thus in a perpetual competition with other global charities, NGOs, and U.N. agencies for private donations and public allocations.

On the one hand, a cosmopolitan star image as multi-layered and rich as Jolie's (global motherhood, female empowerment, unmatched/dangerous glamour) helps to construct a "spiritual image or idea" for UNHCR and the refugee cause, while, at the same time, providing for differentiation among the vast and ever-growing numbers of organizations that make up the international community. As Littler suggests, the meanings and feelings associated with a particular star can be transposed, at once adding value to the star image and to the

organization with which she associates. At the same time, the symbolic work of cosmopolitan stars, as well as the media attention they are able to command, helps to elevate the media profile of certain institutions and causes of the international community above the ever growing slew of third sector players. Well-branded, star-fronted agencies like FINCA and UNHCR are able to maintain their high-profiles on the international stage, distinguishing themselves from the hundreds of thousands of newly established NGOs and citizen groups that have sprung up in recent decades across both the global North and South.<sup>257</sup> Cosmopolitan stars thus help to construct unique brand identities, as well as hierarchies, within the international community.

These aspects of the intermediary function associated with contemporary cosmopolitan stardom are perhaps best illustrated by *Look to the Stars*, the website discussed in Chapter One that invites users to explore “The World of Celebrity Giving.” Built on the idea that fans want to know more about their favorite stars-- in particular, about their good deeds and caring work-- the site hosts individual celebrity pages that provide links to the causes and charities a celebrity supports. Alternatively, visitors can look up a specific cause or charity and find out what celebrities support it, or view videos about stars’ acts of charity and giving. Not surprisingly, idols of goodwill-- Bono, Angelina Jolie, Brad Pitt-- and well-branded, transnational charities-- Oxfam, Red Cross, UNICEF-- are

---

<sup>257</sup> Bornstein, *How to Change*, 4.

prominent mainstays, the backdrop for daily updates and news reports on more “ordinary” celebrity good works, that is, more traditional, U.S.-centered charitable acts. Of course, what falls out of view in the interactive, linked “World of Celebrity Giving” are all those organizations and causes of the international community that are not able (they are perhaps too controversial, too localized) or willing (they wish to remain community-based) to participate in the celebrity-philanthropy complex; so while the “World of Celebrity Giving” is international in orientation and scope, its membership is largely made up of Western stars and causes.

As civic intermediaries, cosmopolitan stars also function to orient audiences more generally towards global governing. The proliferation and increasing mediation of cosmopolitan stars disposes media audiences to the agendas of global governing and the agencies of global civil society, helping not only to constitute global media citizens that are educated about and responsive to international regimes, but also to raise the field of cosmopolitan-oriented practices of giving and citizenship above others. Nowhere is this dynamic more apparent than in Hollywood itself. In the wake of Michael Jackson’s death and the public controversy that emerged around who would foot the \$1.4 million dollar bill for his memorial service, Michael Cieply and Jennifer Steinhauer reported that, “While big companies and their leaders have historically helped out their hometowns in a pinch, out of benevolence or for bragging rights, Hollywood has

been playing a relatively minor role in the civic life of Los Angeles, preferring national and international charities...Homelessness in Santa Monica is eschewed in favor of starvation in Darfur.”<sup>258</sup> Cieply and Steinhauer suggest the “exodus” of Hollywood from civic life in LA can be attributed to numerous factors, for example, the multinational character of today’s major media firms, or the fact that more parochial, civic problems don’t lend themselves to widespread publicity. However, as my research suggests, this dynamic is perhaps owed in no small part to the rise of cosmopolitan stardom and the ways that Hollywood luminaries have been enlisted by and/or inserted themselves into the field of global governmentality. As civic intermediaries and global citizen brands, stars—from Kaye to Hepburn to Clooney and Jolie— have helped to orient practices of citizenship towards the international realm and global governmentality.

As the examples of *Look to the Stars* or *ThinkMTV* (as well as critical work on brands) suggests, in the contexts of media/brand culture and global civil society, this civic intermediary function cannot be thought apart from the digital media technologies which allow cosmopolitan stars to serve as vital, virtual links that bring citizens into contact with the discreet agencies and causes of global governing. Jolie’s cosmopolitan stardom thus turns largely on her image’s ability to mobilize media audiences in material and technical ways as participants in

---

<sup>258</sup> Michael Cieply and Jennifer Steinhauer, “Los Angeles Charities Rarely on Hollywood’s ‘Must Do’ List, *New York Times*, September 4, 2009, accessed August 2, 2011, <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/05/us/05donate.html>

global civil society by linking them to UNHCR in the context of an interactive media/brand culture.

In her work on brands and logos, Celia Lury adopts Lev Manovich's conception of the interface to theorize how brands as new media objects figure in commercial media culture:

The interface—like the static frame of the window or mirror—is a surface or boundary that connects and separates two spaces: an inner and outer environment. So, as an interface, the brand is a frame that organizes the two-way exchange of information between the inner and outer environments of the market in time, informing how consumers relate to producers and how producers relate to consumers. The exchange is a matter not merely of qualitative calculation, but also of affect, intensity...<sup>259</sup>

Cosmopolitan stars like Jolie work in a similar fashion: they are placed across multiple media platforms in hopes of connecting media audiences to UNHCR, emotionally and materially. What is new then about Jolie's cosmopolitan stardom is the way in which it provides a virtual surface, an interface, where audiences come into contact and enter into a relationship with the U.N.'s refugee organization. For example, UNHCR maintains its own YouTube Channel where Jolie figures prominently.<sup>260</sup> An image of the star looking sadly into the distance as she cradles a sickly child dominates the top of the page, which is also a link to UNHCR's website. While the site regularly features new UNHCR videos from

---

<sup>259</sup> Celia Lury, *Brands: The Logos of the Global Economy* (New York: Routledge, 2004): 7.

<sup>260</sup> <http://www.youtube.com/user/unhcr>

the field, the “Favorites” section is comprised totally of Jolie videos, which receive on average tens of thousands of views compared to the hundreds received by other non-Jolie UNHCR productions. While Jolie’s cosmopolitan image still appears in print, and the star, like Hepburn, still offers confessions of caring in much-hyped television interviews, the majority of media content that makes up Jolie’s cosmopolitan stardom is on-line, circulating across social networking platforms like Think MTV and Facebook, YouTube, organizational and campaign websites of the international community, as well as a seemingly endless array of fan, gossip, and news sites. In other words, the hermeneutic relationship between stars and audiences that initially gave global governing a cultural and material base in US culture-- and that cosmopolitan stardom continues to count on and live by-- is constituted largely in digital media environments where Jolie’s image works to bring her fans and audiences into proximity with UNHCR’s “virtual real estate,” at the same time, creating an ethical surplus defined by caring and global commitment which, as I will show in the next section, is also put to work.

However, as a civic intermediary and media interface, Jolie’s cosmopolitan stardom not only links fans and media audiences to the institutions and agencies of global governing: it also helps to suture loosely popular media culture to global civil society in ways that rely less directly on the official participation of media industries. Thanks to the digital, interactive nature of contemporary brand/media culture (not to mention the history and parameters of

star discourse which has made the private lives of stars of keen public interest), UNHCR can produce its own media content whose on-line circulation is ensured by the cultural powers of Jolie's female stardom. Websites of popular gossip rags like *People* and *US Weekly* regularly trace and report on Jolie's global do-gooding and UNHCR activities, as do more the more venerable news outfits. On-line stories about Jolie often contain direct links to U.N. sites and/or feature U.N. videos, while U.N. agencies make use of customizable on-line advertising and sponsored links to reach audiences searching out information on idols of goodwill and their caring works. Fan sites, too, provide information on, videos about, and links to Jolie's global humanitarian endeavors. While Hepburn's cosmopolitan stardom turned on the particular dynamics of her mediated star image, Jolie's cultural power as an idol of goodwill has perhaps more to do with the circulation potential her image carries in and across digital environments.

Despite the increasing mediation of cosmopolitan stardom and the logics of branding that circumscribe its production, the practice of sentimental education still remains at the heart of star participation in contemporary global governmentality. Like Hepburn and Kaye, Jolie's field trips are documented by cameras in hopes of finding their way into popular media culture. Images are captured of Jolie talking with refugees and aid workers, delivering services in the field, and touring UNHCR facilities. Similar images of Hepburn served to lend visual support to her confessions of caring in the context of television interviews;

however, as mentioned above, images of Jolie's humanitarian work are carefully edited not only by television producers but also by UNHCR itself who regularly produces two to four minute digital videos of Jolie's various missions for on-line distribution via emails to UNHCR supporters, on UNHCR's website, as well as other digital platforms like YouTube. In these mini documentaries designed to show the agency's good works, Jolie plays the part of sentimental educator, providing her audiences with context and facts, highlighting the role of UNHCR, and offering her own personal reflections and observations. For example, In the 2008 video entitled "Goodwill Ambassador Angelina Jolie Visits Afghanistan," Jolie is shown visiting with refugee families, while she educates her viewers about situation in the war-torn country through a voiceover narration.

Since the fall of the Taliban in 2001, more than 5 million Afghans have returned home. Among them more than 4.3 million have repatriated with the assistance of UNHCR. Afghanistan has been struggling to absorb these massive returns, and it's understandable as it's one of the largest population movements in recent history. These families have been displaced for nearly 30 years, and now many returnees are facing reintegration difficulties, including lack of land, shelter, water and basic services such as health care and education for their children...

When you ask them what they need, they just smile and say everything. When you ask them what kind of work they want to do, they say anything. They have suffered so much and yet the

Afghan people remain gracious and open. They have a quiet dignity.<sup>261</sup>

Unlike the Kaye documentaries though, the shorter, digital Jolie videos are made to be viewed by audiences within their own rhythms of reception, shared and circulated through audiences' own virtual networks.

*Mobilizing Digital Care, Building Governing Capital*

Global citizen brands create emotional and material bonds between Western citizens by articulating feelings and values to particular organizations and institutions, thereby infusing global governing with systems of spiritual and symbolic meaning. At the same time, cosmopolitan stars produce an ethical surplus, a sense of social relation and belonging, that can be acted upon to generate value and what I call governing capital for the agencies and agendas of international regimes. In contrast to political capital, which registers agency and power within a particular political situation or context, I use the term governing capital to refer to social and cultural forms of legitimacy, as well as the economic and political means by which to carry out the work of governing. States, who rely on traditional forms of democratic legitimation, need not worry too much about governing capital. However, as international agencies have found themselves

---

<sup>261</sup> "Goodwill Ambassador Angelina Jolie Visits Afghanistan," Video Galleries, UNHCR, <http://unhcr.org/v-49b7c1042>

increasingly embroiled in the actual work of governing without any official authority and often without much funding, the generation of governing capital is crucial. Put differently, I'm less interested to parse Jolie's political capital and more keen to show how her global citizen brand builds governing capital, which includes not only revenues, but also socially and culturally generated ("soft") forms of political legitimacy and authority for global governing. Of course, all of this happens within the digital media environments of global civil society and media/brand culture: in linking their fans and followers to particular agencies and causes, cosmopolitan stars are deployed to harness the ethical surplus, creating networks of emotionally-invested, hard-working (inter)active supporters, who are helping at once to build the brand (e.g., UNHCR and the refugee cause) and governing capital for the agendas and rationalities of global governing.

Digital environments like media/brand culture and global civil society readily support star-led sentimental education, while making traditional caring acts like charitable giving easy to accomplish (a couple of clicks vs. writing a check and mailing a stamped envelope) and often fun, like shopping. For example, since 2004, UNHCR has used "Star Appeals"— web-based, annual Christmas-time fundraising campaigns— to raise monies for the organization and draw public attention to the plight of refugees. The 2009 effort<sup>262</sup> featured the massive refugee camp in Dadaab, Kenya. Entitled "Give Dadaab A Brighter

---

<sup>262</sup> "Star Appeal," UNHCR, <http://www.starappeal.unhcr.org/>

Future,” the Star Appeal’s home page featured a large map of Africa with a prominent yellow star marking Dadaab that read “Click here to enter Dadaab.” Next to the map was an image of Jolie talking with a group of young Somali refugees, under the headline “Watch UNHCR Goodwill Ambassador Angelina Jolie in Her Recent Visit to Dadaab.” Clicking on Jolie’s image loaded a 2-minute video produced by UNHCR that chronicled Jolie’s tour of the refugee camp, which, she explains, is the largest in the world, housing “300,000 people in a space that was designed for 90,000.” The short documentary opened with extreme long-shots of the camp shot from above. Against images of make-shift homes and trash, Jolie introduces viewers to the camp via a voiceover narrative that persists throughout the film: “I’ve been to many camps and this is certainly one of the most dire... This is Dadaab.”<sup>263</sup> The video is speckled with familiar images, frames crowded with malnourished bodies and sad faces. Jolie is shown talking with refugees and humanitarian aid workers, asking questions about the situation in Somalia and the pressing health matters facing the camp’s inhabitants. As in all her work with UNHCR, Jolie stresses the generosity and strength of the refugees she meets, concluding, “The Somali families I met today are full of warmth and affection. I wish more people could meet them and then they would have a stronger desire to help.” The video is designed to encourage media audiences to

---

<sup>263</sup> “Watch Goodwill Ambassador Angelina Jolie in her Recent Visit to Dadaab,” UNHCR, <http://www.starappeal.unhcr.org/video/>

participate in UNHCR's annual giving campaign, which this particular year was to benefit the refugees at Dadaab.

However, the Star Appeal did not simply ask for monetary donations for UNHCR and the residents of Dadaab; rather, it urged visitors to shop, that is, to choose specific gift items to send to particular areas of the camp. Potential donors were presented with a range of aid products, grouped in three main categories: water, education, and health care. In the area of water, for \$20, one could purchase 10 jerry cans that families would use to carry water to their home; for \$50, a portable water testing kit; and for \$320, a community tap stand that would provide water to 500 refugees. Other gift options included a \$10 mosquito net, 100 textbooks for \$20, a \$100 therapeutic feeding kit, and building a classroom for \$1000. Once the donor had selected gifts for purchase, they were asked to deliver their aid virtually, by dropping their gift items (represented by icons) onto an area of the camp (rendered as a virtual map) of their choosing. With each purchase, the donor was asked to send emails to friends about the unique and important purchases they had just made.

UNHCR's 2009 Star Appeal reveals much about media interactivity's and branding's role in global governing. Not only does the effort highlight Jolie's status as both a sentimental educator and civic intermediary/media interface; it also helps to specify the ways in which her media audiences are imagined to function as members of global civil society and active participants in global

governing. Jo Littler has argued recently that our present conjuncture is marked by a proliferation of diverse opportunities for citizens to engage in what she calls “cosmopolitan caring through consumption”—from campaign’s like RED to Oxfam’s consumer-oriented fair trade campaigns.<sup>264</sup> However, the Star Appeal addresses media audiences as consumers or “causurers,” but it does so in a peculiar way. Audiences are addressed, at once, as calculating consumers, enterprising global citizens, generous donors, and virtual aid workers, suggesting that the forms of cosmopolitan caring and global media citizenship invited by contemporary global governing and star-led sentimental education are premised on forms of interactive audience labor that go well beyond the business of “shopping for change.” Rather, in contemporary global governmentality, media audiences are invited to practice global citizenship through engaging in a variety of digital caring acts that not only generate funds and awareness for specific agencies and their programs, but also double as international community-building work, brand management and expansion, and the production of governing capital.

As global citizen brands, perhaps the most important work that idols of goodwill perform is mobilizing digital caring acts through managing interactive audience labor, directing it towards the projects and causes of global governing and the international community. Recent developments in media culture— most

---

<sup>264</sup> Jo Littler, *Radical Consumption: Shopping for Change in Contemporary Culture* (New York: Open University Press, 2009) 23-49.

notably, the rise of interactive technologies— have inspired many to re-visit the concept of audience labor. As scholars have long argued, media audiences have been required to perform different types of labor as consumers. “The work of watching” advertisements<sup>265</sup>, the work of learning to read/consume different television genres, the work of learning appropriate behaviors for movie-going, and the work of filling out consumer surveys represent just a sampling of the different forms of audience labor that media and cultural industries have solicited from their audiences.<sup>266</sup> In contemporary media culture, audience labor takes new forms, as media audiences are increasingly urged follow their favorite brands, shows, and stars across multiple platforms, to become interactive consumers. As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, some celebrate the rise of on-line interactivity for its potential to democratize media culture, while Andrejevic has pointed out these new forms of interactive, audience labor—what he calls “the work of being watched”—allow for the increased surveillance of audiences by marketers and advertisers, thereby greatly expanding the exploitation potential of media industries, not to mention political operatives and elite. Media industries can easily offload their own work onto audiences who double as unpaid focus groups for marketers.

---

<sup>265</sup> See Dallas W. Smythe, “On the Audience Commodity and its Work,” in *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*, ed. Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas Kellner (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001): 253-279.

<sup>266</sup> See Shawn Shimpach, “Working Watching: The Creative and Cultural Labor of the Media Audience,” *Social Semiotics*, 15:3 (2005).

More specifically, Andrejevic suggests that media industries today rely on and seek to fashion a new type of consumer: “one prepared to devote time and energy to developing the skills necessary to participate in an increasingly interactive media economy:”

The list of such skills is growing longer and includes not only the ability to operate a computer and surf the Internet, but to master an array of devices including video remote control programmers, cell phones, Palm Pilots, and video games. This work is productive not just in the sense that it facilitates the consumption of an increasingly technologically sophisticated array of media products and services; it also becomes directly economically productive to the extent that it allows producers to offload work onto consumers. A privately controlled digital enclosure allows for the capture and repurposing of transactionally generated information and for the mobilization of the promise of interactivity to help generate information for marketers, content for producers, and added value for media products.<sup>267</sup>

In turn, Andrejevic suggests that the “interactive consumer is the market analogue of the responsible citizen as construed by the proponents of neoliberal post welfare state.”<sup>268</sup> Noting similarities between the ways in which neoliberal regimes ask citizens to become entrepreneurs of the self and media industries ask consumers to assume responsibility for and strategically manage their own consumption practices, Andrejevic sees a parallel between media consumption and prevalent modes of neoliberal citizenship. However, as I’m suggesting, it’s not only media corporations that rely on interactive audience labor: contemporary

---

<sup>267</sup> Andrejevic, *iSpy*, 144.

<sup>268</sup> Andrejevic, 144.

global governing hinges on similar forms of highly structured, carefully managed forms of interactivity in the context of global civil society. Here the interactive media user is not “market analogue” of the self-entrepreneurial neoliberal citizen but the direct embodiment of the socially entrepreneurial global media citizen.

As global citizen brands, cosmopolitan stars constitute media audiences not only as caring global citizens performing acts of charity and/or consumption, but also as well-educated, participating members of global civil society, more specifically, as social marketers. For example, for World Refugee Day 2011, UNHCR developed the “Do 1 Thing” campaign,<sup>269</sup> which was publicized primarily by a 30-second PSA featuring a somber Jolie pleading with viewers to understand that “1 family forced to flee is too many. 1 child growing up in a camp is too many. 1 refugee without hope is too many.” Visitors to the Do 1 Thing website are first invited to “Learn,” which includes, in addition to watching the Jolie PSA, linking to a YouTube page entitled “UNHCR’s Storytelling Through the Eyes of Refugees.”<sup>270</sup> Here users can watch short videos documenting the personal stories and struggles of refugees from across the world. “Learning” may also include testing one’s own knowledge about refugees through on-line quizzes,<sup>271</sup> which pose multiple choice questions to viewers (e.g.: “An Asylum

---

<sup>269</sup> “Do 1 Thing,” UNHCR, <http://www.unhcr.org/do1thing/index.php>

<sup>270</sup> “Storytelling Through the Eyes of Refugees,” UNHCR, <http://www.youtube.com/user/storytellingunhcr>

<sup>271</sup> “Simple Acts Quiz,” UNHCR, [http://www.refugeeweek.org.uk/simple\\_acts\\_quiz/player.html](http://www.refugeeweek.org.uk/simple_acts_quiz/player.html)

Seeker is: someone who travels half way around the world to claim benefits; an album by the Fugees; someone who applies for refugee status on the basis that they are fleeing war and persecution; someone who is an illegal immigrant; someone who claims to be a refugee but isn't; a foreign vegetable.” ) or playing “Against All Odds: the game which lets you experience what it’s like to be refugee.”<sup>272</sup> The “Learn” menu also includes resources for teachers looking to incorporate refugee issues and the interactive Do 1 Thing campaign into their curriculum. Here interactivity is meant to enhance public education efforts, as Jolie’s traditional version of sentimental education is linked up with newer interactive templates (watching videos, video games) that more directly engage citizens in the sentimental learning process.

Do 1 Thing also invites supporters to “Spread the Word” and to “Give,” which mostly involve putting their sentimental education and interactivity to work in highly specific ways for UNHCR. Most obviously, to “Give” involves making an on-line donation, either of money or time. As mentioned throughout this chapter, individual contributions are important sources of economic value and revenue for organizations like UNHCR, and, in recent years, private donations to international institutions and NGOs have been on a dramatic rise. However, supporters looking to make a more intensive contribution and “give” time are addressed as potential social entrepreneurs, that is, as enterprising agents of social

---

<sup>272</sup> “Against All Odds,” UNHCR <http://www.playagainstallodds.com/>

change: “Your role as a U.N. Volunteer is that of both facilitator and catalyst. UNV [United Nations Volunteers] encourages you to be creative and entrepreneurial in finding ways to develop capacity and to promote and foster volunteerism for peace and development -- both within and beyond the formal framework of your assignment.”<sup>273</sup> Citizens can volunteer on the ground in service areas, or, alternatively, on-line, as the U.N. has recently developed a virtual volunteer center which allows supports to donate services from the comfort of their own home or workspace. On-line volunteers are encouraged to “Unleash your talents to help address challenges faced by developing countries.”<sup>274</sup>

Connected to on-line forms of volunteering, “Spread the Word” involves distributing UNHCR materials through one’s own personal social networks. For example, supporters are enabled to share Jolie’s PSA on Facebook and to send e-cards to friends and family based on the Do 1 Thing campaign theme. On UNHCR’s primary website, these actions are referred to as contributing to a “digital dialogue.”

UNHCR has actively embraced online social networking sites and regards them as an important resource for connecting with our supporters and reaching a wider audience. Platforms such as

---

<sup>273</sup> “What it Means to be a UN Volunteer,” UN Volunteers, <http://www.unv.org/how-to-volunteer/what-it-means-to-be-a-unv-volunteer.html>

<sup>274</sup> “Change the World by Volunteering Over the Internet,” UN Volunteers, <http://www.onlinevolunteering.org/en/vol/index.html>

Twitter, Facebook, Causes, YouTube, MySpace and Flickr provide ideal mediums for people to share their stories, ask questions, and receive instant notices about UNHCR's latest campaigns and activities.<sup>275</sup>

Website visitors are urged to watch video, “befriend UNHCR” on social networking sites, view photos from the field, and sign up to receive live field reports and alerts. “Changing the world” on-line thus requires actions that are analogous to those described by Andrejevic in relation to interactive consumers, actions that, at the same time, double as brand management and expansion for UNHCR. Contribution to the “digital dialogue” adds cultural, social, and economic value to UNHCR’s virtual real estate, helping to extend the reach of the brand and thereby grow its base of citizen supporters. Practices of global citizenship thus now include engaging in individualized social marketing campaigns for the general welfare, and depending on one’s chosen “1 thing,” taking on the role of a social entrepreneur for the international community. In other words, audience interactivity doubles at once as brand labor (i.e., the production of economic, cultural, and social values) and significant international community-building work for global governing seeking to generate governing capital by mobilizing active, socially enterprising citizen-supporters through the media networks of global civil society.

---

<sup>275</sup> “Get Active On-Line,” UNHCR, <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646c443.html>

Jenkins proposes that the collaborative and interactive nature of contemporary popular culture has the potential to spill into political culture, allowing for increased participation in the democratic process via expanded conceptions and practices of citizenship. In the case of Jolie's deployment by UNHCR, it's not potential spillages of fandom into citizenship, but rather, a more direct convergence at work. Jolie's stardom provides a sort of affective charge and spiritual meaning that brings media audiences into contact with UNHCR in the digital environments of media/brand culture and global civil society, while, at the same time, her construction as a cosmopolitan star, sentimental educator, and global citizen brand are meant to engage her followers in acts of citizenship and digital caring that generate cultural, economic, and social value for global governing. Thinking about interactivity in the context of global governing thus complicates questions of exploitation and participation that have defined current debates over brand culture, audience interactivity, and practices of citizenship: what is involved in the digital caring acts mobilized by global citizen brands is indeed at once a form of labor (brand management and expansion, digital caring) and, as I suggest and argue in the next chapter, a political practice of global citizenship. At stake is not the exploitation of audiences at the hands of powerful corporations or the manipulation of audiences by the U.N., but rather the careful channeling and directing of practices of citizenship towards global civil society and global governing. UNHCR's deployment of Jolie as a global citizen brand is

geared at activating digital caring acts for the agency that provide crucial funds, requisite publicity, and ultimately governing capital in a crowded, competitive field of international outfits and causes at a time when need continues to grow and funds are hard to come by.

Certainly we might question the extent to which global citizen brands and the individualized digital caring acts they mobilize represent the further privatization of international aid-- perhaps acting as a mildly less vulgar instance than RED. And certainly we might consider how global citizen brands and individualized digital caring acts offer powerful evidence of the “marketization of the social” that has accompanied the rise of neoliberalism and brand culture. However, I sense the situation to be more complicated. While seemingly less substantive than more traditional forms of civic and political participation, these individualized digital caring acts-- what Andrejevic might call global citizen feedback loops-- are nonetheless highly significant when placed in the context of the contemporary political rationalities of global governmentality. The U.N.’s own governing capital is currently rooted in the emerging global civil society, in particular, the ways in which global civil society is thought to be able to constitute a new “global public opinion” and “majority will” regarding human rights, development, and democracy largely through media and communication. As will be argued in my concluding chapter, today’s idols of goodwill, as global citizen brands, are thus in fact deeply implicated in specific ways in current political

struggles concerning the horizons of sovereignty, world government, and global liberalism, as the values they produce and conducts they mobilize are readily rationalized within the frameworks of contemporary global governmentality in the name of present day One World visions.

## Chapter Five

### Conclusion: Cosmopolitan Stars and the Promotional Politics of Global Governing

#### *Back to Haiti*

At the 2010 Emmy Awards show, George Clooney was presented with the Bob Hope Humanitarian Award by his longtime friend and former *ER* co-star Julianna Margulies. Established by the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences in 2002, the “award goes to someone’s who humanitarian work brings credit to the television industry and whose actions’ have had a lasting impact.”<sup>276</sup> While Margulies’ tribute mentioned his on-going efforts to raise public consciousness around the crisis in Darfur, it was clearly Clooney’s heavy hand in television charity events like *America: A Tribute to Our Heroes*, *Tsunami Aid: A Concert of Hope*, and most recently, *Hope for Haiti Now* that earned the star the honor. In his acceptance speech, Clooney explained,

It’s important to remember how much good can get done because we live in, in such strange times where bad behavior sucks up all the attention in the press and the people who really need the spotlight, the Haitians, the Sudanese, the people in the Gulf Coast on the five-year anniversary, the people in Pakistan, they can’t get any....Now the truth is, look, when a disaster happens, everyone wants to help, everyone in this room wants to help, everyone at

---

<sup>276</sup> “The 62nd Primetime Emmy Awards,” NBC, August 29, 2010, <http://www.nbc.com/emmys/video/bob-hope-humanitarian-award-george-clooney/1246436/>

home wants to help. The hard part is 7 months later, five years later, when we're on to a new story, and, honestly we fail at that, most of the time, that's the facts. I fail at that. So here's hoping that some very bright person, right here in the room or at home watching can help find a way to keep the spotlight burning on these heartbreaking situations that continue to be heartbreaking long after the cameras go away. That'd be an impressive accomplishment.<sup>277</sup>

Clooney envisioned the significant role that media culture *could* and *should* play in rebuilding Haiti. Hoping to inspire “some bright person” to “find a way to the keep the spotlight burning,” Clooney’s argument was strikingly similar to the one made by Sean Penn just a month earlier in his interview with Amy Goodman on *Democracy Now*: “I think that the—you know, your being here, and any time there’s media and responsible media here, is virtually more important than any aid organization’s presence at all. With that alone, people in the United States would get to know the Haitian people and send the money right into their hands. They’d adopt neighborhoods. They’d adopt schools.”<sup>278</sup> As mentioned in the Prologue, Penn, a longtime political activist, morphed himself into an international aid worker, founding his own relief organization and ultimately assuming responsibility for the lives and well-being of thousands of displaced Haitians.

---

<sup>277</sup> “Emmys”

<sup>278</sup> “Sean Penn on Haiti Six Months After the Earthquake, Recovery Efforts, and Why He Decided to Manage a Tent Camp of 55,000 Displaced Persons,” *Democracy Now!*, July 13, 2010, accessed July 20, 2010, [http://www.democracynow.org/2010/7/13/sean\\_penn\\_on\\_haiti\\_six\\_months](http://www.democracynow.org/2010/7/13/sean_penn_on_haiti_six_months)

Animating both of these stars' visions are broader discourses of social responsibility and global citizenship that cast U.S. citizens as active members of an international community with obligations and desires to care for less fortunate populations--- discourses that I have shown to be rooted not simply in colonialism or charity, but rather, and, more importantly, in post World War II conceptions of internationalism and the celebrity-mediated cultural life of global governing. Within these visions, the media has a crucial role: enabling U.S. citizens to "get to know" problems facing their less fortunate counterparts. The problem is not Western citizens, who are assumed to care and want to help, but rather a commercial media culture that focuses on the wrong stories, chasing after silly scandals. As Hepburn explained to *The Christian Science Monitor*, "I've also discovered once they know, they give, they help. It's not knowing that holds them up."<sup>279</sup> Ironically, stardom, long blamed for the "tabloidization of news," has become a seductive "lure," an imperfect though strategic resource for the international community to command attention from an otherwise occupied and hard-to-move commercial media culture.

While idols of goodwill, media culture, and caring audiences have long played a crucial role in global governing, especially in Western contexts and particularly in moments of natural disaster, the idea of "some bright person"

---

<sup>279</sup> Robert Press, "A Visit of Compassion to Somalia," *The Christian Science Monitor*, October 5, 1992.

finding a (better) way “to keep the spotlight burning” is specific to our present times. In fact, the agency Artists for Peace and Justice, mentioned previously and founded by Hollywood elite, is devoted solely to media-based international advocacy and fundraising, particularly to the media promotion of Father Rick Frechette’s community work in Haiti. The group works explicitly to leverage the cultural powers associated with celebrity culture and Hollywood stardom to direct and sustain public attention on Haiti. For example, while the organization had already established a presence in Port-au-Prince before the earthquake, in the wake of the disaster, the group spearheaded a slick multimedia campaign that featured short and simple appeals/public service announcements from celebrity supporters like Penelope Cruz, Chris Ludacris Bridges, and Daniel Craig designed to elicit support for the group’s building of the first free secondary school in the slums of Port-au-Prince.

While, historically, the UN had to be careful to distinguish between its public education and fundraising efforts, in the context of an interactive, highly mediated global civil society, these two functions are increasingly intertwined. Media-based advocacy/fundraising campaigns like Artists for Peace and Justice are an indispensable component of contemporary global governing and its material work serving the general welfare, as today a primary agent in carrying out international caring work for poorer populations is global civil society itself. As detailed in the last chapter, cosmopolitan stars-- and the interactive media/

brand culture in which they circulate and accrue meanings and values-- suture media audiences to global civil society. As global citizen brands, idols of goodwill generate economic, social, and cultural value for particular projects and agencies and, at the same time, constitute the field of global governing as a relevant site for practices of global media citizenship. Chapter Two theorized the generalization of star-led sentimental education in recent years, showing how this discourse now enlivens a host of communication practices associated with the international community. Star-studded media advocacy campaigns like Artists for Peace and Justice, ONE, and the Listen Campaign proliferate, in hopes of connecting media audiences materially and emotionally to the discreet projects of global civil society and the broader One World rationalities that underwrite contemporary global governing.

This chapter situates these recent media developments-- global citizen brands and media-based advocacy-- within broader governing and political contexts. More specifically, I show how the proliferation of cosmopolitan stardom over the past two decades is authorized by new political rationalities of global governing rooted in the promise of engendering a new "majority will" for liberal world government through the media networks of global civil society. As a result, contemporary global governing runs on media promotion, thus affording expansive and important roles to global citizen brands and global media citizens alike. Cosmopolitan stars like Jolie, Clooney, and Bono and the media audiences

they mobilize as caring global citizens are thus highly significant players in what I describe as the promotional politics of contemporary global governing.

### *Cosmopolitan Stars and Global Governance*

At the same time that Hepburn was traveling the world to shine a light on the plight of suffering children, the international monetary institutions that manage world markets were being highjacked by new governing rationalities rooted in neo-classical theories of economic development forwarded by the disciples of Frederick Hayek. As explained in the introduction, the rise of global neoliberalism in the 1980s constituted a hegemonic project that sought not only to transform cultures of domestic governing but also to remake the global order by replacing the Keynesian-inspired “embedded liberal compromise” of Breton Woods with the radical neoliberal policies of the Washington Consensus, which promised freedom through unfettered economic growth.<sup>280</sup> The IMF and World Bank adopted new development policies that bound foreign aid to austere economic reforms geared to “shock” developing nations into compliance. Development discourse, which had long been rooted in liberal theories of modernization, was refashioned, brought into alignment with neoliberal doctrine. Much needed and counted on aid become conditioned on immediate economic restructuring, which

---

<sup>280</sup> David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005):11.

included, among other things, the privatization of the public sector, rollbacks on government spending and tax/tariff collection, and the devaluation of local currencies. The Washington consensus stressed the state as a primary barrier to economic growth and free markets as the only viable, long-term solution to social ills. In other words, developing countries did not need more foreign aid as much as foreign corporate investment.

The resultant economic, political, and social crises that followed these experiments in economic restructuring (a.k.a. structural adjustment) precipitated enormous public outcry. Mass protests, the birth of a transnational anti-globalization movement, and dissent from within the international governing community itself forced a re-conceptualization of the global neoliberal regime. Today the excesses of unfettered market expansion are imagined to be tempered by principles like corporate social responsibility and the return of the regulatory, liberal state as a key partner in creating economic growth. In concert, poverty eradication through development aid has also returned as an important political rationality of international regimes.<sup>281</sup>

At the same time, the U.N. was updating its own approaches to global governing for the post-Cold War era, crafting an ambitious agenda of global democratization through global development rooted in the twin concepts of good

---

<sup>281</sup> See Jacqueline Best, "Why the Economy is Often the Exception to Politics as Usual," *Theory, Culture, & Society*, 24:4 (2007): 87-109.

governance and global governance. On the one hand, the U.N. has increasingly come to understand its work promoting the general welfare in terms of “good governance.” During his tenure as Secretary General, Kofi Annan championed the notion of good governance as a new sort of liberal compromise, involving states, civil societies, and market forces working together to promote human development in poor countries. According to Annan, “Good governance is effective, participatory, transparent, accountable and equitable and promotes the rule of law. Governance is led by the State, but transcends it by collaborating with the private sector and civil society. All three domains are critical for sustaining human development.”<sup>282</sup> Zanotti explains the emergence of good governance in terms of a governmentalization of the international regime:

In the post-Cold War era, governmentality, which previously pertained to domestic government, emerges as a modality of the international regime promoted by the United Nations and other international organizations... Good governance aims at universalizing governmentality both as a modality of state rule and as a modality of international ‘conduct of conduct.’<sup>283</sup>

In other words, good governance eschews the paternalistic state dismantled by neoliberalism in favor of a liberal one capable of governing at a distance through civil society.

---

<sup>282</sup> Laura Zanotti, “Governmentalizing the Post-Cold War International Regime: The UN Debate on Democratization and Good Governance,” *Alternatives*, 30 (2005): 471-472.

<sup>283</sup> Zanotti, “Governmentalizing,” 466.

On the other hand, the UN's embrace of good governance discourses was circumscribed by new conceptions of global governance. Throughout the nineties, at the same time that the U.N. was defining its global democratization and development efforts in terms of good governance, it was also creating the new political rationalities of world government. As Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall explain,

The vocabulary of "global governance" appeared at the very same moment that the Cold War receded from view. The Cold War was not only a description of a bipolar threat system; it also represented a mode of organizing the analysis and practices of international politics. With the end of the Cold War, the issue became what would and should take its place. For many, global governance represented a way of organizing international politics in a more inclusive and consensual manner...

The very language of global governance conjures up the possibility and desirability of effecting progressive political change in global life through the establishment of a normative consensus—a collective purpose—usually around fundamental liberal values. The language of interests is often married to the language of values of the "international community," values such as democracy, human rights, the rule of law, and markets.<sup>284</sup>

While good governance is the primary governing rationality for managing developing states and their populations, global governance emerges as the primary governing rationality for regulating the international system of states. Global

---

<sup>284</sup> Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, eds. "Power in Global Governance," in *Power in Global Governance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005): 5-6.

governance's liberalism is political in orientation, centered on engendering new political norms and collective values for the entire international community.

The culmination of the U.N.'s efforts to chart a new paradigm of global governance is the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Adopted by U.N. and the World Bank in 2000, the MDGs spell out a new global contract between developed and developing nations: developed nations pledge increased aid payments to poor countries to support health, education, economic growth, and community development, while poor countries pledge to foster good governance through cracking down on corruption and waste, promoting transparency and accountability, and honoring human rights. In this new liberal compromise, the U.N. provides a loose framework of aims (poverty elimination, human development) and guidelines (good governance) for development programs and practices, while the majority of work associated with achieving global development is left to community-based groups, NGOs, charities, philanthropic foundations, and other members of the international community working in partnership with corporations and private citizens in/as global civil society. Citing the U.N. Commission on Global Governance, Hans-Martin Jaeger explains: “‘global governance’ now had to be understood not only in terms of interstate cooperation, but ‘as also involving NGOs, citizens’ movements, multinational corporations’ and ‘global mass media.’ Global governance implied ‘a varied cast of actors’ with a variety of approaches: ‘people acting together in formal and

informal ways...as global civil society.”<sup>285</sup> The goal was to foster an active and empowered global civil society that would “mobilize ‘world opinion’ on a host of issues including the environment, development, human rights, population growth, and the status of women” and “crystallize a ‘majority will’ for ‘new norms, new policies, and new modalities of action.’”<sup>286</sup>

This reinvention of global governing by the U.N. not only represents shifts in approaches to development and aid, but also registers the extent to which the U.N.’s approach to promoting the general welfare in the post-Cold War era hinges on a global civil society facilitated and constituted largely by global mass media. For example, central to the U.N.’s new vision of global governance is a dynamic and highly responsive media alert system made possible at once by the proliferation and dispersion of transnational NGOs that has happened in the post-Cold War era and new technologies which allow for swift and mobile flows of information through multi-platform media channels across the variegated domains of global civil society. Within the institutional discourses of the U.N., global mass media is a vague and amorphous concept, intimately bound up with the idea of global public opinion. A 2004 report entitled “We the peoples: civil society, the United Nations and global governance” (commissioned to make recommendations

---

<sup>285</sup> Hans-Martin Jaeger, “Global Civil Society and the Political Depoliticization of Global Governance,” *International Political Sociology*, 1(2007): 263.

<sup>286</sup> Jaeger, “Global Civil Society,” 263.

to enhance the UN-civil society relations) notes “the rising power of global public opinion.”

Civil society organizations, through their web sites and other channels, are informing citizens about policy choices. Global networks of activists, parliamentarians, journalists, social movement leaders and others are also influencing policy debates, especially on international issues. All this is reinforced by the impact of the mass media on current affairs — and by the diverse sources that most people can turn to for information. And all this is creating a new phenomenon — global public opinion — that is shaping the political agenda and generating a cosmopolitan set of norms and citizen demands that transcend national boundaries. Civil society and citizen action have contributed to the opening up of a global public space for debate. In this sense, civil society is as much part of today’s global governance as are Governments.<sup>287</sup>

Surfacing the albeit vague, yet central role of global mass media within emerging conceptions of global civil society and global governance brings the increasing deployment of cosmopolitan stardom and sentimental education by international institutions into clearer focus. Today’s idols of goodwill are, more often than not, one way or another, articulated to the new and sprawling agenda of global development spelled out in the MDGs. At the same time that the U.N. was crafting the parameters of a new global democracy for the post-Cold War era anchored by the concepts of good and global governance and enlivened by sophisticated media networks and an active global civil society, it was also

---

<sup>287</sup> “We the peoples: civil society, the United Nations, and global governance,” Report of the Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations-Civil Society Relations,” United Nations General Assembly, June 11, 2004, 15.

reaching out to stars, celebrities and other high-profile VIPs. Today idols of goodwill proliferate. Stars clamor for U.N. appointments and actively seek out relationships with global development causes, while NGOs, UN agencies, and charitable organizations rely increasingly on the publicity and funds generated by caring stars in global civil society.

Since Hepburn's death in 1993, the number of idols of goodwill associated with the UN has ballooned to over 400. Andrew Cooper explains that the one of the distinguishing features of Kofi Annan's tenure as secretary general was his "desire to galvanize celebrities...to become supporters of the U.N." <sup>288</sup> He initiated "Celebrity Advocacy for the New Millennium" designed to mobilize celebrity support for the U.N.'s MDGs. Mark Alleyne reports Annan's keen interest in the cultural powers of celebrity and the high significance he placed on publicity/public relations earned him the title of the "American secretary-general." <sup>289</sup> According to Alleyne,

Annan's penchant for favoring U.S. and European celebrities to be his propagandists can be viewed not only as a means of currying favor in the richest, most powerful parts of the world but also as a strategy of going to the parts of the world where it is easiest to find those who buy into the notion of universality. These countries made universality part of the United Nations' mission from its inception. <sup>290</sup>

---

<sup>288</sup> Andrew Cooper, *Celebrity Diplomacy* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2008): 28.

<sup>289</sup> Mark Alleyne, "The United Nations' Celebrity Diplomacy," *SAIS Review*, xxv:1 (2005):177

<sup>290</sup> Alleyne, "Celebrity Diplomacy," 182

However, as I have tried to suggest throughout this study, the U.N.'s reliance on star power is a more complicated venture than propaganda and is tied to the organization's attempt to establish a cultural, material base for global governing in powerful Western contexts through acting at a distance on the conducts and dispositions of media audiences. The U.N.'s recent, hard turn to celebrities and publicity under Annan should also be contextualized within the exigencies and aims of global governmentality, which today are increasingly intertwined with media/brand culture, the media networks of global civil society, and the promotional logics by which they operate.

### *The Promotional Character of Contemporary Global Governing*

As suggested by the discourses of global governance, the U.N. understands global mass media not in terms of the multinational character of media firms, but rather in terms of new media technologies alleged to enable a global public sphere, where new cosmopolitan opinions and norms can be cultivated. As Graham Knight has recently argued, this global public sphere, in practice, is a promotional one, as governments, corporations, and, in turn, activists vie— of course, unevenly— for attention and relevance. “The promotional public sphere becomes used more and more for strategic reasons as participants focus their energies on promoting their ideas and opinions, and on establishing their own topics, issues,

and discursive frames as the most pressing, urgent, and important.”<sup>291</sup> It’s important to see that within this discourse of global governance, global mass media then is not simply as an ideological apparatus for manufacturing consent but also as the conduit of institutional legitimation—the medium through which global governance materializes, gains ground, and garners authority-- in other words, produces governing capital. Put differently, within the logics and rationalities of contemporary global governing, media promotion, especially in wealthier Western contexts, becomes increasingly central to the aim of promoting the general welfare. Specific cultural and media technologies of global governing (a.k.a., global citizen brands, media-based advocacy) are put to work in global civil society in the service of creating a “new majority will” registered most powerfully by a shifting “global public opinion.”

What I’m calling the promotional character of contemporary global governing takes inspiration from Knight’s theory of a promotional public sphere, as clearly this concept is germane to the U.N.’s own understandings of media and its key role in global governance. Knight’s work however recalls Andrew Wernick’s influential account of promotional culture, where logics and forms originally pioneered by advertising have come to constitute a more general regime of communication and signification. Wernick’s thesis is “that the range of cultural

---

<sup>291</sup> Graham Knight, “Activism, Branding, and the Promotional Public Sphere,” in *Blowing Up the Brand: Critical Perspectives on Promotional Culture* (New York: Peter Lang, 2010): 180.

phenomena which, at least as one of their functions, serve to communicate a promotional message has become, today, virtually co-extensive with our produced symbolic world.”<sup>292</sup> In a promotional culture, signs and communicative messages are distinguished less by what they say and more by how they persuade and act; selling animates political and cultural discourses alike. Alison Hearn argues that, “There can be doubt that promotionalism is now a dominant cultural condition. Our clothes, our cars, our homes-- even our own senses of self-- are intricately bound up with the logic and meanings of corporate brands and promotional messages.”<sup>293</sup> My conceptualization of the promotional character of global governing is a relatively modest proposal, however, meant to capture global governing’s reliance on global mass media and global public opinion and, more specifically, its reliance on branding and star-studded media advocacy/sentimental education campaigns for funding, as well as cultural and political relevance, especially in Western contexts.

The promotional character of contemporary global governing is perhaps most blatant in commercial, aid initiatives like RED, as well as in the less risky, consumer-oriented practices of celebrity giving discussed in the first chapter, where stars donate an item for charity auction, design lifestyle products like

---

<sup>292</sup> Andrew Wernick, *Promotional Culture: Advertising, Ideology, and Symbolic Expression* (London: Sage, 1991): 182.

<sup>293</sup> Alison Hearn, “Hoaxing the Real: On the Metanarrative of Reality Television,” in *Reality TV: Remaking Television Culture*, 2nd Edition, eds. Susan Murray and Laurie Ouellette (New York: New York University Press, 2009): 166.

clothing or jewelry whose sale will benefit a social cause, or participate in cause-related marketing campaigns. For example, Jolie partnered with former Asprey designer Robert Procop to produce her own line of jewelry-- including “statement stones”-- to benefit one of her latest endeavors with UNHCR, The Education Partnership for Children of Conflict.<sup>294</sup> Over the past five years, in honor of World Water Week, UNICEF’s efforts to deliver clean water to children and families in needy areas has been supported by The Tap Project, the brainchild of a boutique Madison Avenue ad agency which solicits donations for UNICEF from restaurant patrons when they order tap water. While The Tap Project has always deployed the services of a celebrity, this year the effort featured Celebrity Tap, as stars like Rhianna and Selena Gomez donated tap water from their own homes. The water, bottled in a fancy container and featuring an image of the star, was given away as a fundraising prize. UNHCR Goodwill Ambassador Giorgio Armani was also involved, promising to donate a dollar to UNICEF for purchases of his new fragrances, as well as for “Likes” they received on Facebook.<sup>295</sup> These fundraising stunts and the practices of consumer citizenship they invite are indicative not only of how branding and marketing have come to play an

---

<sup>294</sup> Tim Saunders, “Brad and Angelina Design Jewelry for Children of Conflict,” Look to the Stars, <http://www.looktothestars.org/news/3410-brad-and-angelina-design-jewelry-for-children-of-conflict>

<sup>295</sup> Stuart Elliot, “Celebrities Bottle Water for UNICEF Sweepstakes,” *New York Times Media Decoder*, March 11, 2011, accessed August 3, 2011, <http://mediadecoder.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/03/11/celebrities-bottle-water-for-UNICEF-sweepstakes/>

increasingly important role in the political economy of global governing, but also of how businesses are valuable partners and thus often bend the communication and education efforts of global governing, as well as practices of global citizenship, towards the commercial private sector.

While these last examples are keenly illustrative of the the promotional character of contemporary global governing, it is in fact the above mentioned global development discourses that are actually more indicative of how promotion figures more generally and significantly in global governance. In recent decades, the U.N. has moved away from traditional development discourses rooted in modernization theory and premised on the imposition of Western scientific and technical expertise and towards a Communication for Development approach grounded in strategic communication practices. As the U.N. report “Harnessing Communication to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals” explains,

In sharp contrast to the linear, hierarchical approach espoused by the modernization and dependency theorists, communication for development thus became understood as a two-way process, in which communities could participate as key agents in setting normative development goals and standards. Added to this, the notion of participation was deepened by the emphasis on community access. As a result, interpersonal approaches are now recognized alongside mass media communication as key to achieving impact.<sup>296</sup>

---

<sup>296</sup> “Harnessing Communication to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals: Towards a UN System Approach,” United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and United Nations Development Programme, Prepared for the 10th Inter-Agency Roundtable on Communication for Development (2007): 17.

Communication for Development promises empowerment, participation, and self-determination to populations who are the target of U.N.-related development programs, indicating Zanotti's point about the governmentalization of the international regime signaled by good governance. At the same time, however, Communication for Development is global in its scope, aimed at changing the social norms and political climates internationally through mass media communication. As the "Harnessing Communication" report elaborates, Communication for Development includes three primary approaches:

One is behaviour change communication (BCC), which aims to empower individuals and enable communities to make informed choices as to their well-being, and to act on the basis of those choices. A second approach is communication for social change (CFSC), predicated on collective community change and long-term social change, and based on participatory, voice-amplifying strategies that emphasize dialogue and process. A third approach is advocacy communication, involving organized efforts, including by coalitions and networks, to influence the political climate, policy and programming decisions, public perceptions of social norms, funding decisions and community support and empowerment, on specific themes, such as HIV/AIDS.<sup>297</sup>

Hence, Communication for Development at once signals the incorporation of liberal techniques of governing through freedom and civil society into the apparatus of global social security *and* the development of a robust and extensive public educational advocacy apparatus that aims to win support-- both political and economic-- for global governing through strategic communication and media

---

<sup>297</sup> "Harnessing Communication," 17.

promotion in global civil society. As a result, development becomes a global, liberal project, relying increasingly more on a host of new players, from billionaires to celebrities to ordinary citizens, and less on the traditional aid agencies tied to wealthier Western states. What's more, this global, liberal project is to be realized and materialized through media promotion.

In *Global Development 2.0* Lael Brainard and Vinca LaFleur chart the contours of this U.N. led development apparatus running on promotion, identifying five new groups active in the development field: megaphilanthropists who bring “an eye for breakthrough innovation, a keen drive toward efficiency, and marketing savvy” to the table; the corporate sector, whose corporate social responsibility endeavors help to “provide key services and products to the poor”; new bilateral donors such as China and Chile; celebrities, defined as “high profile individuals—from rock stars to actors, preachers, and former presidents—who are maximizing the power of their public appeal to champion global poverty awareness and activism”; and, finally, the global public itself, which is “fueled by celebrity appeals and the “voice” power of Internet communities.”<sup>298</sup> While megaphilanthropists and socially-responsible corporations provide an infrastructure for social entrepreneurialism, stars, as global citizen brands, are

---

<sup>298</sup> Lael Brainard and Vinca LaFleur, “Making Poverty History? How Activists, Philanthropists, and the Public are Changing Global Development,” in *Global Development 2.0: Can Philanthropists, the Public and the Poor Make Poverty History?* (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2008).

imagined to generate a “development buzz” for the “development biz” thanks to their affective ties to the global public. In turn, the global public lends its “voice” to specific campaigns and initiatives, helping to win support among citizens for the “new majority will” by engaging in a variety of digital caring acts.

Indeed, as my research has shown, global governing at a distance, especially in wealthier, Western contexts, has long been a promotional venture, as caring stars have been deployed as cultural technologies to leap governments and to provide a cultural, material base for global governing by acting on the conducts and dispositions of media audiences. However, in contemporary global governing, media promotion is more than a cultural technology, it is a broader governing rationality. Global development happens in global civil society, more specifically, in a highly mediated, competitive transnational social field whose communication practices are strategic, that is, designed both to encourage particular behaviors and dispositions and to sell particular social programs and approaches. For the agencies of global governmentality, promotion is the primary means of establishing a media profile and hence relevance within global civil society. It is also the form media communication takes, as slick, savvy, often star-studded advocacy campaigns at once educate and advertise. Promotion is about fundraising, meaning-making, and ultimately the generation of governing capital for particular organizations and specific causes, but also, more generally, for

global governance *writ large*. In global governance, promotion rationalizes and authorizes.

However, despite the prominence of fundraising stunts like Celebrity Tap or problematic business-aid ventures like RED, it is crucial to see that the promotional character of contemporary global governing and the ways in which it seeks to mobilize citizens in realms of both media and consumer culture is not inherently at odds with serious stuff of politics, policy, and meaningful citizenship. Rather, as evidenced by new discourses of global governance, promotion *is* politics, and is, in fact, implicated in on-going struggles over sovereignty, world government, and the horizons of global liberalism. While Jolie continues to figure as the most high-profile idols of goodwill, especially in U.S. culture, and consumer/commercial-oriented ventures like RED continue to inspire the most attention critical scholars, it is actually Bono's international efforts apart from RED-- including the lobbying of U.S. senators like Jesse Helms, the media advocacy campaign ONE (discussed in Chapter Two), and the global rock concert Live 8 (discussed below)-- that best illustrate the promotional politics of contemporary global governing and cosmopolitan stardom.

*Bono and the Liberal Arts of Promotional Politics*

Bono's willingness to fraternize and be photographed with powerful politicians like George W. Bush in the name of combating global poverty and AIDS has maddened his closest peers, and Bono regularly butts heads with bandmates Larry Mullen and The Edge. Mullen told music magazine *Q*: "My biggest problem really is sometimes the company that he keeps. And I struggle with that. Particularly the political people, less the financial people. Particularly Tony Blair – I mean, I think Tony Blair's a war criminal. And I think he should be tried as a war criminal. And then I see Bono and him as pals, and I'm going: 'I don't like that'."<sup>299</sup> Bono counters such critiques by focusing on what he perceives to be the moral imperatives and broader stakes associated with global poverty. Recounting a debate with The Edge, Bono explains,

Edge was pleading with me not to hang out with the conservatives. He said, 'You're not going to have a picture with George Bush?' I said I'd have lunch with Satan if there was so much at stake. I have friends who won't speak to me because of Helms. But it's very important not to play politics with this. Millions of lives are being lost for the stupidest of reasons: money. And not even very much money. So let's not play, Who are the good guys and who are the bad guys? Let's rely on the moral force of our arguments.<sup>300</sup>

Although Bono insists he's not playing politics, what he really means is that he's not playing national politics: he *is* however playing world politics by using his

---

<sup>299</sup> "Mullen Takes a Swipe at Bono's Friendship with Blair," *Q*, December 28, 2008, [http://news.qthemusic.com/2008/12/mullen\\_takes\\_a\\_swipe\\_at\\_bonos.html](http://news.qthemusic.com/2008/12/mullen_takes_a_swipe_at_bonos.html)

<sup>300</sup> Madeleine Bunting and Oliver Burkeman, "Pro Bono," *The Guardian*, March 18, 2003, accessed August 1, 2011, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/mar/18/usa.debtrelief>

cultural sway and political capital to win U.S. government support (and thus build governing capital) for the cosmopolitan, One World agendas of global governance.

It's important to see that this wooing of Washington (as well as other power centers) was also the aim of Bono's most ambitious and high-profile lobbying effort, the 2005 transnational, mega rock concert Live 8, designed to pressure leaders of G8 countries to support the U.N.'s MDGs. Live 8 was conceived as a follow up to the charity rock concert Live Aid, which, twenty years earlier, had brought rock stars together to raise funds for the famine victims in Ethiopia. Live 8, however, was both bigger and slicker: it included 9 venues total: 8 concerts staged near simultaneously on July 2, 2005 in London, Paris, Rome, Berlin, Moscow, Chiba (Japan), Johannesburg, Barrie (Ontario), and Philadelphia, with a grand finale in Edinburgh on July 6<sup>th</sup> at the conclusion of the G8. As Paul Valley writes in his introduction to the Live 8 DVD set: "This time 3 billion people watched— almost half the earth's population. But it was not about raising money; it was about raising ideas, consciousness, awareness. Africa did not need mere charity; ultimately it needed justice. And the gigantic audience became the most massive political lobby for change in human history."<sup>301</sup>

---

<sup>301</sup> Paul Valley, *Live 8: The Long Walk to Justice*, DVD booklet, in Live 8, producer Jill Sinclair (USA: EMI, 2005), DVD.

Billed as a “Declaration of Interdependence” on the eve of Independence Day in the U.S., Live 8 was a carefully-staged, well-branded campaign rally with a central theme: support the U.N.’s global development agenda and help end extreme poverty in Africa. As Philadelphia emcee and crossover star extraordinaire Will Smith explained, “The reason millions of you have tuned in is that every 3 seconds in one of the poorest countries in the world a child dies as result of extreme poverty. Dies of hunger, or malaria or TB. Dies for lack of drugs that we here in Philly, and you in Berlin, and you in Moscow, can buy at a pharmacy. Every three seconds. [Snap.] Dead.”<sup>302</sup> Sporting a bright red Nelson Mandela T-shirt, Smith introduced audiences strewn across the developed/ democratic world to each other via satellite, and then presented a glitzy, interactive piece of sentimental education featuring glamorous stars like Penelope Cruz, Kate Moss, Brad Pitt, Hugh Grant, Sean Combs, Justin Timberlake, and David Beckham staring at the camera and snapping quietly against a white background to mark the passing of a child from extreme poverty. Enjoining audiences to snap together in a gesture of solidarity and protest to the needless, mundane tragedy of 30,000 children dying daily, Smith set the tone for the day’s event.

Explicitly eschewing the logics and practices of charity (the event was subtitled “The Long Walk to Justice”), Live 8 addressed its international

---

<sup>302</sup> Will Smith, “9 Concerts,” *Live 8*, DVD.

audiences as politicized global media citizens with specific grievances about global poverty, and elevated industrialized states as the primary power brokers, the locus of responsibility for remedying these ills. Live 8 thus put a particular global politics front and center, educating audiences about existing global inequalities and mobilizing them to demand recourse in the form development aid for Africa. Audiences were asked to register their caring and grievance not through charity but through media promotion, that is, through joining the transnational media-advocacy campaign that aims to end extreme poverty by 2015.

Not surprisingly, given the spectacular, star-studded, promotional nature of the event, Live 8 came under fire, especially from the left. Most notably, Naomi Klein, staunch critic of global neoliberalism and author of *No Logo* and *The Shock Doctrine*, was troubled by what she thought to be Bono's watered-down approach to global social change and protest. To CNN, Klein explained:

The Bono-ization of protest particularly in the UK has reduced discussion to a much safer terrain. It was the stadium rock model of protest -- there's celebrities and there's spectators waving their bracelets. It's less dangerous and less powerful... They are saying we don't even need government anymore, it's the replacement of nation states with corporate rule -- this Billionaires Club, including Bill Clinton, that gets together to give a little something back... The story of globalization is the story of inequality. What's been lost in the Bono-ization is ability to change these power structures.<sup>303</sup>

---

<sup>303</sup> Bridget Delany, "The Bono-ization of Activism," *CNN World Weekly*, October 12, 2007, <http://edition.cnn.com/2007/WORLD/europe/10/12/ww.klein/index.html>

Like Bono's bandmates, Klein was also upset by Bono's proximity to power, except here it's Bono's close work with the political economic elite that is disconcerting.

Of course, the right has its own problems with Bono, as the rock star cum diplomat is regularly invoked by high-profile opponents to development aid like William Easterly<sup>304</sup> and Dambisa Moyo.<sup>305</sup> Proponents of neoliberal approaches to economic growth, these critics often use Bono's celebrity/star status to delegitimize the U.N.'s global development agenda represented today by the MDGs. For example, Easterly editorializes in the *Los Angeles Times*:

Why do aid organizations and their celebrity backers want to make African successes look like failures? One can only speculate, but it certainly helps aid agencies get more publicity and more money if problems seem greater than they are. As for the stars—well, could Africa be saving celebrity careers more than celebrities are saving Africa? In truth, Africans are and will be escaping poverty the same way everybody else did: through the efforts of resourceful entrepreneurs, democratic reformers and ordinary citizens at home, not through the PR extravaganzas of ill-informed outsiders.<sup>306</sup>

---

<sup>304</sup> William Easterly, *The White Man's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good*, (New York: Penguin Books, 2006).

<sup>305</sup> Dambisa Moyo, *Dead Aid: Why Aid Is Not Working and How There is a Better Way for Africa*, (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2009).

<sup>306</sup> William Easterly, "What Bono Doesn't Say About Africa; Celebrities like to portray it as a basket case, but they ignore very real progress," *Los Angeles Times*, July 6, 2007, A23.

In his accounts of celebrity diplomacy, Easterly often suggests that cosmopolitan stars like Bono present Africa as a spectacular and hopeless basket-case in order to enhance their own image as well as that of the aid community, both of whom are obsessed with saving Africa through social planning and engineering.

However, as I have shown, star-led sentimental education, especially in today's development context marked by discourses of Communication for Development, stresses individual and community empowerment, cooperation in global civil society, practical, solution-oriented approaches, social entrepreneurialism, and business innovation.

Connecting both sides-- that is, Klein's and Easterly's-- is a critique of cosmopolitan stars and the promotional politics in which they participate; yet while Klein's view dismisses Live 8's politics as safe and unsubstantial, Easterly's critique uses the promotional character, embodied by Bono, to shrewdly and simultaneously undermine the U.N's global agenda and champion global neoliberalism. The promotional politics of Live 8 may not offer a dangerous or radical threat to the status quo, especially to political economic elite who often are (and have long been) happy to participate in global health and welfare initiatives in the underdeveloped/developing world; yet, they do represent a more modest (and historically consistent) attempt to bring governing capital to global governance through mobilizing individual acts of citizenship in the realm of media culture.

I want to suggest that the promotional politics of Live 8 specifically-- and of cosmopolitan stardom more generally-- are best understood as germane to contemporary global governmentality, especially to the revitalization of One World visions in recent decades as the Cold War closed and global neoliberalism devastated populations. As Kathy Nash argues, Live 8 and other media advocacy efforts associated with the MDGs should be seen in relationship to what David Held calls the “cosmopolitanizing state,” where, ideally, state sovereignty is shared in international institutions and global governance, and state legitimacy hinges on conforming to international agreements and norms. Nash explains that “networks of the cosmopolitanizing state ‘stretch’ traditional modern state institutions in space, offering the potential for moving the concerns of global politics away from traditional struggles over sovereignty, readiness for war and wealth-producing territory towards issues of mutual concern: peace, the world economy, environmental sustainability, human rights.”<sup>307</sup> Nash notes “a *real paradox*,” “real because it is not just a paradox in thought, but in practices themselves: citizens using the structures and democratic procedures of their (cosmopolitanizing) state must feel and act as *global citizens*.”<sup>308</sup> Powerful, wealthy, war-reliant countries like the U.S. obviously have the most to lose in

---

<sup>307</sup> Kathy Nash, “Global Citizenship as Show Business: the Cultural Politics of Make Poverty History,” *Media, Culture & Society*, 30:2 (2008): 169.

<sup>308</sup> Nash, “Global Citizenship,” 170.

such a scenario, while the U.N.'s global governing agendas take on increased significance and weight. Star-studded media-advocacy campaigns like Live 8 and ONE-- targeted at the most powerful Western states and designed to elicit acts of global media citizenship from audiences (and hence build the "new majority will" by shifting "global public opinion"-- and Bono's lobbying efforts-- targeted at right-wing, anti-integrationist senators like Helms and designed to win support for global governance-- can all be seen as an updated, more aggressive version of global governing's soft power, that is, as an explicitly political attempt to act on the dispositions and conducts of nation-states and their citizens, bending them towards cosmopolitan ideals of the U.N. and One World rationalities that animate emerging paradigms of global liberalism.

Cosmopolitan stars are thus implicitly and sometimes explicitly (as in the case of Live 8 and lobbying efforts) bound up in broader political struggles over sovereignty, the parameters of world government, and the horizons of global liberalism; the results and implications of these struggles promise to play out unevenly for nations and their populations, though not necessarily in easily predictable ways . Put differently, in present day media and political contexts, promotion and the cultural technology of star-led sentimental education not only extend a cultural base to global governing in Western contexts by working on the conducts and dispositions of citizens; at the same time, they help to realize and materialize new cosmopolitan political rationalities of One World order, at once

leaping *and* transforming powerful national governments, in hopes of bringing them into alignment with emerging cosmopolitan norms and governing rationalities.

### *One World Under the Stars*

At the heart of contemporary One World visions and concepts of global citizenship, at least as far as wealthier Western citizens (and states) are concerned, is a simple concept: giving. In fact, today's most prominent articulators and circulators of One World ideals-- besides from the idols of goodwill-- are not politicians like Willkie or cultural leaders like Cousins, but rather megaphilanthropists like Bill Gates and George Soros, who've given their riches, business acumen, and human energy to the cause of promoting and realizing global development. While philanthropists have played a significant role in the health and social welfare of poor nations since the early 20th century, the massive, high-profile social entrepreneurial efforts of today's superrich within global civil society have inspired economists Matthew Bishop and Michael Green to conceptualize a new form of capitalism, what they call philanthrocapitalism which involves "successful entrepreneurs trying to solve big social problems

because they can, and because they feel they should.”<sup>309</sup> Indeed, the MDGs hinge on giving, the giving of both the megaphilanthropists and wealthy states. Former President Bill Clinton, perhaps the most famous and politically powerful One World leader, founded the Clinton Global Initiative precisely to encourage such global giving on the part of the powerful and wealthy. According to the organization’s website, the initiative works

to inspire, connect, and empower a community of global leaders to forge solutions to the world's most pressing challenges.

By fostering partnerships, providing strategic advice, and driving resources toward effective ideas, CGI helps its members – organizations from the private sector, public sector, and civil society – maximize their efforts to alleviate poverty, create a cleaner environment, and increase access to health care and education.<sup>310</sup>

At the same time that Clinton seeks to engage organizations -- from community groups and international institutions to corporations and states-- to work together across borders in new ways to better the world, he also enjoins individual citizens to do their part, also through different forms of globally-minded giving. As Clinton explains in his book, *Giving: How Each of Us Can Change the World*,

In every corner of America and all over the world, intelligence and energy are evenly distributed, but opportunity, investment, and effective organizations aren’t. As a result, billions of people are denied the chance to live their lives to the fullest, and millions die

---

<sup>309</sup> Matthew Bishop and Michael Green, *Philanthrocapitalism: How the Rich Can Save the World* (New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2008): 30.

<sup>310</sup> “About Us,” Clinton Global Initiative, <http://www.clintonglobalinitiative.org/aboutus/default.asp?Section=AboutUs&PageTitle=About%20Us>

needlessly every year. Because we live in an interdependent world, we cannot escape each other's problems.<sup>311</sup>

Just like celebrity giving takes many forms (from fundraising stunts to field trips), so too may the giving asked of caring global citizens. Small acts might include making an on-line donation to an organization like Oxfam or an act of what Littler calls "cosmopolitan caring through consumption," like buying RED. Global citizens might also participate in an on-going media advocacy campaign like ONE, pressing their state to act with cosmopolitan intent, or, alternatively, become a social marketer for their favorite organization or cause-- sharing video, spreading the word, contributing to the "digital dialogue" through their social networks. More intense displays of One World giving and citizenship, however, would entail joining up with the social entrepreneurs that fuel global civil society, becoming one of the "*transformative forces*: people with new ideas to address major problems who are relentless in the pursuit of their visions, people who simply will not take 'no' for an answer, who will not give up until they have spread their ideas as far as they can."<sup>312</sup> Indeed, the ever-expanding international community has emerged as a promising place of employment.

Contemporary One World visions and the practices of global citizenship they invite are indicative of a new version of global liberalism, one that is brought

---

<sup>311</sup> Bill Clinton, *Giving: How Each of us Can Change the World* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 2007): 1.

<sup>312</sup> David Bornstein, *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007): 1-2.

to life and sustained by media promotion, and that asks states and their citizens to participate in the project of global development through giving. This new One World vision promises a world of good governance, where corporations, citizens, social welfare agencies, and community groups work together with states across national borders to address issues of shared international concern, in turn creating a new majority will for human rights, fair trade, environmental protection, and poverty elimination. It envisions a world made up of caring citizens in the West, connected through sentimental, mediated bonds to their counterparts in the Global South, all of whom are committed to promoting development through partnerships and participation in global civil society. Binding together the giving acts of billionaires, corporations, wealthy states, global civil society, and ordinary citizens are cosmopolitan stars and the interactive media/brand culture that, within the context of promotional global governing, have a vital part to play in realizing One World governing rationalities.

As was the case with earlier global imaginaries of integration described by Klein in Chapter Two, present day One World discourses reflect both right and left political histories. Many scholars have shown how a neoliberal ethos permeates global civil society and new development discourses,<sup>313</sup> and I suspect

---

<sup>313</sup> See for example, Jaeger, "Global Civil Society" and Christina Rojas, "Governing through the social: Representations of poverty and global governmentality." In *Global Governmentality: Governing International Spaces*, eds. Wendy Larner and William Walters (London: Routledge, 2004).

that most scholars of global governmentality would confirm that contemporary global governing and One World visions-- global governance, the global development, global civil society-- speak to a humanized version of global neoliberal governmentality, one that tries to compensate for the excesses of the Washington Consensus by stressing the more congenial aspects of neoliberal approaches: individual empowerment, community agency, private-public cooperation. At the same time, internationalism and global civil society are seen and experienced by many on the left as viable paths for creating economic and social justice on a global scale. In contrast to theorists of global governmentality, political theorist Ulrich Beck would see these One World rationalities as indicative of a significant and exciting shift in global politics towards a cosmopolitan world order, where the primary political actors are not workers, but rather consumers, acting in concert through global civil society to establish new social norms and collective values and to dictate the rules of governing in accordance with the needs and desires of the global human community. From Beck's vantage point, the founding of the United Nations on the premise of protecting individual human rights set into motion a "creeping revolution," whereby human rights has slowly gained priority over the rights of nations, internationalizing and intertwining the affairs, welfares, and desires of once bounded populations. Beck thus sees global civil society not as the primary

partner-in-crime, but rather, the primary counter-power to the neoliberal regime which tries to institutionalize the private interests of capital.

Caring stars and their citizen-shaping work thus figure generally on the horizons of a global liberalism whose relationship to either the recent past/current moment of global neoliberalism or a cosmopolitan future remains uncertain. What *is* clear, however, is that stars and media culture are and have long been deeply implicated in the production and circulation of One World discourses, and that today articulations of stardom and global governing take on increasing significance in a world where the fates of populations and their governments are increasingly intertwined-- culturally, politically, and economically-- and the contours of citizenship are increasingly global. Cosmopolitan stars are helping to harvest the conditions for this global liberalism and to birth a new system of cosmopolitan global governmentality whose implications, I suggest, cannot be simply assessed by bemoaning celebrities, promotional/brand culture, and the highly mediated, often consumer-oriented, feminized practices of caring and giving they facilitate. Rather, scholars need to take seriously the small acts of mediated caring, consumption, and citizenship, as they remain the material, cultural base for global governing in Western contexts, as well as for emerging paradigms of global liberalism.

As many scholars have argued, one thing this new liberal version of global governing cannot do, despite its noble, ambitious aims and its utopian, justice-

oriented One World political rationalities, is seriously address the highly uneven social and economic relationships that continue to define the global capitalist context, an unevenness that is embodied in the wealth and mobility of the caring star.<sup>314</sup> In this way, cosmopolitan stars and the feelings and practices of citizenship they mobilize among Western media audiences, can certainly be seen as providing rhetorical cover for the capitalist status quo: as Littler puts it, as “plugging the gap.”<sup>315</sup> However, rather than seeing caring stars as cultural managers of structural contradictions and antagonisms, I have traced the *productive* and *technical* role that idols of goodwill have played and continue to play in global governing. Like Danny Kaye had long ago, today’s cosmopolitan stars, largely through sentimental education, are helping to promote and realize One World visions. As the neoliberal economy cracks and tries to crumble and the right continues to reach harder than ever for a privatized planet, idols of goodwill like Bono, Clooney, and Jolie continue to make visits to Washington, as well as to television and computer screens, to remind the West of its moral, social, and economic obligations to poor and distant populations.

---

<sup>314</sup> See Priyamvada Gopal, “The ‘Moral Empire’: Africa, Globalisation, and the Politics of Conscience,” *New Formations*, 59 (2006):81-97.

<sup>315</sup> Jo Littler, “‘I feel your pain’: Cosmopolitan Charity and the Public Fashioning of the Celebrity Soul,” *Social Semiotics* 18:2 (2008): 248.

## Epilogue

### Letter from Jane

“If you use stars, people will give you money,” explained the opening voiceover to Jean-Luc Godard and Jean-Pierre Gorin’s *Tout Va Bien*.<sup>316</sup> Indeed, the participation of Jane Fonda helped to ensure studio funding for the film whose aim was to examine the state of class struggle and left politics in France in the aftermath of May ’68. Fonda played an American journalist working in Paris, whose already rocky relationship with a former New Wave director further disintegrates after the couple spend a night trapped in a sausage factory with striking workers and their loathsome bosses, factory and union. In many ways, Fonda was the perfect fit for the part. She had spent the majority of the previous decade living in Paris, part of that time with her then husband, French director Roger Vadim who directed Fonda in *Barbarella* (1968). What’s more, Fonda’s critically acclaimed, Oscar nominated performance in the Depression era tragedy, *They Shoot Horses, Don’t They?* (1969) had helped to further establish the Hollywood beauty as a strong actress with a political edge. Finally, Fonda had recently become intensely engaged in the anti-war movement, working closely with anti-war veterans and GIs; the star regularly attended meetings, lobbied Congress, donated funds, and headlined rallies. Perhaps Fonda’s most definitive

---

<sup>316</sup> Jean-Luc Godard and Jean-Pierre Gorin, *Tout Va Bien* (1972; New York: The Criterion Collection, 2005), DVD.

activity as an anti-war activist was her 1972 trip to Vietnam, where the star met with American POWs and North Vietnamese antiaircraft fighters. Slowly but surely, the photos from Fonda's trip made their way into international papers, infuriating Cold Warriors and inspiring the "Hanoi Jane" controversy. One photo (above) captured the imagination of Godard and Gorin and became the subject of yet another film 'starring' Fonda. While *Tout Va Bien* did not fare well commercially or critically, *Letter to Jane*<sup>317</sup>-- the short, hastily thrown together, experimental film made to promote and explain *Tout Va Bien*-- did manage to garner praise and peak interest. The film used the still image of Fonda in Vietnam as a visual backdrop for an audible essay that obliquely attempted to parse the role of cinema in the revolutionary struggle via the female star's anti-war activism. Harping on the difference between the militant as star and militant activity, the film berates the image of Fonda as ideologically "hazy," steeped in borrowed expression and feigned concern. Mostly though, the French directors just seem pissed off by Fonda's sheer presence in North Vietnam, the site of an 'authentic' revolutionary struggle. Stars-- especially popular, female, American ones-- are, after all, little more than a crass means to an end: "If you use stars, people will give you money."

---

<sup>317</sup> Jean-Luc Godard and Jean-Pierre Gorin, *Letter to Jane* (1972; New York: The Criterion Collection, 2005), DVD.

Impressed by the extent of Fonda's anti-war activism and troubled by *Letter to Jane* (by how easily female stars can become icons of all that's wrong with politics-- and society-- for their alleged ties to consumption, narcissism, spectacle, promotion), Fonda has remained on my mind as I've written this manuscript. This Epilogue is entitled "Letter from Jane" first, and obviously, to flip the script on Godard and Gorin's reading of Fonda's celebrity politics, echoes of which I hear in many of the charges against today's idols of goodwill that come from the left and seem to be rooted in fundamental distrust of and disdain for entertainment stars as serious and 'authentic' political actors. While the proliferation of idols of goodwill and cosmopolitan stars certainly warrants a keen critical eye, such work should not begin in a simplistic critique of stardom as inherently and necessarily tied to consumer culture and all the connotations— cultural and critical alike— that tend to follow from such assumptions. Second, I use Fonda's case to further underscore and nuance my primary arguments about idols of goodwill and their significance as makers and shapers of global citizens. Rethinking Fonda's female star activism<sup>318</sup> through the lens of global governmentality brings to light new questions about Fonda, as well as cosmopolitan stardom and the on-going cultural life of global governing and citizenship, especially in the U.S..

---

<sup>318</sup> Throughout this chapter, I rely primarily on Mary Hershberger's biography for details of Fonda's anti-war activities. See Mary Hershberger, *Jane Fonda's War: A Political Biography of an Antiwar Icon* (New York: The New Press, 2005).

While Fonda certainly helped to give the anti-war GI movement the stamp of celebrity, her work with agencies like Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW) and the Indochina Peace Campaign went far beyond the stuff of publicity stunts and Hollywood style stagecraft. In 1970 Fonda successfully lobbied Congress to establish a GI Office to investigate allegations of GI mistreatment often for anti-war activity. That same year, Fonda played a key role in The Winter Soldier Investigation, a series of hearings organized primarily by VVAW and designed to serve as public war crimes investigations. In the aftermath of the My Lai massacre becoming public, government and military officials were working hard to lay blame with low-level servicemen for atrocities committed against civilians in Vietnam. The Winter Soldier Investigation sought to remind the public that, after the Nuremberg Trials and according to international law, responsibility for war crimes rested squarely on the shoulders of those up the chain-of-command responsible for strategy and policy. Fonda not only raised the majority of funds for Winter Soldier but also helped organize events and win support from other groups and politicians.

Throughout the course of her anti-war activism, Fonda kept an exhaustive schedule traveling across the U.S. to attend organizing meetings and rallies. On the set of *Klute* (where she gave the performance for which she won her first Oscar), the star conducted organizing work on set between shoots. Fonda and her co-star Donald Sutherland went on later that year to headline the raucous anti-war

road show *F.T.A.* (a.k.a., Free, or more popularly, Fuck the Army), that offered an alternative source of entertainment and morale boosting for American troops. In contrast to the officially sanctioned, pro-war Bob Hope shows that had begun in 1965, *F.T.A.*'s sketch comedy and musical acts played explicitly to growing anti-war sentiments among troops, as well as the anti-war GI movement. The revue debuted in March of 1971 near Fort Bragg at the Haymarket Coffee House; not surprisingly, Fonda and crew's request to perform on base had been denied on the grounds that the show would be detrimental to morale. In 1972 *F.T.A.* went international, performing shows for dissident GIs stationed across the Pacific Rim. During the course of the two week trip, the show reached over 64,000 servicemen stationed abroad via 21 performances and became the subject of a documentary shot by feminist filmmaker Francine Parker.<sup>319</sup> The film had a brief run in New York City before disappearing. In an interview included on the DVD of Parker's *F.T.A.*, Fonda reflected on tensions and contradictions she navigated as a female star active in the anti-war GI movement:

What was hard for me was, because *Barbarella* had just been playing...I was the pin-up...and it's possible that a lot of them came to see *Barbarella*, and they had pictures of me as *Barbarella*, sex kitten...When I came out with no make-up, jeans, and everything, you could tell they were disappointed, and it scared me...I knew it was important for me to have a film career, because that's where my clout came from, and that's why I could do what I could do in

---

<sup>319</sup> Francine Parker, *F.T.A.* (1972; New York: Displaced Films, 2008), DVD.

the movement, but I didn't know if anyone would ever want to see me in a movie again.<sup>320</sup>

Ultimately, the articulation of Fonda's female stardom to her chosen cause meant working through a messy mix of both national and gender politics.

As the war shifted from a troop-intensive ground to a quieter, air-based operation, and, as a result, began to fade into the backdrop of public life, Fonda remained diligent in her attempts to educate fellow citizens about the on-going war and its implications. Later that year, the star paired up with an anti-war educational foundation, the Indochina Peace Campaign, and began touring the U.S.. At community events, Fonda and her colleagues, including Tom Hayden, showed slides from Vietnam, spoke of Vietnamese culture and history, and fielded audience questions. Many meetings included a screening of a film shot earlier that year in Vietnam entitled *Village by Village* that showed the effects of US carpet-bombing on schools, hospitals, homes, and agriculture.

The *image* of Fonda's anti-war activism was, however, sealed by her two-week field trip to North Vietnam in 1972. The aims of the journey were multiple. First, Fonda carried mail to deliver to American POWs from friends and family members back home, a practice that was organized by Women Strike for Peace and began back in 1965. The group had sent nearly 300 U.S. citizens to North Vietnam (in direct violation of U.S. policy) carrying humanitarian supplies and

---

<sup>320</sup> Jane Fonda interview, *F.T.A.* (1972; New York: Displaced Films, 2008), DVD.

mail for POWs to learn about the war from the perspective of the Vietnamese people and the soldiers actually fighting it. Second, Fonda went to North Vietnam to participate in cultural diplomacy initiatives. Invited by the Vietnamese Committee of Solidarity with the American People, the Vietnam Cultural Association, and the Vietnam Film Artists Association, Fonda's mission was authorized on the grounds of promoting cultural exchange among American and Vietnamese peoples. On one of her final days in Vietnam, Fonda was treated to a special performance of Arthur Miller's *All My Sons* by the Hanoi Drama Troupe, which had been touring the play in recently bombed villages. Surprised by what she had seen, Fonda questioned the director as to his choice of plays and recalled receiving the following answer: "The play shows that there are bad Americans and good Americans. We must help our people distinguish between the two. We are a small country. We cannot afford to let our people hate the American people. One day the war will be over and we must be friends."<sup>321</sup> Finally, and most importantly to Fonda, she went to collect filmic evidence of the U.S. bombing of dikes in the Red River Delta, a tactic that destroyed the lives and livelihoods of peasant farmers in the region, violated international laws of war established by the Geneva Accords, and was vehemently denied by the U.S. government. Convinced that such evidence would galvanize U.S. citizens and the international community alike to press the Nixon administration to end the practice of dike bombing, Fonda

---

<sup>321</sup> Jane Fonda, *My Life So Far* (New York: Random House, 2005): 313.

was determined to use her star power to publicize the detrimental effects of U.S. war policy and strategy on the Vietnamese people. Fonda was correct in her assessment, and, despite the loss (or perhaps confiscation) of her film in route back to the U.S., the star was successful in elevating the dike-bombing issue to a matter of international concern that neither the U.N. nor ultimately the U.S. could ignore.

Despite these broader cultural and political aims, it was two specific activities that came to define the Hanoi Jane image and to establish much of the public discourse around Fonda's anti-war activism. After experiencing life under bombing and its aftermath, Fonda was reportedly compelled to follow in the footsteps of other previous visitors and broadcast messages to U.S. troops on Radio Hanoi: "I have come to bear witness, and while I have not planned this, I feel it as a moral imperative."<sup>322</sup> The majority of the broadcasts were unscripted and consisted of Fonda reporting on what she had seen and learned on the ground and passionately imploring her audience of American troops to weigh their actions. In many ways, Fonda's broadcasts can be thought of as a highly politicized and specified form of star-led sentimental education, as Fonda sought to teach her audience of US soldiers about their moral obligations to a broader global humanity and to create emotional bonds between American soldiers and

---

<sup>322</sup> Fonda, *My Life*, 304-5.

the Vietnamese population suffering the consequences of their actions. For example, in one typical broadcast Fonda questioned,

Can we fight this kind of war and continue to call ourselves Americans? Are these people so different from our own children, our mothers, or grandmothers? I don't think so, except that perhaps they have a surer sense of why they are living and what they are willing to die for.<sup>323</sup>

Fonda's concept of what it means to be an American is clearly an international one, rooted in postwar cosmopolitan concepts of shared humanity and moral obligations to distant strangers. For Fonda, being an American included a capacity to care about human suffering and to feel the plights of others, as well as the obligation to act in accordance with humanitarian/cosmopolitan principles.

Most infamously, on the last day of her trip, Fonda allowed herself to be photographed with North Vietnamese antiaircraft fighters and weapons. Fonda had been leery of this final stop, hoping to stay on task of documenting devastation and learning about the Vietnamese people and their culture.

I realize that it is not just a U.S. citizen laughing and clapping on a Vietnamese antiaircraft gun: I am Henry Fonda's privileged daughter who appears to be thumbing my nose at the country that has provided me these privileges. More than that, I am a woman, which make my sitting there even more of a betrayal. A gender betrayal. And I am a woman who is seen as Barbarella, a character existing on some subliminal level as an embodiment of men's fantasies; Barbarella has become their enemy.<sup>324</sup>

---

<sup>323</sup> Hershberger, *Jane Fonda's War*, 94.

<sup>324</sup> Fonda, *My Life*, 318.

While Godard and Gorin scolded the image of Fonda for its ideological haziness, the ideologically clear Cold Warriors back home attacked the star and her trip to North Vietnam on surprisingly similar grounds from the other side of the political spectrum. Like Godard and Gorin's, their mode of attack was most obviously Fonda's female stardom. In narratives constructed by and in conjunction with the Nixon administration, Fonda was to be regarded as a political dupe who had allowed herself to be fashioned into a new and dangerous propaganda weapon in which "glamour" and "prestige value"<sup>325</sup> covered for carefully crafted enemy lies. According to government officials, Fonda was not smart enough to have written her own speeches to troops and therefore had to have been assisted by those skilled in the arts of communist indoctrination. While Fonda's activism had made her the subject of on-going secret investigations by intelligence agencies, it was her trip to North Vietnam that ultimately made her a traitor, earning her the title of Hanoi Jane. In right-wing circles, especially on-line, Fonda is still widely discussed as someone who should answer to charges of treason and providing aid and comfort to the enemy for her radio broadcasts and fraternization with North Vietnamese soldiers.

In addition to providing aesthetic inspiration to the French directors, Fonda's energetic mix of female stardom and political activism clearly made her a

---

<sup>325</sup> Hershberger, *Jane Fonda's War*, 118-12.

lightening rod in U.S. Cold War politics, and, for media scholars and cultural historians interested in questions of celebrity activism, the reception of Fonda in U.S. culture has provided much inspiration. Most scholarship on the politicized female star has predictably focused on Fonda's mediated star image and its ideological work within the broader context of U.S. Cold War politics. For example, Jerry Lembcke reads the Hanoi Jane image as yet another iteration of a long-standing myth of female betrayal during wartime. Amidst attempts to come to terms with losing the war, narratives of internal betrayal (that losing the war was a result of a weak national will and subversion from within) assumed cultural prominence; the idea of Fonda as traitor crystallized by the image of Hanoi Jane provided a convenient and potent scapegoat for American military defeat, especially in right-wing circles.<sup>326</sup> Alternatively, while critical of *Letter to Jane*, Richard Dyer uses Fonda's anti-war activism to theorize of the ideological limitations and inherent contradictions of political stars. He explains, "The significance of all of this [Fonda's activism]...is always in terms of the fact that *it is Jane Fonda doing them*...What the star does can *only* be posed in terms of *the star doing it*, the extraordinariness or difficulty of her/his doing it, rather than in terms of the ostensible political issues involved."<sup>327</sup> In this way, Fonda's star

---

<sup>326</sup> Jerry Lembcke, *Hanoi Jane: War, Sex, and Fantasies of Betrayal* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2010).

<sup>327</sup> Richard Dyer, *Stars* (London: British Film Institute, 1998): 78.

image, especially during her political phase, raised the question of white radicalism, specifically, of what business a privileged female star has in Vietnam or in the anti-war movement. For Dyer, Fonda's case testifies to a certain structural incongruity between the individualizing structure of star discourse and meaningful coverage of political issues and stakes. Indeed, "the fact that *it is Jane Fonda*" at once allowed the star to emerge and remain a cultural icon of anti-Americanness for the right *and* to regain sway in popular media culture as a workout guru just a decade later.

Throughout previous chapters I have traced how the liberal structure of star discourse theorized by Dyer has been governmentalized by international institutions and put to work as a cultural technology for fashioning global citizens. Less interested in how stardom obfuscates politics by ideologically focusing attention on the individual, I have documented the productive role that star discourse has played in shaping contemporary ideas and practices of global citizenship, and theorized a form of stardom-- cosmopolitan stardom-- that is operative in the fields of global governmentality. Allegedly transcending petty politics and domestic squabbling, caring, cosmopolitan stars like Audrey Hepburn and Angelina Jolie embody, perform, and materialize the political rationalities that enliven the international community comprised of institutions and agencies seeking to tend to the general welfare of the world.

Despite the controversy that marked Fonda's image and the fact that she was connected to community-based, grassroots groups rather than official institutions of global governing, I wonder: might we think of Fonda as a cosmopolitan star? Historically speaking, Fonda's anti-war activism occurred in the era between Kaye's inaugural goodwill ambassadorship and Hepburn's perfection of the role, at a time when containment discourses that authorized military action in Vietnam were losing their luster on both cultural and political fronts. Like the idols of goodwill that have been my subjects throughout, Fonda's activism was circumscribed and animated by political rationalities of global governmentality that were intimately bound up with the proliferation of international institutions and agencies in the wake of the World War II. Fonda's activism can be situated in the context of emerging paradigms of global governing that I have shown to have been promoted, extended, and buttressed through the cultural realms in crucial ways by cosmopolitan stars.

Throughout the Cold War, the U.S. government managed a robust cultural diplomacy apparatus in hopes of promoting versions of internationalism germane to its own economic and geopolitical interests. However, at the same time, alternative versions of internationalism and cultural diplomacy connected to the international community and the burgeoning institutions of global governing informed practices of citizenship and activism, percolating in rights-based and student-led democratic movements. Fonda's activism should be thought of in

relationship to the cosmopolitan norms and One World rationalities taking hold in the aftermath of World War II and embodied in the founding of the U.N., as ideas of human rights and global humanity were not only authorizing international institutions but also animating the social, political, and cultural activism that defined so much of the postwar period. Carol Anderson documents how civil rights leaders appealed to the U.N. and human rights discourse early on in the movement before ultimately adapting the rhetoric of civil rights in the face of communist paranoia and containment ideologies.<sup>328</sup> The Port Huron Statement, a crucial document of the student-based organizing, powerfully refracted left internationalist ideals of anti-colonialism and self-determination, international cooperation and peace, and humane versions of capitalist expansion:

The United States' principal goal should be creating a world where hunger, poverty, disease, ignorance, violence, and exploitation are replaced as central features by abundance, reason, love, and international cooperation. To many this will seem the product of juvenile hallucination: but we insist it is a more realistic goal than is a world of nuclear stalemate. Some will say this is a hope beyond all bounds: but is far better to us to have positive vision than a "hard headed" resignation.<sup>329</sup>

Realizing this vision depended not only on disarmament but also on increased international aid payments by the U.S. to the U.N. so that the institution could

---

<sup>328</sup> Carol Anderson, *Eyes Off the Prize: the United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-55* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

<sup>329</sup> "The Port Huron Statement of the Students for a Democratic Society, 1962," H-Net, <http://www.h-net.org/~hst306/documents/huron.html>

work around domestic politics to pursue development and bring an end to massive global economic and social inequality.

Seeing Fonda in this context, thinking of her through the lens of global governmentality, brings Hanoi Jane into conversation with the “Spirit of Audrey” and other idols of goodwill who have worked and continue to work in more official capacities and institutional contexts. Fonda’s cosmopolitan stardom took form within movement politics rather than within the specific aims and exigencies of the U.N., yet connecting both are the One World political rationalities that undergird and authorize the international community and its commitment to promoting the general welfare, that is, international peace and global social security. Put differently, we might read Fonda’s anti-war activism as part of a broader history-- part of which has been constructed here-- of stars promoting global governmentality and articulating alternative visions of world order built on values like international cooperation, cultural exchange and understanding, global humanity, and development. Documented field trips to war zones, missions of listening and learning, star-led diplomacy and sentimental education, fundraising and lobbying for causes connected to a broader project of international peace and cooperation: Fonda might well indeed be thought of as a cosmopolitan star. Yet what separates Fonda from the idols of goodwill discussed in earlier chapters is worth considering in some detail, as these differences help to focus previous claims.

As explained in Chapter One, the U.N. and the post- World War II international community work on two primary fronts in their promotion of the general welfare. The first involves promoting international peace and cooperation among nations. The second involves tending to the health and social welfare of disadvantaged populations through development and humanitarian aid programs. The proliferation of idols of goodwill that I have traced belongs to the latter front: as cultural technologies of global governmentality, Kaye, Hepburn, and Jolie were presented as icons of global care and community who transcended domestic politics, focused on the universal, shared concerns of the human community, and facilitated practices of global citizenship germane to the UN's governing agendas rooted in rationalities of development aid and humanitarianism. Indeed, idols of goodwill often appear in war zones as Messengers of Peace to deliver needed food and medical supplies but they are careful to keep their demands, especially of sovereign nations, centered on the humanitarian. Fonda, on the other hand, belongs-- albeit very loosely-- to the former front, to what is in many ways a much trickier prospect for internationally-oriented institutions and agencies, especially during wartime that pits sovereign nation(s) against sovereign nation (s). Containment ideologies and Cold War geopolitical realities made Fonda's cosmopolitan stardom highly controversial, yet a valuable cultural resource for both the anti-war left and the pro-war right. While Fonda's female stardom mobilized affects and resources for the anti-war movement, it also provided a

convenient narrative device for the Nixon administration's pro-war propaganda campaign.

In contrast to Fonda, the forms of citizenship embodied and promoted by idols of goodwill are usually cautious and highly feminized, focused on private acts of care, charity, and consumption not usually connected to the serious and sometimes dangerous business of 'authentic' political activism, like attending demonstrations and loudly protesting powerful national regimes and their policies. While stars like Jolie—like Fonda— travel to war zones on humanitarian missions, the practices of citizenship they invite can usually be undertaken in the context of the home or leisure with little risk. As I have shown, cosmopolitan stardom and the non-threatening, feminized practices of global citizenship they engender are strategic and practical. They help to generate publicity, funds, and governing capital for international institutions, giving them a material, cultural base in Western contexts where the international community's and global governmentality's own power is relatively weak and often in question. Idols of goodwill and the feminized ways in which star discourse is able to facilitate global citizenship are crucial technologies of governing at a distance, of uncontroversially leaping national regimes and bringing citizens into the fold of global governing. Here stardom's relationship to consumer culture, morality, and matters of the heart, as well as its individualizing structure, are a political plus: somewhat ironically, they help to obfuscate the fact that these stars are indeed

serious political actors promoting alternative political rationalities that may or may not be in line with those of national political regimes.

These feminized templates of global citizenship promoted by cosmopolitan stars in the realms of media culture can indeed be considered political, especially when viewed from the vantage point of contemporary global governmentalities. In the post-Cold War context of economic globalization and escalating environmental threats, the prospect of world government is becoming less a sentimental, juvenile pipe dream of One World visionaries and more a hard and fast necessity given the increasingly integrated fates and fortunes of nation-states. Hence, at the heart of current politics are questions of global governing and, in particular how much state sovereignty should be surrendered in favor of international norms and values. The Washington Consensus proposed an international neo-liberal regime run by the economic interests of global capital, which precipitated massive economic crisis and social upheaval. On the other hand, the international community has proposed an alternative global liberal regime based on its own set of One World political rationalities: human rights and humanitarian activism, global civil society, a refashioned development apparatus, philanthrocapitalism, social entrepreneurialism. In this alternative governing regime of global governance, fair trade trumps free trade. The state returns to governing prominence on the condition of abiding by international standards of good governance, and richer nations are required to contribute percentages of

their own wealth to the development of poorer states in the name of global justice. And here is where we find the majority of today's cosmopolitan stars, working to promote, fund, and garner legitimacy for a particular version of global governing through activating and fashioning global citizens responsive to and engaged with these regimes in the context of media culture.

In his 2008 mammoth, self-published right-wing expose, *The Hollywood Culture War*, Michael Vincent Boyer devotes an entire chapter to Fonda entitled "Jane Fonda: The Enemy Within." "Her contradiction and blurred vision of reality, facts, and truth places her in the same category of 'the useful idiots' that Lenin loved to employ to spread lies and deception in order to control 'the people.'"<sup>330</sup> Boyer ends his lengthy chapter on Fonda with a discussion of "Modern-Day Hollycoms" and their promotion of "cultural communism" which include Al Gore and "Hollywood sidekick Leonardo DiCaprio," as well as Bono's ONE partner, megaphilanthropist George Soros "and his one-world vision of one-way thinking."<sup>331</sup> As Hershberger's research and Boyer's anti-Hollywood rants suggest, today's cosmopolitan stars, despite their status as idols of goodwill, are, like Fonda, always already potential political lightning rods, as the proliferation of cosmopolitan stardom-- and the strong articulation between stars and global governmentality-- is indicative of Hollywood's peculiar and prominent historical

---

<sup>330</sup> Michael Vincent Boyer, *The Hollywood Culture War* (Bloomington: Xlibris, 2008) :273.

<sup>331</sup> Boyer, *Hollywood Culture War*, 295.

place in the promotion of liberal internationalism and One World visions. It's generally assumed that Hollywood's alleged liberalism has to do with its both its political ties to the official Democratic party as well as its embrace of lax moral and social codes and alternative lifestyles. However, undergirding much of this notion of a liberal Hollywood is stars' high-profile embracing of cosmopolitanism and internationalism ever since World War II.

As cosmopolitan stars operative in the fields of global development and governing, idols of goodwill like Bono, George Clooney and Angelina Jolie are at that the center of a post-Cold War culture war germane to contemporary national and world politics. This new culture war pits proponents of a cosmopolitan state and global citizenship against conservatives of various stripes fiercely clinging to discourses of unilateralism and American superiority on the world stage. Broadly speaking then, cosmopolitan stars are, like Fonda was and remains, a central cultural axis along which politicians and US citizens alike are negotiating the changing horizons of global and national governing.

Given the current world of perpetual war and conflict, the rise of the Tea Party, ever-growing economic inequality nationally and internationally, continued environmental devastation and degradation, the lack of human rights, living wages, and basic freedoms in both Western *and* poorer countries, and what appears to be, hopefully, the end of U.S. global hegemony, perhaps the most problematic issue raised by the proliferation of idols of goodwill is not

cosmopolitan stars themselves, their sentimental education campaigns, or the caring, feminized forms of global citizenship they mobilize; rather, it is the fact that global governing has to rely on caring stars and “some bright person” to “find a way to keep the spotlight burning” for governing capital.

## Bibliography

- Anderson, Carol. *Eyes Off the Prize: the United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-55*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Andrejevic, Mark. *iSpy: Power and Surveillance in the Interactive Era*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2007.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2006.
- Arvidsson, Adam. *Brands: Meaning and Value in Media Culture*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Asher, Robert et al. *The United Nations and the Promotion of the General Welfare*. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1957.
- Alleyne, Mark. *Global Lies?: Propaganda, the UN, and World Order*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The United Nations' Celebrity Diplomacy." *SAIS Review* xxv:1 (2005): 175-185.
- Banet-Weiser, Sarah and Lapsansky, Charlotte. "RED is the New Black: Brand Culture, Consumer Citizenship, and Political Possibility." *International Journal of Communication* 2 (2008): 1248-1268.
- The Barbara Walters Special*. ABC. March 29, 1989.
- Barnes, Brooke. "Angelina Jolie's Carefully Orchestrated Image." *New York Times*, November 20, 2008. Accessed August 2, 2011.  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/21/business/media/21angelina.html>
- Barnett, Michael and Duvall, Raymond. "Power in Global Governance." In *Power in Global Governance*, edited by Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, 1-32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1957.
- Beck, Ulrich. *Power in the Global Age*. Cambridge: Polity, 2005.
- Benhabib, Seyla. *Another Cosmopolitanism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Bennett, Tony. *Culture: A Reformer's Science*. London: Sage, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Putting Policy into Cultural Studies." In *Cultural Studies*, edited by Lawrence Grossberg et al, 23-37. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Best, Jacqueline. "Why the Economy is Often the Exception to Politics as Usual." *Theory, Culture, & Society* 24:4 (2007): 87-109.
- Biography*. "Angelina Jolie." A&E Television Networks. 2005.

- Bird, Elizabeth. *For Enquiring Minds: A Cultural Study of Supermarket Tabloids*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1992.
- Bishop, Matthew and Green, Michael. *Philanthrocapitalism: How the Rich Can Save the World*. New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2008.
- Boorstin, Daniel. "From Hero to Celebrity: The Human Pseudo-Event." In *The Celebrity Culture Reader*, edited by P.D. Marshall, 72-90. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Bornstein, Daniel. *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Boyer, Michael Vincent. *The Hollywood Culture War*. Bloomington: Xlibris, 2008.
- Brainard, Lael and LaFleur, Vinca. "Making Poverty History? How Activists, Philanthropists, and the Public are Changing Global Development." In *Global Development 2.0: Can Philanthropists, the Public and the Poor Make Poverty History?* Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2008.
- Bratich, Jack et al. *Foucault, Cultural Studies, and Governmentality*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003.
- Bunting, Madeleine and Burkeman, Oliver. "Pro Bono." *The Guardian*, March 18, 2003. Accessed August 1, 2010.  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/mar/18/usa.debtrelief>
- Burchell, Graham. "Liberal Government and Techniques of the Self." In *Foucault and Political Reason*, edited by Andrew Barry, Thomas Osbourne, and Nikolas Rose, 19-36. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Busby, Joshua. "Bono Made Jesse Helms Cry: Jubilee 2000, Debt Relief, and Moral Action in International Politics." *International Studies Quarterly* 51 (2007): 247-275.
- Butler, Judith. *Prekarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London: Verso, 2004.
- Cabrera, Luis. "World Government: Renewed debate, persistent challenges." *European Journal of International Relations* 16:3 (2010): 511-530.
- Campbell, Colin. *The Romantic Ethic and the Spirit of Modern Consumerism*. London: Blackwell, 1987.
- Castells, Manuel. *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.
- Cater, Nick. "Beyond Reality: the Hollywood Treatment of Humanitarian Aid." *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, November 13, 2003. Accessed August 2, 2011.  
<http://philanthropy.com/article/Beyond-Reality-the-Hollywood/62568/>

- CBS This Morning*. CBS. June 3, 1991.
- Cieply, Michael and Steinhauer, Jennifer. "Los Angeles Charities Rarely on Hollywood's 'Must Do' List." *New York Times*, September 4, 2009. Accessed August 2, 2011.  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/05/us/05donate.html>
- Clarke, Robert. *Celebrity Colonialism: Fame, Power and Representation in Colonial and Postcolonial Cultures*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009.
- Clinton, Bill. *Giving: How Each of us Can Change the World*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 2007.
- CNN staff. "Hollywood and Haiti: Who's Giving What?" *The Marquee Blog*, CNN Entertainment, January 25, 2010. Accessed May 6, 2010.  
<http://marquee.blogs.cnn.com/2010/01/25/hollywood-and-haiti-whos-giving-what/>
- Coombe, Rosemary. "Author(iz)ing the Celebrity: Engendering Alternative Identities." In *The Celebrity Culture Reader*, edited by P.D. Marshall, 721-769. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Cooper, Andrew. *Celebrity Diplomacy*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2008.
- Cosmopolitan* staff. "Audrey Hepburn: An Intimate Biography." *Cosmopolitan* 215:5 (1993): 251-253 and 268-282.
- Curtain, Michael. *Redeeming the Wasteland: Television Documentary and Cold War Politics*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1995.
- Dean, Mitchell. *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Governing Societies: Political Perspectives on Domestic and International Rule*. Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2007.
- deCordova, Richard. *Picture Personalities: The Emergence of the Star System in America*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001.
- Delany, Bridget. "The Bono-ization of Activism." *CNN World Weekly*, October 12, 2007.
- Democracy Now!* "Sean Penn on Haiti Six Months After the Earthquake, Recovery Efforts, and Why He Decided to Manage a Tent Camp of 55,000 Displaced Persons." July 13, 2010.
- Dominus, Susan. "Relief Pitcher," *The New York Times Magazine*, October 8, 2000. Accessed August 1, 2011.  
<http://partners.nytimes.com/library/magazine/home/20001008mag-qa-bono.htm>

- Douglas, Susan. *Where the Girls Are: Growing Up Female with the Mass Media*. New York: Three Rivers Press, 1994.
- Dyer, Richard. *Stars*. London: British Film Institute, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Heavenly Bodies: Stars and Society*. Hampshire: Macmillan Press, 1986.
- Easterly, William. *The White Man's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good*. New York: Penguin Books, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Bono Doesn't Say About Africa; Celebrities like to portray it as a basket case, but they ignore very real progress." *Los Angeles Times*, July 6, 2007.
- Elkus, Adam. "Celebrity Colonialism: Buying Africa is the Latest Trend Among the Famous." *Colorlines: News for Action*, March 1, 2007. Accessed February 11, 2010.  
[http://colorlines.com/archives/2007/03/celebrity\\_colonialism.html](http://colorlines.com/archives/2007/03/celebrity_colonialism.html)
- Elliot, Stuart. "Celebrities Bottle Water for UNICEF Sweepstakes." *New York Times Media Decoder*, March 11, 2011. Accessed August 3, 2011.  
<http://mediadecoder.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/03/11/celebrities-bottle-water-for-UNICEF-sweepstakes/>
- "The 62nd Primetime Emmy Awards." NBC. August 29, 2010.
- Enloe, Cynthia. *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Escobar, Arturo. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Estes, Leona Jane. "Hunkered Down in Haiti with Sean Penn, Humanitarian," *Vanity Fair*, June 3, 2010.
- Falk, Andrew. *Upstaging the Cold War: American Dissent and Cultural Diplomacy, 1940-1960*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2010.
- Fall, Papa Louis and Tang, Guangting. "Goodwill Ambassadors in the United Nations System." Joint Inspection Unit. 2006.
- Feher, Michel. "The Governed in Politics." In *Nongovernmental Politics*, edited by Michel Feher, 12-27. Brooklyn: Zone Books, 2007.
- Feldman, Gene. *Audrey Hepburn Remembered. The Hollywood Collection*. Wombat Productions, 1993, DVD.
- Ferguson, James. *The Anti-Politics Machine: Development, Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

- Ferrer, Sean Hepburn. *Audrey Hepburn, An Elegant Spirit*. New York: Atria Books, 2003.
- FINCA. "Urgent Message From FINCA's Ambassador of Hope Natalie Portman about Haiti." January 15, 2010.  
<http://www.finca.org/site/apps/nlnet/content2.aspx?c=6fIGIXMFJnJ0H&b=6088875&ct=844260>
- \_\_\_\_\_. "About FINCA." [http://www.finca.org/site/c.6fIGIXMFJnJ0H/b.6088399/k.75E7/ABOUT\\_FINCA.htm](http://www.finca.org/site/c.6fIGIXMFJnJ0H/b.6088399/k.75E7/ABOUT_FINCA.htm)
- Fonda, Jane. *My Life So Far*. New York: Random House, 2005.
- Foucault, Michel. *Security, Territory, Population*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Birth of Biopolitics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Technologies of the Self." In *The Essential Foucault*, edited by Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose, 145-169. New York: The New Press, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Subject and Power." In *The Essential Foucault*, edited by Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose, 126-144. New York: The New Press, 2003.
- Gamson, Joshua. *Claims to Fame: Celebrity in Contemporary America*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Gledhill, Christine. "Signs of Melodrama." In *Stardom: Industry of Desire*, edited by Christine Gledhill, 207-229. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Godard, Jean-Luc and Gorin, Jean-Pierre. *Tout Va Bien*. 1972 (New York: The Criterion Collection, 2005), DVD.
- Gobe, Marc. *Citizen Brand: 10 Commandments for Transforming Brands in a Consumer Democracy*. New York: Allworth Press, 2002.
- Gopal, Priyamvada. "The 'Moral Empire': Africa, Globalisation, and the Politics of Conscience." *New Formations* 59 (2006):81-97.
- Gordon, Colin. "Governmental Rationality: an introduction." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, 1-52. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Gottfried, Martin. *Nobody's Fool: The Lives of Danny Kaye*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994.
- Greene, Ronald. *Malthusian Worlds: U.S. Leadership and the Governing of the Population Crisis*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Y Movies: Film and the Modernization of Pastoral Power." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 2:1 (2003): 20-36.
- Greene, Stephen. "Star Widens Refugee Group's Appeal." *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, January 15, 2002.

- Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Harvey, David. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Hearn, Alison. "Hoaxing the Real: On the Metanarrative of Reality Television." In *Reality TV: Remaking Television Culture* 2nd Edition, edited by Susan Murray and Laurie Ouellette, 165-178. New York: New York University Press, 2009.
- Huang, Andrew. "The Diary of Angelina Jolie and Dr. Jeffery Sachs in Africa." *Diary*. New York: MTV Networks, September 15, 2005.
- Held, David. *Global Covenant: The Social Democratic Alternative to the Washington Consensus*. Cambridge: Polity, 2004.
- Hellstern, Melissa. *How to be Lovely: The Audrey Hepburn Way of Life*. New York: Dutton, 2004.
- Hermes, Joke. "Reading Gossip Magazines: The Imagined Communities of Gossip and Camp." In *The Celebrity Culture Reader*, edited by P.D. Marshall, 291-310. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Hershberger, Mary. *Jane Fonda's War: A Political Biography of an Antiwar Icon*. New York: The New Press, 2005.
- Hesmondhalgh, David. "Bourdieu, the Media and Cultural Production." *Media, Culture, & Society* 28:2 (2006): 211-231.
- Holson, Laura. "Charity Fixer to the Stars." *New York Times*, December 3, 2010. Accessed August 2, 2011. <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/05/fashion/05TREVORNEILSON.html>
- Iriye, Akira. *Global Community: The Role of International Institutions in the Making of the Contemporary World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Jaeger, Hans-Martin. "Global Civil Society and the Political Depoliticization of Global Governance." *International Political Sociology* 1(2007): 257-277.
- Jenkins, Henry. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York: New York University Press, 2006.
- Jolie, Angelina. *Notes from my Travels*. New York: Pocket Books, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Staying to Help in Iraq." *The Washington Post*, February 28, 2008. Accessed August 2 2011. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/02/27/AR2008022702217.html>
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Justice Delayed is not Justice Denied." *Newsweek*, December 9, 2009. Accessed August 2, 2010. <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2009/12/09/justice-delayed-is-not-justice-denied.html>

- King, Barry. "Articulating Stardom." In *Stardom: Industry of Desire*, edited by Christine Gledhill, 167-182. London: Routledge, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Embodying an Elastic Self: The Parametrics of Contemporary Stardom." In *Contemporary Hollywood Stardom*, edited by Thomas Austin and Martin Barker, 45-61. London: Arnold, 2003.
- King, Samantha. *Pink Ribbons, Inc.: Breast Cancer and the Politics of Philanthropy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006.
- Klein, Christina. *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945-1961*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- Klein, Naomi. *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2007.
- Knight, Graham. "Activism, Branding, and the Promotional Public Sphere." In *Blowing Up the Brand: Critical Perspectives on Promotional Culture*, edited by Melissa Aronczyk and Devon Powers, 173-194. New York: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Kotler, Philip and Zaltman, Gerald. "Social Marketing: An Approach to Planned Social Change." *Journal of Marketing* 35:3 (1971): 3-12.
- La Bella, Laura. *Angelina Jolie Goodwill Ambassador for the United Nations*. New York: Rosen Publishing Group, 2009.
- Larner, Wendy and Walters, William. "Globalization as Governmentality." *Alternatives* 29 (2004): 495-514.
- Lembcke, Jerry. *Hanoi Jane: War, Sex, and Fantasies of Betrayal*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2010.
- Lewis, Justin and Miller, Toby. *Critical Cultural Policy Studies: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.
- The Listen Charity. "Ashley Judd Listening in Delhi." <http://www.listencharity.org/ashleyjudd2.html>
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Artists Listening," <http://www.listencharity.org/listening-to-children.html>
- Littler, Jo. "'I feel your pain': Cosmopolitan Charity and the Public Fashioning of the Celebrity Soul." *Social Semiotics* 18:2 (2008): 237-251.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Radical Consumption: Shopping for Change in Contemporary Culture*. New York: Open University Press, 2009.
- Live 8: The Long Walk to Justice*. DVD. USA: EMI, 2005.
- Lowenthal, Leo. "The Triumph of Mass Idols." In *The Celebrity Culture Reader*, edited by P.D. Marshall, 124-152. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Lury, Celia. *Brands: The Logos of the Global Economy*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

- Marshall, P. David. *Celebrity and Power: Fame in Contemporary Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- May, Lary. *Screening Out the Past: The Birth of Mass Culture and the Motion Picture Industry*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Big Tomorrow: Hollywood and the Politics of the American Way*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- McCarthy, Anna. *The Citizen Machine: Governing By Television in 1950s America*. New York: The New Press, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “‘Stanley Milgram, Allen Funt, and Me:’ Postwar Social Science and the ‘First Wave’ of Reality TV.” In *Reality TV: Remaking Television Culture* Second Edition, edited by Susan Murray and Laurie Ouellette, 23-43. New York: New York University Press, 2009.
- McDonald, Paul. “The Star System: The Production of Hollywood Stardom in the Post-Studio Era.” In *The Contemporary Hollywood Film Industry*, edited by Paul McDonald and Janet Wasko, 167-181. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
- McNeil/Lehrer *NewsHour*, November 5, 1992.
- Miller, Toby. *Technologies of Truth: Cultural Citizenship and the Popular Media*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
- Moor, Liz. *The Rise of Brands*. New York: Berg, 2007.
- Morin, Edgar. *Stars*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Moseley, Rachel. *Growing up with Audrey Hepburn*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.
- Moyo, Dambisa. *Dead Aid: Why Aid Is Not Working and How There is a Better Way for Africa*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2009.
- MSNBC, “MSNBC’s Lawrence O’Donnell explains the need for school desks in Africa.”  
<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/21134540/vp/40711558#40711558>
- \_\_\_\_\_. “K.I.N.D. on *The Last Word*.” <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/40558738/>
- Nash, Kathy. “Global Citizenship as Show Business: the Cultural Politics of Make Poverty History.” *Media, Culture & Society* 30:2 (2008): 167–181.
- Newsweek* staff. “I Have Found Purpose.” *Newsweek*, October 24, 2003. Accessed August 2, 2011. <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2003/10/24/q-amp-a-i-have-found-purpose.html>
- New York Times* staff. “A U.N. Documentary.” March 7, 1955.
- Nussbaum, Martha. “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism.” In *For Love of Country*, edited by Martha Nussbaum and Joshua Cohen, 3-20. Boston: Beacon Press, 1996.
- Nye, Joseph. “Soft Power.” *Foreign Policy* 80 (1990): 153-171.

- ONE. "About" <http://www.one.org/c/us/about/3782/>  
 \_\_\_\_\_. "Living Proof." <http://www.one.org/livingproof/en/>  
*The Onion Radio News*. "Celebrities Seize Africa." November 22, 2009.  
<http://www.theonion.com/audio/celebrities-seize-africa,14066/>
- Ouellette, Laurie. *Viewers Like You? How Public TV Failed the People*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Ouellette, Laurie and Hay, James. *Better Living Through Reality TV*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
- Pareles, Jon. "We are the World 25 for Haiti: Big-Name Karaoke with Good Intentions." *New York Times*, February 13, 2010. Accessed August 1, 2011.  
<http://artsbeat.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/02/13/we-are-the-world-25-for-haiti-big-name-karaoke-with-good-intentions/>
- Parker, Francine. *F.T.A.* 1972. (New York: Displaced Films, 2008, DVD)
- Parks, Lisa. "Our World, Satellite Televisuality, and the Fantasy of Global Presence." In *Planet TV*, edited by Lisa Parks and Shanti Kumar, 74-93. New York: New York University Press, 2003.
- People staff. *People Extra Weekly A Tribute to Audrey Hepburn* (1993)  
*The Phil Donahue Show*, January 26, 1990.
- Press, Robert. "A Visit of Compassion to Somalia." *The Christian Science Monitor*, October 5, 1992.
- Prevots, Naima. *Dance for Export: Cultural Diplomacy and the Cold War*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1998.
- Richey, Lisa Ann and Ponte, Stephano. *Brand Aid: Shopping Well to Save World*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.
- Roberts, Shari. "'The Lady in the Tutti-Frutti Hat': Carmen Miranda, Spectacle of Ethnicity." *Cinema Journal* 32:3 (1993): 3-23.
- Rojas, Christina. "Governing through the social: Representations of poverty and global governmentality." In *Global Governmentality: Governing International Spaces*, edited by Wendy Larner and William Walters. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Rose, Nikolas. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Rusk M.D., Howard A. "Good Halloween Ghosts." *New York Times*, October 27, 1958.
- See It Now*. "The Secret Life of Danny Kaye." New York: CBS, December 2, 1956. DVD copy provided by UNICEF, October 2009.
- Seigel, Jessica. "Audrey Hepburn on a Role." *The Chicago Tribune*, January 20, 1992.

- Shimpach, Shawn. "Working Watching: The Creative and Cultural Labor of the Media Audience." *Social Semiotics* 15:3 (2005): 343-360.
- Slater, Don. *Consumer Culture and Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997.
- Smith, Dina. "Global Cinderella: *Sabrina* (1954), Hollywood, and Postwar Internationalism." *Cinema Journal* 41:4 (2002): 27-51.
- Smythe, Dallas. "On the Audience Commodity and its Work." In *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*, edited by Meenakshi Gigi Durham and Douglas Kellner, 230-256. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Stacey, Jackie. *Star Gazing: Hollywood Cinema and Female Spectatorship*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Stanley, Alessandra. "Celebrities Go Low-Key, and Sometimes Nameless, in Haiti Telethon." *New York Times*, January 23, 2010. Accessed August 1, 2011. <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/23/arts/television/23watch.html>
- Stoler, Ann Laura. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995.
- Street, John. "The Celebrity Politician: Political Style and Popular Culture." In *The Celebrity Culture Reader*, edited by P.D. Marshall, 359-370. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Students for a Democratic Society. "The Port Huron Statement of the Students for a Democratic Society, 1962." Available at H-Net <http://www.h-net.org/~hst306/documents/huron.html>
- Temporal, Paul. *The Branding of MTV: Will Internet Kill the Video Star?* Singapore: John Wiley and Sons, 2008.
- Thomas, Karen. "Pitt, Jolie In Haiti: 'We plan to be back.'" *USA Today*, January 13, 2006. Accessed August 1, 2011. [http://www.usatoday.com/life/people/2006-01-13-pitt-jolie-haiti\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/life/people/2006-01-13-pitt-jolie-haiti_x.htm)
- Time* staff. "Television: the Good Seed." December 10, 1956. Accessed August 2, 2011. <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,808741,00.html>
- Traub, James. "The Celebrity Solution." *The New York Times Magazine*, March 9, 2008.
- Turner, Graeme. *Understanding Celebrity*. London: Sage, 2004.
- UNESCO. "Harnessing Communication to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals: Towards a UN System Approach." Prepared for the 10th Inter-Agency Roundtable on Communication for Development (2007).
- United Nations. "What it Means to be a UN Volunteer." UN Volunteers. <http://www.unv.org/how-to-volunteer/what-it-means-to-be-a-unv-volunteer.html>

- \_\_\_\_\_. “UN Works: for People and the Planet.”  
<http://www.un.org/works/sub2.asp?lang=en&s=11>
- \_\_\_\_\_. “We the peoples: civil society, the United Nations, and global governance.” Report of the Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations-Civil Society Relations.” United Nations General Assembly, June 11, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Guidelines for the designation of Goodwill Ambassadors and Messengers of Peace.” Retrieved from [www.un.org.ua/files/guidelines\\_gwa.pdf](http://www.un.org.ua/files/guidelines_gwa.pdf) on August 1, 2011.
- UNHCR. “Angelina Jolie releases new video to draw attention to plight of refugees around the world.” UNHCR News, June 16, 2009.  
<http://www.unhcr.org/4a37a0466.html>
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Star Appeal.” <http://www.starappeal.unhcr.org/>
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Do 1 Thing.” <http://www.unhcr.org/do1thing/index.php>
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Goodwill Ambassador Angelina Jolie Visits Afghanistan.”  
<http://unhcr.org/v-49b7c1042>
- \_\_\_\_\_. “With a Little Help From Our Friends.” UNHCR People.  
<http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646c3b.html>
- UNICEF. *Assignment: Children*. New York: Paramount Pictures, 1954. DVD copy provided by UNICEF, October 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Danny Kaye’s Around the World Storybook*. New York: Random House, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Goodwill Ambassador Archive: Audrey Hepburn. Tape 1: 1988-1989. DVD copy provided by UNICEF. Shot lists and scripts available on-line from:  
[http://origin-www.UNICEF.org/videoaudio/media\\_15904.html](http://origin-www.UNICEF.org/videoaudio/media_15904.html)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Goodwill Ambassador Archive: Audrey Hepburn. Tape 3: 1992-2003. DVD copy provided by UNICEF. Shot lists and scripts available on-line from:  
[http://origin-www.UNICEF.org/videoaudio/media\\_15904.html](http://origin-www.UNICEF.org/videoaudio/media_15904.html)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Kofi Annan Goodwill Gala Remarks, Beverly Hills, California, December 3, 2003. Available at: <http://www.unis.unvienna.org/unis/pressrels/2003/sgsm9049.html>
- \_\_\_\_\_. Kul Chandra Gautam, Remarks At the Annual Meeting of the US Fund for UNICEF, Atlanta, June 19, 2008. Available at: <http://kulgautam.org/website/kuls-speech/kuls-speech-UNICEF/207-audrey-hepburn-humanitarian-award.html>
- \_\_\_\_\_. “UNICEF People: Danny Kaye.”  
[http://www.UNICEF.org/people/people\\_danny\\_kaye.html](http://www.UNICEF.org/people/people_danny_kaye.html)
- Us Magazine* staff. “Olivia Wilde ‘Gutted’ by Haiti Earthquake.” January 14, 2010. Accessed August 1, 2011. <http://awards.omg.yahoo.com/news/1525-olivia-wilde-gutted-by-haiti-earthquake>

- Von Eschen, Penny. *Satchmo Blows Up the World: Jazz Ambassadors Play the Cold War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Wagner, John. "In Helms, Bono Finds the Ally He's Looking For." *Raleigh News and Observer*, September 2, 2000.
- Weisberg, Jacob. "Condi, Hollarly, and...Angelina?" *Slate.com*, October 11, 2005. Accessed February 11, 2010. <http://www.slate.com/id/2127834/>
- Wernick, Andrew. *Promotional Culture: Advertising, Ideology, and Symbolic Expression*. London: Sage, 1991.
- West, Darrell M. and Orman, John. *Celebrity Politics*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2003.
- Wheeler, Mark. "Celebrity Diplomacy: The United Nations' Goodwill Ambassadors and Messengers of Peace." *Celebrity Studies* 2:1 (2010): 6-18.
- Willkie, Wendell. *One World*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1943.
- Wilson, Julie. "Star Testing: The Emerging Politics of Celebrity Gossip." *Velvet Light Trap* 75 (2010): 25-38.
- Wolf, Naomi. "The Power of Angelina." *Harper's Bazaar*, June 8, 2009. Accessed August 2, 2011. <http://www.harpersbazaar.com/magazine/cover/angelina-jolie-essay-0709>
- Women's Wear Daily* staff. January 7, 2010. Accessed August 2, 2011. <http://www.wwd.com/media-news/fashion-memopad/glossy-karlie-vogue-and-lucky-launch-partnerships-new-gravy-train-2405375?full=true>
- Zanotti, Laura. "Governmentalizing the Post-Cold War International Regime: The UN Debate on Democratization and Good Governance." *Alternatives* 30 (2005): 461-487.