

Environment, Politics and Development Working Paper Series

Department of Geography, King's College London

Year 2011

Paper # 38

Celebritus Politicus and Neo-liberal Sustainabilities

Mike Goodman

Department of Geography, King's College London

©2011 by the Author(s)

This paper is posted at King's College London, Department of Geography at
<http://www.kcl.ac.uk/schools/sspp/geography/research/epd/working.html>

... [I]t is safe to say that in many countries around the world celebrity politics has become more than a fringe phenomenon. Nor is it likely to be an ephemeral one. It is inextricably tied to the late-modern constitution of the public sphere and it is therefore here to stay.

(Marsh et al, 2010: 16)

Emotional capitalism is a culture in which emotional and economic discourses and practices mutually shape each other, thus producing what I view as a broad, weeping movement in which affect is made an essential aspect of economic behavior and in which emotional life—especially that of the middle classes—follows the logic of economic relations and exchange. ... In fact ... market-based cultural repertoires shape and inform interpersonal and emotional relationships, while interpersonal relationships are at the epicenter or economic relationships. More exactly, market repertoires become intertwined with the language of psychology and, combined together, offer new techniques and meanings to forge new forms of sociability.

(Illouz, 2007: 5)

In liberal communist ethics, the ruthless pursuit of profit is counteracted by charity. Charity is humanitarian mask hiding the face of economic exploitation. In a superego blackmail of gigantic proportions, the developed countries 'help' the underdeveloped with aid, credits and so on, and thereby avoid the key issue namely their complicity in and co-responsibility for the miserable situation of the underdeveloped.

(Zizek, 2008: 19)

Jim Carrey concerned about Third World sustainable rice production. Demi Moore and Ashton Kutcher focused on sex trafficking and global prostitution networks. George Clooney as the 'face' of Darfur and Sean Penn that of Haiti. Lyndsey Lohan tweeting about child labour in India. Kim Kardashian and Naomi Campbell raising awareness about 'conflict' diamonds. And Scarlett Johansson, Helena Christensen and Kristin Davis—all as Oxfam's global ambassadors—writing an open letter to the UK's *Guardian* newspaper about their hopes for the Cancun climate conference. From the perspective of these examples, the contemporary icons of development, human rights and the environment are undergoing 'make-overs' of spectacular proportions.¹ Relatively gone or at least in the process of being overtaken are the 'old' images of drowning polar bears, starving, fly-covered African children and even the well-branded, human-rights group NGO Amnesty International in favour of those images and media formulations of the 'caring' and 'politicised' celebrity. Indeed, evolving out of this growing confluence of care, politics, foundations, activism, NGOs, media, popularity and stardom—as encapsulated in Littler's (2009) quip that compassion is now part of the job description of the contemporary celebrity—is what I like to now think of as a novel 'species' of celebrity called *Celebritus politicus*. This is the increasingly stable figure of the 'rich and famous' who are more and more fronting various causes that work for broadly-defined 'progressive' improvements in the multitudinous environment- and development-related problems across the

¹ Indeed, at the time of the writing of this chapter, the earthquake and tsunami had just hit in Japan with a number of celebrities, like P. Diddy and Khloé Kardashian immediately jumping up to help through Twitter to tell us they are praying for the victims. As a *Guardian* newspaper blog post rather cynically put it: 'say what you will about the world's celebrities, they're nothing if not redoubtable in a crisis. No sooner had the Japanese earthquake struck than they sprang into action, immediately using their fame to offer the most effective and practical form of help imaginable: better than urging their fans to donate money to Red Cross efforts, better even than donating themselves. They mounted a hashtag campaign on Twitter suggesting people should pray. ... "Let us pray!!!!" offered P. Diddy. "Praying hard" added Khloé Kardashian' (Lost in Showbiz Blog, 2011).

globe. In this, the rise and evolution of *Celebritus politicus* is working to change the nature of celebrity, fame and ‘expertise’ (e.g. Goodman and Barnes, 2011; Richey and Ponte, 2011) but also seeming to shift the cultural politics of environment and development as they become more deeply celebritised (Boykoff and Goodman, 2009; Goodman, 2010; see also Brockington, 2008, 2009; Ponte et al, 2009; Richey and Ponte, 2008).²

But, as the opening quote by Marsh et al (2010) alludes to, celebrity politics are quickly becoming much more than a privileged few pronouncing on the poor state of the environment or the state of the poor through these growing ties of celebrity politics to what they call the ‘late-modern constitution of the public sphere’. As I argue in this chapter, we need to consider the processes and impacts of celebrity politics even *further* than Marsh et al give them credit: more than just contributing to the production of the public sphere (how and in what ways?), celebrity politics in the body of *Celebritus politicus* have been situated and also worked to situate themselves as a stylised form of the neo-liberalised governance of the problems of environment and development. In short, drawing on but also contributing to the ‘moral authority’ of a hegemonic market-led governance of sustainability, this ‘celebrity governance regime’ works to produce a kind of ‘market’ in caring and responsibility that goes right to the people in the form of ‘fans’ designed to circumvent the slow politics of States, policy and government regulations. The results—to build on Illouz’s (2007) writings on ‘emotional capitalism’—are a sort of neo-liberal form of sustainability politics: on the one hand, the ‘heroic individualism’ (Boykoff and Goodman, 2009) of celebrities and these new ‘fans’ of ‘enviro-’ and ‘poverty-tainment’ are called upon to solve current and ongoing world crises directly through this market in emotions. On the other hand, these same individual responses are collectivised into markets for and of care through the body of celebrities, their foundations/charities and their access to powerful decision- and other market-makers. However, given the attention economy embedded in the spectacles of *Celebritus politicus*, the ‘natural selection’ of causes, attention, care and resources is similarly embedded in and constructs the very boundaries of what it is we should be caring about and how we should go about doing this caring in an increasingly unequal world.

Through the sections of this chapter, I hope to produce an initial exploration of the ways in which *Celebritus politicus* acts as an embodiment of neo-liberal sustainabilities. In this, my arguments are diffusely based on interviews, conversations and reflections over the last two years with a number of progressive UK NGOs about their engagements with and uses of celebrities in their campaigns, as well as a kind of reflexive ‘participant observation’ emersion in the television, newspaper and online media related to celebrity politics and activism. More specifically, though, I want to firstly establish what I mean by ‘celebrity governance regimes’ and how they draw on but also contribute to ‘neo-liberalised sustainabilities’³ and the wider cultures of neo-liberalisms that circulate in contemporary post-industrial societies. And, while this is merely one possible interpretation of many of the characteristics, impacts and a/effects of celebrity politics (e.g. Brockington, 2009; Bunting, 2010; Cooper, 2008; Marsh et al, 2010; Marshall, 1997; Street, 2004), the point here is to open up further and wider questions about the relationalities of *Celebritus politicus* and the cultural political economies within which they are embedded.

Second, the chapter focuses in on the processes by which this celebrity governance regime works, namely through the ‘fame-seeking’ and ‘fame-utilising’ behaviours of celebrities to bring attention to their various causes; the ultimate goal, I would argue, is to create new ‘fans’ of development and/or environmental causes and concerns, whose concerns are then, through this poverty- and enviro-tainment, collectivised through the bodies, foundations and access of *Celebritus politicus* to the halls

² One particular aspect to the fascinating history of the rise of *Celebritus politicus* in the form of ‘celebrity diplomats’ is described in Cooper (2008).

³ For more on this see Part IV in Goodman et al (2011).

of power. In this, the 'heroic individual' in the figure of *Celebritus politicus* acting as the mechanism through which to collectivise this 'market' in existing and new fans' emotions and care as a way to further their particular causes they are concerned about. As such, one of the key tensions of *Celebritus politicus* is expressed here: In order for them to generate the emotional capital and monetary value for various causes and concerns they must work to shed their (commodified) skins as consummate commodities to instead present to audiences their 'ordinary' personhood as caring individuals willing and able to do something about suffering, environmental damage and human rights abuses. The relationalities between and among the commodity-ness and non-commodity-ness of the 'caring commodities' of *Celebritus politicus* are embedded at the very core of their species-media-being. Here—and while I am unable to do full justice to this in this chapter—the paradoxes, contradictions and somewhat awkward nature of *Celebritus politicus* come to the fore: at one and the same time, their very individualised, commodified-nature-ness circulates and mitigates against their non-commodified, 'fan-collectivising' function which, in turn, works to mitigate against and circulate in relation and opposition to this individualised, commodity-ness. In the words of Žižek (2008), they, as 'liberal communists' (13) who are the 'true citizens of the world' (17) working to create their very own 'Porto Davos'⁴ (14), are able to unsteadily embody market and social responsibility side-by-side through their 'neutral, non-ideological, natural [and] commonsensical' (31) approach to poverty and environmental destruction.

Finally, the chapter briefly concludes with questions about the competitive political economies, much of them tied to the psychologies and personal concerns of particular celebrities and their potential to garner media coverage, related to the 'natural selection' of not only celebrities but of their causes. It is my hope that this chapter works to provide an initial assessment and set of questions surrounding the possibilities but also problematics of *Celebritus politicus*—somewhat beyond Žižek's (2008) rather crude (but justified) indictment of liberal communists—as a way to more fully bring into sharp relief the rich ironies of working to reduce global inequalities and environmental problems through many of the same neo-liberal governmentalities that have had a hand in creating and facilitating them in the first place.

Neo-liberalised celebrity governance regimes

It is pretty safe to say we in the post-industrial North—if not most of the globe—are governed in various and multitudinous ways and means by the precepts, materialities and ideologies of neo-liberal capitalism. Privatisation, marketisation, commodification, entrepreneurialism, freedom of choice, individualisation, competition, consumerism, anti-regulation and voluntarism seemingly rule much of the political and cultural economics of the day. And, yet, as most geographers and many others will argue, the reach and actual impacts of neo-liberalism are uneven, incomplete, shifting and indeed contested (e.g. Harvey, 2005; Smith, 1984; Gibson-Graham, 2009); this is especially true when it comes to the commodification, privatisation and marketisation of nature (Mansfield, 2008; McCarthy and Prudham, 2004; Castree, 2003). Indeed, debates are now centred around exploring and uncovering 'actually existing neo-liberalisms' (Castree, 2005) and also engaging with contestations within neo-liberalism through the use of market-based forms and tools (Ferguson, 2009) in the pursuit of 'diverse economies' (Gibson-Graham, 2009). Yet, even with the unevenness of the 'roll-back' of the state and 'roll-out' of neo-liberalist political economies, the hegemonic *cultural politics* of neo-liberal capitalism seemingly remain, endure and, if the newly elected Conservative government in the UK and the back-in-power (Tea Party) Republicans in the US are any indication, set to expand to an even greater extent (Cf. Goodman and Boyd, 2011).

⁴ This is Žižek's mash up of Porto Alegre, the meeting place of the 'who's who' of global social movements and Davos, the yearly meeting place of the 'who's who' of global capitalism.

One of the areas in which neo-liberal capitalism is particularly ascendant is in the realm of how to 'fix' environment- and development-related problems. As Micheletti and Stolle (2008: 750) put it in the specific context of the politics and materialities of the anti-sweatshop movement, 'capitalism is helping capitalism to develop a face of social justice'. In the realm of environment politics, McAfee (1999) has astutely called this 'greening of capitalism' (Bakker, 2010) the 'selling of nature to save it'. Here, in more general terms, the tools of privatization, commodification and marketisation are deployed to create new markets in sustainable or environmentally-, development- and/or human rights-friendly goods for 'ethical consumers' to purchase. Or, in parallel, complete markets like those for carbon offsets are created in order to turn whole economic sectors 'green'. Called everything from 'natural capitalism' (e.g. Hawken et al, 1999) to social entrepreneurship, green capitalism, caring capitalism, to the triple bottom line, these neo-liberal sustainabilities work on and through 'values' to create and extract conservation and development 'value' through markets for sustainable natures and developments. While subject to a number of critical academic treatments of late (e.g. *Antipode*, 2010; Bakker, 2007, 2010; Castree, 2003; Fridell, 2007; Prudham, 2009; Rutherford, 2007; see also Escobar, 1995), in particular, I have argued that neo-liberal sustainabilities work to, on the one hand, not only marketise and commodify care and caring across space—the most obvious example of this being the purchase of 'care' off the supermarket shelf through fair trade products—but also responsabilise consuming publics with the task of making the 'choice' for sustainability in the products they buy (Cf. Guthman, 2007). On the other hand, counter-arguments see these 'ethical consumption singularities' (Clarke et al, 2007; Clarke, 2008; see also Barnett et al, 2010) as the empowerment of caring consumers in the processes of social change through their 'everyday' and 'ordinary' acts of choice that then, in turn, work to similarly empower development and environmental NGOs who do the 'hard work' of civil society lobbying for progressive change in the name of these ethical consumers. Here, NGOs work to 'collectivise' these individual purchases into a monetarized but also 'socially responsible' market of caring emotions, that, if this market is large or influential enough, is able to garner media attention as well as access to policy makers. How this all plays out on a vastly unequal playing field remains to be seen, but if the success of the fair trade movement and market in the UK—at over £1 billion in 2010 and potentially recession-resistant (Fairtrade Foundation, 2011)—is any proof, then neo-liberal sustainabilities can be quite successful, 'compete' with capital to a certain extent, but also have far-reaching implications for livelihoods and environments in those markets *that are successful*. The wider point is this however: neo-liberal sustainabilities draw on but also contribute to the political but also cultural and moral authority of neo-liberal capitalism and so seem to further embed it in civil society and our everyday lifestyles and livelihoods.

But what, might you ask, does this have to do with *Celebritus politicus*? Well, for me, the figure of *Celebritus politicus* is fundamentally situated in, draws on and also contributes to these hegemonic cultural politics of neo-liberalism and of the neo-liberal sustainabilities that define this particular historical moment. More specifically, the processes surrounding and constructing *Celebritus politicus* are entrenched in the implicit and/or explicit moral authority of the neo-liberal 'ways of doing things' in, for example, how it creates media-ated and competitive 'markets' for various causes and concerns; more on this below. And, while like any species, the individualized behaviours at any one time might be quite different for various members of that species, there are generalisable trends, if not 'genetic markers' that lend themselves to categorisation and comparison within and across these trends. Put another way, while there are different specific processes, characteristics and outcomes for different celebrities and different celebrity-fronted campaigns, there exists here what I am calling a 'celebrity governance regime' that works to emulate, take guidance from and contribute to the processes of neo-liberal sustainabilities.

I want to turn now to sketch the outlines of this celebrity governance regime by exploring how it expresses and embeds key aspects of neo-liberalism/neo-liberal sustainabilities as the morally 'right'

and/or 'good' way of going about 'doing' development, conservation or human rights. Be aware, however, that more is going on here as these governance regimes have, across their diversity, made neo-liberal sustainabilities very much in their own complex and even sometimes paradoxical image that cross the boundaries of media-tion, personas and personalities, fans, audiences, emotions, tastes and knowledges in addition to the complicated and slippery politics surrounding causes, charities and relief efforts. Indeed, the various discourses and material processes that create these celebrity governance regimes through their own internal differences and dynamics work to lend credibility to the arguments that there are multiple cultural and political economies of neo-liberalisms (Cf. Castree, 2005). In this, these neo-liberalisms circulate in and out of celebrity governance regimes to discipline but also reward those operating within them and their moral framing about what *does* and *should* count as progressive development and environmentalism through the figure of *Celebritus politicus*.

In order to explore celebrity governance regimes in more detail, I have divided their main aspects and characteristics into several descriptive and analytical categories that, while separated out for effect, are very often (yet also differentially!) connected across these regimes.

Heavenly bodies and (media) market competition

The first point to make here is that celebrity governance regimes are fully market-oriented and –coordinated both metaphorically and in actual practice. Market-led competitive relationalities define most aspects of *Celebritus politicus*: from competition by causes for A-list or 'hot' celebrities, to competition by these celebrities for media 'face time' for their causes, to that among celebrities for the emotions and (very often) donations by 'caring' audiences. Moreover, *Celebritus politicus* is in fundamental competition with all the other messages, marketing, knowledges and imaginaries transmitted by media 'out there' in wider media-scapes. Here then is a market created by and for the 'fame game' in which (some) 'celebrity sells' (Pringle 2004), the marketing and sales pitch of which is for attention—and often, ultimately donations, purchases and revenues—for progressive causes. Indeed, it might be argued that through the use of some of the top A-list celebrities such as Angelina Jolie, Beyoncé and Matt Damon, causes and concerns gain, at least for a short time, the exposure and access to media power often only reserved for the likes of large corporations.

Yet all of this competition amongst *Celebritus politicus* and within the celebrity governance regime is situated within the competitive markets for media more generally. Thus, the power of *Celebritus politicus* is fully mediated by the power, powerful markets—but more often monopolistic power (McChesney 2008; see also Marshall, 1997)—of media outlets as well as their own internal political and cultural economic logics. And, while buffers against these media monopolies are being created through the growth of internet media in general and the growing number of online celebrity gossip and news websites⁵ in particular the goal for much of *Celebritus politicus* is to explicitly make it *into* more mainstream news and media outlets to gain the greatest amount of coverage. Indeed, simply in terms of exposure, and in what might seem like a heretical statement, for *Celebritus politicus*, media monopolies are actually a 'good' thing for those who can, indeed, make it into the mainstream in efforts to further the awareness of particular causes. Nevertheless, the mediated power of celebrities works to create distinct 'winners' and 'losers' in the competitive, marketised fame game embedded in celebrity governance regimes, but so too does the power embedded in and wielded by the distinctive political economies of the media landscape. Thus, the outcomes of these markets are a result of the competitive logics, relationalities and tensions of *Celebritus politicus*, causes and concerns, and the political and cultural economies of the media. The neo-liberal tendrils embodied in *Celebritus politicus* have long and winding networks that reach not only into and out of

⁵ There are now several dedicated websites such as looktothestars.com and ecorazzi.com specifically devoted to the media surrounding these stars and their politicised doings.

the marketised competition for and of celebrity, causes and audiences, but into the highly mediated realms of profit- and audience-seeking media organizations, their editorial boards and board rooms.

Part of this competition means that *Celebritus politicus* and the progressive organizations they are involved with must be particularly 'entrepreneurial' across all media in order to maximize exposure or develop exposure in the first instance. This entrepreneurialism is needed specifically to creatively and decisively 'cut through' both the signal and noise of the wider media landscape and so is expressed in what celebrities are matched up to what causes, how they go about gaining exposure and/or what types of media to use where to develop concerned fans and followers. One of the contemporary hallmarks of this entrepreneurialism is the growing use of social or 'new' media such as blogs, Facebook and/or Twitter.⁶ Examples here might include Ben Stiller tweeting that 'People in Haiti need our help and attention right now' immediately after the disaster and George Clooney's 'Not on Our Watch' Darfur Facebook page which has now morphed into his star- and corporate-studded 'Satellite Sentinel Project' designed to be an 'Antigenocide Paparazzi' (Benjamin, 2010).⁷ Indeed, given the overt obsession of the current 'mainstream' media about the simple use of new media by campaigns of all stripes, many activists are merely counting on the fact that they simply use Facebook and Twitter as a way to get traditional media exposure regardless of the campaign, the celebrities or the contents of either. But of course the type of and/or need for entrepreneurialism is differentially situated across the various actors involved in celebrity governance regimes. So, for example those already on the A-list or those organizations like WWF with a well established brand and media profile need to seemingly work much less hard at this versus other celebrities and organizations. Rather, A-listers and established environment and development NGOs work at 'new' ways in which to harness the media and develop or sustain new campaigns. The real work of the 'entrepreneurial spirit' comes in with less well known campaigns and celebrities who need to develop new and more creative ways of 'making it' into the media. In either case, though, the point still stands: entrepreneurialism here is about the creativity and inventiveness in both the use of celebrities by campaigns but also about the ways that *Celebritus politicus* wield their celebrity in new, interesting and sometimes 'shocking' (think PETA here) ways to garner attention from media and audiences both new and old.⁸

"Stars—They're Just Like Us"⁹: A/effective (non)commodification and the economies of hope

Second, commodification, one of the cornerstones of capitalism and not just its neo-liberal variants, is also rife in celebrity governance regimes in a number of interesting, multiple, complex and even contradictory ways. Here, celebrity-driven campaigns are very often focused around the purchase of socially-responsible goods, be they Product (RED) lattes from Starbucks, hybrid cars, sustainable fish or fair trade coffees and other goods. Through these mechanisms, celebrities lend their elevated voices, media-generated credibility and 'expertise' in all things environment and development-related to the credibility of these goods but more fundamentally, the commodifying processes behind them. Their authority and exposure feeds into the authority, power and 'correct-', 'good-'

⁶ Twitter in particular has been used for *Celebritus politicus* to announce support for certain causes or for causes to either demonstrate their connections to celebrities or launch and/or maintain existing campaigns.

⁷ Satellite Sentinel uses satellite mapping to publicise conflict and military/militia movements in Sudan; for more, see www.satsentinel.org.

⁸ While not explored specifically here, entrepreneurialism is also involved in celebrity governance regimes in the more traditional sense: social businesses like Product (RED) (see Richey and Ponte, 2011), or at least stumping for these social businesses, are quickly also becoming part and parcel of the job description of *Celebritus politicus* as well as more 'progressive' business and civil society leaders; Porto Davos (Zizek, 2008) indeed.

⁹ This is the by-line from the ongoing featured section in the American 'star-gazing' tabloid US Magazine that works to show just how 'like us' real people mega-stars actually are through candid photos of them bike riding with their children, buying coffees at Starbucks or wearing 'relaxing' clothes on the weekends.

and 'right-ness' of the commodification of care and responsibility for Others and the environment as well as feeding into the wider moral authorities of neo-liberal sustainabilities. This, to me is one of the furthest reaching implications of the celebrity governance regime and *Celebritus politicus*: given their seemingly increasing power to 'market' to us the 'right' pathways and products to deal with the global inequalities and environmental concerns, this fundamentally strengthens the cultural and economic hands of consumerist capitalism as a specific tool for more sustainable and 'caring' societies.

Attached to the above, there are also other processes of commodification, or at least commodification 'by proxy', through a further key component circulating in celebrity governance regimes in the monetary contributions made by the public as cajoled by *Celebritus politicus*. In this, care and emotion are monetised and set a particular 'price', the amount depending on what a particular person is willing to voluntarily give or pay, to then be collected into the total amount given. Then, these monetised acts of care are more fully (re)commodified into the goods provided to the poor/environment at the other end of the networks of *Celebritus politicus*: they are turned into conservation habitats, mosquito nets, anti-viral drugs, disaster relief, food aid and sometimes local labour used to rebuild war- or disaster-torn places, landscapes, cities and homes. Thus, along with the deployments of socially responsible goods for consumption, through their extensive focus on donations and giving, the celebrity governance regime has developed a heavy reliance on growing and sustaining these commodified and monetarised forms of care politics that further flesh out the moral authority of neo-liberalised sustainabilities.

In celebrity governance regimes, there is also a kind of 'reverse' or 'relational' commodification of care, emotion and responsibilities: here, the politics and ethics of care become part of or at least intimately related to the commodity form of *Celebritus politicus*. This, then translates into a 'de-differentiation' of consumption (Bryman, 2004) whereby there is increasing slippage among the purchase of the more 'normal' outputs of *Celebritus politicus* in their albums, movies, cookbooks and television shows and a 'buying-in' to them as caring celebrity subjects and an equal (but potentially more distant) 'buying in' to the caring campaigns they are associated with. Thus, *Celebritus politicus* is not just like any celebrity commodity—of which they very much still are, *politicus* or not (Turner 2004, 2010)—but rather, they are commodities that are now even more fully embedded with meanings related to care, politics and emotion. The most obvious instance of this reverse commodification is where celebrities expressly 'do things' (e.g. appearances, shows, competitions, etc) for charities or causes or whereby part of the value created by their 'normal' outputs in albums, books, clothes lines and perfumes might 'go' towards charities, causes or foundations. Here value and values in their multiple forms flow and circulate in a number of interesting ways: by using their celebrity value as a commodity and cultural icon, celebrities 'add value' to campaigns through exposure and/or increasing the monetary value of campaigns. But this can also flow the other way: care as a value works to contribute to the 'value' of celebrity brands and commodities as well as their own subjectivities as caring individuals with elevated voices bent on—as Bono has put it—spending their 'currency' of this celebrity for good and worthy causes (Boykoff and Goodman, 2009). Care has thus also become a 'currency' of a kind that can work to add meanings and values to the celebrity commodity brand in its more normal and non-*Celebritus politicus* state (Cf. Littler, 2008).

This growing currency of care can be briefly but incredibly well-illustrated by the recent moves of the former Pussycat Doll Nicole Scherzinger who

...announced her forthcoming debut solo album or, as she put it, "a miracle of Haiti's disaster": She had met the album's producer at the recording of a charity single for Haiti. "The one good thing to come from that tragedy," she suggested, "was my music" which will doubtless come as considerable comfort to the relatives of the 316,000 people who

died, the 1.6 million left homeless and the 3,500 affected by a subsequent outbreak of cholera. Obviously they're suffering, but with the news that Scherzinger[']s got a "raw, soulful and funky" solo album out of it, at least their suffering isn't in vain. (Lost in Showbiz Blog, 2011)

Not surprisingly, many critics have quickly jumped on instances like these and worked to articulate the much more cynical position that caring celebrities are either working to plot the further elevation of their brand or some sort of 'comeback' for those either knocked off the A-list, on the B-list anyway, or undergoing some sort of media/tabloid scandal. The question is of course one of the 'weighing up' of authenticity by audiences: where does the 'caring' versus commodity-ness of *Celebritus politicus* begin and where do they each end? This clearly depends on the specific celebrity and/or campaign in question, but this is also partially about our *hope* that celebrities might be as authentic and altruistic as they seem, especially given their power to articulate the politics of development and the environment. In short, we (or at least I!) have a deep-seated hope that our contemporary politicised glitterati actually *really* do care about the climate (DiCaprio), 'clean' diamonds (Kardashian) and water (Damon), sustainable housing (Pitt), global poverty, women's rights and refugees (Jolie), exploited children (Lohan), hunger in the US (Affleck) and Aids and poverty (Lennox) amongst the other massively growing bevy of celebrity-fronted causes and concerns. Or, maybe a better approach here is to simply collapse the caring- and commodity-nature present in *Celebritus politicus* and their 'terrains of affect' to suggest that they are *themselves*—much like socially responsible consumer goods—'caring commodities' that utilise their elevated voices to articulate to us what they want us as publics to do about underdevelopment and environmental problems.

Yet, from a different perspective, this is also about celebrities working to 'de-commodify' themselves and appear to be coming from a more 'normal' subjectivity of ordinary personhood. Here the task is to slip the bounds of their super-stardom to engage with us as regular people who not only can take our phone calls in charity drives, set up tent villages in places of disaster or crisis, write letters extolling our political leaders into action, but that they can seemingly 'bear witness' for us by engaging with, walking amongst and being filmed in the presence of the poor and deteriorating environments (Goodman and Barnes 2011; see also Nunn and Biressi 2010 and Chouliaraki, 2008). What we need to see, hear and read about is Matt Damon's trip across Africa for the ONEXONE's clean water campaign, Jim Carrey joking with locals in the midst of rice fields and David Beckham laughing as he plays a round of 'footie' with poor African children. This is a very important point as it introduces one of the key paradoxes that circulate and make up celebrity governance regimes: *Celebritus politicus* works to generate monetary value and emotional values out of their commodified *but also* non-commodified, ordinary forms for seemingly both the campaigns/causes they contribute to but also their own 'brand' value. And the motivations behind all of this are also potentially paradoxical: the currency of celebrity can be spent to invoke care and care in others for Others and for the environment but at the same time this care is its own currency that can be spent to much more cynically invoke the 'care' by publics, consumers, fans and audiences for the more quotidian products of celebrities and so expand their own personal and media values and brands.

Publicising private politics and the new responsabilisation

Finally, in celebrity governance regimes, privatisation, whether of politics, care, or of 'giving' or all the way to 'private enterprise' and the 'private sector', is extolled and/or implied as the way to go about solving underdevelopment, dealing with disasters or confronting environmental problems. And, here this privatisation of care falls across a number of the 'ways and means' of *Celebritus politicus*. First, as both rhetorically applied or implied more diffusely, privatisation is set up as the 'right' and 'better' way to perform these things as States and governments are constructed as too

slow to respond, corrupted and captured by other (often corporate) powers, mis-guided, not flexible and generally to have 'failed' the development and environmental project. This sense of failure on the part of States—and in particular for States to take care of their own people and environments—figures very large here and so the alternative of extolling the virtues of private individuals and the private sector, as well as the 'private' politics of *Celebritus politicus*, has been put forward in celebrity governance regimes as the way to very often 'do' development and conservation. Much like NGOs and other movements, celebrities have stepped into the gap of the growing 'democratic deficit' both nationally and globally and attempted to fill this up in very interesting, private-led 'collectivised' ways.

Furthermore, however, the private politics and care emotions of celebrities 'go public' to implore us to also take our own private donations, purchases and emotions public in the form of 'help' for those less fortunate than us. And these connections, brokered by the private/public emotions of *Celebritus politicus* and their own connections to foundations, NGOs and relief organisations, can take the form of us as private citizens emotionally and materially connecting to private citizens or specific species 'over there' to wider connections between our private selves, lives and media audiences to wider civil societies and/or forms of nature 'in need'. Here, it might be argued that the figure of *Celebritus politicus* is in the very real business of fostering and creating, through private donations and the 'collecting' and connecting up of private emotions and care, a more aware, political and active 'global citizenship' that might stand in distinction to or at least outside of neo-liberalism's penchant for hyper-individualism. Much more needs to be made theoretically and empirically of the relationalities between and among the private/public subjects and objects of individuals, civil societies, the public realm and global citizenship and the functioning of the private/public politics of *Celebritus politicus*. Suffice it to say here, however, much of the celebrity governance regime calls on us, one way or another, as privatised subjects and the private sector to act in ways very often contra the State, to confront underdevelopment and environmental crisis.

Tied very much to this penchant for privatisation in celebrity governance regimes is that of both the volunteerism and responsabilisation of individuals and also *Celebritus politicus*; both this voluntary 'regulatory' approach and that of the responsabilisation of civil society individuals further embed the moral authority of the privatised, individualised, choice-based politics that are at the veritable core of not only neo-liberal sustainabilities—especially in the form of progressive food politics (Guthman, 2007; Johnston, 2008)—but which are core to neo-liberalisms of all stripes. In celebrity governance regimes, then, donations, contributions and the purchase of socially responsible goods are voluntary and so become yet another version of this choice-based politics, but one that works through the 'imploring' media exposure of the 'volunteered' philanthropic and emotional politics of celebrities. Celebrity-driven campaigns can also be seen to work to responsibilise consumers and audiences as the agents of change through their targeting of audiences, publics and private individuals; this often elides or wilfully ignores the offending structures, corporations and/or other actors involved in underdevelopment, poverty and environmental destruction. As articulated in more dire and uncompromising Zizek-ian (2008) terms, the distracting, 'bait-and-switch' of this 'objective violence' in the spectacularized images of celebrity-fronted campaigns seems to work quite well to actively cover for the wider processes of 'subjective' or capitalistically-induced violence they are consciously or unconsciously part and parcel of.

Here, through *Celebritus politicus*, audiences are asked to choose amongst worthy celebrities, campaigns, petitions, corporations and products as *the* force for 'good', outside of the power and agency of (failed) States and governments. Yet, this is also about and works on the empowerment of audiences through the words, images and power of *Celebritus politicus*. In some ways similar to 'ethical consumption' (Clarke et al 2007; Lewis and Potter 2010; Littler 2009), having these particular choices of 'doing good' through donations, charity and ethical consumption in celebrity governance

regimes—in an era where too much information or the democratic-deficit seemingly ‘dis-empowers’ people or at least gives them the impression ‘nothing can be done’—works to empower individuals to donate or shop for social and environmental change. This of course says little about *who* has the resources to donate/shop and then be/feel empowered, but it is most often triggered through the discourse that come from *Celebritus politicus* like ‘your donation will...’ to ‘simply sign this petition...’ to ‘please give what you can to...’ and also the abilities of celebrities to lead by example as ‘heroic individuals’, the closer examination of which I turn to now.

Fame matters: Heroic individuals that create collectivised caring markets

Much more than the other characteristics of the celebrity governance regime described above, it is the neo-liberal cultural economic figure of the individual that reigns supreme here. Celebrities are a kind of ‘ultimate’ or ‘uber’ neo-liberal individual: through their own meritorious or media-generated power, their very individuality in the form of their individual person-hood comes to represent a commodified ‘brand’ in and of itself but also represents the apogee of what an individual can and should be. As Marshall (1997: 17; see also Marshall 2010 and Boykoff et al, 2010), in drawing on Dyer (1979) puts it ‘...the star is universally individualized, for the star is the representation of the potential of the individual’. By the power of who they are individually, through their image, name, words or action they sell and endorse themselves and, equally, their campaigns, causes and politics. They are the ‘heroic individuals’ who use their fame for good causes but who are also the self-same heroic individuals we are inspired to be, we aspire to be or at least be related to through our own ‘heroically individual’ relief-fund donations and socially-responsible purchases.

But there is much more going on here: while neo-liberalism ‘works’ to empower individualism, it also, through its discourses and the materialities of consumer purchases, works to empower ‘markets’ as well. Here, in economic theory at least, rational, consuming individuals are ‘collectivised’ into markets that can be used to speak for and about markets in this or that, but which can also be used as forms of power by corporations wishing to ‘speak’ for and in the name of these ‘markets’ of collectivised individuals across a number of different settings. Similarly, as in ethical consumption networks, neo-liberal sustainabilities work in very much the same way: individual progressive consumption choices for, for example fair trade goods, are ‘collectivised’ by NGOs—in this case—who then gain ‘political’ power by speaking for and through these markets for ethical goods or contributions from members (Clarke et al, 2007). In many ways this is also happening here in celebrity governance regimes: *Celebritus politicus* as individuals, work to ‘collectivise’ us/publics as individuals and our ‘singular’ emotional responses through progressive campaigns and their individual actions as the voice for various causes. In their recent book ‘Brand Aid’, Richey and Ponte (2011) show the propensity for this—or at least for politicised celebrities to *believe* this propensity—in stark relief through the words of Bono:

The reason why politicians let me in the door, and the reason why people will take my call is because I represent quite a large constituency of people. Now, I do not control that constituency, but I represent them in a certain sense, even without them asking me to, in the minds of the people whose doors I knock upon. That constituency is a very powerful one, because it is a constituency of people from eighteen to thirty, who are the floating vote. . . . They’re the most open-minded, contemporary culture and what a rock star might have to do with all of this: because of the people I represent. (Richey and Ponte, 2011: 36)

In a sense, *Celebritus politicus* is at the epicentre of the creation of novel markets in care and emotions, that they not only mobilise through and for donations, internet campaigns and like, but they then also ‘speak’ for us when writing letters, talking to the media and/or engaging with those in

power in the context of their politicised concerns. The key here, though, and somewhat contra neo-liberal sustainabilities and neo-liberalism more broadly, is that these are markets that are importantly made up of ‘fans’ of *Celebritus politicus* and so, much beyond the more traditional ‘markets’ made up of monetary donations, charity giving and petition signatories, these new parallel markets in emotion are created but also fundamentally bounded by issues of ‘taste’, media-exposure, personality and their relationalities to *Celebritus politicus*. So, increasingly important in celebrity governance regimes are the number of Facebook ‘friends’ or Twitter ‘followers’—an equally increasingly important way for celebrities to gather, speak to and speak for their fans (Marshall 2010)—for both *Celebritus politicus* and the causes they are associated with as this too is now part of the collectivised ‘market’ for which they speak to and from and from which they draw their power and elevated voice.

In order to create these markets, *Celebritus politicus* and the celebrity governance regime work principally through two types of celebrity behaviours. The first involves those ‘fame-utilising’ behaviours to bring awareness to campaigns through the already accreted fame to a particular celebrity and the second includes those ‘fame-seeking’ behaviours that work to publicise campaigns through celebrities working to ‘up their brand’ by association with particular causes. In short, both behaviours try to raise the awareness of already-existing fanbases as well as bring in ‘new’ fans to either the celebrity or the cause or both such that the focus here is on the development of more fans of what might be called ‘poverty-’ and/or ‘enviro-tainment’. In this, these markets of emotion and care come into their own: *Celebritus politicus* is used to ‘sell’ causes and contributions, concerns and socially-responsible consumerism through a competitive market for poverty/enviro-tainment designed to develop, capture and ‘use’ the fans of this poverty/enviro-tainment towards progressive ends.

Towards a conclusion/beginning: The psycho-political economies of *Celebritus politicus*

By way of a conclusion to this chapter—which is actually more of a beginning into what needs to be a much more sustained exploration into the worlds, networks and relationalities of *Celebritus politicus* and its celebrity governance regimes—I want to make several observations as well as offer some key questions for further work. First, poverty- and enviro-tainment are the growing end-results of the celebrity governance regime and one of the major ways we engage with disasters, crises, underdevelopment and threatened natures now. Structured by celebrity governance regimes which, if my analysis holds any empirical water, take on and contribute to the trappings and moral authority of neo-liberalism/neo-liberal sustainabilities, poverty/enviro-entertainment are as much structured by the political economies of media as they are ‘real’ and ‘authentic’ needs. But, very importantly, poverty/enviro-tainment is not only shaped by the political and cultural economic networks it is situated in, but it is also structured by the ‘powerful’ psychologies, personal experiences and affects of *Celebritus politicus*. In many ways, it is these caring (non)commodified politicised media figures who are now very much in the (actual) business of relating to audiences/publics what is wrong with the world today, what to do about it and in what ways to go about doing this ‘doing’. The psycho-political economies that shape the who, what and how of *Celebritus politicus* and, in turn, their, shaping of poverty/enviro-tainment are working to not only structure the bounds of our understandings and solutions to underdevelopment and environmental destruction, they are fundamentally shaping the much wider cultural and political economies of the terrains of care that circulate in contemporary societies. Moreover, and in a final nod to Zizek’s (2008) bleak take on all of this, there comes with *Celebritus politicus* a kind of ‘plausible deniability’—similar to what Max Boykoff and I have called ‘conspicuous redemption’ in the context of climate change celebrities—that gets turned into a kind of ‘caring deniability’ designed to set loose the philanthropic sensibilities and materialities of *Celebritus politicus* that very often work to hide the systemic and subjective violences upon which neo-liberal capitalisms are based.

Through this, and secondly, more power has been ceded to and collected by already fabulously powerful individuals. Here, through *Celebritus politicus*, the generic power of celebrity and media-generated fame is extended even further into our daily lives and the public realm through the ‘do-goodingness’ of celebrities, their pedagogical functionality and the often extended media coverage this all continues to get. More importantly, though, in the context of this chapter, celebrities have been granted but also seized the power to define for us what is important (or not) to ‘fix’ and ‘save’ and how to specifically govern these social and environmental problems (or not). From the psycho-political economies surrounding the cultures of *Celebritus politicus*, celebrities are our contemporary muses about what is wrong with key aspects of the globe and what approaches to take to deal with these crises of underdevelopment, poverty and threatened natures. Thus, the ‘markets’ in emotion created in and through *Celebritus politicus* create ‘winning’ and ‘losing’ causes, concerns and solutions that, when on the winning side like Hope for Haiti in the US (\$57 million), Comic Relief in the UK (£74 million in 2011) and the global success of Product (RED) (\$160 million by 2011) can generate millions in donations/purchases, or, when on the losing side, may not even make it much, if at all, into the public sphere or its consciousness (cf. Marsh et al, 2010).

A number of important questions and issues remain in the context of this flourishing of poverty- and enviro-tainment. For example, how might celebrity governance regimes and *Celebritus politics* change or add to our understandings of how ‘fandom’ is created and experienced now? Similarly, what are the actual, material impacts of ‘new media’ such as Facebook and Twitter on the constitution as well as outcomes of campaigns fronted by *Celebritus politicus*? In short, what does the growing importance of the number of Facebook friends and Twitter followers mean, beyond the arguments put forward here, for the ways activist campaigns are carried out, *Celebritus politicus* gets their work done and to the ultimate success of creating a better, more caring and more progressive set of global politics? Moreover, how does *Celebritus politicus* and the celebrity governance regime—and in particular their inclusion of the subjectivities and objectivities of ‘fans’ into these stylised markets for care—challenge the development of new theorisations around the growing discussions of ‘ethical consumption’ (Barnett et al 2010; Lewis and Potter, 2010), new forms of (elite?) ‘global citizenship’ and the new spaces of care emerging in the post-industrial, globalised world? Furthermore, how do the paradoxical trends and momentums of individualisation versus collectivisation, super-stardom versus ‘normalisation’ and commodification versus non-commodification play out in the specific instances of the practices of *Celebritus politicus*? In other words, how do all of these seemingly contradictory cultural political economies and materialisms work to construct *specific* instances and cases of (un)successful campaigns and the progressive politics of the day? Finally, much more critical light needs to be shed on the kinds of social, political, cultural and economic inequalities that are paradoxically somewhat challenged by but also further entrenched in celebrity governance regimes and the figure of *Celebritus politicus*. In other words, who is and/or what politics are collectivized in the individualized embodiments of *Celebritus politicus* and the (current) terrains of care they are in the processes of creating and why might this be the case in different spatial, cultural and temporal contexts?

Otherwise, poverty- and environ-tainment might simply be (re)creating a novel cultural and economic spectacle of hegemonic neo-liberalist capitalism in a world seemingly in need of something much more, different and/or alternative. And, while it remains to be seen if some of the world’s most rich and powerful individuals in the form of *Celebritus politicus* can usher in a new era of globalised care across the political economic geographies of difference, it is these sets of contemporary icons that will be the public voice of the environment and development for much of our near and continuingly celebrity-focused—and celebrity-governed—future.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks go to Julie Doyle and Lisa Ann Richey, both of whom read earlier versions of this chapter and provided extensive and insightful comments, not all of which I was able to incorporate here; I appreciate their engagement with my, at times (!), diffuse and overtly non-specific arguments. I would also very much like to acknowledge the intellectual but also personal encouragement and support of both Gavin and Martijn in the crafting of this chapter; their comments and suggestions have made it a much better piece, but, as usual, any oversights or weak points firmly remain my responsibility.

References

- Antipode*. 2010. Special issue on Capitalism and Conservation. 42 (3).
- Bakker, K. 2007. The 'Commons' Versus the 'Commodity': Alter-globalization, Anti-privatization and the Human Right to Water in the Global South. *Antipode* 39:430-455.
- . 2010. The limits of 'neoliberal natures': Debating green neoliberalism. *Progress in Human Geography* 34:715-.
- Barnett, C, P Cloke, N Clarke, and A Malpass. 2010. *Globalizing Responsibility: the political rationalities of ethical consumption*. London: Blackwell.
- Benjamin, M. 2010. Clooney's 'antigenocide paparazzi': Watching sudan. *Time Magazine*.
<http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,2039887,00.html>
- Boykoff, M, and M Goodman. 2009. Conspicuous Redemption?: Reflections on the Promises and Perils of the 'Celebrization' of Climate Change. *Geoforum* 40:395-406.
- Boykoff, M, M Goodman, and J Littler. 2010. Charismatic megafauna': The growing power of celebrities and pop culture in climate change campaigns. Environment, Politics and Development Working Paper Series, WP#28, Department of Geography, King's College London.
- Brockington, D. 2008. Powerful environmentalisms: conservation, celebrity and capitalism. *Media, Culture and Society* 30 (4):551-568.
- . 2009. *Celebrity and the Environment*. London: Zed Books.
- Bryman, A. 2004. *The Disneyization of Society*. London: Sage.
- Bunting, M. 2010. The issue of celebrities and aid is deceptively complex. *The Guardian*. Available:
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/poverty-matters/2010/dec/17/celebrity-aid-development-bono-brad-pitt>
- Castree, N. 2003. Commodifying what nature? *Progress in Human Geography* 27 (3):273-297.
- . 2005. The epistemology of particulars: human geography, case studies and 'context'.
Geoforum 36:541-544.
- Chouliaraki, L. 2008. The mediation of suffering and the vision of a cosmopolitan public. *Television and New Media* 9 (5):371-391.
- Clarke, N. 2008. From ethical consumerism to political consumption. *Geography Compass* 2 (6):1870-1884.
- Clarke, N, C Barnett, P Cloke, and A Malpass. 2007. Globalising the consumer: doing politics in an ethical register. *Political Geography* 26:231-249.
- Cooper, A. 2008. *Celebrity diplomacy*. Boulder: Paradigm.
- Dyer, R. 1979. *Stars*. London: BFI.
- Escobar, A. 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fairtrade Foundation. 2011. Fairtrade sales soar to well over £1bn showing the UK still cares in tough times. Available:
http://www.fairtrade.org.uk/press_office/press_releases_and_statements/february_2011/fairtrade_sales_soar_to_well_over_1bn_showing_the_uk_still_cares_in_tough_times.aspx
- Fridell, G. 2007. *Fair trade coffee: the prospects and pitfalls of market-driven social justice*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Gibson-Graham, J K. 2006. *A post-capitalist Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Goodman, D, E. M DuPuis, and M Goodman. 2011. *Alternative Food Networks: Knowledge, Place and Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Goodman, M. 2010. The Mirror of consumption: Celebrityization, developmental consumption and the shifting cultural politics of fair trade. *Geoforum* 41:104-116.
- Goodman, M, and C Barnes. 2011. Star/poverty space: the making of the 'development celebrity'. *Celebrity Studies* 2 (1):69-85.
- Goodman, M, and E Boyd. 2011. A social life for carbon?: commodification, markets and care. *The Geographical Journal* 177 (2):102-109.
- Guthman, J. 2007. The Polyanyian way?: Voluntary food labels and neoliberal governance. *Antipode* 39:456-478.
- Harvey, D. 2005. *A short history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: OUP.
- Hawken, P, A Lovins, and L H Lovins. 1999. *natural capitalism: creating the next industrial revolution*: Little Brown.
- Illouz, E. 2007. *Cold intimacies: the making of emotional capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Johnston, J. 2008. The citizen-consumer hybrid: ideological tensions and the case of Whole Foods Market. *Theory and Society* 37:229-270.
- Lewis, T, and E Potter, eds. 2010. *Ethical consumption: a critical introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Littler, J. 2009. *Radical Consumption*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Littler, J. 2008. "I feel your pain": cosmopolitan charity and the public fashioning of the celebrity soul. *Social Semiotics* 18 (2):237-251.
- Lost in Showbiz Blog. 2011. Come earthquake or tsunami, there's always a celebrity there to help. *The Guardian*. Available: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/lifeandstyle/lostinshowbiz/2011/mar/17/earthquake-tsunami-celebrities-offer-help>
- Mansfield, B. 2008. *Privatization: property and the remaking of Nature*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Marsh, D, P 't Hart, and K Tindall. 2010. Celebrity politics: the politics of late modernity. *Political Studies Review* 8 (3):322-340.
- Marshall, P D. 1997. *Celebrity and Power: Fame in Contemporary Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 2010. The promotion and presentation of self: celebrity as marker of presenational media. *Celebrity Studies* 1 (1):21-34.
- McAfee, K. 1999. Selling Nature to Save it? *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 7:155-74.
- McCarthy, J, and S Prudham. 2004. Neoliberal nature and the nature of neoliberalism. *Geoforum* 35:275-283.
- McChesney, R. 2008. *The political economy of media: enduring issues, emerging dilemmas*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Micheletti, M, and D Stolle. 2008. Fashioning social justice through political consumerism, capitalism and the internet. *Cultural Studies* 22 (5):749-769.
- Nunn, H, and A Biressi. 2010. 'A Trust Betrayed': Celebrity and the work of emotion. *Celebrity Studies* 1 (1):49-64.
- Ponte, S, L Richey, and M Baab. 2009. Bono's Product (RED) initiative: corporate social responsibility that solves the problem of 'distant others'. *Third World Quarterly* 30 (2):301-317.
- Pringle, H. 2004. *Celebrity Sells*. Chichester: John Wiley.
- Prudham, S. 2009. Pimping climate change: Richard Branson, global warming, and the performance of green capitalism. *Environment and Planning A* 41:1594-1613.
- Richey, L, and S Ponte. 2011. *Brand Aid: Shopping well to save the world*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Richey, L, and S Ponte. 2008. Better (Red)[™] Than Dead: Celebrities, consumption and international aid. *Third World Quarterly* 29 (4):711-729.
- Rutherford, S. 2007. Green governmentality: insights and opportunities in the study of nature's rule. *Progress in Human Geography* 31 (3):291-307.

- Smith, N. 1984. *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Street. 2004. Celebrity politicians: popular culture and political representation. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 6 (4):435-452.
- Turner, G. 2004. *Understanding Celebrity*. London: Sage.
- . 2010. Approaching celebrity studies. *Celebrity Studies* 1 (1):11-20.