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In November 2014, thirty years after the first iteration of *Do They Know It’s Christmas* by Band Aid, the supergroup orchestrated by Irish musician Bob Geldof to support famine relief in Ethiopia, a new version of the song was released by Band Aid 30, its aim being to raise funds for the campaign against the Ebola epidemic in west Africa. But as seems to be the quotidian norm with celebrity philanthropy, Geldof’s fundraising event attracted mixed popular cultural and media reactions that veered from applause and celebration on the one hand, to derision, critique and outrage on the other. The song was a financial success. According to Geldof it raised some US$1.7 million in its first few minutes on iTunes alone, and sections of the UK press lauded that outcome (Kwong 2014). By contrast, one particularly dismissive take appeared in the UK’s *Daily Mail*. Under the title ‘Do they know it’s not the Eighties any more? As Bob Geldof forms a new Band Aid supergroup, how 30 years have taken their toll on the original line-up’ (2014), photographs of many participants in Band Aid 30 were contrasted with images of their youthful selves from 1984. The unflattering comparisons suggested that the motley crew of aging, world weary but wealthy musicians was no longer up to the tasks of either music making or effective philanthropy. More damningly, a host of musicians including the UK-Ghanian rapper Fuse ODG cited what they interpreted to be the song’s pathologised, disease-ridden and poverty stricken vision of Africa as the reason for their refusal to participate in the event (Fuse ODG 2014).

Summarising the mixed reactions to Band Aid 30, the Canadian journalist Matt Kwong (2014) wrote perceptively that the resurrected Band Aid model, while successful from a financial point of view, could also nonetheless be seen as a celanthropic anachronism in the digitised, social-mediatised twenty-first century. As Kwong put it, ‘in the age of viral media and [given] a more cynical and sophisticated public, fundraising strategists say philanthropy is tilting more towards grassroots campaigns and “clicktivism”, and away from rock star benefit songs and celebrity-hosted telethons’. Kwong cited a number of public relations managers who agreed that the gathering of celebrities together for one single fundraising event or philanthropic cause is being challenged in an epoch in which celebrities and their publicity machines very carefully manage their online and media identities and draw targeted attention to their specific philanthropic campaigns without the need for involvement in such outmoded spectacles as telethons or collaborative songs. Moreover, the social media realm has also witnessed a shift in expectation among participants in philanthropic and social change campaigns. That is, participants now post evidence of their involvement with the intention of being acknowledged and recognized –liked and shared – on social media platforms like Facebook, Instagram and Twitter, and in Cloud Funding initiatives. That grassroots level approach to supporting sociopolitical and other philanthropic causes contrasts profoundly with such past practices as the rarely acknowledged purchase of a record designed and released for the purposes of fund-raising, and which always seemed to bring more celebrity attention to the participants than the recipients of the so-called Aid.

As the range of reactions to Bob Geldof’s Band Aid 30 recording in support of Ebola victims in west Africa in November 2014 confirmed, celanthropy generates strongly articulated differences in opinion about the efficacy of philanthropic work and the motives of the celebrities who are involved in that work. That trend is very much recognised by the contributors to this volume for whom the conjunction of celebrity and philanthropy is not simply a growing global phenomenon of importance, but one that also has concrete local manifestations and a range of technologized and mass-mediated effects, consequences and implications. To varying degrees the contributors in this book also demonstrate that just as there can be no single, untroubled definition of the ‘celebrity function’, to redeploy Foucault’s conceptualization of an author in the mass-mediated celebrity-industry setting (Foucault 2007), the same is true of philanthropy. When it comes to celanthropy – what Rojek calls ‘charity projects fronted and, in the public mind, defined by celebrities’ (2014: 127) – it is clear, as ‘t Hart and Tindall note, that ‘no grand, one-size-fits-all interpretation is sufficient’ (2009: 257).

This truism informs our conviction that the celebrity philanthropy model as understood in North America, and which is commonly identified as being embodied by the celebrity coupling par excellence of Angelina Jolie and Brad Pitt, is not the only model that operates across the globe, or indeed in the North American portions of the Global North. Nor should that celebrity coupling be regarded as the template against which celebrity philanthropy anywhere and everywhere is compared, analysed, judged and deemed to be meaningful, and even effective or not in achieving a range of philanthropic aims. In international terms the Jolie-Pitt duo represent a particularly US-centred (or, at best, transatlantic-centred) celanthropic paradigm, one that in many parts of the world might not even register or compute as being of local note and interest.

The current volume therefore can be regarded as an opening gambit in what will hopefully be growing attention to more genuinely transnational critical understandings of celebrity philanthropy and the ways by which it changes shape and has uneven impacts and receptions over historical and geocultural time and place. As Jonathan Marshall argues in his contribution here: ‘Criticism of celebrity philanthropy might … stem from a desire for tidiness and order in the world that does not acknowledge the complexities of the situation, of human motivation, of the difficulties of virtue, or of unintended effects, and itself does little to fix the situation.’ Put another way, as Elaine Jeffreys does in ‘On celebrity philanthropy’ in this volume, ‘While supporters may overstate the transformative capacity of celebrity philanthropy, critics tend to unify different types of celebrities, philanthropic activity, and even the motivations of individual celebrities and their fans, under the overarching framework of “bad capitalism and consumer culture at work”’. Given the diverse manifestations of both celebrity and philanthropy, Jeffreys reiterates Stewart’s argument that ‘Further case studies and typologies are required to comprehend the nature and effects of the different kinds of celebrity-mediated philanthropy and activism that exist in the world today (Stewart 2007: 19).’ This is particularly important, Jeffreys argues, because ‘despite the proliferation of intellectual complaints about the privileged, superficial and racist nature of celebrity philanthropy in the international arena, there are no empirical studies of how celebrity-involved or celebrity-inspired philanthropy operates in practice in the context of developing countries, and what it does for local recipients and how it is viewed and understood by them. Such studies are vital to any informed critique’.

Much more, therefore, can be said and thought about celanthropy. Indeed, celanthropy may provide numerous opportunities for people engaged with a range of pressing socioeconomic, educational, environmental and cultural causes, and for the champions and detractors of those causes as well. There is then a genuine need for nuanced international and comparative research into its growing influence and importance across the globe that moves beyond and thereby challenges North American and/or Anglophone orthodoxy in such fields as celebrity, media, philanthropy and development studies. Noting this need, we conclude the volume here by identifying five areas of potential critical interest.

First, given that celebrity itself is constantly changing in response to the inexorable technologisation and social mediasation of identities in the 21st century, that evolution has as yet unforseen implications for the work of philanthropy as well. Some evidence for this changing environment is provided by the November 2014 reactions to Band Aid 30. The singer Adele apparently eschewed involvement in the celanthropic spectacle, preferring instead to announce her contributions to a range of charitable courses via her own social media accounts (Kwong 2014). Similarly, rapper Fuse ODG took to an opinion piece in the British newspaper *The Guardian*, backed up by his own social media posts, to explain why he was not going to be involved in Band Aid 30, and how he would contribute in other ways to the efforts to contain the spread of Ebola while not misrepresenting ‘west Africa’ (Fuse ODG 2014; Kwong 2014).

Second, despite the global hegemony of English, facility in other global languages adds as yet under-theorised dimensions to both celebrity and philanthropy and their effective combination (Ronen, Gonçalves, Hua, Vespignanib, Pinkere, and Hidalgoa 2014). The bi- or multilingual facility suggests that the Jolie-Pitt model is a limited and limiting one when it comes to understanding celanthropy in genuinely transnational and transcultural terms. Indeed, a study by Ronen and his colleagues (2014) indicates that new methods for measuring celebrity status and impact are required in the 21st century, hence their comparative research into the links between global celebrity as manifested in the social media platform Twitter, the multilingual web-network of Wikipedia, and UNESCO’s astonishingly ambitious Index Translationum project, which aims to chronicle and archive book translations in all of the world’s languages (Ronen, Gonçalves, Hua, Vespignanib, Pinkere, and Hidalgoa 2014). The authors justify their choice of the three ‘networks’ as distinct but complementary nodes that permit robust mapping of ‘the paths of direct and indirect communication between speakers from different languages’. This in turn allows them to claim that ‘Our method formalizes the intuition that certain languages are disproportionately influential because they provide direct and indirect paths of translation among most of the world’s other languages’. Their findings confirm that English currently prevails as a global language, pretty much guaranteeing global celebrity status to numerous stars from Anglophone countries. But they also find that global celebrity status is dependent on ‘direct’ information flows between other global languages, such as French and Spanish, which in turn facilitate ‘indirect’ communication in other languages. In effect, this means that multilingual speakers of global languages have global advantages over bi- and monolingual speakers of any languages: ‘they mediate the flow of information not only among each other, but also, among people with whom they do not share a language’ (Ronen, Gonçalves, Hua, Vespignanib, Pinkere, and Hidalgoa 2014: 6).

Third, the local matters, as the above point about direct and indirect communications would indicate. One example here will suffice. Since the 2014 collapse of the Argentinian economy, the second in the 21st century, an unforeseen celebrity phenomenon has emerged in Argentina that is not as yet replicated anywhere else in the world: that is, the eruption into popular cultural and social media view and attention of photogenic but highly qualified economists now dating the country’s music, sport, film and media celebrities and becoming celebrities in their own right, with as yet unknown implications for the evolution of philanthropy and social activism in Argentina and other parts of Latin America (‘Celebrity economists: The sages of the pampas’ 2014).

Fourth, there may be other means of measuring the impact of celanthropy that enable us to avoid the bifurcated approach of dismissing versus celebrating the phenomenon. Ronan and his colleagues have suggested one possible comparative method vis-à-vis the links between global languages and global celebrity. Another model is proposed by Matthew Bishop and Michael Green (‘Happy birthday, GDP’ 2014). Speaking about the need for governments, corporations and philanthropists to work together under the rubric of philanthrocapitalism in building ‘a global economic system that is socially and environmentally sustainable,’ Bishop and Green argue that standard measures of economic success and viability such as the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) that rates economic growth, income and profit do not provide substantive insights into a state’s welfare capacities (Bishop and Green ‘Happy birthday, GDP’ 2014). As they say, ‘[b]etter measurement is an urgent priority.’ Bishop and Green advocated in 2009 for the Social Competitiveness Index (SCI), which after receiving considerable philanthropic and corporate endorsement, has resulted in the ‘Social Progress Index’ (available at [http://www.socialprogressimperative.org/data/spi](http:///%E2%BC%80www.socialprogressimperative.org/data/spi)). For Bishop and Green the SCI provides ‘an important yardstick as we try to build a better world for all’. It is a utopian approach to ‘resolving’ the world’s inequities, but as the map on the Social Progress Index website indicates, global inequities are represented in order to indicate visually where the authors identify the parts of the world from which philanthropic interventions must come: Canada, the USA, the states of western Europe, Japan, Australia and New Zealand, that is, most of the countries currently leading the world on so-called social progress measures.

However, such approaches to understanding and measuring the efficacy of celebrity philanthropy seem inexorably to lead us back to the Global North and its offshoots, and to question whom specifically in celanthropic debates gets to speak for, or on behalf of, philanthropic recipients and celebrity fans alike when adjudging the capacities of celanthropic work to effect viable, material change. Here there are salutary lessons to be drawn from anthropology and subaltern studies about loci of enunciation and the critical presumption to speak for and on behalf of others, including so-called voiceless subaltern subjects (Spivak1998; Mignolo 1995). As Allatson has argued elsewhere, the need for academic self-reflection on one’s own locus of enunciation ‘is particularly evident when’ critics ‘presume to represent, champion, or identify with subaltern subjects without questioning their own authorial relation to the material preconditions of subalternity, or their intellectual complicity in the textual production of subalternity’ (Allatson 2004: 14). Applied to the terrains of celanthropic criticism, this understanding would seem to demand research that actively heeds the viewpoints of the non-Global North recipients of celebrity philanthropic assistance. But that research, as in much ethnographic work, must attend to the subaltern dilemma, ‘by which the first-world intellectual speaks for her subjects and constructs the subalternity that concerns her’ (Allatson 2004: 40).

In 1989 the Chicano anthropologist, Renato Rosaldo, warned his fellow anthropologists not to structure ‘the untidiness of everyday life [events] so that they can be “read” like articles, books, or, as we now say, *texts*’ (emphasis his, 1989: 12). In the 21st century we would argue that there is a pressing need for a similar critical approach to understanding the messiness of celebrity philanthropy wherever it may be encountered.
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