This article was downloaded by: [Australian National University]

On: 11 December 2011, At: 19:18

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Third World Quarterly

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ctwq20>

Marketing Development: celebrity politics and the 'new' development advocacy

April Biccum^a

^a Australian National University, University Park, Canberra, ACT, 2600, Australia

Available online: 09 Aug 2011

To cite this article: April Biccum (2011): Marketing Development: celebrity politics and the 'new' development advocacy, Third World Quarterly, 32:7, 1331-1346

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2011.600107>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Marketing Development: celebrity politics and the ‘new’ development advocacy

APRIL BICCUM

ABSTRACT Politics and culture, once considered separate, are now fusing in new and interesting ways. Political activism is becoming popular, particularly through the expansion of a new kind of development advocacy made highly visible through celebrity involvement. Theorists of globalisation celebrate the democratisation of civil society made possible by new information and communications technology; critical theorists will note the various ways in which ICT ambivalently makes the contradictions in global capitalism more obvious and has become the means by which globalisation is contested. Some metropolitan governments have sought to capitalise on this new knowledge economy by making knowledge for development part of their strategies to produce ‘global citizens’ necessary for the global economy. This paper examines the linkages between celebrity and government-funded development advocacy in Australia, which comprise the introduction of free market principles to form a marketing campaign for neoliberal globalisation.

Global poverty has been more visible in the past 20 years, yet the nature of development and the future of foreign aid has been the subject of significant debate both within policy circles and among activists and academics. A growing critical literature in development studies has emerged which calls the entire architecture of development into question,¹ highlighting the complexity of its power dynamics,² and even showing its similarities with empire and colonisation.³ Contestation over the nature of global development is also reflected in the large-scale protests that characterise the anti-globalisation movement, which has culminated in a yearly meeting, the World Social Forum (WSF), that mobilises grassroots initiatives to seek alternatives to the market organisation being implemented by development policies.⁴ Critique has even emerged from a popular literature which argues that the private sector is more efficient than foreign aid at providing solutions to global poverty.⁵ All the while academic debates that characterise the world in terms of globalisation have had to move over and make room for debates which characterise it in

April Biccum is at the Australian National University, University Park, Canberra, ACT 2600, Australia. Email: April.Biccum@anu.edu.au.

ISSN 0143-6597 print/ISSN 1360-2241 online/11/071331-16

© 2011 Southseries Inc., www.thirdworldquarterly.com

DOI: 10.1080/01436597.2011.600107

1331

terms of empire.⁶ Both in theory and practice the nature of this contemporary moment, how the world has come to be this way, the causes of global poverty and solutions for global security are undergoing substantial upheaval.

The rise of ICTs has meant that citizens are increasingly more aware of global issues, and grassroots pressure on international institutions in the form of mass disruptive protest (such as those that occurred in Seattle, Sydney, Genoa, Montreal and Edinburgh between 1999 and 2005) has demonstrated the effectiveness of the 'knowledge economy' for mobilising people across a broad spectrum of interest groups. Paradoxically metropolitan governments are becoming concerned about the level of knowledge and interest among their citizenry on developing country issues. Governments have solicited research to gauge levels of awareness among the public and have spent money to ensure that domestic populations are aware of and endorse national development policies.⁷ With its election in 1997 the British Labour government announced its development policy as twofold—development abroad combined with awareness raising at home—which it funded through a 10-year Development Awareness Fund targeting education, media, civil society and trades union organisations. The current Labour government in Australia has recently echoed this policy with a year-long pilot project called The Community Call to Action Against Poverty (CCAAP), which is meant to be the national expression of the Global Call to Action Against Poverty (GCAAP) and a national expression of Millennium Development Goal 8, building a global partnership to tackle poverty.

The paradigm of global citizenship has emerged in response to general disillusionment with the free market approaches to development and poverty. The concern of metropolitan governments over the level of knowledge and interest among metropolitan citizenry about developing country issues is a response to the rising parochialisms, nationalisms, 'home-grown terrorism' and identity politics across many communities that threaten to sharpen societal divisions and social cohesion. It also emerges in response to the growing global critique of development from a variety of sectors. The terrain of development advocacy has been expanded by government-funded development awareness, civil society-led development education and a paradigm for 'global citizenship' in all areas of education.⁸ The policy remit to increase citizen awareness of development through development and global citizenship education is not limited to the UK and Australia. Canada, the US and the EU also engage in similar policies with different manifestations. However brief, in both the British and Australian cases, government-funded development advocacy intersects with celebrity activism through networks of civil society actors and in the activities of specific individuals. These developments constitute a shift towards free market principles in development advocacy.

There has also been a change in development advocacy among civil society actors, including large-scale networking, intra-national spectacles for awareness raising (such as Live8) and involvement by private sector actors such as high-profile philanthropists and celebrities. The mobilisations and spectacles that have resulted also comprise part of the new development advocacy, as they are a unique combination of politics and popular culture.

The development advocacy that began in the 1970s and 1980s has become mainstream and, arguably, reached new heights of success. Moreover, the nature of development apparatuses is undergoing a sea change, with a global compact, as represented in the Millennium Development Goals, consolidation of civil society advocates and actors, and a veritable explosion of new development actors from the private sector. Not only has there been an increase in the numbers of people involved in development, new and different kinds of development advocates have emerged, along with the professionalisation of development advocacy,⁹ and a speeding up of its operation through the density and complexity of international linkages. New kinds of development players include mega-philanthropists using their wealth to establish foundations such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (reminiscent of Rockefeller and Ford); multinational firms using corporate social responsibility endeavours, such as engaging in social marketing and microfinance; more than two dozen new bilateral donors from China to Chile to the Czech Republic; high-profile personalities and celebrities; and the global public itself, mobilised by celebrity endorsement and the internet.¹⁰ The proliferation of new development actors has been attributed to a broader cultural shift facilitated by new information and communications technology which enthusiasts regard as having created a 'new kind of global public'. Some of these new actors, celebrities in particular, espouse the development thinking reflected in the work of Jeffrey Sachs and Paul Collier, namely the idea that private actors are less encumbered by state bureaucracy and partisan shifts in policy and therefore are more efficient development actors, and that the free market, particularly the expansion of financial services, is the panacea for global poverty. Using their independent wealth, prestige and global connections, celebrities are able to establish more flexible charitable foundations, get in on the ground and get the job done, or so the logic goes. This is illustrated by Brad Pitt's reconstructive work in New Orleans and Sean Penn's work in Haiti,¹¹ and by Bill Gates' GAVI Alliance on vaccination. Celebrities then use their high visibility status to bring attention to their charitable work and encourage others to get involved. They combine in a single personage the free market development actor and advocate.

By the 'new development advocacy', then, I am referring to a two-fold phenomenon: on the one hand, the explosion of new development actors in the global North, in particular among American celebrities and high-profile private philanthropists, and on the other, metropolitan government funding of development advocacy in the guise of development education and development awareness. This article explores the connections between celebrity advocates and organisations funded in Australia under the 'Community Call to Action Against Poverty'. It will argue that this combination of celebrity, private actors and government funding of what is usually a civil society enterprise in partnership with the global South comprises a new development advocacy. By examining these connections in the Australian case between government-funded and celebrity development advocacy, I argue that, rather than promoting a sense of political literacy that is cognisant of the complexity and debate around poverty, development and

globalisation, the new development advocacy is modelling a form of entrepreneurialised activism that promotes market-based solutions to development and is aimed at (re)producing neoliberal subjectivity. While the Millennium Development Goals have brought greater awareness of the urgent need for development to metropolitan populations, the contested and political nature of development is not being communicated; instead there has been a narrowing of the definition of 'poverty' and of 'development'. In addition, the new development advocacy is congruent with global policy trends in education for economic development and global citizenship which have as their mandate the creation of competitive cosmopolitan subjects. The new development advocacy, with its celebrity connection, is the ultimate expression of neoliberal subjectivity.

A new culture of politics?

In the past 30 years a 'cultural turn' has hit every discipline in the social sciences. There has been a shift in the study of politics that has widened the scope of investigation to include culture—as a factor in state behaviour, as endemic to the construction of identities and subjectivities, as the cause of wars to come,¹² as a site for the struggle for representation, meaning, power/knowledge and national narratives. Politics and culture, while once considered separate and distinct, are now regarded as fusing in new and interesting ways. Two circumstances forced the political to collide with the study of culture: postcolonial migration and the rise of postcolonial theory; and the rise of mass media and globalisation. Postcolonial theory combines politics and culture because the exclusion of literatures from the former colonies and from outside the Euro-American sphere in comparative literature was an obvious gesture of politics and power, and because the literatures forged in newly decolonising countries were of necessity politically self-aware, written as they often were to mobilise a national consciousness. By theorising the subjectivities produced in empire, postcolonial theory demonstrated the centrality of culture to the success of empire. By the 1980s the effects of postwar migration, decolonisation, and post-fordist massification had produced within the academy a shift towards the legitimate study of culture in its own right, heavily invested in the Frankfurt tradition of Critical Theory which has, since the 1930s, developed an interpretation of popular culture which combines Marx and Freud. All the while the assumption within the emerging disciplines of globalisation (in politics and sociology) and media studies was that, while a cultural imperialism was certainly within their purview, the nature of culture and politics was new and that (and this assumption was generally shared) politically at least, empires were a thing of the past. By the 1990s Edward Said was arguing in *Culture and Imperialism* that part of what enabled imperial culture to function as imperial culture (that is, as a matrix of narratives that circulate to make material relations possible) was the separation of culture from politics, which informed both cultural production and framed the disciplines.¹³

Given the revolution in communications technologies, culture has also been brought closer to politics in the public domain. This is in evidence in the campaign strategies of politicians in the global North, but also in a spate of relatively recent phenomena which see a closer linking of Hollywood celebrity with topical issues such as highlighting the plight of refugee children (Angelina Jolie), of conflict in Sudan (George Clooney), of the environment (Leonardo DiCaprio), of the recent earthquake in Haiti (Sean Penn), celebrity endorsement of Barack Obama's campaign in 2009, and the mass spectacle highlighting the developmental agenda for Africa that was Live8 in 2005. The combination of celebrity and political activism and advocacy is not entirely new. The charity work of Audrey Hepburn and her involvement with UNICEF is an early example (upon which Angelina Jolie is doubtless modelling herself), as are the advertisement appeals of television actor Sally Struthers back in the 1980s, and of course most of us would remember LiveAid. In fact, as Darrell M West illustrates, celebrity involvement in politics has been fairly consistent over the course of the postwar period, particularly from the 1960s onwards.¹⁴ Not only has there been an avalanche of celebrity involvement in politics, crescendoing from the 1950s, but politics itself has been celebritised, with politicians modelling their campaigns on marketing techniques and making use of celebrity to increase their popular legitimacy. Alongside these more mainstream manifestations, the bringing together of culture and politics has also arisen in a new culture of dissent, what has been labelled the 'New Culture of Politics', a new kind of mass mobilisation facilitated by the networked nature of ICT because the contradictions of global capital are in plainer view to the 'average' metropolitan citizen. This has given rise to 'new' modes of resistance and new modes of political organisation via the web (terrorist networks and spontaneous protest). Given this state of affairs, Edward Said's observation regarding the instrumental epistemological split between politics and culture appears to have been reversed, and the multiple combinations of politics and popular culture have provided a new legitimacy for political literacy.

New global subjects?

There is a general assumption among scholars of globalisation, civil society and social movements that changes in communications are generating changes in culture and producing new types of subjectivity.¹⁵ This is the argument of scholars of the anti/alter-globalisation movement and the new social movements who envisage new subjects of emancipation, such as Hardt and Negri, Arturo Escobar and Michael Drake.¹⁶ These scholar-activists are enthusiastic about horizontal and 'meshworked' political organisation that is self-organising, flexible, leaderless and breaks down classical modern oppositional politics as expressed in Gramscian understandings of hegemony and class, which are replaced with graduations along a networked continuum of actors.¹⁷ Hardt and Negri describe new kinds of affective, immaterial labour which arise from a shift in the international division of labour towards

a service sector economy in the global North. They envisage new modes of subjectivity that arise from the creative and networked nature of these modes of labour that contain within them possibilities for social organisation in excess of the 'empire' they have arisen to serve. It is also the assumption of more pessimistic accounts, such as that found in Jean-Francois Bayart, who argues that globalisation is producing new global subjects of ambivalence. Bayart, along with Hardt and Negri, argues that material culture, things and how they are used, are key in determining the kinds of subjectivities that cultures produce. So, like Hardt and Negri, Bayart would concur that the shift in metropolitan labour towards computer-based creative and service industries of necessity produces new types of people and new horizons for action. For Bayart globalisation is a process of subjectivisation that encompasses the 19th and 20th centuries. The only thing that makes this particular phase of it distinct is the increasing hybridisation of the public and the private, such as the privatisation of force and security, and the combining of the private sector in the provision of public sector goods.

Critical approaches to development often cite the ways in which the development apparatus is also a process of subject production. Cowen and Shenton have argued that subject production has always been a key feature of modernisation theory,¹⁸ and Mark Duffield has argued that the aim of the global development apparatus in part has been the production of appropriate subjectivities, flexible and entrepreneurial in the global South, able to compete in and withstand the vagaries of the global market.¹⁹ Recent work on the combination of postcolonial theory and development has argued that the discourse of development is part and parcel of how a nation imagines itself and constructs its identity. Ilan Kapoor in *The Postcolonial Politics of Development* points out that the effect of the duplicitous nature of foreign aid's communication to the public contributes to and even produces a cohesive sense of national narrative and identity.²⁰ In this sense, while the foreign aid regime abroad consolidates national sovereignty by extending its state apparatus in other territories,²¹ its communication to the domestic public consolidates sovereignty at home through its repetitive equation with what it means to be British or Australian and 'developed'.

What interests me in the phenomena I describe *vis à vis* the Australian case is the attempt in the global North also to produce subjectivities that are amenable to and capable of participating in the global market via the expanding development apparatus. Much of the work on globalisation, education and development argues that there is a need for new types of subjects to carry forward the changes deemed necessary to global stability and growth, or they wax euphoric about the inevitability that changes in communications and global mobility will bring. Recent scholarship in the sociology of education and the knowledge economy has traced the ways in which education service and content in metropolitan countries is shifting towards the production of networked, resilient, cosmopolitan subjects—global citizens—whose knowledge and care for the wider world is both a source of human capital for states and makes their educational services more competitive in the global economy.²² So while development efforts in the

global South, according to Mark Duffield, seek to produce flexible, resilient entrepreneurial subjects (particularly through the use of microcredit), education and training apparatuses combined with the new development advocacy in the global North seek also to produce flexible, resilient, entrepreneurial subjects.

As a mechanism of subject production, education and pedagogy serve an ambivalent role in the service of mobilising people politically and changing behaviour and economic capacity. For example, education and pedagogy are key tenets in the anti-globalisation movement and for the proponents of the WSF, who regard the meshworks of mobilisation and the 'open space' of the Forum as means of distributing knowledge and experience in a way that will grow the movement and produce alternatives, yet education is also a key feature of the global development apparatus, both as a central platform of the Millennium Development Goals and a central platform in new policies in education focused on marketising education globally. Education has always been regarded as essential to global economic development,²³ but how it is understood is undergoing a radical revolution in the context of globalisation. With shifts in global governance towards liberalising education as a service sector with a global market, knowledge is both a tool used to innovate and a product for sale. What is valued in this paradigm is know-how and expertise; 'human capital' (embodied value) is as valuable as other economic resources. The 'global knowledge economy' has come to dominate policy talk at all scales since the mid-1990s,²⁴ which has sparked a raft of policies, executed to different degrees, oriented towards generating a more competitive environment and producing a more entrepreneurial individual. Two policy agendas at the level of global governance, with slight differences in emphasis, are in tension with one another and being promulgated by the World Bank and the OECD. Both organisations propose changes for education that will do away with the current bureaucratic school system, which they regard as an antiquated hindrance to further economic growth. But there are differences regarding what should replace it. The OECD proposes a social network-based model in which learning is diversified beyond the school infrastructure, schools become community hubs and teachers become facilitators of learning where learning is life-long, student-led and predicated upon student choice. The World Bank proposes a more strictly market-based model, based on human capital formation above social citizenship, where learning activities are embedded in some kind of institutional arrangement, but education becomes entirely entrepreneurialised and networked wholly through ICTs. Students seek out the knowledge they want from networked knowledge brokers. Knowledge and education become products you buy for purely instrumental purposes (and of course those with more affluence buy the better education). The OECD prefers the social network model because it acknowledges the possibility of market failures and the inequalities this will produce.

The OECD and World Bank (in addition to the UK think-tanks under the Labour government) are setting the agenda for the transformation of schools,

inviting the private sector into what was strictly a public state provision via what is now commonly regarded as the 'third way'. The tensions in this policy formulation between the OECD and World Bank were reflected in UK education policy under Labour, which gave rise to the orientation towards 'world class education' and 'global citizenship'. With the introduction of the awareness raising agenda and funding stream in 1997, the Labour government formulated its education policy in two key conflicting documents, the (now defunct) Department for Education and Skills' *Development: The Global Dimension in the School Curriculum*, of 2001 and 2005 (which is about producing a cosmopolitan, other-regarding citizenry, respectful of difference, knowledgeable about other cultures, endorsing development);²⁵ and *Putting the World into World Class Education: An International Strategy for Education, Skills and Children's Services* (2005), which is about making the British education system marketable and using it to produce an internationally competitive citizenry. These two policy objectives in seeming tension are actually complementary because producing the cosmopolitan other-regarding global citizen is actually the human capital or affective labour that the UK will need to compete in the global knowledge economy.

The development awareness fund of the UK's Department for International Development (DFID) bridges the tensions between these two competing yet complementary policy visions for education,²⁶ because the Development Awareness Fund (DAF) makes clear that it funds organisations which promote the DFID understanding of development. The DAF was targeted at any UK-based NGO or network that 'shares' the government commitment to 'raising awareness and understanding of development issues'.²⁷ Some of the objectives of the scheme include 'generating understanding of and support for international efforts to reduce poverty'; 'promoting recognition of the progress so far made, and that further progress is affordable, achievable and most of all vital';²⁸ and building capacity for action on the part of individuals, as in 'building understanding of the role that individuals can play, enabling them to make informed choices with the knowledge of how their actions impact on the world around them'.²⁹ The aim of DAF was to create a population committed to solving global poverty under the terms set out by the British government and in doing so contribute to British competitiveness in research and development by producing innovations in development practices and technologies.

The introduction of the DAF provided a boon to the development education architecture that already existed within the UK, with the rising prominence of the Development Education Association in London as a hub for the Development Education Centres (DECs) networked around the country. These hubs are connected to the wider civil society advocacy community and large-scale campaigns such as Make Poverty History and Live8, because the large development organisations affiliated with these campaigns produce the resources which DECs use to educate the public and engage with schools. Large NGO such as Oxfam, a key participant in Live8 and Make Poverty History, provide educational resources to the DECs and are also funded by DFID Programme Partnership Agreements (PPAs).³⁰ Thus

government-funded development education in the UK is connected to celebrity advocacy through these expansive networks.

Global citizenship as it is embedded in formal education contributes to a marketable educational service that can attract foreign students and is capable of being exported. As espoused in DFID's promotional literature, global citizenship is possessed by those who have 'fulfilled the fullness of the human condition';³¹ those who have yet to 'develop' in terms OECD countries deem acceptable cannot lay claim to it. Global citizens would be capable of doing the developing, they can fill jobs in civil society, expertise and consultancy in the expanding terrain of the development architecture and as such add to British global competitiveness in the form of human capital. Global citizens pursue their own individual interest and embody the national interest in the service of a 'greater good'. In the figure of the global citizen, an exclusive category of competitive affective labour, British education policy 'does good' by acting in its own self-interest.

A central ethos of free market ideology is that, with the market as the mediator, everyone acting in their own self-interest will produce maximum efficiency in productivity and social justice.³² Neoliberal subjectivity therefore is competitive, entrepreneurial and 'does good' by acting in its own vested interest and sees no contradiction in it. The rhetoric of mainstream development in many national contexts is that development is both a moral objective that doesn't contradict but complements pursuit of national interest. Both the UK's DFID and Australia's AusAid make explicit that the pursuit of poverty reduction and development is in the national interest. For example, a 2000 DFID White Paper asserts:

We must combine our efforts with a wider international commitment to improve the lot of the poor. *It's also in all of our interests to do so.*³³

And AusAid's website makes it explicit that

AusAID is the Australian Government agency responsible for managing Australia's overseas aid program. The objective of the aid program is to assist developing countries reduce poverty and achieve sustainable development, in line with Australia's national interest.³⁴

In this discourse, which combines the existence of poverty with vested interest, a reason is never offered for poverty's existence. The causes of poverty are posited as the singular origin of all global ills from the environment to security. The academic literature on poverty is vast and identifies a number of complex causes of poverty (shifts in the international division of labour, by way of example). The literature on globalisation is also vast and provides a number of different competing explanations, as is the literature on development. DFID and Ausaid are quite consistent in their deployment of these terms in the context of their communication, and none of the more contested meanings is ever engaged with. There is a common narrative thread occurring in national discourses on development which

chimes with the neoliberal literature on development and is reflected, as we shall see below, in the Australian case of nationally funded development advocacy and its links with the new celebrity development advocacy. This rhetoric is key to what I'm calling the 'new development advocacy' because it is distinct from the non-governmental nature that is presumed to exist for traditional civil society advocacy and also from the self-organising meshworks of the anti/alter-globalisation movement. In *Counter-Hegemonic Globalization: Transnational Social Movements in the Global Political Economy*, Peter Evans argues:

... global neo-liberalism is not just a structure of domination it is also a set of ideological and organizational structures vulnerable to being leveraged by oppositional movements. Global neo-liberalism's aggressive efforts to spread the domination of market logic make it easier for diverse movements to mount a common program. As the gap between the formal hegemony of global neo-liberalism's ideological program and its substantive manifestations grow more stark—most obviously in the case of 'democracy'—shared opportunities for leveraging these ideological presuppositions increase.³⁵

What we see via the new development advocacy is that the inverse is also true: neo-liberalism leverages networks of development advocacy by hitching development to morality and vested interest. Kick and Sikkink argue in *Activists Beyond Borders* that advocacy networks get their name from the fact that they advocate in solidarity and that their actions cannot be easily linked to a rationalist understanding of self-interest.³⁶ This is what should distinguish the 'new development advocacy' from the melée of global development advocacy networks because the former expressly deploy the notion of interest iterated in both DFID and Ausaid development discourse.

Although there is far less comment upon it in the globalisation literature, the expanding terrain of celebrity comprises a significant kind of 'new global subject'. In his introduction to the *The Celebrity Culture Reader*, David Marshall argues that celebrity is an exploration and celebration of identity, individuality and the self, articulating and selling identity and individuality.³⁷ Celebrities are an expression of the potential of the individual under the rubrics of capitalist democracy. There has also been an expansion of the global terrain of celebrity; it has become the lens through which we understand a variety of issues, from nature and wildlife, to food, celebrity news anchors, etc, through the genre of reality TV. Celebrity is the pinnacle of modern subjectivity and the commodity culture, embodying the received understanding that it is the result of free competition and meritocracy, which creams off the best and celebrates achievement in all fields in a free market of entertainment in which the audience is sovereign.

The old Hollywood studio system in which celebrities represented themselves as free agents has given way to the expansion of a support and management industry above these public entities that feeds the branding process, where brokers trade and speculate on celebrity brands. The celebrity brand can then be deployed for a whole host of purposes from product

placement to endorsement of politicians and political issues. The apparatus of celebrity operates at the hub of the entertainment industry and its management structure is designed to give the impression that audience desires determine the value of celebrity, when in fact managers place celebrities in their various positions and then capitalise on their public presence as efficiently as possible. Celebrities are embodied commodities of affective labour whose present and future values are speculated upon and traded by this elaborate and vastly networked entertainment industry with global reach. Celebrity identity then becomes a form of intellectual property.

Celebrities serve as channels through which even the concept of globalisation can be understood: celebrities are entities that often internationalise entertainment, generalise expansively an expression of individuality and often presage the movement of other goods and services from continent to continent, and nation to nation.³⁸

Bayart argues that globalisation is a tale of two centuries, that is, ultimately a process of subjectivisation. Celebrity is the highest expression of subjectivisation, the manifestation of embodied commodity culture, and simultaneously the entrepreneurialisation and commoditisation of subjectivity *par excellence*. This overlaps with Hardt and Negri's account of global subjects of emancipation in that the sale of an embodied celebrity brand is also affective labour *par excellence*. Bayart's account is of the distinctiveness of this phase of neoliberalisation as the increasing hybridisation of the public and private, which is the seam that links the social web of globalisation. Arguably, then, celebrity is an extreme manifestation of this hybridity between public and private, even the collapse of the public and private, the embodied subject/object of neoliberal subjectivity.

The proposed shifts in education policy described above aim to produce the kinds of subjects necessary to growth in a global economy, and in these subjects are combined some of the elements of the new global subjects of emancipation as envisaged by anti/alter-globalisation scholars, in that they are flexible, networked, autonomous, self-organising and possessing affective skills. At the same time the new competitive subjects of human capital also map onto the new cosmopolitan subjects of global citizenship and more politically aware metropolitan citizens, who want to see amelioration of some of the harsher effects of globalisation. These are the key targets of the new development advocacy which, in connection with celebrity, models and reproduces entrepreneurial activism that, like celebrity, is also 'embodied value' as 'human capital'.

The Community Call to Action in Australia

There are significant overlaps in UK and Australian development and education policies, as there are in their rhetoric on development. In 2009 Australia introduced a pilot version of DFID's policy and it is here where development education and celebrity development advocacy intersect. Australia, like the UK, is a key player in the global development architecture and a proponent of the Millennium Development Goals. Australia's pilot

scheme to raise awareness among its domestic population is a reflection of the country's commitment to MDG8, building a global partnership for development. The pilot version was announced in October 2009 by then Labour MP Bob McMullen as the Community Call to Action Against Poverty (CCAAP). This is a year-long pilot project with Aus\$1.5 million given to various groups, a couple of which are manifestations of the Make Poverty History campaign. The CCAAP resembles the UK Development Awareness Fund in the kinds of projects funded and in the express remit that projects support and promote the government line on development and its successes so far. Most of the projects funded are roadtrips designed to draw media attention in rural areas combined with leadership training in development advocacy for participants. For instance, a project with the Rotary club is a 'roadshow' to raise awareness of maternal and child mortality, as is Symbiosis International—another roadtrip of 2000 km with people going around on rickshaws to raise awareness, in particular targeting local media as they go. While some funded projects focused exclusively on leadership—for instance, a small grant went to the Girl Guides Take Action campaign, which included a weekend event focused on developing leadership skills, advocacy training and the MDGs for 20 young women—not all projects target young people. Some target workers or the general public. For instance, there is a project targeting business leaders with a lecture from Professor Mohammed Yunus, who won the Nobel Peace Prize for development of micro-credit schemes in Bangladesh, another project targeting Australian local government and various projects promoting fair trade. What is significant across all these programmes is that, in contrast to the diversity of projects funded under the UK Labour government's admittedly much more substantial scheme, a significant proportion of the projects funded under OCCAP seek to create community leaders in development advocacy, offer no reason for poverty's existence and make explicit the solution to poverty that is being promoted: micro-credit.³⁹ Students at a meeting of one of CCAAP's funded projects, who were proselytising about it to other students, were stunned when asked what causes poverty. They had no answer and they had never before considered the question. Some of projects funded by CCAAP were an explicit endeavour in the production of entrepreneurialised activists whose thinking on development has been effectively circumscribed by Ausaid's official line and by the neoliberal literature on development.

In the Australian case government-funded development advocacy is also linked to the GCAAP via the Make Poverty History Campaign and large-scale celebrity advocacy through the networked nature of the organisations involved, but also through the activities of one particular individual. One of the projects funded is organised by the young man responsible for bringing the Make Poverty History Campaign to Australia and who is making a career of linking his advocacy work with high profile celebrity. Hugh Evans' former organisation the Oaktree Foundation is a feature project of the CCAAP, and has funded a roadtrip for university students. An organisation expressly for young people under the age of 26, while it currently exists under new leadership, it is a particularly good example of the new development advocacy.

Young people have to apply to be a part of Oaktree and had to apply to participate in the CCAAP-funded roadtrip, where they were trained in Oaktree's version of development, leadership and advocacy, which is essentially based on the work by Paul Collier, Jeffery Sachs and Mohamed Yunus, the same version endorsed by celebrity activists. In his address to students wanting to participate in the roadtrip, former Labour MP Bob McMullen emphasised that it is the students' job on the roadtrip to promote government success. When approached after its presentation to enlist student involvement and asked about its Labour government funding, the current head of Oaktree enthusiastically replied, 'they're paying us to lobby them!' When asked if he saw any contradiction in this he looked a little puzzled and uttered a slightly incredulous, 'No!' So, like its UK counterpart, Ausaid is expressly funding projects which will promote its development activities and convince the public of its success.

Having moved on from Oaktree's efforts to create a cadre of youth leaders, Hugh Evans is now involved with Australian actor Hugh Jackman (who acts, along with Jeffery Sachs, as a global advisor) in the Global Poverty Project (GPP). The project is engaged in rolling out a travelling presentation called '1.4 Billion Reasons' (another roadshow), which is promoting its model of leadership and development advocacy based explicitly on interest. Having tailored his Paul Collieresque presentation for multiple sectors, and trained a cadre of presenters, the GPP has expanded activities to the UK, Canada and the USA. The GPP is rapidly becoming a key player in the expanded terrain of development advocacy as evinced by its appearance as a collaborator in a report by a consortium of British NGOs, the British Overseas NGOs for Development (BOND), *Finding Frames: New Ways to Engage the UK Public in Global Poverty*.⁴⁰ The GPP, like Oaktree, Ausaid and other recipients of Ausaid funding, emphasises this element of interest. Ambassadors are attracted with the promise of training in confidence, knowledge and skills, that will be built up through volunteering, making them effective agents of change as circumscribed by the parameters already described, good at public speaking and literate in development issues.

The aim of the GPP's travelling road show is to explain 'the facts of extreme poverty and provide audiences with the information and tools they need to take effective action'.⁴¹ Despite a nod to the 'complexity' of development on the website, there is in fact no deviation from the discourse delineated above. The GPP offers to its ambassadors an education in the type of affective labour that is identical to the vision of competitive human capital embodied in the global citizen of UK Labour education reform. It also promises that the curriculum is designed around the skills its participants want to learn, offering a tailored service that echoes the World Bank vision for education. The GPP website is highly interactive, featuring a series of promotional videos (all posted on YouTube for greater reach), a few including Hugh Jackman, and all kinds of marketing strategies. The differences between this and the vision of new global subjects of emancipation are striking in that their organisation is explicitly hierarchical, based upon vested interest that has no mechanism of self-reflection and no concept of advocacy as acting in

solidarity. It has a singular view of development (vs the diverse and disaggregated discussion of development as contestation in the WSF) which is an expression of a new development orthodoxy that argues for increased marketisation, entrepreneurialisation and an expansion of financial services. This is an attempt at the entrepreneurialisation of activism that sees the latter's aim as the production and replication of model entrepreneurial subjects, well versed in the latest neoliberal version of development, possessing the affective labour to enable them to be 'leaders' in development and proselytise to others. It looks good on your CV and the answer to poverty is simple—microcredit.

Whereas in the WSF multiple models of development and social organisation are under debate, with the co-opting of GCAAP by corporate interests, celebrity advocates, and the direct funding of development advocacy by metropolitan governments (in the two cases explored here, the UK and Australia), only a single model of development and poverty reduction is being communicated and promoted, and it is one that serves the interest of those doing the promoting.

Conclusion

My discussion has been framed in terms of new combinations of culture and politics in which what I am describing as a 'new development advocacy' is only one manifestation. I have argued elsewhere that the conceptualisation of global citizenship animating reforms in education, particularly in the practice of development communication, is a reinvention of the 19th century humanism that animated the civilising mission, the idea that full humanity is only expressed by rationally organised industrial societies, and those regions of the world that are not yet industrialised need to come under colonial/global tutelage until they are civilised enough to govern themselves. Postcolonial theory has elaborated an idea of colonial culture as a process of subject production that enables empire to function. What I am describing is comparable, as a 21st century attempt to produce subjectivities in the global North that are commensurate with the kind of interventions that have become increasingly to be regarded as a 'new' form of empire.⁴² There is more going on here than the merger of politics and popular culture. There is a sustained marketing campaign for development under neoliberal terms whose remit is to convince the metropolitan consumer citizen that the answers to the problems of global capital of which they are increasingly aware lies in the globalisation of free market capitalism, and the extension of financial services. On this score we might have grounds to challenge Bayart's notion that globalisation is not being directed by elite-led global governance. Under discussion in this paper has been the global arena of policy formulation and co-ordination in education and its connection with mechanisms for reproducing elite subjectivity, such as education for global citizenship, which will ensure the reproduction of these values and produce the kinds of people necessary to facilitate their promulgation. While high-profile participants at the World Social Forum, such as Vandana Shiva, argue for an 'Earth citizenship' or transnational

literacy as an alternative to the notion of global citizenship, I shall finish by suggesting that the assumption of some anti/alter-globalisation theorists and activists—that the organisational meshworks of the anti-globalisation movement are enough to sustain a challenge to neoliberalisation—need to pay closer attention to the processes I describe here.

Notes

- 1 A Escobar, 'Imagining a post-development era? Critical thought, development and social movements', *Social Text*, 31–32, 1992, pp 20–57; A Grieg, D Hulme & M Turner, *Challenging Global Inequality: Development Theory and Practice in the 21st Century*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007; and M Duffield, *Development, Security and Unending War*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.
- 2 J Ferguson, *The Anti-politics Machine: 'Development', Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1994; R Abrahamsen, 'The power of partnerships in global governance', *Third World Quarterly*, 25, 2004, pp 1453–1467; and G Harrison, *Neoliberal Africa: The Impact of Global Social Engineering*, London: Zed Books, 2010.
- 3 M Duffield & H Vernon (eds), *Empire, Development & Colonialism: The Past in the Present*, Woodbridge, UK: James Curry; and M Frey, 'Control, legitimacy, and the securing of interests: European development policy in South-East Asia from the late colonial period to the early 1960s', *Contemporary European History*, 12, 2003, pp 395–412.
- 4 M Kaldor, 'Civilising globalisation? The implications of the "Battle in Seattle"', in J Sen & M Kumar (eds), *Are Other Worlds Possible? The Open Space Reader on the World Social Forum and its Engagement with Empire*, New Delhi: 2000; and S Amin, 'For struggles, global and national', in J Sen, A Anand, A Escobar & P Waterman (eds), *World Social Forum: Challenging Empires*, New Delhi: Viveka Foundation, 2004.
- 5 J Sachs, *The End of Poverty: How we can Make it Happen in our Lifetime*, London: Penguin, 2005; D Moyo, *Dead Aid: Why Aid is not Working and How there is a Better Way for Africa*, New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 2009; R Calderisi, *The Trouble with Africa: Why Foreign Aid isn't Working*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006; and P Collier, *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries are Failing and What can be Done about It*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- 6 C Johnson, *The Sorrows of Empire: Militarism, Secrecy and the End of the Republic*, London: Verso, 2004; M Hardt & A Negri, *Empire*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000; and M Mann, *Incoherent Empire*, London: Verso, 2003.
- 7 Ausaid, *Overseas Aid Study*, Canberra: Government of Australia.
- 8 In the UK government-funded Development Awareness is being phased out under the new coalition government not only because of partisan differences in approach to development policy, but also in response to the global financial crisis. Australia's engagement with this policy is brief. This does not, however, negate the argument being made here that there is a new development advocacy comprised of an expanded terrain of activists and advocates.
- 9 A Darnton & M Kirk, *Finding Frames: New Ways to Engage the UK Public in Global Poverty*, London: BOND for International Development, 2011.
- 10 L Brainard & D Chollet (eds), *Global Development 2.0: Can Philanthropists, the Public and the Poor Make Poverty History?*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2008, p 12.
- 11 See <http://jphro.org/>.
- 12 SP Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- 13 E Said, *Culture & Imperialism*, London: Vintage, 1994.
- 14 DM West, 'Angelina, Mia and Bono: celebrities and international development', in Brainard & Chollet, *Global Development 2.0*, p 75.
- 15 J-F Bayart, *Global Subjects: A Political Critique of Globalisation*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007; R Falk, 'An emergent matrix of citizenship: complex, uneven, fluid', in N Dower & J Williams (eds), *Global Citizenship: A Critical Introduction*, London: Routledge.
- 16 A Escobar, 'Beyond the Third World: imperial globality, global coloniality and anti-globalisation social movements', *Third World Quarterly*, 25, 2004, pp 207–230; and MS Drake, 'Power, resistance and "anti-globalisation" movements in the context of the "war on terror"', in M Mullard & B Cole (eds), *Globalisation, Citizenship and the War on Terror*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- 17 This is the argument of Michael Drake, 'Power, resistance and "anti-globalisation" movements in the context of the "war on terror"'.
- 18 M Cowen & RW Shenton, *Doctrines of Development*, London: Routledge, 1996.
- 19 M Duffield, *Development, Security and Unending War*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007 pp 4–12.

- 20 I Kapoor, *The Postcolonial Politics of Development*, London: Routledge, 2008.
- 21 M Aaltola, *Western Spectacle of Governance and the Emergence of Humanitarian World Politics*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- 22 SL Robertson, 'Re-imagining and rescripting the future of education: global knowledge economy discourses and the challenge to education systems', *Comparative Education*, 42, 2005, pp 151–170.
- 23 DE Bloom, 'Globalization and education: an economic perspective', in MM Suárez-Orozco & DB Qin-Hilliard (eds), *Globalization: Culture & Education in the New Millennium*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004.
- 24 Robertson, 'Re-imagining and rescripting the future of education'.
- 25 DFES Curriculum & Standards, *Developing the Global Dimension in the School Curriculum*, London: Department for Education & Skills (DFES), 2001, 2005; DFES, *Putting the World into World Class Education: An International Strategy for Education, Skills and Children's Services*, London: DFES.
- 26 Despite the desire expressed in Labour policy documents for the production of a global citizen, actual attempts on the ground were mired by two sets of circumstances: first, the fact that the UK under Labour had the highest social exclusion rates in Europe (so the production of global citizens needs also to be contextualised *vis à vis* British parochialism and the need to dissuade disaffected diasporic youth from becoming politically radicalised; and, second, the fact that practitioners of development education were for the most part fully aware of some of the contradictions in British education policy and the complexities involved in development. Thus the policy as the government envisaged it was far more complex in its implementation on the ground.
- 27 <http://collections.europarchive.org/tna/20100423085026/dfid.gov.uk/working-with-dfid/funding-opportunities/not-for-profit-organisations/daf/guidelines-and-procedures-201011/>.
- 28 *Ibid.*
- 29 *Ibid.*
- 30 H Thornton & S Hext, 'Review of DFID's work to build support for development through the Development Awareness Fund and the Mini-Grants Programme', London: Department of International Development & Veralum Associates.
- 31 B McGettrick, 'Lessons to be learned', *Developments*, London: DFID/Limehouse Group, at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100823124637/http://www.developments.org.uk/articles/lesson-to-be-learned.>" > <http://jphro.org/>.
- 32 D Harvey, *The New Imperialism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- 33 DFID, *Eliminating World Poverty: Making Globalisation Work for the Poor*, London: DFID, 2000, emphasis added.
- 34 <http://www.usaid.gov.au/about/default.cfm>.
- 35 P Evans, 'Counter-hegemonic globalization: transnational social movements in the contemporary global political economy', in T Janoski, AM Hicks & M Schwartz (eds), *Handbook of Political Sociology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 36 ME Keck & K Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998.
- 37 PD Marshall, *The Celebrity Culture Reader*, New York: Routledge, 2006.
- 38 *Ibid.*, p 6.
- 39 For a list of successful applicants, see http://www.usaid.gov.au/hottopics/topic.cfm?ID=9799_8200_757_8783_6781.
- 40 Darnton & Kirk, *Finding Frames*.
- 41 http://www.globalpovertyproject.com/pages/about_the_presentation.
- 42 M Ignatieff, *Empire Lite: Nation-Building in Bosnia, Kosovo & Afghanistan*, London: Vintage, 2003.

Notes on contributor

Canadian born **April Biccum** received an MA in critical theory and PhD in politics and international relations from Nottingham University. April now lectures in international relations at the Australian National University. Her research brings postcolonial theory closer to the study of politics and IR, specifically through an engagement with international development. Recent publications include 2010 *Global Citizenship and the Legacy of Empire: Marketing Development* (Routledge); and 2009 'Theorizing Continuities between Empire and Development', in Duffield and Hewitt (eds) *Empire, Development and Colonialism* (James Currey).