

Celebrity Humanitarianism and the Politics of
Development in Sub-Saharan Africa

by

Barbra Chimhandamba

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral
Affairs in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Political Science

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

© 2022, Barbra Chimhandamba

Abstract

Over the past 30 years, celebrities have been increasingly involved in humanitarian and philanthropic work and in bringing attention to poverty, disease and other disasters around the world, especially in developing countries. Africa, in particular, has caught the attention of celebrities, some of whom have turned themselves into advocates for the continent and its development issues. Through their humanitarian and philanthropic work, celebrities have portrayed international development as the panacea for poverty, conflict and disease that plague many countries in sub-Saharan Africa. Their activities, however, raise serious questions about legitimacy, accountability, as well as efficacy and motivation. In light of this, my dissertation engages in a critical theoretical analysis of the phenomena of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy by embarking on an empirical research of the work of the Bono-led ONE Campaign and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in South Africa and across sub-Saharan Africa in order to understand how these activities are conducted and how they are viewed by their beneficiaries. My research questions are: what are the benefits and limitations of celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic organizations for development and to what extent have celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy contributed to development and the improvement of life in South Africa and sub-Saharan Africa? The literature on celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy has focused on the debate between cosmopolitan/liberal perspectives, which suggest that these practices are a moral good, on the one hand, and critical approaches on the other. Critical perspectives view celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy as ways of exercising power over, and exploitation of beneficiaries. But few of these critiques are based on empirical research of how celebrity humanitarians and philanthropic foundations operate on the ground and how they are viewed by their beneficiaries. My research addresses this gap. The findings show that although celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic organizations are helpful, there is evident unease with the control that they and their founders have over development in sub-Saharan Africa. Employing a neoliberal imperialism theoretical lens, I argue that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy re-entrench the saviour-victim hierarchy, thus perpetuating, rather than challenge, global hierarchies between the Global North and Global South.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I am grateful to God Almighty for the opportunity to pursue a PhD and for his grace and favour throughout my studies.

This work has been a collaborative effort. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my dissertation committee for their support, professional and personal, and for their intellectual guidance throughout the dissertation process. I would like to thank Blair Rutherford for encouraging me to never give up pursuing my dream of furthering my education, to keep knocking on doors until one opens and for also opening doors for me. I will always be grateful for the academic counsel and professional advice he has so readily given me since I met him with and shared my desire to embark on graduate studies. I would like to thank Laura Macdonald especially for her helpful and thought-provoking feedback as this project evolved and for her kindness and encouragement over the years. I am profoundly grateful for the amazing support of my supervisor and mentor, Fiona Robinson who believed in me and encouraged me to pursue a PhD in the first place. I especially appreciate her for always being there for me and for going beyond the call of duty when the unpredictable happened and we were faced with uncertainty following the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic. Fiona, you are a formidable embodiment of the ethics of care!

I would also like to thank my examiners, Stephen Brown of the University of Ottawa and Nduka Otiono of the Institute of African Studies at Carleton for their helpful feedback that helped to improve my final product.

More generally, I would like to express my thanks to the faculty, staff and students who have helped make my experience at Carleton a memorable one. A special thanks to Brookes Fee, the graduate administrator for her incredibly helpful and friendly ways.

I would also like to express my sincere thanks to my field supervisor David Moore of the University of Johannesburg, and to the faculty, staff and students in the Department of Anthropology and Development Studies at the University of Johannesburg, for hosting me when I was conducting my fieldwork. I am indebted to all of my respondents for their time, patience and for sharing their insights, which helped shape my dissertation.

Thank you to all my friends for their love, encouragement, prayers and support throughout this journey. I am profoundly grateful for my family, for their support, love, prayers and encouragement and for always being there for me. I feel truly blessed to have had all of you rooting for me and cheering me on, especially when the going got tough. Finally, I would like to thank my amazing parents, Bernard and Annie Farai Chimhandamba, without whom I would not be the person I am. Thank you for your love, for teaching me to work hard, to never stop dreaming of greater things, and for being the wind beneath my wings. Even though my mother did not live to see me embark on this PhD journey, I know she is smiling down on me and is very proud. This work is dedicated to her. Her love, faith, courage and resilience until her last breath, have been a constant source of inspiration and strength for me.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|------------|
| Abstract..... | ii |
| Acknowledgements..... | iii |
| Table of Contents..... | iv |
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| 1. Overview..... | 1 |
| 2. Questions and Argument..... | 6 |
| 3. Research Design and Methodology..... | 14 |
| 4. Limitations and Weaknesses of the Research..... | 31 |
| 5. Contributions..... | 35 |
| 6. Conclusion and Chapter Plan..... | 42 |
| Chapter 1: Theoretical Approaches..... | 45 |
| 1.1 Introduction..... | 45 |
| 1.2 Celebrity Humanitarianism, Philanthropy-Neoliberal Imperialism, Postcolonialism Nexus..... | 47 |
| 1.3 Celebrity Humanitarianism, Philanthropy and Neoliberalism..... | 57 |
| 1.3.1 Neoliberal Discourse..... | 64 |
| 1.3.2 Lack of Accountability..... | 66 |
| 1.4 Humanitarian Governance..... | 69 |
| 1.5 Philanthrocapitalism and Entrepreneurship..... | 75 |
| 1.6 Conclusion..... | 79 |
| Chapter 2: Current Themes in the Literature on Celebrity Humanitarianism and Philanthropy.... | 82 |
| 2.1 Introduction..... | 82 |
| 2.2 The History of Humanitarianism..... | 84 |
| 2.3 Celebrity Humanitarianism and Philanthropy..... | 98 |
| 2.4 Scholarly Study of ‘the Celebrity’..... | 101 |
| 2.5 Celebrity Humanitarianism and Philanthropy as Forces for Good..... | 105 |
| 2.6 The Critical Literature..... | 109 |
| 2.6.1 Constitution of Subjectivities..... | 110 |
| 2.6.2 A Neoliberal Project?..... | 116 |
| 2.6.3 The Various Roles of Celebrity Humanitarians and Philanthropists..... | 121 |
| 2.6.4 The ‘Violence’ of Celebrity Humanitarianism and Philanthropy on Beneficiaries..... | 124 |
| 2.7 Conclusion..... | 132 |
| Chapter 3: The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation..... | 135 |
| 3.1 Introduction..... | 135 |
| 3.2 The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation: Background..... | 136 |
| 3.3 Organizational Culture..... | 141 |
| 3.4 Why the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation? Its Work in South Africa..... | 152 |
| 3.5 The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation’s Work Across Africa..... | 166 |
| 3.6 Conclusion..... | 180 |
| Chapter 4: The ONE Campaign..... | 183 |
| 4.1 Introduction..... | 183 |
| 4.2 Background of the ONE Campaign..... | 186 |
| 4.3 Why ONE Campaign? ONE’s Work in Africa..... | 198 |
| 4.4 The ONE Campaign’s Work in South Africa..... | 218 |
| 4.5 The ONE Campaign’s Work in Other Countries..... | 221 |

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| 4.6 | The ONE Campaign’s Work With Multilateral Organizations..... | 224 |
| 4.7 | Conclusion..... | 225 |
| Chapter 5: Results and Discussion - Reimagining Celebrity Humanitarianism and Philanthropy.. 228 | | |
| 5.1 | Introduction..... | 228 |
| 5.2 | Emergent Themes..... | 229 |
| 5.2.1 | Approval of Celebrities in Humanitarian and Philanthropic Work..... | 229 |
| 5.2.2 | Underlying Themes/ Concerns Raised..... | 231 |
| 5.3 | A Critical Analysis of Findings and Interpretation..... | 233 |
| 5.3.1 | Agenda-setting..... | 242 |
| 5.3.2 | Power Imbalance..... | 244 |
| 5.3.3 | The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation’s Strategic Funding Approach..... | 249 |
| 5.3.4 | The ONE Campaign’s Work..... | 249 |
| 5.4 | Implications for Theory and Research..... | 261 |
| 5.4.1 | Neoliberal Imperialism and Postcolonialism..... | 263 |
| 5.4.2 | Humanitarian Governance..... | 270 |
| 5.4.3 | Neoliberalism and Neoliberal Discourse..... | 276 |
| 5.4.4 | Lack of accountability..... | 282 |
| 5.4.5 | Philanthrocapitalism..... | 285 |
| 5.5 | Insights From the Voices on the Ground..... | 287 |
| 5.6 | Conclusion..... | 293 |
| Conclusion..... 298 | | |
| 1. | Overview..... | 298 |
| 2. | Summary of the Research Findings..... | 298 |
| 3. | Practical Implications on Development..... | 302 |
| 4. | Contribution to Knowledge..... | 319 |
| 5. | Limitations and Future Research..... | 320 |
| | References..... | 324 |

Introduction

1. Overview

In the past three decades, celebrities have become increasingly involved in humanitarian and philanthropic work, highlighting poverty, disease and various disasters across the globe, particularly in developing countries. Africa, specifically, has drawn the attention of many celebrities, including pop singers, movie stars and high net worth individuals, who have assumed the role of spokespersons and advocates for the region and its development issues. Rock star and leader of the band *The Boomtown Rats*, Bob Geldof, became a key player on the global stage in the 1980s, especially through his role in the organization of *Band Aid*, which brought together leading pop stars of the day and of the original *Live Aid* concert to raise money for victims of the famine in Ethiopia. Paul “Bono” Hewson, the front man of Irish rock band *U2*, has been involved in efforts to end extreme poverty and to raise awareness and funds to fight the HIV/AIDS pandemic in various parts of Africa through the ONE Campaign (ONE), and the (RED) Campaign, respectively. Actress Angelina Jolie, in her various roles, including as a Goodwill Ambassador of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees and a United Nations Special Envoy, also brings attention to poverty and carries out projects in several parts of the world to fight it. Super rich philanthropists Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates, through their foundation, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF), are also engaged in efforts to combat poverty and enhance health and economic development throughout the developing world, including many countries in Africa. It is important to note that Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates are not ‘celebrities’ in the same way as

actors or popular musicians, but rather can be included in that category as public and extremely well-known business people. This would also include some non-Western celebrity philanthropists, Aliko Dangote from Nigeria, the richest man in Africa, and Strive Masiyiwa, the Zimbabwean billionaire and philanthropist, among others.

Through their humanitarian¹ and philanthropic activities, celebrities have portrayed international development as the panacea to the poverty, conflict and disease that afflict many countries throughout the continent. In the early years, celebrities emphasized money as the answer to poverty as reflected in Bob Geldof's passionate appeal at the 1985 *Live Aid* concert "Give us the money!" (Lockhart, 2017), suggesting that giving money would end hunger once and for all (de Waal, 2008, p. 5). However, in recent years, there has been a shift from simply raising money to economic development and empowerment. As explained by Bono in a promotional video for ONE, "commerce is the greatest player in taking people out of extreme poverty.... Development assistance is the bridge from here to there" (ONE, 2017). Bono further elucidates that development assistance creates employment and "...when people have work, they can sort out their own problems" (ONE, 2017). Nevertheless, even with this new approach, celebrities tend to depict international development aid as relatively simple – raising funds, encouraging investment and cancelling debt, all of which would eliminate poverty, and bring global justice. In their depiction of mass poverty, celebrity humanitarians tend to prioritize shock-value rather than critique, and action rather than questioning. As Žižek (2010) puts it: "Don't think, don't politicize, forget about true causes of poverty, just act, contribute

¹ In this instance I am not addressing humanitarian assistance, which refers primarily to disaster relief but rather on-going celebrity humanitarian activism such as practiced by Bono, Bob Geldof, Angelina Jolie, among others.

money...” (Žižek, 2010a, p. 4 cited in Kapoor, 2012, p. 90). Activists and academics have raised concern over this kind of assistance and the extent it can actually lead to lasting and large-scale development.

In this dissertation I examine the phenomena of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy from a critical perspective. In this introductory chapter, I present this dissertation’s key questions and objectives. I also provide a summary of the argument before proceeding to presenting the methods and methodology (research design). To conclude, I emphasize the contributions of the research and preview how the argument will unfold with brief summaries of each chapter. But before proceeding, it is important to define some key terms.

“Celebrity” is defined by Boltanski and Thevenot (1991) as a state of being superior in a world where opinion measures greatness. A celebrity has visibility and access, is recognized in public, is distinguished and endorsed by opinion leaders, and the media (cited in Richey, 2016, p. 11). Marshall (2014) also explains that “celebrity status also confers on the person a certain discursive power: within society, the celebrity is a voice above others, a voice that is channelled into the media systems as being legitimately significant” (p. xlviii). Thus, ‘celebrity’ is “the condition of being much extolled or talked about, that is being a famous or notorious public character” (‘Celebrity, n’ 2012[1989] cited in Jeffreys and Allatson, 2015, p. 6). Celebrity also represents a distinct form of capital – “recognizability” – that is based on “recurrent media representations or accumulated media visibility” (Driessens, 2013, pp. 550-1, cited in Richey & Brockington, 2020, p. 45). I have used these definitions to create my own understanding of the term “celebrity humanitarian” which I use in this dissertation, which

is an individual who has all the above attributes and also uses their influence and wealth in bringing awareness to and solving global issues, especially poverty. This definition, therefore, includes pop and movies stars as well as high-profile, high-net worth individuals as celebrity humanitarians.

Philanthropy and humanitarianism are often used interchangeably. There is, however, a difference between them, though they are closely linked. Philanthropy is defined as “voluntary action for the public good. It includes the giving of money, service, talent, time, voluntary association” (Payton & Moody, 2008, p. 6). Humanitarianism, by contrast, is a more complex term; it is a “work in progress”, as Barnett and Weiss (2011, p. 9) put it, and its practice and meaning have changed over the course of time. It is defined in several different ways. For example, for Alex Bellamy, humanitarianism involves activities such as the pursuit of universal human rights, the prosecution of those who are accused of “offending the conscience of mankind”, the supply of emergency assistance and the use of military force in various situations (Bellamy, 2003, p. 335). Moniz (2016) defines it as “far-reaching effort to improve the lot of humanity” (p. 5). However, the most common definition among scholars and practitioners is the one used by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), which emphasizes the “impartial, neutral and independent provision of assistance to victims of armed conflicts and natural disasters” (Barnett & Weiss, 2011, p. 4). As Brockington (2014) also puts it “humanitarianism requires a needy other” (p. xxii). Celebrity humanitarianism is generally understood in the context of the changing nature of humanitarianism in general. Celebrity humanitarianism involves well-known figures from the worlds of entertainment, sports and business who use their fame to advocate for humanitarian

causes (Mitchell, 2016, p. 291). It is defined as a form of advocacy for the poor or “do-gooding” for underprivileged people living in the developing regions of the world that includes an implicit or explicit claim for the moral basis of its good (Mitchell, 2016, p. 288; Richey, 2015, p. 12). Celebrity humanitarianism can also be interpreted as a ‘performance’ between the celebrity as benefactor and the public for whom she/he represents as a donor (Richey, 2015, p. 4). In other words, celebrity humanitarianism provides the possibility for people to indirectly participate in humanitarianism – or to perform – through supporting their favourite celebrities’ work in that regard. Often, celebrity humanitarianism is a response to suffering (Littler, 2008, 247). In this way, it has an important ‘moral’ aspect insofar as it is motivated by a desire on the part of celebrities to use their wealth and influence to ‘do something’ about extreme poverty. This was evident in early celebrity interventions such as *Live Aid*, which can be seen as a direct antecedent to Bono today and the current work of the ONE Campaign. Celebrity philanthropy is clearly related to this, especially with respect to the use of influence and wealth to ‘solve’ problems like global poverty. However, celebrity philanthropy focuses more specifically on the creation and role of private foundations by the influential super-rich. Indeed, Jeffreys and Allatson (2015) define it as “the use of public visibility, brand credibility and personal wealth to promote not-for-profit organizations that are increasingly institutionalized, ‘business-like’ and transnational in form” (p. 5). From this perspective, in this dissertation, an organization such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) engages in celebrity philanthropy and its co-founders are celebrity philanthropists. Furthermore, Bill Gates’ (and, to a lesser extent, Melinda French Gates’) celebrity comes from “the bite attached directly to their material wealth” as aptly put by

Cooper (2008, p. 84) when describing Bill Gates' and George Soros' appearance at the World Economic Forum in Davos in 2005.

From the above, it is clear that celebrities are distinctly different from development entrepreneurs, even though the celebrities may also be seeking profits from their humanitarian activities. It is indisputable that indigence, strife and HIV/AIDS remain a challenge for many countries in Africa. This would therefore seem to justify the attention some celebrity activists are paying to the region. Their activities, however, raise serious questions about legitimacy, accountability and representation in developing global social policy, as well as efficacy and motivation (Littler, 2008, p. 248).

2. Questions and Argument

It is against this background that the main objective of this research is to undertake both empirical research and critical theoretical analysis on the actual effects of particular celebrity-led projects by the ONE Campaign and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) principally in South Africa in order to establish the impact of these projects on the beneficiaries. Of course, I recognize that celebrity humanitarian and/or philanthropists cannot simply be 'equated' with their organizations, and that statements made by Bono or Gates do not necessarily reflect the work that is being done by ONE or the BMGF. That said, I do take into account the role played by the celebrity founders of these organizations because, as the figureheads, they have great influence on how their organizations operate. As was noted by one of the interview participants "when Bill Gates speaks, people listen" (representative of Ezintsha, Feb, 2020). Celebrities at the helm of humanitarian and philanthropic organizations are important spokespersons of

their organizations because of their media savviness. As Cooper (2008) asserts “...celebrity diplomats, if originating from a range of backgrounds and with differing levels of experience, certainly shares (sic) one trait: media savviness” (n.p.). The ONE Campaign and the BMGF are situated within the broader context of efforts to achieve poverty alleviation and development of South Africa in particular and many other countries across the continent. These two organizations are based in Johannesburg, South Africa, but they also work in various countries throughout the region. The ONE Campaign opened its offices in South Africa in 2010, while the BMGF started working in the country in 1999 before it became a fully-fledged foundation in 2000. Most importantly, as I will show in chapters three and four, these two organizations often cooperate and complement each other in their work. I approach these two case studies from the perspective that Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates are celebrities and the BMGF is one of the largest private philanthropic foundations in the world. The foundation also has a large footprint in South Africa, in particular, and in sub-Saharan Africa, in general. For its part, ONE was co-founded and is largely led by Bono, arguably the most influential celebrity humanitarian of our time.

Specifically, the research questions I seek to answer are as follows: What are the benefits and limitations of celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic organizations for development and to what extent have celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy contributed to development and the improvement of life for the population of South Africa and sub-Saharan Africa? It is important to note that I do not embark on an evaluation of specific projects, but rather look at ‘improvement’ of quality of life as understood and assessed by the various beneficiaries/partners of the BMGF and ONE.

The aim of this empirical research is to complement the largely theoretical critical literature by interviewing the ‘people on the ground’ about their interactions and perceptions of these organizations. As noted by Jeffrey and Allatson (2015), “there are *hardly any empirical studies of how celebrity-involved or celebrity-inspired philanthropy operates in practice in the context of developing countries, what it does for local recipients and how it is viewed and understood by them*” (p. 8, italics added). In this way, my research builds on the critical theoretical work on celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, while also incorporating the too-often overlooked voices of local recipients and partners. This allows me to construct a multi-dimensional argument regarding the way that power operates in and through these organizations and their practices on the ground.

These questions aim to provide sufficient information about how celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy are practiced on the ground and to establish whether these activities have led to any long-term improvement of life. This is against the background of neoliberalism which saw the rolling back of the state from the provision of social services, thereby making way for celebrity humanitarians and philanthropists to step in and fill the gap. Many African countries experienced a serious economic crisis in the early years of independence in the 1970s and 1980s, which had far-reaching negative consequences on their populations (Hope, 1997, p. 3). The intervention of the international financial institutions (IFIs) in the 1980s was marked by the scaling back of the state as a condition for loans as well as various other market-oriented reforms such as the privatization of state-owned enterprises, deregulation of key sectors of the economy, trade and financial liberalization and devaluation of national currencies. Neoliberal

reformers hailed the market as the most important agent for the distribution of economic resources (Oloruntoba & Falola, 2018 cited in Oloruntoba & Falola, 2020, p. 6).

Nevertheless, the state continued to play a role in either the promotion and/or protection of the private sector (Oloruntoba, 2020, p. 6). It is against this background that philanthropic and humanitarian organizations such as the BMGF and ONE have gained a foothold in the region.

It is important to note that the role NGOs have played in the expansion and consolidation of neoliberal hegemony (Manji & O’Coill, 2002, p. 582) is similar to that which is undertaken by celebrities through their humanitarian and philanthropic initiatives. In this sense, celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic organizations largely replicate and reproduce the problems associated with development NGOs. These include legitimacy challenges over the extent and nature of their interactions in developing countries where those development NGOs provide technical assistance. Other legitimacy and performance critiques against NGOs suggest that they mainly concentrate on symptoms instead of the causes of development problems (Budabin, Rasmussen & Richey, 2017, p. 1954). Development NGOs also advocate commerce as a means of pulling people out of poverty, in the same way celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic organizations and leaders do (Bono, 2017; Kiviat and Gates, 2006).

The significant difference between NGOs and celebrity-led organizations, however, lies in their leadership and style of organization in which the celebrity is predominant as will be shown in chapters three and four. Often celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic organizations are eponymous – they bear the name of their founder (or co-founders as is the case with the BMGF) and are inextricably linked to the celebrity

who acts as the spokesperson in media appearances, even though that celebrity may not be the official spokesperson of the organization. For example, while Bill Gates often speaks on behalf of the BMGF, the foundation has a chief executive officer (CEO), Mark Suzman, who is the official spokesperson. Furthermore, the celebrities are supposedly in charge of their organizations; they are listed as chairpersons of the Board of Directors and/or co-founders even though the actual running of the organizations is done by professional staff (Budabin, Rasmussen & Richey, 2017, p. 1955). This is true of the two case studies in this dissertation. Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates are the co-founders and co-chairs of their foundation and Bono is a co-founder and Board member of the ONE Campaign. Importantly, celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic organizations perceive themselves as ‘disruptors’ who carry out development initiatives differently from traditional donors by providing private sector solutions to development problems. These organizations also differ from traditional donors in that they have capacity to pull new funding into the development sector from the corporate world, to draw public attention to issues and to successfully publicize the business model for development to general populace and elite audiences (Budabin & Richey, 2021).

My key finding is that, although local recipients recognize the gains that have been made possible through the work of celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic organizations, their responses demonstrate an evident unease with, and even distrust of, the control that these organizations, and their founders, have over development in sub-Saharan Africa. Thus, in this dissertation, I argue, using the theoretical lens of ‘neo-liberal imperialism’, that development led by celebrity humanitarians and private philanthropic foundations ultimately re-entrenches the saviour-victim hierarchy, thus

perpetuating, rather than challenge, inequalities between the Global North and the Global South. The ONE Campaign and the BMGF focus on highly visible and often ‘depoliticized’ issues such as poverty eradication and health, but avoid issues that fundamentally challenge the global order, such as trade policies and regulations which favour developed countries, or tax avoidance and evasion by the ultra-rich. Furthermore, their lack of democratic accountability and position of superiority *vis-à-vis* the recipients of their philanthropy are widely viewed by local recipients as problematic, as indicated by a number of my respondents. Indeed, these activities are fraught with inequalities and power dynamics between the givers and the recipients which can serve to reinforce relations of dominance between the West and region.

Of course, it could be argued that state and NGO-led development, and indeed, the entire project of ‘development’ itself, is equally guilty of perpetuating the global hierarchy between the ‘haves’ and ‘have nots’ (Escobar, 2011; Hickel, 2014). Indeed, this has led to a burgeoning ‘post-development’ literature which suggests that development has been harmful and should therefore be abandoned in order to make way for alternative strategies (Escobar, 2011; Nustad, 2001; Matthews, 2004). But while there are many similarities between ‘celebrity’-led humanitarianism and philanthropy, and development, there are also important differences, which are a key feature of this dissertation. In particular, I focus on the lack of accountability that can be traced back to the ‘god-like’ status of the celebrity heads of celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic organizations, as well as the normative and material contradictions of their extreme personal wealth, and the activities with which their organizations are involved. These claims are supported

both by the fieldwork conducted, and by the critical theoretical literature which serves as the framework for my analysis.

As will be shown in chapters three and four, both the BMGF and ONE profess that they are working to bring about global justice (BMGF, 2020; ONE, 2020). However, as will be shown in chapters three, four and five, the kind of development celebrities like Bono advocate for is deeply immersed in neoliberalism, which can be linked to vast and still growing disparities in global income inequality. For example, Bono often employs the language of justice in his public discussions on development and poverty (Kapoor, 2012, p. 16; Littler, 2008, p. 247). The activities in which ONE engages, such as the *Electrify Africa* (ONE, 2021) and *Life Empowered* campaigns, take the responsibility for the provision of public goods from the state into the hands of private players.² These programmes promote the participation of American business in the supply of electricity in Sub-Saharan Africa. The advocacy movement's entrepreneurial inclination reflects its neoliberal logic. I therefore argue that Bono and the Gateses' humanitarian and philanthropic outlook should be read in conjunction with a broader agenda of neoliberalism, which entails the shrinking of the state and the privatization of service provision. There is an important link between justice and development as inequality prevents development (Morvaridi, 2008, pp. 1-2). Therefore, without addressing inequality, efforts to alleviate poverty and enhance development and economic growth may be futile. Neoliberalism sought to push the state out of the economy through

² It is important to note, however, that the 'state' is not necessarily a 'just' and 'fair' entity. Indeed, it has been argued that removing goods from corrupt, incompetent and impartial states could be a form of justice (De Soto, 1989), but there is no guarantee that that would be the case. The inequalities which have occurred in the wake of neoliberalism are testimony of this fact. I argue that, for all its limitations, the state has greater potential for democratic accountability than the private sector.

deregulation and privatization while extending market relationships to all realms of society. Yet, as was clear in the wake of the IFI-induced reforms in Africa, markets failed to provide essential services, and those reforms resulted in massive unemployment and hardship for the people on the continent (Stiglitz, 2002).

The above notwithstanding, there is no denying that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy have been beneficial in some ways. Apart from alleviating suffering in needy situations and providing much needed assistance in urgent and immediate situations, celebrity philanthropy also raises public awareness of humanitarian causes. Furthermore, celebrities act as role models, especially to younger people. Through their work, celebrities may inspire others to take an interest in the world around them, among other benefits. However, I maintain that humanitarian and philanthropic work by celebrity-led organizations, like humanitarianism in general, is problematic. In making this argument, I draw on the responses of local recipients as read and analyzed through wide range of critical literature which reveals ways in which the ‘antipolitics’ of celebrity humanitarianism results ultimately in the perpetuation of hegemonic control by the Global North (Müller 2013: 61; see also De Waal, 2009; Fassin, 2011; Manji & O’Coill, 2002; Reich, 2018, Silver, 2007). I also analyze the tendency of celebrities to engage in philanthropy as a means to bring attention to the celebrities themselves, thereby enhancing their public image which furthers their careers and businesses (Bishop & Green, 2008, p. 7; Kapoor, 2012, p. 13; Littler, 2008, p. 238).

3. Research Design and Methodology

My selections of the BMGF and ONE organizations as case studies and specifically their work in South Africa, was influenced by various factors. The BMGF and ONE are led by two of the most famous celebrities in the area of humanitarianism and philanthropy who were named *TIME Magazine* Persons of the Year in 2005 for their philanthropic work (*TIME Magazine*, 2005). The BMGF is the biggest private philanthropic foundation in the world, led by some of the most well-known billionaire philanthropists, Bill Gates and Melinda French-Gates. The public face of ONE is its rock star co-founder and arguably one of the most famous celebrity humanitarians of our time, Bono. These two organizations, therefore, are good examples of celebrity philanthropy (BMGF) and celebrity humanitarianism (ONE). While there are other activities led by Western celebrities in South Africa and indeed across the African continent, for example Oprah Winfrey's Leadership Academy for Girls in South Africa and Ben Affleck's Eastern Congo Initiative (ECI), among others, they are not as widely spread in other countries as the BMGF and ONE are. The extent of these two organizations' presence in the sub-Saharan African region is detailed in chapters three and four. Furthermore, while Bill Gates, Melinda French Gates and Bono do not represent the whole universe of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, they are certainly the most dominant in the field, the most well-known and the most important.

The BMGF is indisputably the most influential private philanthropic foundation in the world currently. Some commentators suggest no other public figure has been more influential in shifting the global discourse on philanthropy in recent decades than Bill Gates (McGoey, 2015, p. 24). To illustrate this point, the BMGF has been a major donor to the WHO over the past decade, accounting for as much as 16.95 per cent of the

organization's budget for the 2016-2017 period (WHO, 2017). The foundation is also one of the biggest donors to the WHO Africa Regional Office, based in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo (interview with the representative of the WHO, February 2020). For the period 2015-2017, voluntary contributions made up 80 per cent of the budget of the WHO, and of this amount, the BMGF's contribution comprised 13.7 per cent, behind the United States' 18 per cent. The fourth largest donor to the WHO is the Global Alliance on Vaccines and Immunization (GAVI), which is mainly funded by the BMGF (Butler, 2019, p. 7). This means that the foundation is in fact, the largest contributor to the global health body. In February 2020, the foundation pledged \$100 million to fight the corona virus (COVID-19) pandemic, and it increased that amount to \$250 million in April 2020, following the U.S. government's decision to halt its funding to the international health agency (McPhillips, 2020, May 29).

As already noted, the selection of ONE as a case study was influenced by its being co-founded by Bono, an iconic figure whose activism against poverty, hunger and international debt has won him three Nobel prize nominations and an honorary knighthood (Andersson and Calvano, 2015, p. 128). Furthermore, Bono's use of his celebrity as a galvanizing tool has contributed to his success in maximizing publicity for ONE and other causes he cares about (Cooper, 2008, p. 49). However, little research has been done on ONE, despite this organization's importance as will be shown in chapter four. The linkage between some of the work of ONE and the BMGF also made ONE an appropriate choice. Both organizations seek to fight against extreme poverty and preventable disease. They also lobby governments to come up with better policies. The BMGF claims to "partner with governments, the public and private sectors...to change

public policies, attitudes, and behaviours to improve lives” (BMGF, 2019). Similarly, ONE aims to “educate and lobby governments to shape policy solutions that save and improve millions of lives” (ONE, 2018). The two organizations are important to this dissertation as I seek to do an empirical investigation of what they are doing on the ground in South Africa and some selected countries around the continent, especially in light of these stated objectives.

My selection of South Africa was influenced by the fact that the African regional headquarters of both the BMGF and ONE are located in Johannesburg. I am also interested in the effects of the BMGF and ONE throughout the region. Africa is seen by some in the West as “...the Mecca of misery and desperation of humanity” (Diop, 2006, pp. 70-71, cited in Dubgen, 2012, p. 73) and the “continent of the poor” (Dubgen, 2012, p. 74). In other words, the continent is represented and discursively constructed through images and iconography as being the ‘face of poverty’; as being in a “humble, passive and subordinated position” (Dubgen, 2012, p. 70). “Development aid’s hegemonic image represents itself as a gesture of generosity while at the same time it serves to sustain the status quo, effectively affirming existing power hierarchies” (Dubgen, 2012, p. 73). But, as Dubgen (2012) aptly observes, this approach fails to take into consideration the fact that Africa’s underdevelopment is a result of history of colonialism and slavery (p. 73). This narrative also overlooks Western intervention and botched development programmes, among other factors. It is for this reason that I sought to establish these two organizations’ work in selected countries as it was not possible for me to cover all the countries where the foundation and ONE conduct projects throughout the sub-Saharan Africa region.

The BMGF is heavily involved in South Africa and across sub-Saharan Africa. As of February 2020, the BMGF was conducting over 250 projects valued at about US\$400 million in South Africa alone (BMGF representative, January, 2020). The foundation's projects in South Africa and other parts of the continent will be explored in greater detail in chapter three. The ONE Campaign, for its part, while it does not do much work in South Africa, the advocacy organization oversees its work in several countries in sub-Africa from its Johannesburg head office. A closer analysis of the organization's work is presented in chapter four.

South Africa was ranked the most unequal country by the World Bank in 2018 (World Bank, 2018). The 'minerals-energy complex' system of accumulation – in which accumulation was dominated by and depended upon a cluster of industries which were heavily subsidized by the state around mining and energy which began during the apartheid era – has persisted post-independence (Ashman et al, 2011, pp. 178-180). This has led to structured unevenness, which was exacerbated by neoliberalism (Ashman et al., 2011, p. 186; Bond & Ruiters, 2016, p. 175). In 2011, South Africa had the highest HIV infection rate in the world, with a life expectancy of only 51.5 years. (Ashman et al., 2011, p. 177). These are some of the reasons why the BMGF chose to locate its head offices in that country, which in turn influenced my selection of it as a country from which to investigate the two case studies. Southern Africa in general, is also one of the most unevenly developed regions globally (Bond & Ruiters, 2016, p. 171). In the 1980s, the region underwent structural adjustment programmes which were designed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank to promote economic growth and real income. But the result was largely below expected growth and much hardship for

the populations (Hope, 1997, pp. 120-122). This has in turn led to the involvement of celebrity humanitarians and philanthropists in the region as they seek alleviate the resultant poverty.

Some activists and academics have raised concern over how these celebrities and foundations determine which policies are best, their lack of accountability and the implications of that lack of accountability. Celebrities and foundations represent relatively unregulated and unaccountable concentrations of power and wealth, promote causes and, in effect, establish an agenda for what deserves the attention of society (Arnove, 1980, p. 225; 253; Bergman Rosamond, 2020, p. 131; Giridharadas, 2018, p. 33). The work of these two organizations, which is described in detail in chapters three and four, respectively, illuminates the impact of celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic projects on their beneficiary and/or partner organizations in South Africa and in other parts of the continent, and by extension, on the lives of the people targeted by those organizations.

To investigate these two cases, I used qualitative methodological tools, specifically semi-structured interviews. Qualitative methods were the most appropriate for my research as I sought to understand the impact of the BMGF and ONE ‘on the ground’, by hearing from the particular people I interviewed in their own words. The bulk of the fieldwork for this dissertation was conducted between January 19 and March 18, 2020. During that period I lived in Auckland Park, Johannesburg, which is in close proximity to the University of Johannesburg (UJ), where I held the position of Visiting Scholar in the Department of Anthropology and Development Studies. Following the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in my premature departure from Johannesburg,

some of the fieldwork was conducted remotely from Harare and Ottawa. Even though my methodology included secondary literature research from the beginning, the inability to complete my fieldwork as originally planned and other reasons of lack of access described in detail in below, resulted in a heavy reliance on secondary literature research, incorporating information from the BMGF's and ONE's websites, media articles and scholarly literature. It is important to note that while there was a significant amount of literature on the BMGF, ONE proved to be an under-researched organization, leaving me to primarily use its own material from blogs, videos and the website, as already mentioned.

The fieldwork included semi-structured interviews with various actors: representatives of the BMGF and ONE; their partner organizations, including government departments and other non-governmental organizations. The process of conducting these is described in detail below. Interviews are powerful in eliciting narrative information that allows researchers to investigate people's views in greater depth (Kvale 1996, p. 1). Specifically, semi-structured interviews allow depth to be achieved by the interviewer through the opportunity to probe and expand the respondent's responses (Rubin and Rubin, 2005, pp. 12-13). Consequently, while I developed some question guides, some of the questions emanated from the interview participants' responses. Moreover, the ability to dig deeper using semi-structured interviews provided reliability and precision to the data collection process. Furthermore, as Halperin and Heath (2012) note "a semi-structured interview is a powerful research instrument which can help a researcher understand people's perceptions, feelings, opinions, experiences, understandings, emotions, behaviour, formal and informal roles

and relationships” (p. 212). Indeed, through semi-structured interviews I was able to obtain information regarding participants’ experiences, perceptions and understandings of the projects run by the BMGF and ONE and celebrity philanthropy and humanitarianism in general. The individuals interviewed were organizational representatives and experts in their fields. This meant that the interview respondents were knowledgeable about their organizations’ relationship with the BMGF and the use of funds donated by the foundation in their organizations. In the case of ONE, the representatives of the partner organizations were high level, and therefore had liaised with the advocacy organization for their projects.

In total, 18 participants were interviewed. Apart from the BMGF, the recipient/partner organization participants were divided into different categories which include government and quasi- government entities (National Department of Health (NDH) and the South African Medical Research Council (MRC)); research organizations (the Desmond Tutu HIV Centre, Ezintsha – a division of the University of the Witwatersrand’s Reproductive Health Institute (Wits RHI), Aurum Institute, University of Cape Town (UCT), the Foundation for Professional Development (FPD)); non-profit organizations (Clinton Health Access Initiative (CHAI), Praekelt Foundation); multilateral organizations (African Development Bank (AfDB), the Africa Capacity Building Foundation (ACBF); the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD); World Health Organization (WHO) Africa Regional Office, Grow Africa) and international development NGO (Farm Radio International (FRI)). Participants were recruited via email. Two former officials of ONE - with whom I engaged in informal conversations which touched on my research project - agreed to have some of the

information used in the dissertation, with some discretion. The other participants also agreed to their organizations being identified.

The interviews were conducted in English, which is one of the official languages of South Africa, in which the participants were fluent. I based all my questions on the guides below, but given the semi-structured nature of the interviews, some of the questions emanated from the responses provided by the participants, as already mentioned. In general, with regards to the BMGF and ONE, I sought to understand how these organizations identified and interacted with their partners/beneficiaries and the host government and what mechanisms were in place to ensure their projects' sustainability. From the government and other partners/beneficiaries, I sought to learn how they viewed the work of the BMGF and ONE and whether there was any consultation at all regarding the partners/beneficiaries' needs. Although I started the study with a hypothesis – based on my review of the secondary literature - that was not favourable to the philanthropic/humanitarian organizations, I made every effort to be neutral in my questioning and not let my own biases influence the participants' responses.

Several of my prospective interview participants refused to participate, either by blatantly saying so or by simply ignoring my invitations. I believe that those who would not get involved with my project, including ONE, and various BMGF partner organizations and government departments, viewed me with suspicion. One government official quizzed me about how I had found her contact information. When I responded that I had found it from a conference document on the internet, she castigated me for snooping around and ordered me to never contact her again as she did not know anything about the information I was looking for. Some of these prospective participants would

initially express an interest but then later make excuses for not participating. In some instances, prospective participants appeared to ‘pass the buck’ to someone else and that would go on and on, until someone in that chain would simply say they did not have the information I was looking for, even before hearing my questions. One high-level government official I had been directed to scolded me and accused me of wanting to get her into trouble over the funding of her department.

In the case of ONE, the negative media publicity the organization received following bullying allegations by former staff members in South Africa may have prompted it to shield itself from scrutiny. With regards to the BMGF, I got the impression that some prospective interview respondents did not want to speak about their funder as they might say something which might cause retribution and cut off their source of finances. It is, therefore, not surprising that those who did agree to be interviewed said mostly positive things about the foundation. I suspect they believed that I was on a fault-finding mission, which was not the case. Even though my hypothesis was negative, my objective was to establish for myself what exactly was happening in the implementation of celebrity-led projects in South Africa and in other countries across the region.

However, those who did take part in my interviews generally seemed willing and interested to do so. It was heartening for me to hear most of the interview respondents comment that this was a timely and important study. Nevertheless, it was apparent that some of them were ‘toeing the party line’ in their responses and were careful not to speak negatively about the BMGF, their sponsor. For example, one interview respondent actually said that “we should not look a gift horse in the mouth” (March 2020), suggesting that they should not criticize the work of the BMGF, their benefactor. In

some cases, interviewees wanted to talk about their organizations and their work which detracted focus from my interview questions, but it was good ethical practice to allow them to talk, and to politely bring them back to the questions at hand. Given that the interviewees were mostly practitioners in their fields – doctors, scientists, economists, etc., as already noted, there was a professional power imbalance, vis-à-vis myself. They assumed that I did not know anything about their organizations or their work, even though I would always do some background research before each interview. However, this did not adversely affect the data collection process. No token of appreciation was offered. Indeed, none was expected. Even though I had offered to bring refreshments to the interview in the invitation email, at the time of the interviews, the interviewees were the ones who offered refreshments (for the face-to-face interviews). This was also in line with the cultural context of South Africa, where, if someone receives you in their office, you are considered their guest, and as such, the host is obligated to show some hospitality.

Most interviews lasted between 35 and 45 minutes. As already noted, participants were experts in their fields and therefore were quite familiar with academic research interviews procedures and consented to participate without any queries. The interviews usually ended with the researcher asking for a referral to other potential participants and the participants obliged. In response to this question, the first interview participant from a partner organization suggested that in my invitation, I should make it clear that I am Zimbabwean. The reason was that people in South Africa were tired of academics coming from Western universities to conduct research and never sharing their results. The fact that I was from neighbouring Zimbabwe would therefore open doors. I was

grateful for the advice, and thereafter started identifying myself fully in subsequent email invitations. That same interview respondent also advised that given the time constraints that most prospective participants faced, it was better for me to reduce the amount of time the interview was expected to take. Accordingly, I changed the information on the invitation email from saying that the interview would last between 45 and 60 minutes to between 30 and 45 minutes. Indeed, most interviews were completed within this time frame, as already noted.

It is important to note that as a black, Zimbabwean woman who had had some experience with celebrity humanitarianism in the context of my work, I was viewed by many of my interview participants as uniquely positioned to carry out this timely project. In 2016, I participated in the Conference for the Replenishment of the Global Fund Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (the Global Fund), which was held in Montreal and attended by, inter alia, Bono, Bill Gates and ministers of health from several African countries. Indeed, part of the motivation for my project emanated from my experience from that conference. Most research participants praised me for embarking on such a project as they felt it was an issue which needed interrogation. The fact that I was from the continent indeed opened doors, as had been suggested by one interview respondent. One participant I met with prior to the advice to identify myself as a Zimbabwean confided in me that he had only agreed to meet with me when he figured out that my name was African, even though I was coming from a Canadian institution. That respondent expressed exasperation with Western scholars who come to South Africa to conduct research and never share their findings. He said that he felt that that was exploitative.

The initial interview was carried out with the BMGF official. With the BMGF, the research largely focused on health and agriculture as those are the foundation's main focus in Africa. The rationale behind starting with the BMGF was that from there, through snowball sampling, I would be able to gain access to the partners/recipients with which the foundation was working. My questions were as follows:

- How did you start operating in this country? Did you approach the government or were you invited?
- How much autonomy does the local office have?
- How do you generally operate- i.e. how do you identify partners/ beneficiaries?
- How do you interact with the host government?
- What mechanisms are in place to ensure the sustainability of the projects you are carrying out here?
- Have you ever met Bill and/or Melinda Gates? Have they ever visited this office?

From the interview with the BMGF employee, I was able to identify other research participants, as planned. However, while the ensuing interviews typically drew on the themes of the guide above, they included questions that were tailored towards the specific context of each of the organization or government department analyzed. These included the National Department of Health; the MRC and Ezintsha, which is a subdivision of Wits RHI. In turn, through these institutions and from the BMGF South Africa brochure (which was provided by the BMGF interview respondent) and the website, I was also able to identify and recruit the following organizations for participation in the research: the CHAI; the Aurum Institute; FPD; the Desmond Tutu HIV Centre; the UCT; Praekelt

Foundation; ACBF, WHO Africa Regional Office; NEPAD, the AfDB, Grow Africa- a division of NEPAD and FRI. These were chosen based on their relationship with the BMGF and/ or with ONE and also because they were working in the health sector in one way or another.

The interview question guide for these organizations was as follows:

- How do you interact with the BMGF/ONE? Who approaches the other to initiate cooperation?
- What informed the decision to get the BMGF/ONE involved in the areas they are working in with you e.g. HIV/AIDS, TB, malaria, maternal and child health?
- How do you view the work of the BMGF/ ONE? i.e. would you have been able to carry out the work you are doing without the help of the foundation?
- Have these projects had any significant impact on the improvement of life in South Africa/ Africa?
- How do you view the role of celebrities like Bono and Bill Gates in humanitarian and philanthropic activities?
- Philanthropic organizations, such as the BMGF have been accused of attaching too many conditionalities to their funding, thereby eroding the autonomy of their beneficiaries. Do you think this is the case?
- Philanthropic and humanitarian organizations, such as the BMGF and ONE, have been accused of influencing what deserves the attention of governments and societies (agenda setting). From your interaction with these organizations, do you think this is a valid criticism/accusation?

- What sort of partners are the BMGF/ONE? Are they visible/invisible? Hands on or hands-off approach? Have Bono and Bill and/or Melinda Gates ever visited this office?

The fact that different projects involved different types of partner organizations/beneficiaries of the BMGF and ONE inevitably means that the nature of the relationship of the foundation and the advocacy movement to those organizations is different, as will be discussed in detail in chapters three and four.

While I was able to gain entry to BMGF to carry out an interview through a prior introduction from a friend, that was not possible with ONE. Access to this organization was denied as explained in the latter part of this chapter. Nevertheless, I was able to engage in casual conversations with two former officials of ONE. Those conversations touched on issues related to my research and the individuals agreed that, with some discretion, I could use those conversations as background material. Additionally, some of the respondents who were working with BMGF had worked with ONE (despite the fact that officially the organization had indicated that it does not do any work in South Africa) and/or with Bono, and they were also able to answer a few questions regarding that organization and Bono. This information was supplemented with empirical data found in project documents posted on ONE's website and secondary information from various sources such as news outlets, speeches and a review of relevant scholarly literature. Apart from providing facts and data, these materials were also examined with a view to uncover how celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy are talked about in order to analyze the discursive aspects of these activities.

The purpose of carrying out interviews with all the participants involved in this research was to listen to the voices on the ground to hear their versions of how BMGF and ONE are working, and to consider these in light of the published aims and goals of these two organizations. As Brockington (2011) notes in his review of the study of celebrity and development: “we actually need to listen to what exactly different groups of the public say about their interactions with celebrity and development. How are they consuming it? What are they thinking about it and what individual journeys does it lead to?” (p. 40). The ONE Campaign claims to “educate and lobby governments to shape policy solutions that save and improve millions of lives” (ONE, 2018, n.p.). Similarly, the BMGF claims to “partner with governments, the public and private sectors ... to change public policies, attitudes and behaviours to improve lives” (BMGF, 2019, n.p.). Furthermore, there are allegations of agenda-setting by celebrities and by private philanthropic foundations, among other critiques of these organizations. In other words, foundations and celebrities are accused of setting goals and influencing what their beneficiaries should focus on. Therefore, in carrying out empirical research, the aim was to hear first-hand how those within the two organizations (as well as those from various partner organizations) see the work that is being done, and the role that ONE and the BMGF play in fighting global poverty and diseases. Moreover, through interviews I hoped to gain an understanding of how the partners/beneficiaries of ONE and the BMGF perceive the assistance they are receiving and how they value their interactions with these humanitarian and philanthropic entities. The ultimate purpose of the whole interview exercise, therefore, is not simply to provide a critique of these organizations, but to consider their activities and the discourses that construct their identities as ‘humanitarian’

actors, in relation to a wider set of questions about neoliberalism, democracy, inequality and poverty in global politics.

The interviews were recorded and then transcribed. After transcription, I embarked on the process of coding the data. I did this by reading through the transcribed text with my research concerns in mind, filtering it by identifying relevant text. As Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) explain, “text that is related to your specific research concerns is called *relevant text*” (p. 40, emphasis in the original). As already noted, some research participants in their responses tended to talk about issues that were not necessarily related to my research, but I would politely steer them back to the questions at hand. Having selected the relevant text, I noticed that different interview respondents often used the same or similar words to express the same idea. These repeating ideas (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003, p. 4) shed some light on my research concerns. For example, most interview respondents said they “welcomed” and “appreciated” the financial assistance from the BMGF and the work of celebrities in philanthropic and humanitarian sectors. These repeating ideas occurred across different partner/ beneficiary organizations.

From these repeating ideas emerged themes which are “implicit topics that organize a group of repeating ideas” (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003, p. 42). The theme that emanated from the above-mentioned example was approval of celebrity-led humanitarian and philanthropic activities. It is important to note that there was also some relevant text that was not necessarily repeated. Therefore, in some cases I noted an issue, even if it was reported by one respondent. As Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) aptly explain, “because qualitative research is not focused on quantity, individual differences have an important place in this paradigm” (p. 60).

In my interpretation of my findings, I sought to understand what my interview participants were telling me more deeply as “an interpretation could generate a better sense of the author’s unconscious [i.e. unintended] communication [an understanding of what may have motivated the author to say what he or she said or did even though he or she may not be aware of this motivation him- or herself]” (Willig, 2014, p. 3). I used a combination of ‘suspicious’ and ‘empathic’ approaches to interpretation. ‘Suspicious’ interpretation “...aims to reveal the hidden truths. Appearances are not taken at face value” (Willig, 2014, p. 4). A ‘suspicious’ approach to interpretation assumes that the experiences we come across (whether they are accounts, behaviours, symptoms, social practices etc.) are simply the superficial manifestations of underlying processes and structures which cause them (Willig, 2014, p. 4). In other words, things are not what they appear to be; real understanding is achieved by digging deeper. Indeed, in my research I assumed that this was the case. ‘Empathic’ interpretation “...seeks to elaborate and amplify the meaning which is contained within the material. The interpreter stays with [rather than digs below] what presents itself and focuses on what is manifest [as opposed to that which is hidden]” (Willig, 2014, p. 5). In other words, with ‘empathic’ interpretation, the interpreter tries to understand a phenomenon ‘from within’ [hence the reference to empathy]” (Willig, 2014, p. 5). For example, in my research, when participants responded positively to certain questions, I tried to understand why that was. In some cases, it was clear that respondents did not want to speak negatively about their benefactor. A combination of both ‘suspicious’ and ‘empathic’ interpretation is required to come up with a satisfactory insight (Willig, 2014, p. 6).

I also employed discourse analysis to analyze the interview data and the secondary literature on the two case studies. In discourse analysis, language “...is seen as the medium which actually brings particular versions of events and experiences into being by constructing them in a particular way, for particular purposes, in particular social contexts” (Willig, 2014, p. 11). For example, as will be shown in chapter five, particular projects run by the BMGF and ONE use specific language which reveals their neoliberal inclination.

4. Limitations and Weaknesses of the Research

The research conducted for this dissertation had several limitations, the main one being the denial of access by ONE to its offices. As already noted, when the organization was selected as a case study, indications from a contact I had made from within the organization had been that access would be granted. However, by the time I was ready to conduct the interviews, the same contact denied me access. Prior to travelling to South Africa to conduct the interviews, I had contacted ONE Canada and ONE UK to learn more about the organization and the work it was doing in other parts of the world. ONE Canada said that its work was significantly different from the work that the organization was carrying out in Africa. For that reason, ONE Canada saw no reason to engage with me. For its part, ONE UK, which is based in London, England, after initially welcoming me, declined the invitation to participate in my research citing denial of permission from ONE’s global headquarters in Washington DC. I was also advised by a contact from within ONE’s Africa office located in Johannesburg that they had received an instruction from the global head office not to engage with me on the grounds that the advocacy

organization was not doing any work directly with the South African government.

However, given that the ONE Africa office is the regional head office which oversees other national offices located across the continent, my intention was to get an overview of the organization's continental activities from there. But, despite this explanation, I was still denied access. This was a huge disappointment and shock, but it made me more determined to investigate the organization. I also attributed the scarce secondary literature specifically on the organization to this closed door-policy that it exhibited.

The research results were, therefore, limited by the inability to interview the various representatives of the ONE Campaign. To mitigate this situation, I mainly used secondary literature on the advocacy movement. For the movement's programmes, I relied heavily on the information from its website and others with which the movement cooperates, such as the BMGF. It is obvious that information from the organization's website is mainly promotional. Consequently, it is unlikely to be objective and only highlights the successes. Nevertheless, the information that I was able to get from the website is crucial as it gives a picture of the organization and its work - its leadership and membership, *modus operandi*, and the issues it is interested in. Furthermore, I believe that this information from the movement's website is still helpful because it is probably what the representatives of ONE would have given me in the interviews. It is unlikely that the organization's representatives would have said anything contrary to the mission statements and issues highlighted on the website. I was also able to glean some useful information about the ONE Campaign from two former staffers of the movement during informal conversations. Moreover, some of the BMGF partners I interviewed had done some work with ONE and they were able to answer some questions on the advocacy

movement and Bono. But, it should be noted that because of the obstacles mentioned above, some of the analysis in chapter five will mainly focus on the BMGF whose projects representatives I was able to interview.

Another obstacle encountered during the research process was that while I was able to interview the representative of the BMGF in South Africa, she insisted that the interview be carried out on the phone. This was a disappointment since I was in Johannesburg and had wanted to interview her in person. A phone interview does not afford one the opportunity to gauge the respondent's body language. Furthermore, the phone interview was rather hurriedly done, as the BMGF representative claimed to be busy, despite having set that time aside to speak with me. I obliged but concluded that this was a strategy to ensure that the interview was as short as possible, thus denying me the opportunity to probe some of her responses. This notwithstanding, the information I managed to glean from the BMGF representative was useful as again, it corroborated the information on the foundation's website and what was provided by some of its partners. Compared to the ONE Campaign, there is a lot more secondary literature on the foundation, which helped to fill in some of the gaps I still had from the interview responses of the BMGF's representative.

The research results were also limited by my inability to interview representatives of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Johannesburg. I had planned to conduct interviews with officials of the UNDP in Johannesburg office to learn more about the two cases I am investigating. The UNDP partners with both the BMGF and the ONE Campaign in some of its projects. Moreover, the UNDP also partners with the South African government. As such, the UN agency would have been in a position shed

more light on how the two organizations operate and their impact on the lives of people targeted by their projects in that country. After an initial expression of willingness to participate in my project, in a response to an email invitation, followed by several phone calls, the individual who had been designated to meet with me simply went quiet. Numerous follow up emails and phone calls went unanswered. An invitation which was specifically directed to the UNDP country representative was also ignored. Due to this fact, the results cannot confirm whether the BMGF and the ONE Campaign's projects have resulted in any concrete, sustainable benefits in the lives of people in South Africa. I had hoped to learn from the UNDP if there had been significant change in the sectors which the BMGF and ONE are involved in and also how the UN agency perceived the work of these organizations in South Africa and across the continent.

Similarly, I was not able to interview a prospective participant in the Department of Basic Education, with which the BMGF runs a sanitation project, who had initially agreed to participate in the study. I had also done my part to complete the preliminary processes required for researchers to be able to conduct research in the department. After the COVID-19 pandemic outbreak, and the subsequent state of emergency and lockdown were imposed in South Africa, follow up emails, phone calls and text messages about the interview went unanswered. Fresh efforts to get the interview when I was back in Ottawa also led to a dead end after another individual in the department who was identified as the BMGF-sponsored sanitation project point person declined to participate in the interview on the grounds that she did not know anything about the project. In that same conversation, the individual confided in me, saying that she did not want to jeopardise the project and/ or lose her job. This was after I had been moved from pillar to post before

being led to that particular individual. In the words of a colleague of that individual, “that in itself was a research finding” (Department of Basic Education official, April, 2020). I understood this statement from the official to mean that no one was willing to discuss the project as they did not want to talk about the BMGF for fear of biting the hand that was feeding them. Indeed, this was the impression I got from other prospective research participants who refused to be interviewed, although there may have been other explanations. However, despite not being able to conduct an interview with the Department of Basic Education sanitation project representative, my interview with the representative of the South African National Department of Health gave an overview of how the BMGF interacts with South African government departments in general. This was helpful for my research as I was able to understand how the foundation cooperates with all government ministries.

5. Contributions

Before outlining how the dissertation will proceed, this section highlights some of the key findings and contributions. Firstly, the dissertation provides empirical evidence of how celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic projects are conducted on the ground and how they are received. Several scholars agree that there is scarce empirical research on how celebrity-led projects are conducted (Hojjer, 2004, p. 513 cited in Scott, 2015, p. 451; Huliaras & Tzifakis, 2010, p. 257; Richey and Budabin, 2016, p. 2; Richey, 2015, p. 3). As Richey (2015) states, “academic discussion over celebrity engagement is often limited to theoretical critique...without much grounded research into what it is that celebrities are doing, the same or differently-in different or even the same places,

throughout the world” (Richey, 2015, p. 3). Richey (2015) also explains that “existing literatures still lack, for the most part, any empirical grounding from the side of the recipients of humanitarian ‘help’” (p. 9). Indeed, as will be shown in chapter two, there is vast critical literature, but relatively little of it is supported by more empirical research on how celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic activities are implemented and how they are viewed by recipients. How are these projects executed on the ground, how do they affect the local recipients and how do those local recipients view and understand these projects? These studies are vital for any informed analysis and my dissertation seeks to fill this gap. As I also discovered, an organization like the ONE Campaign is quite under-researched, yet it is led by one of the most prominent celebrity humanitarians of our time.

Secondly, this dissertation aims to offer a more detailed and nuanced understanding of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. As Littler (2008) observes, “offering support for global charities has become practically part of the contemporary job description and a hallmark of the established star” (p. 237). In their do-gooding, celebrities make extensive use of the media, especially social media, to publicise their work. In so doing, they enhance their likeability to their audience, thereby raising their profiles (Littler, 2008, p. 239). There is a connection between celebrity media coverage and charitable causes (Littler, 2008, p. 238). As Kapoor (2012) aptly puts it, we live in the “information age- in which entertainment stars play a prominent role as ‘humanitarians’ in world politics” (p. 18). Celebrity involvement in philanthropic causes is likely to continue to expand. Several scholars agree that philanthropy is a big and growing part of our lives and society (Payton & Moody, 2008, p. 22; Tutu HIV Centre representative, March 2020). The philanthropic sector is also one of the fastest growing

industries in the global economy (McGoey, 2015, p. 17). In light of this, it is important to reimagine how celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy are conducted in order for these activities to have a more transformative effect and long-term impact on the lives of those they seek to assist.

As will be shown in chapter two, most critical literature does not always concede the existence of any positive outcomes of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. However, as Street (2004) argues, “whether one welcomes, detests or tolerates celebrities, their work at the intersection between formal politics for humanitarian causes as proxy philanthropists, statesmen, executives and healers requires attention...” (cited in Richey and Brockington, 2020, p. 44). This dissertation seeks to deepen our understanding of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy by investigating inequalities and power dynamics within celebrities’ humanitarian and philanthropic programmes and the larger global playing field. Questions of power and accountability need academic investigation, especially in light of celebrities’ ability to gain power based on their ability to reach audiences, as well as to build authority and influence (Daley, 2013, p. 376; Richey, 2016, p. 13). In fact, celebrity humanitarian activism has been depicted as a distinct form of transnational political activity which has grown in importance and visibility in recent years. It is against this background that my research becomes most pertinent and timely as it seeks to understand the impact of such activism on the ground.

The key findings in my research indicate that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy activities are beneficial and appreciated for providing much-needed funding to organizations which would otherwise not get funding at all. For example, one

respondent said despite tobacco consumption being a cause of many deaths on the continent, before the donation of funds by the BMGF, her organization was not implementing any tobacco control projects because of lack of funding for that issue (ACBF representative, Feb, 2020). These activities are also helpful in providing funding for urgent and immediate needs. This is a crucial finding as most critical literature does not concede this point, as will be shown in chapter two. Nevertheless, another key finding was that celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic activities were problematic because of the overinvolvement of the funding organizations in the work of the recipients which was tantamount to agenda setting. The BMGF's heavy involvement meant that the foundation, in some cases, directed the work of its grantees, with the result that they ended up venturing into some areas which they knew little about. The use of American firms as sub-contractors by the BMGF was reported to be an issue of concern by some partner organizations who felt that the same work could be done better by local organizations. The power imbalance between the BMGF and its beneficiaries meant that the latter tended to accept whatever the foundation wanted, as not doing so carried the risk of the beneficiaries losing much-needed funding.

With regards to ONE, the power disparity resulted in the advocacy movement identifying the issues to be tackled. In so doing, the organization tended to apportion blame for some of those issues to African governments rather than other possible culprits like multinational corporations, Western governments or international financial institutions. For example, ONE attributed the 2011 famine in the Horn of Africa to African leaders' lack of political will to address the problem. The organization argued that if leaders put in place proper policies, and implemented them in a timely manner,

investments in the continent's agricultural sector would increase, thereby ensuring food for all (ONE, 2020). The advocacy organization also occasionally portrayed Africa as an international security threat in order to get the West to give more aid to the continent (Magubane, 2007, p. 5; ONE DATA Report, 2017). Furthermore, the projects ONE advocates to address the power deficit on the African continent appear to have a blatantly entrepreneurial element as they are designed to benefit American private sector players in the provision of electricity to the region.

Overall, while recipients welcomed celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, mainly because of their short-term gains, these activities are plagued by inequalities and negative power dynamics. Furthermore, I argue that humanitarian and philanthropic programmes did not tackle the deep-seated structural inequities in the global political economy which are often responsible for some countries having to rely on philanthropy. These inequalities can be traced to historical and continuing colonial relations that are exploitative and oppressive. In fact, deploying celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy as the potential solution for inequities can exacerbate those divisions (Littler, 2008, p. 246). Moreover, these activities may ultimately be eroding democratic accountability and long-term development of African countries and their populations.

I argue that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy are neocolonial activities which have a potential to sustain relations of domination between the West and Africa. This is revealed through the use of the concept of "neoliberal imperialism" (Daley, 2013, p. 376; Hahn, 2007, p. 161) and postcolonial theory to examine the implications of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, such as 'philanthrocapitalism' (Bishop and Green, 2008), lack of accountability, and humanitarian governance and the discourses

that propagate and sustain these activities. Neoliberal imperialism is a concept which emerges from critics like Hahn who argue that neoliberalism should be analyzed from a world historical perspective in order to understand its connection to imperialism and neocolonialism (Hahn. 2007, p. 142). Building on the work of Daley (2013), Dubgen (2012) and Kohn (2013), who argue that celebrities focus their humanitarian and philanthropic activism on Africa, I demonstrate that indeed, these practices are at work in some parts of the African continent. I also show how Bono and Bill Gates construct their narrative to bring attention to the continent, while at the same time positioning it in the broader neoliberal logic as representing the source of economic opportunities. As outlined in chapters three and four, in the course of their work, sometimes the BMGF and ONE facilitate public-private partnerships (PPPs) in which American businesses play a key role to fill in some gaps in the health sector or provision of electricity. This can be understood as a new form ‘repackaging’ of the traditional form of imperialism as a collaborative and empowering form of politics, as these celebrity humanitarians can act to advance the agenda of the West (Daley, 2013, p. 385).

Finally, I analyze celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy from a postcolonial perspective as these activities are often carried out in ways which reinforce inequalities that are a result of the historical and on-going colonial relations and practices. Much as the projects are couched in terms of partnership and empowerment, the reality on the ground is that it is an unequal partnership which does not always recognize beneficiaries as knowledgeable subjects. As I will show in chapter five, sometimes BMGF grantees are forced/coerced into expanding their projects into areas they know little about, as part of the conditionalities of the grants. Furthermore, it can be argued that the excessive

influence which the foundation holds over some of its beneficiaries can be a form of humanitarian governance; a way of managing populations under the guise of helping them (Fassin, 2007, pp. 150-151) which is practiced in various ways. Similarly, the concept of humanitarian governance could also be used to interpret some of ONE's projects which depict the continent as a potential international security threat, thereby constructing Africa as conflict-ridden. The discourses which are employed by celebrities in humanitarian activities mostly construct the alleviation of poverty as a moral objective and overlook the reasons for the existence of poverty (Biccum, 2011, p. 1339), while at the same time proffering neoliberal solutions which place individuals at the centre while the role of the state is scaled back. As will be outlined in chapter five, some celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic activities result in the transference of authority from elected governments to private entities in the provision of public goods, thereby potentially ignoring considerations of the public interest (Edwards, 2008). Humanitarian and philanthropic players are not accountable to anyone, as they were not elected into office, and this is a problematic aspect of their activities as was voiced by some interview respondents and will be shown in chapters three and five. This is a critique that is also true of NGOs. Moreover, I interpret these activities in terms of philanthrocapitalism, which can be defined as "marketized philanthropy" (Mediavilla & Garcia-Arias, 2019, p. 862). Both the BMGF and ONE do not hide the commercial aspect of some of their projects as will be highlighted in chapters three and four. I argue, therefore, that while these initiatives may be serving a positive purpose in the short-term, their methods strengthen a system of global capitalism which causes persistent poverty and extreme inequities.

6. Conclusion and Chapter Plan

The past few decades have witnessed an increase in the involvement of celebrities in humanitarian and philanthropic activities, drawing attention to poverty and other disasters around the world, especially on the African continent. Some of these celebrities, including pop artists, billionaire philanthropists and film stars, have acted as representatives and champions of the region on development issues. It is indisputable that indigence, conflict and disease are commonplace in many countries in Africa. This would therefore seem to justify the attention that some celebrities are paying to the region, advocating poverty alleviation, compassion and saving lives. However, celebrities' activities raise serious questions about accountability and representation in developing social policy as well as efficacy (Littler, 2008). As noted in chapter one, the lack of accountability is one of the issues I will focus on to analyze celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, while also touching on the lack of representation and the benefits of these phenomena.

Celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy have indeed led to a better quality of life for some people in South Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa in general, according to my research. For example, more HIV/AIDS patients had access to antiretroviral medication through the efforts of Bono and the BMGF. However, I argue, based on my research, that in spite of this, projects by the BMGF and ONE were fraught with inequalities and domination of the beneficiaries by the providers of aid as will be discussed in detail in chapter five. Furthermore, celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy do not appear to lead to long-term poverty reduction. As was made clear by some research participants, no

donor funds are given in perpetuity, and some projects end once the aid ceases. Therefore, celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy may serve to deepen relations of domination between the West and Africa, and may preserve the existing inequalities. It was also apparent from my research that these practices do not challenge the structural inequities which in some instances cause the poverty the celebrities seek to combat. Furthermore, celebrities masquerade as experts and make pronouncements on issues they lack expertise in, while at the same time, those who are knowledgeable fear to correct them because of their celebrity status. The heavy involvement of the providers of funds in how the funds are used in the case of the BMGF, tends to make those who need funding tailor their projects to position them favourably. This does not necessarily or always correspond with the needs on the ground.

Chapter one outlines the theoretical framework for this dissertation. I interpret celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy through the lens of neoliberal imperialism. I discuss neoliberal imperialism's connection to postcolonialism and neoliberalism before turning to the other concepts which emerge through viewing celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy from this perspective. Chapter two gives an overview of some of the literature on contemporary celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, highlighting the positive as well as the critical themes in the literature. There is a large body of literature on celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, two terms that are closely intertwined, and often used interchangeably though there are differences between them as will be explained in detail in chapter two. My research draws largely on the proliferating critical literature which sets its analyses against the background of the rise of neoliberalism in the 1980s. In chapters three and four, I delve into the discussion of the two case studies, the

BMGF and ONE, respectively, using materials from various sources, including interviews, secondary literature, media articles and information from the two organizations' websites. In both chapters, I present detailed portraits of the organizations, foregrounding elements that assist in answering my research questions, including how these organizations are run and how they interact with their partners/ beneficiaries. Chapter five turns to a critical analysis of the research findings and also provides a discussion on their relationship to the existing literature on celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. I also elucidate the findings in light of the research questions above. I draw particular attention to the nature of cooperation between the BMGF and ONE with their partners on the ground, showing how, even though the projects are welcomed, they are fraught with limitations which result in them not achieving a more long-term and transformative impact. To conclude this dissertation, I explore the implications of my research to international development. I also highlight my project's contribution to knowledge, its limitations and possibilities for further research.

Chapter 1: Theoretical Approaches

1.1 Introduction

This chapter sets out the theoretical framework for this dissertation. My analysis interprets celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy through the lens of neoliberal imperialism. ‘Neoliberal imperialism’ is the merging of neoliberalism and imperialism where ‘imperialism’ does not look the same now as it did from the 1800s to early-mid 20th century, but can be characterized as ‘neo-imperialism’ or neocolonialism. As Hahn (2007) argues, neoliberalism must be analyzed from a “world historical and global” perspective (p. 142) which it often is not. Doing so would make us recognize that “neoliberalism cannot be analyzed without also considering inherent links to imperialism and neocolonialism...” (Hahn, 2007, p. 142). This serves my analysis well insofar as I argue that we can explain the rise of, and the nature of, celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy through reference to both neoliberalism and neocolonialism/imperialism – not just as separate phenomena – but as working together. This allows us to see that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy are both constituted by and constitutive of, neoliberal imperialism. Neoliberalism takes a market-oriented approach to the economy as I describe in this dissertation, but it also legitimizes “Western military interventions and the imposition of economic policies in the name of democracy, human rights and free market economy” (Hahn, 2007, p. 142). Celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy are a form of imperialism as well as a manifestation of neoliberalism. As Daley (2013) aptly puts it “those celebrities operating in the field of humanitarianism, who demand greater intervention by hegemonic Western states, can act to promote the agenda of those states.

This traditional form of imperialism is packaged as a new form of politics that is collaborative and empowering for participants” (p. 385).

Neoliberal imperialism also refers to the dovetailing of neoliberalism with the neo-imperial strategies of development which has manifested through the proliferation of development players. These development actors include wealthy philanthropists and celebrities, some of whom espouse neoliberal development ideas – that private actors are more efficient as they are less encumbered by the state and that the free market is the solution for ending global poverty (Biccum, 2011, p. 1333). I draw on the concept of neoliberal imperialism but my analysis allows me to identify the ways in which both neoliberalism and imperialism are changing in the context of contemporary capitalism. Imperialism is defined by Gallagher and Robinson (1953) as “the process of incorporating regions into the expanding economy” (p. 5). They explain that such incorporation could be carried out either through formal annexation or through informal control. It is the latter that interests me in this dissertation. Informal imperialism can therefore be undertaken by non-state actors at the periphery. While formal imperialism was state-centred, neoliberal imperialism is practiced by non-state actors, including non-governmental organizations (NGOs), multinational corporations and celebrity humanitarians. As Godfrey et al. (2014) also explain “establishing informal empire rests upon the metropolitan power harnessing the power of pliable collaborator elites at the frontier” (p. 19). I argue that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy can be viewed as being undertaken by such ‘collaborator elites’.

I begin this chapter with a discussion of neoliberal imperialism and its connection to postcolonialism, and how I draw on these concepts in this dissertation to interpret

celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. This is followed by a consideration of neoliberalism, a perspective which is at the root of neoliberal imperialism, in the next section. Neoliberalism advocates individualism, free markets, trade liberalization and a scaling back of the state from the economy. This approach manifests in various ways in the economic and political realms and is propagated by specific discourses which construct issues in depoliticized ways that call for neoliberal solutions. Neoliberal discourses will be analyzed in the third section. In the fourth section, I examine the lack of accountability which is another feature of neoliberal politics and economics. As the state is pushed out of the economy and social service provision, other actors, such as celebrity humanitarians, step in to fill that gap. But their activities raise serious concern about accountability. In the fifth and sixth sections I explore the issues of humanitarian governance and ‘philanthrocapitalism’, respectively. With regards to humanitarian governance, I make a case for the importance of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy in the wider liberal agenda and its governmentalized objectives. Philanthrocapitalism is a concept which illustrates how philanthropic projects are both constituted by and constitutive of, the expansion of neoliberal capitalism. The conclusion sums up the chapter as well as providing a transition to chapter two.

1.2 Celebrity Humanitarianism, Philanthropy-Neoliberal Imperialism, Postcolonialism Nexus

Celebrity humanitarians are drawn to Africa because of the continent’s “well-established inferior position in global imaginative geographies - at the bottom of the development hierarchy and outside of modernity, coupled with a colonial legacy that constructs it as the ‘white man’s burden’” as Patricia Daley aptly explains (Daley, 2013,

p. 376). In other words, Western celebrity humanitarian activities in Africa can be seen as part of efforts to ‘develop’ the continent by bringing it into the sphere of globalisation through the extension of market forces. In fact, since the 1980s, Africa has become the site of neoliberal interventions and practices aimed at achieving this very objective, being spearheaded not only by celebrities, but also by international financial institutions, private entrepreneurs and international development organizations (Daley, 2013, p. 376). Celebrity humanitarian activism, therefore, can be viewed in terms of this neoliberal imperialism as it reinforces global power hierarchies in which Western hegemonic powers are portrayed as ‘humanitarian saviours’ whilst enforcing ‘accumulation by dispossession’ in the periphery (Harvey, 2003, cited in Daley, 2013, p. 377).

Neoliberalism has also been transformed away from a more exclusionary character towards new manifestations of neoliberalism that try to legitimate the underlying project – what Arne Ruckert (2006) calls “inclusive neoliberalism” which emphasizes country ownership and the participation of civil society under what analysts refer to as the post-Washington Consensus while at the same time, neoliberal practices like liberalization and privatization of the economy remain in place (p. 37). This new approach to neoliberalism is less prescriptive but still perpetuates the role of foreign donors, foreign actors and elites and deprives local actors of their autonomy and control. My analysis, therefore, identifies how celebrity humanitarianism emerged as a way of responding to some of the earlier contradictions of both neoliberalism and how it continues to thrive under inclusive neoliberalism. Furthermore, in my analysis, I examine the changes in the discursive role of celebrities in our culture.

The concept of neoliberal imperialism emerges from critics like Hahn (2007), who argue that the international development agenda is “an imperial project to control populations and resources” (p. 161), motivated by Western political and economic interests rather than by pro-poor development (Hahn, 2007, p.142). Western celebrities focus much of their humanitarian advocacy on Africa, “the continent of the poor” (Dubgen, 2012, p. 74) or “the Mecca of misery and desperation of humanity” (Diop, 2006, pp. 70-71, in Dubgen, 2012, p. 73) as Africans are the perennial victims of violence, famine and natural disasters (Kohn, 2013, p. 192). Indeed, this perception of the continent of Africa by some celebrities is reflected in the lyrics of the song “Do They Know it’s Christmas?” released by *Band Aid* in 1984, which marked the beginning of the current trend of celebrity humanitarianism:

... And it's a world of dread and fear
Where the only water flowing
Is the bitter sting of tears
And the Christmas bells that ring
There are the clanging chimes of doom...
And there won't be snow in Africa this Christmas time
The greatest gift they'll get this year is life
Where nothing ever grows
No rain nor rivers flow... (Ure & Geldof, 1984)

Celebrities act as brokers who make market relations acceptable in the core Western countries through consumption and at the periphery, in developing countries, through humanitarian initiatives (Daley, 2013, p. 377). A good example is the ONE

Campaign's advocacy for the better utilization of investments leading to development (BUILD) Act³ and the Electrify Africa Act.⁴ The ONE Campaign champions these two pieces of legislation for bringing American private investors to Africa "to increase investments in the region" as part of the promotion of the continent as a place of massive economic opportunity (ONE, 2020). However, the opportunity is presented as being for supporters in the global North, thereby revealing not only the unequal power relations that exist between the global North and Africa, but also the purpose that the continent of Africa serves – as an economic opportunity. Celebrity humanitarian projects are justified in ways that intersect with the prevailing neoliberal discourses which rationalize the entry of new players such as businesses and consumers as "allies" whose investments would reach and benefit the beneficiaries in the global South (Budabin, 2020, p. 69). Moreover, the emergence of celebrities advocating for the involvement of private players in service provision is part of the neoliberal rationale. Power and wealth are concentrated in the hands of local and transnational elites as state-owned assets are transferred to them in the privatization process, thereby revealing that neoliberalism sustains Western hegemony (Hahn, 2007, p. 142). When celebrities present market solutions to development challenges, this argument is also shared by state actors, such as USAID and the US State Department and other official bodies that support private-public partnerships (PPPs) (Budabin, 2020, p. 70). As will be shown in chapters three and four, both the ONE

³ Signed into law on October 5, 2018, the BUILD Act facilitates American private sector investment in Africa by making it easier for American entrepreneurs to do business there. The ONE Campaign lobbied for the legislation, claiming that the policy would create more jobs on the continent, enhance economic development and contribute towards ending extreme poverty (Alexander, 2018).

⁴ Signed into law in February 2016, ONE members had lobbied for the Electrify Africa Bill since 2013. The Act enables both American public and private partners to invest in sub-Saharan Africa's energy sector to modernise the infrastructure and increase access to electricity in that region. This would, in turn, improve the quality of education, alleviate extreme poverty and spur economic growth and development (ONE, 2021).

Campaign and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) are also advocates for PPPs in Africa.

Some humanitarian activities, such as those involving PPPs are portrayed by the celebrity humanitarians as being joint ventures. Indeed, the narratives of celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic projects are couched in terms of empowerment of the beneficiaries. Celebrities involved in these activities have become a transnational force which propagates Euro-American cultural hegemony (Biccum, 2016, p. 1006; 1009). New development advocacy carried out by celebrities and high-profile philanthropists is, therefore, a perfect expression of neoliberal subjectivity and subject production which enables empire to function (Biccum, 2011, p. 1334).

In the early years of celebrity humanitarianism, artists such as musicians and movie stars could mobilise civil society to rally against Western military and economic domination in less developed countries (Hahn, 2007, p. 158). For example, Jane Fonda's activism against the Vietnam War in the 1960s and 1970s created a new form of anti-war politics. She organized and funded anti-war campaigns, mobilizing activists across the US (Hershberger, 2004, p. 549). However, contemporary celebrities work in tandem with liberal Western powers, as "advocates for western neoliberal economic and military interventions" (Hahn, 2007, p. 158), showing how celebrity humanitarianism has been captured by the logic of neoliberalism since the 1980s. By embracing solutions that are proffered by celebrities, Western elite policy makers view these celebrities as "heroes" for forging partnerships that bring in a consumer public to advance development and peace in some conflict afflicted places in Africa, such as South Sudan and the Democratic Republic of Congo (Budabin, 2020, p. 69). It is noteworthy that these countries are some

of the most resource-rich on the continent. South Sudan is at the top of the list of prospective commercial oil producers among East African countries (Fineman, 1993, cited in Hahn, 2007, p. 159). It is therefore unsurprising that populations in the global South consider the international development agenda as an imperial project to control them and the resources that their countries hold (Hahn, 2007, p. 161).

Celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy can also be viewed in terms of neoliberal imperialism in light of how celebrities sometimes couch their activism in security terms. The notion of the liberal democratic peace makes it an obligation of the international community to fight terrorism and help implement democracy, human rights and a free market economy as the only way to ensure peace and economic prosperity (Hahn, 2007, p. 157). Indeed, in a bid to ramp up support for Africa, Bono and some Western leaders have not shied away from constructing the continent as a security threat. For example, linking aid to US national interests and the war on terror, Bono stated in an interview with *NBC News* that it might be smart for the US to make friends with the continent which is 40 per cent Muslim and curb extremism (Kapoor, 2012, p. 27). In a speech at the National Prayer Breakfast on 2 February 2006, in Washington D.C, Bono made an appeal to the then President, George W. Bush, to "...Congress, people of faith, people of America...", to give an additional 1 per cent of the US federal budget to the poor of Africa (Bono, 2007, pp. 50-57 cited in Duvall, 2010, p. 181). In his appeal, Bono asked for foreign aid to be taken as a form of "tithing" by a Christian nation, as well as serving "national security, enlightened economic self-interest" (Bono, 2007, p. 5 cited in Duvall, 2010, p. 181). Even though Bono had opened his speech by referring to equality and social justice, he did not suggest that humanitarian aid should be considered as

compensation by Western nations for the injustices and atrocities committed in Africa during the colonial era. Furthermore, he did not recognize the on-going neo-colonial relations of power that operate through the structures and institutions of the global political economy. Rather, he suggested that the US is a devoutly Christian nation and its politicians should do their Christian duty by “tithing” 1 per cent of the national budget to the poor. Christian rhetoric suggests that the aid is charity, which is coupled with self-interest, as he made clear, rather than restitution. Moreover, he also appealed to “military men” to view aid to Africa as a beneficial way to “transform the way they [i.e. the African “others”] see us” (Bono, 2007, p. 5 cited in Duvall, 2010, p. 182).

In effect, the use of the term ‘Africa’ by most celebrities can be viewed as an attempt to elide or homogenize the continent’s complexity and difference in order to make it more manageable and contain it (Kapoor, 2012, p. 42). At the same time, objects of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy “can be rendered invisible as their historical experiences are not reflected in the hegemonic discourse” (Dubgen, 2012, p. 75). Often celebrities use pity as a discursive mode to highlight the suffering they seek to alleviate, and this ends up eliminating the need to engage with political questions of cause, effect and social justice (Littler, 2008, p. 247; Kurasawa, 2013, p. 204). The ubiquity of images of suffering people serves to reinforce the paternalistic-colonial relationship through which African subjects are treated as victims or infantilized (Kapoor, 2012, p. 42). Celebrity humanitarian activism in Africa is tainted by orientalist notions of superiority as celebrities focus their attention on the non-Western ‘other’. For example, in 2005 Bob Geldof described the continent as conflict-ridden, saying “conflict bedevils Africa” and called the capital city of the Democratic Republic of Congo, Kinshasa “the

capital of chaos” (Kapoor, 2012, p. 40). Such depictions construct Geldof as a ‘white saviour’ of an ‘uncivilized’ Africa. This becomes even more visible when viewing celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy from a postcolonial perspective.

Postcolonialism is a conceptual approach which refers to the perpetuation of colonial relations between the West and the global South long after colonialism officially ended (Seth, 2013, p. 1; Darby & Paolini, 1994, p. 375). In other words, postcolonialism refers to how colonialism has shaped the contemporary world. Postcolonialism, as Kohn suggests, also refers to two related approaches to the legacy of colonialism. One is the humanist/literary approach which stresses the cultural legacies of colonialism and examines the connection between power and knowledge. The other approach is economic and political in nature and it emphasizes the way that colonialism created a lasting legacy of global inequality (Kohn, 2013, p. 190). I argue that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy can be viewed from both these perspectives; as Daley (2013) aptly puts it, “humanitarian work is presented as if it is in isolation from the hegemonic discourse of race and the spatial hierarchies of power embedded in such action. In the context of Africa, celebrity and humanitarian activities are predicated on economic power and ideologies of race and place” (p. 390). The insistence by the BMGF on sub-contracting American organizations to do groundwork in South Africa, when there are local organizations which can do the same, as will be shown in chapter three, is reflective of this.

Postcolonial theory reveals the way that celebrity humanitarianism reproduces colonial subjectivities as celebrities try to raise awareness among Westerners about African issues, such as poverty and debt. And, as pointed out by Darby and Paolini

(1994), postcolonialism, generally invoking Foucault's view of the connection between power and knowledge,

... views power as operating at the very point of textual representation and the construction of language and discourse; that is the way in which we frame events and phenomena around us necessarily carries relations of power that serve dominant interests. In short, representation structures relations between the West and the Third World very much in favour of the former. (p. 385)

Celebrities couch their humanitarian endeavours in ways that are designed to garner the most support from their target audience. However, in so doing, celebrities construct a specific image of Africa and of the West for their audience (Duvall, 2010, p. 120). For example, as Duvall (2010) argues, celebrities' activities in the global South and their advocacy in the West are premised on the claim that they are assisting nations that would otherwise not get any help (p. 171). The issues of poverty which the celebrities seek to address are presented as moral problems, not political issues, as contemporary Western celebrities tend to draw on the colonial legacy of spreading Christian values, Western enlightenment and assumed custodianship of humanity (Daley, 2013, p. 388). For instance, Bono, who is described as a devout Christian (Daley, 2013, p. 388; conversation with former ONE official #1, January, 2020), draws on his Christian beliefs as the motivations of his humanitarian activities. He also relies on his audience's preconceived assumptions about the continent of Africa "in order to evoke superiority of knowledge and rightfulness of purpose" (Daley, 2013, p. 388).

Furthermore, postcolonial theory focuses on the Othering of Africa; in the words of Achille Mbembe, "it is in relation to Africa that the notion of 'absolute otherness' has

been taken farthest” (2001, p. 9). Africa, as a ‘concept’, “has historically served, and continues to serve as a polemical argument for the West’s desperate desire to assert its difference from the rest of the world” (Mbembe, 2001, p. 9). Postcolonialism is therefore an effective lens for viewing the diverse and multiple relationships that constitute the links between the Global North/West and Global South/rest which characterize contemporary humanitarianism and by extension celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. Humanitarianism, in general, and celebrity humanitarianism, in particular, dichotomize the world into core and periphery, developed and less developed, and North and South based on developmentalism that views certain spaces such as West/global North as superior centres of human progress from which come the knowledge and ability to protect ‘global others’ (Daley, 2013, p. 389; Andersson and Calvano, 2015, p. 131). Similarly, humanitarianism and celebrity humanitarian activities can sustain a worldview in which individuals are either victims or perpetrators, or in some cases, beneficiaries and benefactors and not simply and more accurately human beings in a complicated set of relationships (Belloni, 2007, p. 455; Slim, 2010, p. 5). Africa’s inferior position in the hierarchy of development “is so well-established that the construction of donor and recipient would not be challenged” (Richey and Ponte, 2008, cited in Daley, 2013, p. 388). Yet those dichotomized categories are largely false, and the labels are odious and de-personalising. Differences between people and their particular experiences are ignored. The victimised local population is described as weak and helpless, while the ‘helpers’ are brave and generous Westerners, implying that the practice is imbued with attitudes of superiority (Slim, 2010, p. 5). The perpetuation of these binaries represents the Western-centrism of celebrity humanitarianism and also highlights the unequal

relations between the humanitarians/ philanthropists and those they seek to assist. Moreover, the causes of poverty and other forms of hardship to which humanitarianism is directed, are generally not taken into account "...and the international society's role in constructing that historical background is often ignored altogether" (Bellamy, 2003, p. 333). Instead, the hegemonic image presented in development aid represents itself as an act of generosity, while in effect, it serves to maintain the status quo, thereby reinforcing existing power hierarchies (Dubgen, 2012, p. 73). The service to the mainstream and status quo of celebrity humanitarianism is most clearly visible in celebrity diplomats, such as Bono and Bill Gates, as they tend to draw attention away from the structural causes of unequal power structures. In their discussions of Africa's development needs, they do not challenge the inequalities which result in the need for aid. This, in turn, propagates the inequalities inherent in North/South relations (Richey and Brockington, 2020, p. 53), and which are produced and reproduced by the neoliberal character of celebrity humanitarianism.

1.3 Celebrity Humanitarianism, Philanthropy and Neoliberalism

The term 'neoliberalism' refers to political economic practices which propose that human welfare can be advanced best by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills in an institutional framework in which private property rights, free markets and trade liberalization reign supreme. The role of the state is to secure an institutional framework which would be conducive for such practices (Harvey, 2005, p. 2; Hahn, 2007, p. 143). Markets are regarded as an efficient way to carry out economic activity as they involve competition, efficiency and choice (Larner, 2000, p. 5). A central ethos of

the free-market ideology is that, within the market, everyone acts in their own self-interest which produces maximum efficiency in productivity and social justice (Biccum, 2011, p. 1339). Neoliberal development is therefore premised on four central tenets. The first is marketization; the belief that markets should be the means by which societies distribute their resources. Secondly, privatization- the utilization of private funds (instead of public spending) in undertaking public projects. Thirdly, deregulation, which entails the abolition of tariffs and subsidies in order to free the market from state intervention and to ensure optimal capital mobility. Finally, neoliberal development is based on flexibilization which denotes the dynamic and flexible manner in which production is organized in mass consumption societies (Griffin, 2010, p. 220).

The promotion of the markets as a means to facilitate individual economic well-being is one of the key aspects of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy as it is of mainstream development NGOs. Bono and Bill Gates explicitly advocate commerce as a way of getting people out of poverty (Bono, 2017; Kiviat and Gates, 2008). The language of ‘innovation’ and ‘entrepreneurship’ is also central in constructing the dominant discourses of celebrity philanthropy, therefore providing clear evidence that it is constituted in and through neoliberalism. Moreover, it is fundamental to understand the political ideals upon which neoliberalism was founded. Human dignity and individual freedom are powerful and appealing values (Harvey, 2005, p. 5) and they also form an important part of the central narrative of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. Celebrity humanitarianism is carried out not only to save lives, but also to protect human dignity and unleash the entrepreneurial freedom of impoverished individuals “to sort their own problems”, to borrow Bono’s words (Bono, 2017). Celebrities also publicize

Africa's development issues in ways that highlight individualized enterprise and responsibility (Mitchell, 2016, p. 302). The recruitment of individuals in this way can be viewed as part of a larger practice of neoliberal governmentality, which involves subjects being directed away from state-based responses to social problems, towards individualized free-market, quasi-market forms of philanthropy (Mitchell, 2016, p. 302). In other words, the specific form of celebrity humanitarianism tends to amplify these individualistic and self-help dimensions of international assistance.

My research examines how celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic projects are carried out, including the propensity of celebrities to advocate self-help activities for the poor instead of demanding social welfare from the state or reform of the operations of the global political economy. In other words, neoliberal rationality is visible in how celebrity humanitarians promote individual solutions and 'empowerment', while governments are accused of being inefficient. Moreover, PPPs are touted as the more efficient method of provision of public goods (Mitchell, 2016, p. 295). But, as will be discussed in detail later in this chapter, this is tantamount to a transference of authority to unelected individuals to carry out state responsibilities. However, it is important to note the shift in neoliberal practice of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, towards a more inclusive approach. As will be shown in chapters three and four, some of the projects advocated by the BMGF and ONE call for greater investment by African governments in areas of health and agriculture, as well as empowerment and participation of beneficiaries and partners. This points to what Ruckert (2006) aptly calls the emergence of "... a neoliberal project of an inclusive orientation" (p. 41). But, as will be shown in chapters three and

four, these organizations also engage in activities that tend to undermine the very policies they advocate in ways that show a continuity of neoliberalism.

In addition to the economic practices noted above, neoliberalism is also a set of practices that facilitate the governing of people, as well as a political discourse about the nature of governance (Larner, 2000, p. 6). In other words, neoliberalism is a form of governance that encourages both institutions and individuals to conform to the norms of the market, despite the invocation of individual choice. Therefore, “while neoliberalism may mean less government, it does not follow that there is less governance”, as Larner (2000) aptly explains (p. 12). This aspect of neoliberalism will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter. Analyzing celebrity philanthropy and humanitarian activities through this lens can shed some light on how these activities manifest as a form of governance over the beneficiaries as well as Western citizens upon whom celebrities, such as Bono, rely to support their humanitarian projects. I engage with critiques and critical theories that address both the ways in which neoliberalism produces and reproduces particular subjectivities (such as ‘white saviour’ and ‘impoverished Africa’) and particular economic policies (the shrinking of the welfare state in particular, privatization, and deregulation) as mentioned above.

Notably, Gates is himself a product of the neoliberal deregulation of financial markets in the 1980s and 1990s which was accompanied by the emergence of new sectors in the economy, such as information technology (Harvey, 2007, p. 34; Kapoor, 2012, p. 48). Information technology plays a central role in celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic activities as it not only helps in raising awareness of need but is also useful in enabling those who are willing to assist to do so with ease. Celebrity humanitarians

mostly rely on “the possibilities of long distance intimacy and community afforded by the new social media” (Mitchell, 2016, p. 293) and/ or other media, such as television, where western viewers are treated to pictures of suffering Africans, who, the producers of such content hope, they then feel moved to help (Kapoor, 2012, p. 6). For example, the ONE Campaign uses social media to run its advocacy activities. However, it worthy of note that this global media space through which celebrity activists travel is shaped by Western perspectives that privilege liberal ideals of individualism (Duvall, 2010, p. 107).

Therefore, I examine celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy through the lens of neoliberalism in order to understand the ‘logics’ that are driving these processes, putting them into context (historical and contemporary) and revealing the ‘tensions’ and contradictions in what appears, superficially, to be an unqualified ‘good’ for people of the developing world. The insight offered by looking at celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy through the neoliberalism lens is that these activities tend to ‘privatize’ the issues of poverty, welfare and well-being and they divert attention away from the structural inequalities that are built into the global political economy, which in turn, perpetuates the need for ‘development’ and ‘humanitarianism’.

Before turning to the discussion of the various features of neoliberalism, it is important to explain its growth and the reasons for the decline in state development assistance and a shift towards the “NGO-ization” (Nederveen, 2009, p. 180) and celebrity humanitarianism. The end of the Cold War signalled the end of economic assistance to developing countries which had been provided to those countries by the rival super-powers: the United States and the Soviet Union. Commitment to international development aid waned in the absence of strategic motivation (Rieff, 1995, p. 2). In the

context of superpower rivalry, governments had used aid to further their own interests (Brown & Grävingholt, 2015, p. 1). Furthermore, in the mid-1990s, Western governments, including the US, Britain and Japan, and financial institutions were in crisis, thereby necessitating their retreat (Rieff, 1995, p. 1). By the 1990s, in areas where aid was still prioritized, Western governments insisted that it be distributed through private NGOs. Government structures were deemed to be inefficient and unable to deliver assistance timeously or effectively, a critique which tended to place too much faith in the power of NGOs (Rieff, 1995, p. 3). This shift was part of the general privatization of many areas of the public sector in developed countries, in the wake of neoliberalism. It should be noted that celebrity humanitarians like Bono have also made similar allegations against African governments and advocated for channelling aid through NGOs.

The post-Cold War era saw the advent of new forms of conflict including failing states which were not able to exert authority over their territories, posing a threat to international security as well as in their neighbourhoods. This resulted in aid increasingly being utilized for security purposes (Brown & Grävingholt, 2015, p. 3). Development assistance was therefore directed at addressing not only socio-economic matters but also poor governance, which Western governments believed were responsible for civil strife and state fragility (Brown & Grävingholt, 2015, pp. 4-5). In this securitization of aid, as Stephen Brown explains, "... aid becomes more self-interested because poverty is not perceived as a scourge to be eliminated for moral or even economic reasons, but rather a threat to donors' own security" (2016, p. 19). As will be shown in chapter four, in his advocacy, Bono frequently refers to poverty in Africa as a potential threat to international

security. Aid has also been used for commercial purposes, as observed in the case of Canadian NGOs; World Vision partnering with Barrick Gold to implement projects in Peru and IAMGold and Plan Canada in Burkina Faso (Brown, 2016, p. 23). In this case, development aid loses its traditional meaning, and becomes a profit-making endeavour, as will be explored in detail below under philanthrocapitalism. This changing meaning of ‘development’ is part of the evolution of the concept over time. This shift in meanings can be viewed as part of the changing historical context (Nederveen, 2009, p. 23). In other words, development theory has changed meaning in tandem with changing circumstances and sensibilities. Therefore, understanding it as such means understanding it as a response to problems and arguments at the time (Nederveen, 2009, p. 24). As Nederveen aptly argues, “new concerns are broadly shared by development stakeholders, for example globalization, sustainability, gender, diversity, poverty alleviation prompt new combinations and partners” (2009, p. 27). It is in this context that celebrities have entered the field of development and humanitarianism in the wake of neoliberalism which has seen the role of the state being rolled back and NGOs filling the gap.

Poverty alleviation which ONE and the BMGF are involved in is one of the sustainable development goals (SDGs) adopted by the United Nations in 2015 as a call to action to end poverty, protect the planet and ensure universal peace and prosperity by 2030 (UNDP, 2021). The work of the BMGF and ONE in other areas such as health, gender equality, fighting hunger and provision of affordable and clean energy is all in pursuit of the SDGs. While states are inevitably a key part of the process of achieving these goals, the wider coordination, implementation, monitoring roles and the like will be conducted by a variety of actors in the “Global Partnership for Sustainable Development”

(Dalby et al., 2019, p. 2). It is against this background that philanthropic organizations such as the BMGF which had been active in the development field have acquired a much larger role. For example, in 2016, the BMGF contributed \$3.3 billion to global health, an amount equal to what the UK contributed to health and more than the contribution of any other country except the US (Horton, 2016, p. 210). As will be discussed in greater detail in chapter three, one of the BMGF's reasons for locating its head offices in Johannesburg was to assist the country in its attainment of the SDGs. Equally, as will be explored in chapter four, one of the ONE Campaign's mission statements is the eradication of extreme poverty by 2030 – SDG 1. In the next part of this section I tackle the various features of neoliberalism in turn, beginning with neoliberal discourse and then the lack of accountability.

1.3.1 Neoliberal Discourse

Reading celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy through the lens of neoliberalism can reveal the crucial discursive role played by celebrities in framing humanitarian situations in ways that call for neoliberal solutions. Neoliberal discourse combines the alleviation of poverty as a moral objective and self-interest, but does not offer any reasons for the existence of poverty (Biccum, 2011, p. 1339). Western cultural elites may construct existing crises in decontextualized ways. As such, celebrities may serve to depoliticise globalisation and its consequences by presenting their moral concern for humanity as being outside of conventional politics (Žižek, 2008, in Daley, 2013, p. 379). For example, celebrities like Bono engage in public relations with political actors across the political spectrum and view themselves as being above politics, which

supposedly enables them to speak truth to power and to solve global problems through aid (Daley, 2013, p. 379). In a 2017 ONE Campaign promotional video, Bono stated that development aid was the bridge for getting people out of extreme poverty, because it creates jobs, which, in turn, enable people to sort out their own problems (Bono, 2017). He makes no attempt to explain the causes of those problems, or to call on the state, whose role it is to provide welfare for its citizens, to get involved.

An analysis of neoliberal discourse in celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy exposes how the construction of humanitarian crises in apolitical terms strips them of their historical and political context (Daley, 2013, p. 382). Celebrities quite often act as representatives of those who follow them or their fans in places of poverty they go to, speaking for them and to them, suggesting that they are all in this together to solve the problems of poverty and development (Goodman, 2008, p. 109). However, as Chouliaraki (2013) argues, “this may deprive us not only of the voice of vulnerable others, but also of moral discourse that would link vulnerability to justice” (p. 19). Neoliberal discourse presents Africa’s problems as ethical/ apolitical/ behavioural issues and consequences of leadership failure which require technical solutions from the West. However, this can shift the public’s attention away from investigating the root causes of the problems to tackling the manifestation (Daley, 2013, p. 390). For example, in 2001, Bill Gates told a World Economic Forum (WEF) meeting in Davos that the problem of diseases like HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria was “...a real market failure...a failure of incentives, a failure of cooperation” (Pharma Marketletter, 2001, January 31, in Cooper, 2008, p. 83). His message was that governments alone could not solve the problems of primary importance such as healthcare, and that industry needed to come on board

(Cooper, 2008, p. 83). In my investigation of the BMGF's work, I pay close attention to how neoliberal discourse is used to justify projects. There is no attempt to engage with political questions of cause, effect and social justice, though the language of justice is very much in the fore of some celebrities' speeches, such as Bono's (Littler, 2008, p. 247) and even the Gateses', through the BMGF. The foundation states on its website that it is fighting "the greatest inequities in our world" (BMGF, 2021).

1.3.2 Lack of Accountability

Examining celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy by applying a critical approach to neoliberalism shows that celebrity humanitarians, such as Bill Gates, Melinda French Gates and Bono, are part of the transnational class whose existence has become more obvious in the wake of neoliberal globalization. Members of the transnational class, through their activities, exercise immense influence over public policies and international affairs and have an extraordinary freedom of action which is not common among ordinary citizens (Harvey, 2007, p. 36; Madrigal, 2018; Cody, 2012, p. 81). This, therefore, implies that these unaccountable elites hold strong sway over significant global policy issues such as debt, health, poverty reduction and emergency relief (Kapoor, 2012, p. 3). Moreover, celebrities' increasing involvement in the provisioning of public goods means that "mostly unelected individuals and organizations have, for all intents and purposes, taken over what primarily should be state/ public functions, which is itself revealing of the increasing trend towards the neoliberalization of politics and economies" (Kapoor, 2012, p. 3).

The entry of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy to fill in the gap by providing services that were the preserve of states has resulted in a transference of authority to private capital which is mainly concerned with enhancing opportunities for accumulation, away from democratically elected governments whose mandate is to guarantee universal service provision (Larner, 2000, p. 8). This emergence of an alternative authoritative order is best described as “governance without government” to borrow Mitchell Dean’s words (2003, p. 119). This development essentially means that humanitarianism enables individuals and groups to play a greater role on the international scene, which was previously largely the realm of sovereign states (Belloni, 2007, p. 452). Some of the projects advocated by ONE, such as the Electrify Africa Act and the BUILD Act, which promote increased American private investment in Africa’s service provision sector (ONE, 2020), specifically electricity, fit quite comfortably within the free market philosophy of a minimal state, non-government provision of services, economic self-sufficiency and privatization.

Efforts to address issues of poverty also become ‘privatized’ as wealthy individuals like Bill and Melinda French Gates, for example, through the BMGF, have the capacity to decide which diseases are eradicated not because they represent the collective will of the public, but because of the amount of power they wield due to their massive wealth (Nickel and Eikenberry, 2010, p. 272). But this situation where a wealthy few dominate decision making in global social impact ventures and shape society in ways they believe are appropriate, raises serious concerns about accountability (Cooper, 2012, cited in Andersson and Calvano, 2015, p. 132). As Linsey McGoey aptly put it,

Private philanthropy in general can be a threat to democratic accountability and a just society. Reverence for big donors implies that billions of underpaid and exploited people should be satisfied with philanthropic crumbs from a self-appointed aristocracy rather than entitled to economic justice. (McGoey, 2021, n.p.)

Analyzing celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy through the lens of neoliberalism helps us to explain the diversion of attention from structural inequalities in the global political economy (Daley, 2013, p. 376), when “what is really needed for a fairer, more equal society is not charity but justice” (McGoey, 2021, n.p.). As is evident, celebrity activists’ message to policy-makers in London and Washington is a call for “more attention” to Africa, not a demand for radically changed policies and certainly not for justice and equality. For instance, Bono asks for more aid and debt relief. He does not question the structures of the global economic system (Goodman, 2008, p. 262). This shows that “celebrities act to steer global mass political engagement away from those that are antagonistic towards capital, therefore undermining the potential for global cohesion around emancipatory politics” as Daley (2013, p. 377) aptly observes. In other words, celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy perpetuate neoliberal capitalism as the best solution to problems such as endemic and severe poverty, and in so doing, these activities thwart the development of more transformative political and economic solutions. Furthermore, “with market hegemony, governance becomes less state-centred, more networked and involving a range of actors, including celebrity experts” as Daley (2013, p. 377) eloquently puts it, a concept referred to as humanitarian governance.

1.4 Humanitarian Governance

Humanitarian governance can be seen as part of the wider liberal agenda and governmentalized objective of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. From this perspective, humanitarian intervention can be seen as a form of governance. Therefore, I argue, following Mark Duffield, that “rather than simply focus on the reasons why poverty persists, it is important to examine the political function that its constant rediscovery serves, especially how it validates and revitalizes a liberal will to govern” (2010, p. 61). The poverty which celebrities and other philanthropists seek to alleviate through their humanitarian work may, in effect, turn out to be a pretext for a type of governance that sustains the liberal order. Humanitarian governance is, as Fassin explains, “the administration of collectivities in the name of a higher moral principle that sees the preservation of life and the alleviation of suffering as the highest value of action” (Fassin, 2007, pp. 150-151). As such, humanitarian governance is not carried out only by the state, but also by other non-state actors, including celebrity humanitarians.

Viewing celebrity humanitarianism from a neoliberal perspective reveals that, because it is based on compassion, this practice can play a critical role in cementing the “pathos of assistance” which, as Muller (2013) elucidates, “has become a dominant mode of governing all those characterized by ‘precariousness’” (p. 471). This governance style depends on the mobilization of empathy, rather than the recognition of rights (Muller, 2013, p. 471). In other words, humanitarian activism is based on compassion but does not address global inequalities responsible for situations that require humanitarian intervention. This deployment of moral sentiments in contemporary politics leads to what Fassin refers to as ‘humanitarian government’ or ‘the politics of precarious lives’ (Fassin, 2012, pp. 1-4, in Muller, 2013, p. 480). However, humanitarianism is a moral sentiment

from the rich to the poor countries that is designed to alleviate suffering but leaves the structural conditions that are the cause of that suffering not only unchallenged, but also unrecognized and understood (Fassin, 2012, pp. 242-252, in Muller, 2013, p. 481).

Humanitarian governance is based on ‘humanitarian reason’- “the principle under which moral sentiments enter the political sphere” (Fassin, 2013, p. 37). As already noted, most celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic activities are driven by a moral obligation to assist in needy situations. Indeed, this is clear from the definition of celebrity humanitarianism which is a form of advocacy for the poor or “do-gooding” for the people residing in the developing regions of the world, that includes an implicit or explicit claim for the moral basis of its good (Mitchell, 2016, p. 288). Humanitarianism is so powerful and consensual because of its stated goals- “saving lives” and “alleviating suffering” (Fassin, 2013, p. 40). Celebrity humanitarian initiatives are never forcibly imposed. Rather, they are justified by those who carry them out on the grounds of saving lives and mitigating suffering, as already noted. However, I agree with Fassin, that this justification can be a way of governing people. It may be used to legitimize intervention by various actors, including celebrities, states and other humanitarian actors. After all, “who would be against the noble goal of saving lives?” (Fassin, 2013, p. 40).

The desire to save lives and alleviate suffering is the stated *raison d'être* of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, where celebrities express a sense of a moral obligation to give a hand in certain situations. For instance, as Angelina Jolie stated in her CNN interview with Anderson Cooper, in 2006 (referring to Africans), “these people are tribal peoples. We... colonized them. There’s a lot we need to do...understand and be tolerant of, and help them to do. They have just recently learnt to govern themselves”

(cited in Magubane, 2007, p. 6). This illustrates what Duffield (2007) calls, “a liberal conception of trusteeship” which, as he argues, has come to the fore in the political realm in the wake of post-Cold War Western humanitarianism and peace interventionism (p. 7). This trusteeship is imbued with liberal notions of securing freedom by supporting households and community organizations in their bid for economic autonomy and self-reliance (Duffield, 2007, p. 8). As will be shown in chapters three and four, many projects supported by the BMGF and by ONE are designed to support community members, especially women, to be economically independent.

Celebrity humanitarianism can be viewed as a form of governance if it is analyzed as an ideology; that is, “a set of ideas and values concerning political order and having the function of guiding collective behaviour” (Belloni, 2007, p. 454). Humanitarianism could be seen as an ideology in this sense since it involves various notions about the importance of protecting individual and group rights and well-being and aims at guiding political behaviour accordingly (Belloni, 2007, p.454). Moreover, ideology also carries a negative meaning which originates from Marx’s insight that values and ideas emanate from and justify unequal relations of domination and subordination (Belloni, 2007, p. 454). Humanitarianism is an ideology in this negative sense as “it is a belief that Western involvement in weak states in order to protect individual and groups rights arises from unquestionably altruistic motives and is the answer to addressing human suffering worldwide”, as Belloni (2007, p. 454) observes. While Belloni is referring to state humanitarian intervention, the same argument could also apply to celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. Rather than originating from transnational morality,

celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy could be seen as originating from and reproducing unequal power relations between the West and the less developed world.

Humanitarianism obscures the Western agenda of containment, as Belloni points out (Belloni, 2007, p. 454). International development assistance, as Duffield (2007) suggests, is not designed to ensure that global South populations attain the same level of quality life as their Western counterparts, but rather to ensure that they are kept in a stable enough situation so that instability does not spill over to the West (pp. 68-69). This is evidenced in the security rhetoric often used by celebrity humanitarians and Western leaders. In 2005, the then British Prime Minister, Tony Blair, at the launch of the Africa Commission's development report, suggested that helping Africa served British national interest as it reduced poverty and the risk of future instability and enhanced his own country's security. Moreover, he suggested that assisting Africa was also a moral thing to do (Duffield, 2007, p. 2). As already mentioned, moralising Africans' development issues tends to depoliticise them, thereby failing to contextualise them in light of the broader global political economy.

A humanitarian governance perspective of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy is possible if these activities are viewed from a human security perspective. As Duffield (2007) contends, "human security appears as an enlightened way of thinking that broadens security beyond states to include other threats to life, for example poverty, environmental pollution, population displacement and infectious diseases, such as HIV/AIDS" (p. 113). As will be made clear in chapters three and four, both the ONE Campaign and the BMGF's core mandate of fighting extreme poverty and addressing issues related to HIV/AIDS and other diseases, can be classified as human security

activities. Furthermore, human security involves a recognition of the role of individuals and communities in taking care of themselves (Duffield, 2007, p. 113). Celebrity humanitarian activism, with its neoliberal logic, is geared towards empowering individuals and communities to be self-sufficient, thereby ensuring human security. However, human security, as Duffield (2007) argues, can be “an important governmentalizing technology” which carries the idea that underdevelopment is dangerous (p. 113-114). Ensuring self-reliance becomes a way of avoiding social breakdown and destabilization that can result from poverty and widespread disease (Duffield, 2007, p. 115). In other words, as already noted, humanitarian activities can be a strategy designed to prevent the transmission of disorder from poor, peripheral countries to the developed world (Belloni, 2007, p. 464). Furthermore, as Duffield (2010) argues, through ideas of sustainability and human security, the liberal way of development serves to reproduce and maintain the generic biopolitical division between development and underdevelopment (pp. 65-66).

No matter how well-intentioned the celebrities are, the nature of their humanitarian activism suggests that they are part of a network of governance of others who are perceived to be outside of the realm of modernity (Daley, 2016, p. 390). Moreover, given celebrity humanitarians’ status as cultural elites and products of global capitalism, they do not challenge the inequalities of global power relations, but rather, they co-operate with them to produce new disciplinary networks of governance of the global civil society (Daley, 2016, p. 390).

I also use a humanitarian governance approach to analyze the interaction of celebrities and Western publics who donate towards celebrity humanitarian causes. These

publics are shown images of hunger and pain “only for the time necessary to convince ...[them] to contribute a small amount and return to their daily business” (Belloni, 2007, p. 456). Western TV viewers are comforted to know they contributed to a noble mission, in a “moral sentiment from the rich towards the poor countries” to borrow Fassin’s words (2013, p. 39). In this way celebrity humanitarianism can be viewed as a means of manipulating the public conscience in Western countries, and, I would add, a form of governance. Engaging in this type of humanitarian governance, as Muller (2013) argues, “saves something of our idea of ourselves because it makes us believe that in doing our part in alleviating suffering, we somehow diminish the burden of an inequitable world order” (p. 481). Therefore, rather than creating an active global citizenry, celebrity humanitarianism can re-create a privileged class of Western consumers who believe they can save those who live in the developing parts of the world, simply by consuming the right products (Collier, 2004, p. 4; Magubane, 2008, p. 13) and/or donating small amounts. However, as will be shown in later chapters, there is no sustained commitment to tackling the root causes of suffering in other countries. Rather, viewed from a humanitarian governance perspective, celebrity humanitarianism appears to shunt its subjects in a certain direction that serves to uphold the status quo, in most cases, in which the celebrity, playing the role of a humanitarian, acts as a bridge between a (Western) audience and a distant humanitarian situation (De Waal, 2008, p. 44). As such, celebrity humanitarianism is not a discourse of social change, but rather, a celebration of the status quo by the privileged, as aptly put by Jeffrey and Allatson (2015, p. 26).

1.5. Philanthrocapitalism and Entrepreneurship

Examining celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy through the lens of neoliberal imperialism reveals the close links between these practices and business, including the intertwined structures of commodification and marketing that promote the celebrities themselves, business and humanitarian activities - a phenomenon known as philanthrocapitalism. Philanthrocapitalism can be viewed as “an artefact for control and cultural and political hegemony” (Mediavilla and Garcia-Arias, 2019, p. 861). This interpretation of philanthrocapitalism is derived from the works of Gramsci (1975), who viewed philanthropy as a tool used by the elites to control the markets and workers and to divert attention from the unequal distribution of wealth, and buttress the control of politics by the powerful, and of Bourdieu (1994), who asserts that there are no ‘free acts’ (Mediavilla and Garcia-Arias, 2019, p. 862). As Mediavilla and Garcia-Arias (2019) explain, “in the neoliberal/marketized framework, philanthropy is understood as an ‘investment’ and is configured as a hybrid concept. It therefore loses the ‘traditional’ notion of giving unselfishly and is transformed into ‘marketized’ philanthropy...” (p. 862). Indeed, the BMGF refers to its funding of projects in South Africa as ‘investments’ thereby making the neoliberal nature of the foundation’s activities plain. Therefore viewing the work of the BMGF and the ONE Campaign in terms of philanthrocapitalism allows us to see more clearly the neoliberal nature of these organizations’ operations through the application of business solutions to humanitarian problems. It also reveals how philanthropic and humanitarian activities, which appear as a commonsensical approach to aiding and developing poor and underserved populations, can be actions of neoliberal imperialism, whereby global power hierarchies are enhanced by celebrity activism (Daley, 2013, p. 377).

Proponents of philanthrocapitalism argue that if philanthrocapitalists can use their donations “to create a profitable solution to a social problem, it will attract more capital, far faster, thus a far bigger impact, far sooner than would a solution based entirely on giving money away” (Bishop and Green, 2008, pp. 6-7). Philanthrocapitalists are generally strategic, market-conscious, impact-oriented, and knowledge-based (Bishop and Green, 2008, p. 6). Philanthrocapitalists are also “hyperagents” who are able to do some things more efficiently than anybody else because they are unconstrained by having to answer to the electorate like politicians have to, they are not accountable to shareholders like most captains of industry, and they do not have to engage in fundraising activities, like most NGO heads do. Given this scenario, celebrities are able to go against conventional wisdom and implement projects which are too risky for governments and deploy resources in a timely fashion, if need be (Bishop and Green, 2008, pp. 6-7;11; Kiviat and Gates, 2008, p. 1). Moreover, the resources of these entrepreneurial hyperagents are not limited to just money. Celebrities have access to other powerful people, including fellow celebrities as well as politicians, thereby increasing their “hyperagency” (Bishop and Green, 2008, p. 53). I argue that Bill Gates, Melinda French Gates and Bono are hyperagents par excellence. The Gateses not only have access to high echelons of political power in the West as well as in Africa, but they also have liaisons with other billionaire philanthropists like Warren Buffett, who is one of the largest donors to the BMGF. Equally, Bono has easy access to powerful people and the super-rich, including the Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates (Andersson and Calvano, 2015, p. 128).

I analyze the work of the BMGF and ONE through the lens of philanthrocapitalism, which Bill Gates refers to as “creative capitalism”, and advocates as a 21st century solution to the problem of social inequalities on a global, not national basis. He also contends that market incentives and supportive government policies should be used to harness the creative technical skills and profit maximizing inclinations of corporations so that the benefits of capitalism can be spread more quickly to benefit the vulnerable (Kiviat and Gates, 2008, pp. 1-2). Gates explains that,

Naturally, if companies are going to get involved, they need to earn some kind of return. This is the heart of creative capitalism. It’s not just about doing more corporate philanthropy or asking companies to be more virtuous. It’s about giving them a real incentive to apply their expertise in new ways, making it possible to earn a return while serving the public who have been left out. (quoted in Kiviat & Gates, 2008, pp. 6-7)

What is apparent in this statement is that philanthropy is as much about serving the philanthropists themselves as it is about assisting the public. I contend that this conflation of public and private interests is a manifestation of the neoliberal logic of such philanthropic activities and I seek to reveal this in my analysis of the work of the foundation and ONE in South Africa and other countries on the continent.

Kiviat and Gates cite the Product(REDD) initiative as an example of creative capitalism. Product(REDD) involves various companies, including Dell, Gap, Hallmark and Microsoft, among others, selling red-branded products and donating a portion of the profits to the Global Fund (Kiviat and Gates, 2008, p. 2). The Global Fund is a public-private financing organization that partners with donor country governments. As of July

2020, Product(REDD) had generated more than US\$650 million for the Global Fund (ONE, 2020). However, what is not publicised is how much gain the companies involved in this initiative had accrued for themselves. For example, American Express RED Card campaign donates 1 per cent to Product(REDD), but given that American Express is ranked by Interbrand as the 14th most valuable brand in the world, and is the 174th largest corporation in the world, according to *Fortune* business magazine, the 1 per cent donation is a paltry amount. This quota is especially meagre when measured against the amount of added value reaped by American Express and its associated celebrity endorsers from the association with the campaign (Littler, 2008, p. 242). As the above example demonstrates, celebrity humanitarians and philanthropists such as Bono, co-founder of Product(REDD), and Bill Gates, bring their entrepreneurial skills into their humanitarian activities by providing business solutions to humanitarian issues. At the same time, the power of the individual is promoted in true neoliberal rationality (Mitchell, 2016, p. 295). Quite often celebrity humanitarian activities are couched in terms of self-help and empowerment, suggesting that individuals can be empowered to be self-sufficient. In the West, celebrities often criticize Western governments for not doing enough to alleviate suffering and they tend to embrace neoliberal solutions which entail shifting part of the responsibility to Western individuals as consumers.

Development, and celebrity humanitarianism in particular, are thus linked with ‘ethical consumption’, whereby the purchase of everyday goods, ceases to be just consumption, but becomes an ethical and moral act (Daley, 2013, p. 379). Consequently, by deploying their wealth and influence to sell branded goods to raise funds, celebrities help to construct humanitarianism as an entrepreneurial venture, and consumption as an

‘ethical’ act or what Michael Goodman calls “developmental consumption” (Goodman, 2008, p.105). As Žižek points out, for celebrity humanitarians, the market and social responsibility can be reconciled for mutual benefit (Žižek, 2008, p. 15 in Daley, 2013, p. 379). In other words, in celebrity humanitarianism, there is a sustained marketing campaign under neoliberal terms whose objective is to persuade consumers in the core that the panacea to the problems of global capital lies in the globalisation of free market capitalism and the extension of financial services (Biccum, 2011, p. 1344). I argue that this approach does not lead to significant economic development. Further, it serves to perpetuate the existing inequities.

1.6 Conclusion

This chapter has set out the theoretical framework for my analysis on the BMGF and ONE in South Africa, which employs the concept of neoliberal imperialism. This concept is the conflation of neoliberalism and imperialism which results from analyzing neoliberalism from a historical perspective and taking into consideration the connection between neoliberalism and neocolonialism and imperialism (Hahn, 2007, p. 142). Neoliberal imperialism also refers to the merging of neoliberalism and neo-imperial development strategies which involve new non-state actors (Biccum, 2011). Drawing on this concept, I recognize the shift in both imperialism and neoliberalism which has occurred through celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy and how these activities are themselves a manifestation of as well as a result of neoliberal imperialism. Neoliberal imperialism is closely intertwined with postcolonialism, which refers to the continuation of colonial practices long after the official end of colonialism in the global South (Seth,

2013, p. 1). I use both these conceptual perspectives to examine celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. Inequalities necessitate these activities but their celebrity advocates and leaders do not question “what is wrong with the world that it needs philanthropy?” as one research interview participant remarked (NDH representative, March, 2020).

Neoliberal imperialism is rooted in neoliberalism which refers to the primacy of free markets, trade liberalization and individual entrepreneurial freedoms, while the state’s role is reduced to securing an institutional framework conducive for such practices (Harvey, 2005, p. 2). The promotion of markets as a means to enhance individual economic well-being is a key aspect of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. While neoliberalism has developed and transformed over the decades to advocate for greater government participation in certain sectors, as well as the empowerment of individuals and groups – especially women – core neoliberal practices remain, providing conditions for celebrity humanitarianism to thrive.

Analyzing celebrity humanitarianism from a neoliberal imperialism perspective reveals that humanitarianism can imply a type of humanitarian governance which is perpetuated by a variety of actors, including celebrity humanitarians and philanthropists. A neoliberal imperialist lens also reveals a deep-seated intention to profit from philanthropy through the application of business solutions to humanitarian problems – an approach referred to as philanthrocapitalism or creative capitalism. Philanthropists like Bill Gates praise this approach as an efficient way to address global social problems. However, I argue that humanitarianism carried out in this way does not recognize the

complicity of those very humanitarian and philanthropic organizations in creating inequality.

Having identified the key components of my theoretical framework, I go on, in the next chapter, to review the history of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy in the context of existing literature. In so doing, I evaluate the various debates in the field of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy in order to show the knowledge gap which my dissertation seeks to fill.

Chapter 2: Current Themes in the Literature on Celebrity Humanitarianism and Philanthropy

2.1 Introduction

There is substantial research on celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. Much of the literature engages in a critique of these activities, although there is also a significant amount of positive literature on these practices. This chapter gives an overview of some of this literature on contemporary celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy.

I begin by presenting the history of humanitarianism before examining the rise of the study of celebrity in order to show the growth in intellectual interest in celebrities and the diverse activities in which they engage, including humanitarianism and philanthropy. This is followed by a discussion on the various perspectives of the current trend of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. These can be divided into cosmopolitan/liberal approaches, on one hand, and the critical perspectives (critical geopolitics and postcolonial perspectives) on the other. Cosmopolitan perspectives suggest that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy can be constructive ways of addressing indigence in the world. According to the Kantian cosmopolitan approach, friendship towards humanity means that the welfare interests of every person deserve equal consideration (Linklater, 2007, p. 21; Linklater, 2001, p. 264). Since privileged groups are unable to avoid media representations of the plight of the poor and the most vulnerable members of the human race, it is no longer easy to focus on their own personal needs without thinking about the fate of the distant strangers. Bellamy identifies four principles associated with a humanitarian way of thinking:

(1) The principle of humanity- this is the idea that humanitarianism aims to prevent and alleviate human suffering wherever it may be found. (2) The principle of impartiality. Humanitarianism does not distinguish between people according to race, sex, religion, nationality, class, whether they live in a powerful state or strategically, or whether 'we' have interests there. It distinguishes only according to need. (3) The principle of neutrality. Humanitarianism does not take sides in a conflict and is only interested in ensuring that people have access to food, shelter, clothing and medical care. (4) The principle of universality. Humanitarianism is universally applicable and all humans have identical humanitarian rights.

(Bellamy, 2003, p. 337)

By contrast, critical perspectives are skeptical about this kind of universalist ethical view, mostly because it fails to take into consideration the effects and implications of power and the political. In other words, the universalist ethical view overlooks how humanitarianism and philanthropy may not necessarily be mere acts of generosity or charity. Rather, they can also be ways of governing and exercising power over the beneficiaries, or exploiting them, from a dependency theory perspective. For Thomas Moore, humanitarianism is a discourse which involves the "constitutive patterning of political subjects and establishing levels of agency which speak to specific geopolitical constructions of identity and actions" (Moore, 2013, p. 927). Critics of humanitarianism also argue that those who benefit from humanitarianism are viewed as 'human beings in the generic sense' in situations that are 'devoid of historical context, geographical specificity and any real personalisation' (Rieff, 2002, p. 35 in Edkins, 2019, p. 80). Put another way, they are treated simply as lives to be saved, without a political voice or any

agency. This kind of humanitarianism therefore does not seek to tackle the causes of injustice or to address such injustice; the background to a humanitarian situation is usually not given much thought, and the role of the international society in constructing that historical background is completely overlooked (Bellamy, 2003, p. 333).

2.2 The History of Humanitarianism

Humanitarianism draws from the notions of humanity and the human. While humanitarianism has a long genealogy, it has undergone significant transformation over the years (Duffield, 2010, p. 61). Payton and Moody (2008) argue that as early as the 16th century some ‘modern’ characteristics were added to the philanthropic tradition in Elizabethan England. These included the assumption of responsibility for the poor by wealthy private citizens, the institution of charitable trusts and the establishment of workhouses and schools to facilitate for the poor to take responsibility for their own welfare (p. 142). Philanthropic duties fell on the gentry and the newer urban classes who took on a large responsibility for public welfare following the enactment of Poor Laws in 1601 (Payton and Moody, 2008, p. 142).

In America, in the early 17th century, philanthropy was undertaken by the church and the governing agencies. It followed the English model, taking responsibility for providing for those in need. However, informal assistance of people within the same communities also existed (Payton and Moody, 2008, p. 141). From this perspective, it could be said that this philanthropy was by and large local, focused on the improvement of the individual to become a self-sufficient being. As Payton and Moody (2008) assert: “the philanthropic tradition is the social history of the moral imagination [the

development of the philanthropic tradition], the history of efforts to improve human society and the lives of others through imagining a vision of the public good and inventing forms of voluntary action to advance that good” (p. 153).

Michael Barnett situates the emergence of humanitarianism in the late 17th century and early 18th century when the Latitudinarian preachers, an offshoot of Anglicanism, sought to fight the pessimism held by Puritans towards human nature, and to introduce a new realm of virtue oriented around a new spirit of benevolence (Barnett, 2011, p. 49). However, philanthropy is not just an Anglican phenomenon. The Catholic church was also heavily involved in philanthropy in Africa and Latin America. For historian R.S Crane, the doctrine of humanitarianism and the notion of the ‘sympathetic being’ began to flourish in the mid-18th century, with most of these acts being carried out by neighbours helping neighbours. Women were often the leading actors in these philanthropic endeavours. In some cases, humanitarian activities were extended to those outside territorial borders. For example, a major earthquake which occurred in Lisbon in 1755, led to the organization of one of the first Europe-wide humanitarian relief missions. (Crane, 1934, pp. 206-7, in Barnett, 2011, p. 50). In 18th century France, a philosophical movement aided to popularize the concept of ‘humanity’ which meant a deeply felt concern for the plight of one’s fellow human beings (McLoy, 1957, p. 1, in Barnett, 2011, p. 50).

Everill and Kaplan (2013) suggest that as the universalism of humanitarian sympathy expanded and criticism was leveled against those who appeared to be simply participating in ‘spectatorial sympathy’, there were increasing calls to intervene to alleviate suffering. These calls coincided with evangelical revivals and imperial crises of

the late 18th century to produce an interventionist movement for the abolition of the slave trade and slavery in Africa and the New World. These interventions were usually military interventions and they depended on both the universalisation of Western sympathies and a modification of the sovereignty of non-western actors (Everill and Kaplan, 2013, pp. 2-3). As Everill and Kaplan (2013) declare, “interventions necessarily challenge sovereignty because they are attempting to impose a vision of universal humanity on another group without their consent” (p. 3). Such intervention is driven by a Kantian cosmopolitan approach which seeks to alleviate suffering wherever it may occur. From Everill and Kaplan’s perspective, sovereign borders would not be a limitation to humanitarian intervention.

Amanda Moniz observes that philanthropy arose in early modern Europe when Christian humanist thinkers and religious reformers rationalized the provision of relief for the poor by bringing it under lay control (Moniz, 2016, p. 4). The focus of 16th and 17th century philanthropy was mostly local. However, as Moniz (2016) notes, “the early moderns were grappling with the question of what their moral obligations were to strangers – people different from themselves” (p. 4). Religious upheavals led to international initiatives to assist foreign fellow religionists and some were also speaking up about the injustices suffered by people who were different from themselves. In Moniz’s view, the American revolution revamped and universalized philanthropic practices which originated in the European imperial trajectories (Moniz, 2016, p. 4). Philanthropy in 18th century Britain and America was understood as “love of mankind” and was seen to be based on an emotional response of love towards fellow human beings. That emotion was increasingly invoked in the aftermath of wars, as people found ways to

help sufferers who were far away and different from them through new types of medical assistance, prison reform, abolition and anti-slavery movements, among others (Moniz, 2016, p. 4).

Importantly, Moniz (2016) acknowledges that some historians, such as Thomas Haskell, attribute the rise of humanitarianism in the late 18th century to the rise of capitalism, which resulted in the emergence of new class relations. Philanthropic activities gave the wealthy opportunities to experiment with labour discipline and social control. Additionally, economic expansion gave rise to some cultural developments, such as novel reading, and scholars have attributed empathy for the misery of others to the imaginative connections which are promoted by narratives, whether fictional or real (p. 6). Moniz (2016), however, focuses on the activities of a number of medical doctors who included West-Indian born John Coakley Lettsom, Scotsman John Murray, Philadelphia's Benjamin Rush and Samuel Bard of New York. Moniz (2016) argues that "medical men played an outsized role in the late 18th century's humanitarian revolution" (p. 7). These doctors had professional association with fellow doctors in other lands and a professional identity that inclined them to pursue the welfare of humanity (Moniz, 2016, p. 7).

The history of humanitarianism in the late 18th century can also be traced to the resuscitation movement which began with the establishment of the Society for the Recovery of the Drowned, in 1767 by a group of wealthy men in Amsterdam, to tackle the problem of people drowning in the canals around the city. This movement spread throughout Europe, taking the name Royal Humane Society in 1784 in England and leading to the founding of similar humane societies in America (Moniz, 2016, p. 128).

The leaders and members of humane societies espoused a non-discriminatory approach towards philanthropy. For them, all lives deserved to be saved, despite differences in race, political inclination, religion or geographical location (Moniz, 2016, p. 141).

The inclination to save lives in early humanitarian practices is also manifested in the work of moral visionaries like Henri Dunant, who imagined new kinds of responsibilities towards those who were helpless and to extend their obligations to populations in distress, thereby creating a platform for action whose legacy is the framework of care for distant others (Barnett, 2011, p. 30). The horrors he witnessed at the Battle of Solferino during the Italian Wars of Independence led Dunant to establish the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), in 1863, to care for wounded soldiers and to regulate the conduct of war (Barnett, 2011, p. 9; Moniz, 2016, p. 173). But as Barnett (2011) points out, Dunant's moral vision was limited by culture, circumstance and contingency. While Dunant pleaded to make Europe's wars less barbaric, he was silent on the violence which was committed by European powers in the colonies (p. 9). Several points are germane here. Although Dunant is applauded for his moral vision, his work must be viewed in light of the historical period in which he lived; an imperial era in which colonialists held certain notions about the people they had conquered. Colonialism was accompanied and fueled by racist theories which claimed that the dark-skinned races in the colonies were inferior to the civilized, Caucasian Europeans (Barnett, 2011, p. 62). Colonialism was always justified in terms of civilizing missions and religious missionaries who had preceded Dunant in his humanitarian quest believed that colonialism and commerce could help civilize local populations (Barnett, 2011, p. 67). Indeed, the ICRC did not rise above the imperial inclinations and practices prevalent in

the era of the organization's formative years. Gustav Moynier, a co-founder of the ICRC together with Dunant, was, in effect, a "dedicated colonialist" who viewed the spread of Red Cross societies throughout the world as an opportunity for the organization to undertake a civilizing mission that would "humanize" the "savage peoples" by rescuing them from their "brute instincts" (Barnett, 2011, p. 82). Therefore, Dunant and his colleagues were part of the colonial system that abused local peoples, hence his silence on the issue. While humanitarianism is about meeting the needs of others, humanitarians hold preconceived notions about their beneficiaries. Moreover, there is little effort to address situations which result in some people being in need of aid in the first place. This is evident in contemporary humanitarian practices as will be discussed in the latter part of the chapter.

While the growth of humanitarianism in the late 18th century is partly attributed to the expansion of the commercial economy (Moniz, 2016, p. 6), in the 19th century humanitarianism was spurred by the advancement in the transport industry. Better transport shortened the distance between those desiring to give aid and those in need. Equally, the development of the media, from the advent of war reporting in the mid 19th century to the present with satellite, telecommunications and most recently internet technologies, has increased public awareness, which in turn has led to demand for action against suffering (Barnett, 2011, p. 29). Increased industrialization in the 19th century era of *laissez faire* capitalism in the United States and a growing underclass led a number of oil and manufacturing industrialists to found various philanthropic organizations to improve human welfare (Arnove, 1982, p. 4; Bulmer, 1995, pp. 277-278; Duquette, 2019, pp. 554-556; Zunz, 2012, p. 3). Philanthropists like Andrew Carnegie were driven by a

sense of duty (Zunz, 2012, p. 1). In deciding to embark on the philanthropic route, industrialists like Carnegie and Rockefeller sought not only to dispose of their wealth by funding the public good, but to permanently transform social institutions (Duquette, 2019, p. 557). In that sense, according to Duquette, philanthropists were acting like “hyper agents” whose foundations demonstrated their institution-forging social power (2019, pp. 557-558). They were, therefore not involved in relief of the needy, but in advancing and harnessing research (Duquette, 2019, p. 277).

Two important factors emerge from this aspect of the history of humanitarianism. Firstly, philanthropists sought to use their largesse to shape society. In so doing, they wielded unbridled social power that they could only have through their wealth. Secondly, it is apparent that while these wealthy individuals were bent on doing good to improve humanity, their entrepreneurial inclinations remained at core of their charitable works. This suggests that in their giving, the philanthropists did not aim to redistribute wealth in a manner that would bring radical change and eliminate the conditions that result in the need for philanthropy in the first place, as well as to ensure that philanthropic beneficiaries would be permanently lifted out of poverty. Rather, they acted in a way that served their own class interests and ensured that their own positions at the top of the economic hierarchy would be secured. As Arnove (1982) observes, “the wealthy have not only given because they have more but because by alleviating distress, they have secured their own positions against those who might displace them and thus have avoided revolt” (p. 2). This is reminiscent of more contemporary arguments regarding motivations for development assistance. Traditional liberal arguments in favour of development assistance argued as well that there were benefits for the donor in the long-term in terms

of, *inter alia*, economic growth and international stability. Indeed, the *Partners in Development: Report on the Commission on International Development* (Pearson Commission) (1969), which pioneered approaches to aid in the post-WWII era, including setting the 0.7 per cent of the GNP aid target, included such recommendations. Therefore, arguments for aid were not just moral but also long-term self-interest of the donors.

In Britain, three charitable trusts were set up in 1904 by Joseph Rowntree and in later years, other foundations were established in many countries across Western Europe (Bulmer, 1995, pp. 278-279). Though the development of foundations between Britain and the US was somewhat different, due to the different political systems in the two countries, there were exchanges of ideas between the two countries and an awareness of what was happening in either country with regards to philanthropic activities (Bulmer, 1995, pp. 278-279). The growth of the urban population, and the accompanying problems of poverty, housing and crime, among others, prompted the elites and the upper middle class, who acknowledged a responsibility to the working classes, to step in and set up the charity organizations (Bulmer, 1995, p. 279).

There are strong links between private foundations and the business elites and the political establishment in the U.S since the end of the World War II (WWII) (Arnove, 1982, pp. 204-205). These links emerged as part of the American Cold War mentality which viewed Communism as a threat against the economic and political hegemony of the international capitalist structure. Philanthropic foundations therefore sought to create circumstances in developing countries to manage change and to ensure that it would align with their interests (Arnove, 1982, p. 204). Philanthropic foundations, business leaders and the American government also share a concern for the political stability of the

territories in which they have projects (Arnove, 1982, p. 205). Arnove (1982) cites the example of large philanthropies; Ford, Carnegie and Rockefeller, noting that “they are linked so closely through board membership to the American corporate and financial structure and to the governing establishment of the United States, that they pursue policies both at home and abroad which further the interests of both the American business community and the American government” (p. 205). This characteristic of philanthropy is evident in most private foundations in the 21st century. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF), for example, has strong ties to the American government as well as to the corporate world.

The allure of tax incentives in the mid 20th century led to the growth of the philanthropic foundation sector, even though personal factors were and continue to be important influences on philanthropy (Duquette, 2019, p. 555; Zunz, 2012, p. 4). As Duquette (2019) posits, the tax code of the 1950s and 1960s gave wealthy entrepreneurs a strong incentive to donate their riches rather than liquidate them, even if they had little philanthropic inclinations (p. 555). Olivier Zunz also explains regarding philanthropy in America that, “tax exemption has not only nurtured philanthropy in society, it has entrenched it” (Zunz, 2012, p. 4). This shows that it was not always altruism or the desire to help that led to the expansion of the philanthropic sector. Other selfish motives played a significant part.

Europe’s devastation following World War II (WW2) led to decolonization and the rise of independent Third World states. The struggle for independence was accompanied by brutal suffering and new forms of intervention by the great powers. Development took off as a project in the aftermath of WW2 – the “development age”, as

US President Harry Truman called it. Governments funded foreign aid, and in America, there was a linking of development to security, with humanitarian aid becoming an instrument of foreign policy (Escobar, 2011, pp. 3-4). With regards to Africa, in spite of the termination of colonialism at political level, a global matrix of power has guaranteed the continuation of colonial patterns of exploitation and extraction on the continent, as some decolonial scholars have argued, (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018; 2013; Grosfoguel, 2007 cited in Oloruntoba & Falola, 2020, p. 4).

The commodity crisis of the 1970s, the rise in the interest rate of the US Federal Reserve and the crisis of the oil and petroleum exporting countries (OPEC) resulted in a massive debt burden for most of the African countries (Brackington & Harrison, 2003, in Oloruntoba & Falola, 2020, pp. 5-6). The indebtedness of these countries gave international financial institutions (IFIs) the leverage to impose their neoliberal policy prescriptions. The Bretton Woods institutions regarded the state as an obstacle in the way of the proper functioning of the economy. (Oloruntoba & Falola, 2020, p. 6). The IFIs, therefore called for the shrinking of the state as a conditionality for financial assistance in the form of loans. This saw most African countries embarking on a myriad of structural adjustment programmes which entailed the privatization of state-owned enterprises, deregulation of key sectors of the economy, trade and financial liberalization as well as the devaluation of currency (Manji & O’Coill, 2002, p. 578; Oloruntoba & Falola, 2020, p. 6).

Most scholars and activists agree that the IMF and World Bank-induced neoliberal reforms in the 1980s actually caused the increase in the poverty and inequality witnessed in Africa and Latin America in the 1990s and early 2000s (Manji and O’Coill,

2002, p. 578). Resistance to IMF-prescribed austerity measures led the IMF and bilateral aid organizations to reconsider their approach to development in order to repackage the same neoliberal economic and social programmes with a more ‘human face’. This resulted in the focus on ‘good governance’ and the cooption of NGOs and other civil society organizations for the provision of social welfare (Manji and O’Coill, 2002, p. 578). As Laura Macdonald argues,

with growing disenchantment with the results of billions of dollars in official development assistance from state donors, and with the very idea of the state as the main actor promoting development, NGOs emerged as the alternatives to take the mantle of promoting just and democratic reforms of development.

(Macdonald, 1997, p. 3)

Therefore in the 1980s, the presence of Western NGOs in Africa grew at an exponential rate, while at the same time states increasingly lost the authority to determine the direction of social development and the content of social policy (Manji and O’Coill, 2002, p. 579). Programmes by NGOs tend to circumvent and consequently weaken traditional state institutions, reinforcing the impact of cut-backs in the public sector which accompanied structural adjustment programmes. As Macdonald (1997) emphasizes, the intervention of Western NGOs in the global South was problematic as it could engender a relationship of dependence when local organizations depend on short-term grants for their survival (p. 4).

Furthermore, as Manji and O’Coill observe, in the aftermath of WWII, missionary societies and voluntary NGOs were critical players in the ideological war in colonial Africa. They provided the colonial administrations with an affordable form of private

welfare and “...charity was not only designed to help the poor, it also served to protect the rich” (Manji & O’Coill, 2002, p. 570). Charitable organizations also actively assisted in the suppression of anti-colonial struggles. Moreover, the assistance delivered by voluntary welfare provision did not seek to address the causes of poverty, but instead were concerned about what were perceived to be failures of the Africans (Manji & O’Coill, 2002, pp. 570-571). This is an enduring aspect of humanitarianism, even when performed by celebrities, as will be discussed in chapter five. South Africa’s struggle against apartheid was part of the larger, prolonged struggle against colonialism in Africa. In the post-Cold War era transitions, South Africa took a liberal democratic route (Becker, 2020, p. 18). This has resulted in discontent and an increasing sense of disappointment with the failure of post-apartheid policies to uplift the majority of the people in the country (Becker, 2020, p. 20).

The end of the Cold War ushered in an era of international liberalism which was characterized by new conflicts and threats as superpowers cut off their clients leaving these regimes alone to face long-suffering societies (Barnett, 2011, p. 162; Moniz, 2016, p. 172). Weak and failing states were widely believed to be a threat to the stability of the international order. This led to a significant transformation of the purpose of humanitarianism, expanding from addressing symptoms to root causes of humanitarian situations, thereby becoming overtly political (Mallaby, 2002, p. 4; Moniz, 2016, pp. 172-3). Brown (2016) suggests that the internationalisation of violence as a result of state failure in the aftermath of the Cold War saw development assistance being increasingly linked with security (p. 1). Aid organizations played a role in pursuit of state objectives that include a variety of activities such as economic development aid, emergency relief,

the securing of human rights and the promotion of democracy designed to thwart failing states' potential to cause global insecurity (Mallaby, 2002, p. 3; Moniz, 2016, pp. 172-173). As Mallaby (2002) explains, “ ... the aid intelligentsia was certain that it had the solution to chaos...” (p. 3). The issue of humanitarianism as a way of managing populations will be analyzed in greater detail later in this chapter, and in chapter five of this dissertation with specific reference to celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy.

The foundation sector has exhibited rapid growth in the past two to three decades due to *inter alia*, the global economic growth, the enormous increase in private wealth accumulation, tax cuts, perpetual economic and social inequalities and efforts by governments to encourage and support philanthropic institutions (Johnson, 2018, p. 12). A study by Chuck Collins and Helen Flannery of the Institute of Policy Studies found that between 2005 and 2019, the number of tax-advantaged private philanthropic foundations grew from 71 097 to 119 791, a growth of 68 per cent. Over the same period, their assets more than doubled from US\$551 billion to US\$1.2 trillion. The proportion of all charitable giving going into private foundations has tripled over the past 30 years (Collins & Flannery, 2020, n.p.) Johnson (2018) approaches this issue from the perspective of an insider in the philanthropic sector. She attributes this upsurge in private wealth to global economic integration, the growth of new industries, privatization of state-owned enterprises and to the transfer of generational wealth. According to the World Wealth Report 2021, in 2020 global high net worth individual wealth and population increased by 7.6 per cent and 6.3 per cent, respectively (World Wealth Report, 2021, n.p.). Johnson (2018) notes that this new wealth is highly concentrated and there are great social and economic disparities. Many people continue to live in dire poverty (p.

12), and these are the beneficiaries of the largesse of philanthropies. According to Johnson (2018, p. 12) and Bishop and Green (2008, pp. 10-11) many high net worth individuals feel pressured to tackle economic and social inequalities out of a sense of duty or social responsibility and/or the belief that extreme inequalities may jeopardize peace, stability and the free-market system which created such wealth in the first place. This has consequently led to more wealthy people setting up formal philanthropic vehicles to strategically distribute their funds (Johnson, 2018, p. 12). However, it is instructive that Johnson is silent on the issues of the financialization of global capitalism, tax havens for the superrich, wage stagnation for workers and the unequal benefits of growth, as reasons for the increase of private wealth. Since the 1980s, neoliberalism has brought deepening inequalities due to processes such as privatization and de-regulation of publicly held resources and institutions and the discrediting of government assistance. It is therefore these inequalities which, among other factors, have necessitated philanthropic interventions. Johnson's own roots are in the philanthropic sector, having served as Vice President and Director of Global Philanthropy at The Philanthropic Initiative, which is part of the Boston Foundation (Boston University, 2020). Her study under discussion was sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation and UBS, among other sponsors. As such, her views on foundations are not surprising. It is also telling that in some countries there is an increasing conviction that philanthropy has a role to play in tackling economic and social challenges (Johnson, 2018, pp. 12-13). Such a move illustrates the entrenchment of neoliberalism with the abrogation of responsibilities by the governments of those countries to individuals. According to Johnson (2018), in Europe and North America, more than 40 per cent of the foundations were established in the 21st century, in Latin

America, more than 50 per cent, in Africa, 66 per cent and in Asia and the Pacific region, 75 per cent (p. 13). It is noteworthy that the continents with the highest levels of poverty are the ones that have seen large increases in the number of philanthropic foundations, suggesting that there is growing social inequality.⁵ Also noteworthy is the role that private philanthropy is playing in the achievement of the millennium development goals (MDGs) and sustainable development goals (SDGs). According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) foundations are major partners in some specific areas such as health and reproductive health in developing areas. For example, during the period 2013-2015, financial assistance from foundations was the third largest contribution to developing countries with US\$23.9 billion (OECD, 2018, p. 35).

2.3 Celebrity Humanitarianism and Philanthropy

Celebrity humanitarianism can be seen as part of the evolving history of humanitarianism (Richey and Brockington, 2020, p. 445). In the late 19th century, rich industrialists like Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller embarked on philanthropy route driven by a sense of duty to fund the public good, but also a way to transform social institutions (Duquette, 2019, 557; Zunz, 2012, p. 1), as already noted. The first celebrity to engage in humanitarian work in the contemporary era was actor Danny Kaye, when the United Nations Children's emergency Fund (UNICEF) began its programme of involving celebrities as goodwill ambassadors in 1954 (Richey and Brockington, 2020, p. 445; Wheeler, 2011, p. 11). In the 1960s, actor Marlon Brando, raised money for UNICEF to

⁵ There is also persistent frustration with the failure of Southern elites to contribute to philanthropic efforts towards their own people or pay taxes.

assist with the relief of famine in India. It is worth noting that, in the aftermath of the assassination of black civil rights leader, Martin Luther King Jr., Brando's activism became overtly political when he pledged 12 per cent of his earnings to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference to support civil rights activities (Huliaras and Tzifakis, 2010, p. 262; Bishop and Green, p. 197). Other celebrities involved in humanitarianism in that period include George Harrison, band member of *The Beatles*, who organized fundraising and awareness campaigns for the famine in Bangladesh (Bishop and Green, 2008, p. 197; Jeffreys and Allatson, 2015, p. 21). Bono and Bob Geldof rose to prominence during the hyper-liberal era of the 1980s through their role in *Band Aid* and the original *Live Aid* in the wake of the famine in Ethiopia.

In recent years, other famous UN goodwill ambassadors include Audrey Hepburn, Liv Ullman, Mia Farrow and Angelina Jolie (Wheeler, 2011, p. 11-14). It should be noted that the work of these actresses focused mostly on children and their (actresses') 'maternal' roles. Celebrities became more engaged with the UN under Secretary General Kofi Annan, who expanded the goodwill programme and wanted goodwill ambassadors to portray a favourable view of the organization (Cooper, 2008, p. 28; Wheeler, 2011, pp. 13-14) in the context of the MDGs which he launched. As Cashmore (2006) explains, in that period celebrities shifted from being endorsers of products and movie promoters to more ambitious engagements based on ideas of "self-importance": "whereas rock stars, actors, or models once had influence without legitimate, governmental power, in [recent decades] they assumed a kind of moral authority once associated with sages or charismatic leaders" (p. 218). Through their close associations with global institutions, celebrities have become engrossed with the transnational issues of humanitarianism, aid,

and international development. But, as Michael Goodman (2010) argues “the
celebritisation of development involves celebrities bringing their personal politics into the
public realm of their own volition but also through the active recruitment of stars into
various campaigns by anti-poverty NGOs” (pp. 105-106). From this background,
celebrities are nowadays recognized as experts, humanitarians and diplomats. However,
compared to regular humanitarian workers, “the celebrity is a different kind of expert
whose knowledge is not derived from numbers, deduction or semi-structured interviews,
but from ‘feeling the pain’ of the poor and from offering an emotional connection to the
subjects of development” (Abrahamsen, 2012, p. 141 in Budabin, 2019, p. 62). This
brand of expertise has appeal beyond celebrity fan bases; in settings such as Davos and
the UN, officials appreciate celebrities who have the power to frame issues in a way that
attracts visibility and new channels of communication at the grassroots as well as elite
levels (Cooper, 2008, p. 7). For example, Bono has come to be recognized as an ‘expert’
on Africa who is consulted by other celebrities on African development and humanitarian
issues. But some celebrities tend to be simply “experts in the attention and attraction
economy” to borrow P. David Marshall’s words (2014, p. xxii). It is important to note
that unlike Bono whose celebrity is based on his rock star status, Bill Gates’s celebrity is
based on his massive wealth which has accorded him tremendous power in the global
political economy. Unlike the celebrity described above, Gates’s celebrity is closer to a
form of technocratic appeal. As Kapoor also argues, alongside social inequality and
wealth concentration which has resulted from neoliberalism in the 1980s and 1990s, “...
Gates and Soros have emerged as celebrities, partly for their status as two of the richest
people on earth, and partly for their spectacular generosity, giving away hundreds of

millions of dollars to a host of charities” (pp. 48-49). Gates’ giving is “along mostly entrepreneurial lines...” (p. 48). Both Bono and Gates are often invited to the World Economic Forum meetings held annually at the Swiss resort of Davos (Cooper, 2008, pp. 79-80) where they are given an audience and recognized as experts.

2.4 Scholarly Study of ‘the Celebrity’

Early studies of celebrities focused on the 19th century, with scholars examining charisma, fame and power in Europe. One of these early publications is *Constructing Charisma: Celebrity and Power in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (2010) edited by Edward Berenson and Eva Giloi which analyzes fame and power in the 19th Europe (Marshall, 2014, p. xviii). However, in contemporary times, according to P. David Marshall, an interest in celebrity became stronger in the wake of the death of Princess Diana in 1997 when academic publications appeared alongside biographies of her (Marshall, 2014, p. xv). The most popular of these books was *Planet Diana: Cultural Studies and Global Mourning* (1997) edited by Ien Ang, which attempted to show how celebrity had become a means by which aspects of international entertainment could be understood (Marshall, 2014, p. xv). Holmes and Redmond (2010) attribute the current intellectual interest in celebrity to Richard Dyer’s canonical works, *Stars* (1979) and *Heavenly Bodies: Film Stars and Society* (1986). According to Holmes and Redmond, in these two works, Dyer, working from within the film studies discipline, but drawing intellectual tools and theories from cultural and media studies, focused attention on the wider ideological and political function of stardom as a phenomenon, highlighting how stars articulate discourses on personhood, and within capitalist society, individualism, at any one time

(Holmes and Redmond, 2010, p. 5). Holmes and Redmond (2010) suggest that the expansion of interest in celebrity studies has occurred mainly in media sociology, media, television and cultural studies. There have also been other works which have been published sporadically from psychology, journalism, law, fine art, art criticism, literature studies and sports studies (p. 5). Marshall himself is from the communications and cultural studies discipline. The launch of the *Celebrity Studies* academic journal in March 2010 signified the strengthening intellectual interest in celebrity. This was followed by the convening of the first Celebrity Studies Conference in December 2012 at Deakin University in Melbourne, Australia (Marshall, 2014, p. xv). Another publication which demonstrates the growth of scholarly interest in the socio-political uses of fame, the *Journal of Fandom Studies*, was launched in 2013 (Deng and Jeffreys, 2018, p. 217).

Marshall (2014) defines celebrity status as:

convertible to a wide variety of domains and conditions within contemporary culture. Thus the power of celebrity appears in business, politics and artistic communities and operates as a way of providing distinctions and definitions of success within those domains. Celebrity status also confers on the person a certain discursive power: within society, the celebrity is a voice above others, a voice that is channeled into the media systems as being legitimately significant. (p. xlvi)

Moreover, Marshall (2014) argues that the celebrity, as a public individual who participates overtly as a marketable commodity, acts as a strong legitimation of the political economic model of exchange and value, which is the basis of capitalism (p. xlvi). Lisa-Ann Richey also defines a celebrity as one who is characterized by “having a widespread reputation, being recognized in public, being visible, having access, being

distinguished and having opinion leaders, journalists and the media as your testimonials” (Richey, 2016, p. 11). What is apparent in these two definitions of celebrity and indeed in several others, is that a celebrity possesses power, has access to the media and is an authoritative voice in society. This aspect of celebrity, on the one hand, draws attention to social issues, but on the other hand, it can be problematic as celebrities may undermine the democratic process when their voices are amplified, thereby silencing others. Celebrities also tend to weigh into areas in which they lack expertise. While the amplification of the profiles of celebrities works in favour of the stars, it does not necessarily have a positive impact on those whom they may be representing. Some celebrities’ amateurish involvement in issues of global importance has had adverse effects. For example, when Bob Geldof hailed Tony Blair and the G8 for debt relief at the end of the 2005 Gleneagles summit, several NGOs criticized him for misrepresenting the summit’s accomplishments, as neither substantial debt cancellation nor increased Western aid to Africa materialized (Cooper, 2007, p. 13; Kapoor, 2012, p. 23).

Marshall (2014) argues that there are contradictions in celebrity activism in politics. On one hand, celebrities shift attention through various media which cover their work, thereby implying a new form of agency. That new agency, in some cases, is able to garner greater involvement by nations and individuals. On the other hand, celebrities in “celanthropy” can distract and move the allocation of resources in unaccountable ways (Marshall, 2014, p. xxiii). But that notwithstanding, as Marshall (2014) aptly observes, “the power in celebrity advocacy has shifted contemporary politics well beyond the simple endorsement of a political candidate by a celebrity...” (pp. xxiii-xxiv). Celebrities like Bono and Bob Geldof are perfect examples of those celebrities who have significant

sway over politics not only in Western countries, but also in some African countries. Bono's meetings with world leaders such as George W. Bush, Nelson Mandela and others is an example of his political involvement as a celebrity diplomat. Equally Geldof's criticism of British policy on Africa resulted in him being appointed to the Commission on Africa by Tony Blair in 2004 (Kapoor, 2012, p. 13). Interest in the celebrity as an academic field of study was also spurred by the development of celebrities becoming politicians as exemplified by Ronald Reagan, John Glenn and Arnold Schwarzenegger, among others (Marshall, 2014, pp. xxi-xxii).

In the field of popular culture, celebrities are a form of representation and they depend on the media to give them their power and voice (Kapoor, 2012, p. 6; Marshall, 2014, p. xxxii). In other words, celebrities act as representatives of others, and media, such as TV, films, magazines, radio and newspapers have served to build celebrities' power of representation by simplifying and highlighting them. Matthew Bishop, the editor of *The Economist*, and Michael Green, an expert on the relationship between government and the nongovernmental sector, argue that being unbound by political constraints, celebrities can bring new perspectives on national issues. Bishop and Green also contend that there has been an increased demand for celebrity activists from politicians, businesses and others who hope to gain trust by association, by forming partnerships with "people who have greater public credibility", in the wake of the decline of trust in other institutions (Bishop and Green, 2008, p. 203). Other scholars connect the rise in the involvement of celebrities in humanitarian activism to a combination of factors including the triumph of neoliberalism and the accompanying decline of the welfare state system; governments' failure to address the structural inequalities which resulted from

globalization, the expansion of information technology, the increasing dependence of the non-profit sector on marketing, public relations and branding to campaign for funds and the pervasiveness of celebrity culture in everyday life (Cooper, 2007, pp. 5-7; Kapoor, 2012, p. 6; Littler, 2008, pp. 240-241; Sawaya, 2008, p. 212). Celebrities rely significantly on this broad global media body for their humanitarian fundraising, advocacy and advertising campaigns.

With the expansion of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, it is important to study these phenomena because they are playing an increasingly important role in international politics and the wider conceptualization of the relationship between the West and the less developed countries. As Muller (2015) observes “Humanitarianism is always embedded in the political and ignoring this state of affairs has important repercussions” (p. 479). Robert Reich also suggests that philanthropists should be scrutinized and censured, not because philanthropy is necessarily evil, but because it is an exercise of power (Reich, 2018, in Madrigal, 2018, p. 2). Following Reich, I would also argue that celebrity philanthropy is an exercise in transnational power as celebrities like Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates carry out projects in areas as far afield as Africa and Asia. Furthermore, as Dieter and Kumar have observed, “the phenomenon of celebrity activism has become too serious to be ignored” (2008, p. 260). My research, therefore, is an answer to this call.

2.5 Celebrity Humanitarianism and Philanthropy as Forces for Good

Of the substantial literature that assesses the motives, impact and value of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, there is some literature which is inspired by

Kantian/ cosmopolitan/ liberal approaches which portrays the involvement of celebrities and high net worth individuals in humanitarian activism as a positive development that can alleviate suffering. This literature suggests that celebrity humanitarians and philanthropists are driven by a cosmopolitan ethic. For cosmopolitans, it does not matter whether the victims of suffering are near or in faraway lands: what counts is that misery should be met with a cosmopolitan response (Linklater, 2007, p. 27). Linklater (2001) explains that “cosmopolitanism requires friendship towards the rest of the human race, support for the Kantian notion of respect for persons or some equivalent notion of the equality of all human being beings...” (p. 264). The cosmopolitan ethic holds that all interests deserve equal consideration (Linklater, 2007, p. 27). It is instructive that one of the BMGF’s mantras, “every life has equal value” (BMGF, 2020, n.p.), echoes this cosmopolitan ethic.

Authors who view celebrity humanitarianism and celebrity philanthropy as forces for good suggest that celebrities can be an innovative, positive force in “changing the world” by forging new diplomatic links across contexts (Cooper, 2007, pp. 5-7). Moreover, celebrity engagement in development is lauded for enhancing global citizenship and broadening democratic values (Cooper, 2007, pp. 5-7; Jeffreys and Allatson, 2015, p. 26). Celebrity involvement in development matters potentially promotes these goals by reaching a wider audience, specifically younger voters in Western liberal democracies who feel let down by the current political establishments which they (young voters) believe have failed to address the poverty situation (Cooper, 2007, p. 2). The invitation of Bob Geldof and Bono to the G8 summits to discuss indigence may be looked at as a positive response to the problems of legitimacy which

are associated with the G8 which some view as an elitist club made up of representatives of rich countries (Cooper, 2007, p. 2). Celebrity advocacy is therefore also praised for its inclusivity and its potential to be a democratizing force. These authors rely on conventional notions of international relations and see celebrity humanitarianism and celebrity philanthropy as activities that are taking place in relation to the state. For example, for Cooper (2008), ‘celebrity diplomats’ may not be representing specific states, but their activities are disruptive to Western states who are seen as not paying enough attention to situations of poverty in other parts of the world, such as Africa.

Other authors who praise celebrity involvement in humanitarian and philanthropic work do not shy away from acknowledging the profiteering that this work entails- a phenomenon called ‘philanthrocapitalism’. Supporters of this approach to philanthropy commend philanthrocapitalists for being “hyperagents” who are able to go against conventional wisdom and implement projects that are too risky for governments and deploy resources in a timely fashion if need be (Bishop and Green, 2008, pp. 6-7, 11; Kiviat and Gates, 2008, p. 1). Moreover, as Bishop and Green (2008) note, the resources of high net worth individual hyperagents are not restricted to monetary terms; these individuals usually have access to powerful people, thereby increasing their hyperagency (p. 44).

Notably, Bill Gates himself espouses philanthrocapitalism and he adopts a Kantian cosmopolitan approach, declaring that “as a philanthropist, I’ve found that our caring for others compels us to help people right now” (Kiviat and Gates, 2008, p. 2). However, despite good intentions, philanthrocapitalism leaves in place the structures and power relations that lead to injustice and inequality in the first place. Importantly, the

questions of the concentration of wealth and the decline of the state which allows philanthrocapitalism to flourish remain unanswered.

Supporters of celebrity humanitarianism contend that it leverages ‘fame’ and helps to raise public awareness of philanthropic causes, mostly through media publicity. Celebrities have the ability to frame issues in a manner that attracts visibility and new channels of communication at all levels of society, as well as to demystify social issues (Bishop and Green, 2008, p. 7; Cooper, 2008, p. 7; Deng and Jeffreys, 2018, p. 230; Littler, 2008, p. 241). For example, Cooper (2008) contends that Bono’s campaign for debt cancellation and for the ONE Campaign attracted a lot of media attention from the onset because of his celebrity status (p. 37). Furthermore, Bono maximized publicity for the causes close to his heart by mixing his career as a rock star and his activism, often using concert stages to advocate support for his activist ventures (Cooper, 2008, p. 49). The awareness and publicity brought about by celebrity advocacy, in turn, attracts corporate sponsorship and individual donations. Studies have shown that one of the reasons people donate to philanthropic and humanitarian causes is awareness of need (Deng and Jeffreys, 2018, p. 234). Some supporters argue that given celebrities’ local and global networks, celebrity philanthropy has great potential for generating power and spaces for social and civil action (Deng and Jeffreys, 2018, p. 236; Jeffreys and Allatson, 2015, p. 25). The use of music concerts by Bono to spread his humanitarian messages speaks to the populist character of the celebrity activism that stars like him and others like Bob Geldof have engaged in over the past 30 years. While such tactics have publicised their messages and causes, some scholars argue that this has tended to bring attention to the celebrities themselves. As Street (2004) suggests, celebrities achieve

greater success in their other endeavours when they have the support of audiences, media recognition and institutional legitimization (p. 449). However, as I will show in the latter part of the chapter, in some cases, celebrities tend to sensationalize issues, declare premature victory and publicly express moral outrage. Some commentators argue that such a way of handling matters tends to trivialize important global issues by putting them in rather simplistic terms. Scott (2015), posits that celebrities are praised for being especially effective at mediating the lives of strangers in faraway lands more effectively for those, particularly the youth, who are otherwise uninterested in such issues.

Cosmopolitan/liberal approaches do not take the effects of power into account. These approaches disregard the fact that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy may not be benign acts of universal kindness but a form of exercising power over and exploitation of the beneficiaries and partners. In other words, these perspectives overlook the power dynamics and inequalities that characterise philanthropy. Furthermore, these ethical approaches fail to consider the circumstances that bring forth situations of impoverishment and need.

2.6 The Critical Literature

In contrast to the literature described above, there is also significant criticism against the nature and conduct of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. Critical perspectives are skeptical of the cosmopolitan view because it fails to take into account the implications of power and how these activities can be a way of geopolitically exerting control over the recipients of aid. From this perspective, far from being benign activities, celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy are taken to be harmful endeavours. Critical

approaches include critical geopolitics and postcolonial perspectives. My research draws largely on the proliferating critical literature on celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy (Richey, 2016, p. 5) which sets its analyses against the background of the rise of neoliberalism in the 1980s. This literature has several arguments running through it. These include the arguments that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy produce particular subjectivities that re-inscribe inequalities, that these activities are a neoliberal project, that celebrity humanitarians and philanthropists take on various roles through humanitarian endeavours and finally, the ‘violence’ that is dealt on the beneficiaries and partners of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy when they are portrayed as helpless and without any agency.

2.6.1 Constitution of Subjectivities

An important strand of literature addresses the construction of subjectivities through celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. By constitution of subjectivities in this context, I mean how celebrities’ discourses and actions constitute/produce specific images/subjects of those they seek to assist, as well as of themselves and of the West. For example, Dubgen (2012) argues that the benevolent and moralising discourse of aid “hollows out the dignity and self-consciousness of the people who are supposed to be helped, while at the same time it affirms the self-image of the helpers” (p. 75). In other words, in celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, multiple subjectivities are constituted with regards to the givers of aid, the recipients, as well as those in the West to whom the celebrities appeal for donations. Several studies address this issue of the production of subjectivities: (Dubgen, 2012, p. 75; Duffied, 2007, pp. 4-12; Duvall, 2010,

p. 24; Kapoor, 2012, p. 3; Kohn, 2013, pp. 193-194; Littler, 2008, p. 241; Moore, 2013, p. 926-927; Repo and Yrjola, 2011, p. 51-53; Richey, 2016, p. 13). These critiques of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy reflect the critical geopolitics tradition whose critical theorists contest the universalist Kantian/cosmopolitan view of humanitarianism. As Thomas Moore argues, humanitarianism is a discourse which entails the “constitutive patterning of political subjects and establishing levels of agency which speak to specific geopolitical constructions and actions” (2013, p. 927).

Duvall (2010) argues that celebrities face the task of rallying support for their projects through various activities such as holding interviews and engaging in activism, such as the ONE Campaign. However, in their efforts to raise awareness in the West, of the challenges that Africa faces in terms of debt, poverty and disease, celebrities paint a specific picture of Africa and of the West for their audience (p. 75). Africa is represented as a place of suffering that requires intervention while the celebrity philanthropists, and by extension, the West are represented as saviours or “redeemers of distant Others” who are not in any way responsible for the poverty and suffering that they seek to combat (Andersson and Calvano, 2015, p. 131; Kohn, 2013, p. 190). As Duvall (2010) points out, media tend to utilize Christian rhetoric and symbolism to portray celebrity humanitarians as saviours of the Third World, thereby turning celebrities like Angelina Jolie and Bono into objects of worship (p. 24). For example, *TIME* magazine (19 December 2005) described Bono as a “modern day Samaritan” and the *BBC* (23 December 2006) characterized him as an evangelist persona who speaks candidly about global justice (Repo and Yrjola, 2011, p. 51). However, I maintain, following Duvall, that the depiction of Africa as a desperate place waiting to be ‘saved’ by Western celebrities reinforces

racist and colonial attitudes towards Africa. As Easterly (2006) argues “from the beginning, the interests of the poor got little weight compared with the vanity of the rich. The White Man’s Burden emerged from the West’s self-pleasing fantasy that ‘we’ were the chosen ones to save the Rest” (p. 23). Easterly argues that from the Enlightenment era, Westerners have had a superiority complex over the rest of the world, and this attitude is exhibited in contemporary foreign development assistance. Easterly suggests that every time activists like Bono talk in terms of “we” in relation to poverty eradication efforts, they mean “we whites” (Easterly, 2006, pp. 23-26). Bono admits that drawing attention to ‘Africa’ necessitates some dramatization to portray it as business and an adventure, but as Kapoor (2012) aptly notes, Bono refuses to acknowledge that such dramatization ends up focusing attention on the celebrity and not on the continent (p. 22). Furthermore, Kapoor (2012), also highlights that such dramatization also constructs a negative image of Africa as a helpless continent waiting to be saved by people like Bono. When celebrities advocate on behalf of people in the Third World regarding issues of poverty, debt and disease, they reduce the Other into a docile observer, unilaterally representing hers/his desires and needs (p. 2). Kapoor (2012) posits that the saviour fantasies of celebrity philanthropists mean that they construct the West as dominant and Africa, in particular, as a deviant continent. Such a construction justifies external intervention in the form of aid, guidance etc. (Kapoor, 2012, p. 39).

Africa takes on contradictory meanings through celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic discourses. While for some, the continent is a dark place of illness, suffering, poverty, and destruction, for others it is an exotic site of untapped economic potential, and simplicity. For instance, a report on *BBC TV* by Michael Buerk in October

1984 from Korem, an Ethiopian town affected by famine, gave such a bleak picture that it stirred Bob Geldof into organizing the first *Band Aid* initiative and recorded the hit single, *Do They Know it's Christmas?* to raise funds (Muller, 2013, p. 473). Bono markets the continent as a business opportunity, as previously noted (Repo and Yrjola, 2011, p. 53-54). In each of these instances, subjectivities are constructed in and through portrayals which are meant to attract attention to Africa, whether as an economic potential or a famine struck place.

Authors who write from a postcolonial perspective show that discourses construct non-Western countries and peoples as 'other' or different from the West and inferior (Nair, 2017, p. 1). Postcolonialism focuses on the relations of domination and resistance and the effect that those relations have had in, through and beyond the colonial encounter (Darby and Paolini, 1994, p. 375). With regards to global inequality, postcolonialism points to the manner in which characterisations of global poverty are usually accompanied by narratives of non-Western governments and societies as being primitive, dangerous, childlike and feminine (Nair, 2017, p. 1). From a postcolonial perspective, finding solutions to global poverty goes up against representations of the Other that make it difficult for the West to rid itself of its biases and address the global structural issues, like capital accumulation and its international flow, which generate inequality. Consequently, solutions tend to focus only on assistance to the so-called poor states, instead of addressing the underlying structural causes of global inequality (Nair, 2017, p. 1). These authors highlight the infantilizing portrayal of Africa in celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy discourses, thereby justifying western intervention (Repo and Yrjola, 2011, p. 51). Africa is also typically described as savage – depicted by

wild animals, cannibals and tribal wars or as abject, characterized by famine and disease (Kohn, 2013, p. 193). However, as Kohn (2013) posits, these images of Africa are not only biased and distorted, but they also construct and reinforce relations of domination (p. 193). Following Kohn, I contend that such images and narratives produce and reproduce the domination of Africa by the West and undermine the mutual respect that is necessary for collaboration and for addressing the inequalities which have their roots in colonialism.

Celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy engage in what Fuyuki Kurasawa has called the “sentimentalization of suffering” in which narratives and visual mechanisms are deployed to trigger feelings of empathy, pity and nobility among western audiences, towards subjects represented as victims, whose suffering is caused by humanitarian disasters in the global South (Kurasawa, 2013, p. 202). This results in Western populations experiencing a sense of civilizational superiority over Third World peoples, while they turn a blind eye to struggles that seek to address the institutional arrangements that keep those people from the Global South in conditions of indigence and socio-economic marginalization. Furthermore, the sentimentalization of suffering disregards the more radical project of global justice (Kurasawa, 2013, p. 205) as well as ignores past and present injustices (Dubgen, 2012, p. 73). This approach falls short of linking caring to the political, social and economic dynamics which underpin such poverty (Kurasawa, 2013, p. 205). A sentimentalist approach therefore fails to engage in a critical analysis and political resistance to the systemic forces which cause situations of indigence which the celebrity humanitarians seek to tackle, such as neoliberal capitalism, the international arms trade and the like. Moreover, western celebrities can undertake

their role of being the saviours of the disadvantaged because of the wealth and privilege they have gained from the systemic exploitation of the poor (Jeffreys & Allatson, 2015, p. 28). Jeffreys and Allatson (2015) go so far as to argue that celebrities cannot be philanthropists due to their vested interests as collaborators in the capitalist system (p. 28). As American Progressive Presidential candidate, Theodore Roosevelt reacted to the initial request by John D. Rockefeller for a Charter from the US Senate, “no amount of charity in spending such fortunes [as Rockefeller’s] can compensate in any way for the misconduct in acquiring them” (Hall, 2006, p. 47, in Barkan, 2013, p. 636).

Kapoor (2012) observes the way that Angelina Jolie romanticizes Africa, as evidenced in her declaration during her trip to the continent, that she ‘loved’ her very simple and basic accommodation and expresses her awe of Africans (p. 40). Geldof also described Africans as having “a captivating grace of elegance and gesture” (Kapoor, 2012, p. 40), showing that these celebrities do not view Africa and its people as having any agency to be able to represent themselves. Rather, the continent and its inhabitants are feminized as something beautiful to be gazed at and admired, instead of being active members of the global politics, in charge of their own future and representation. Celebrity humanitarianism constructs the Third World, and Africa in particular, as passive, voiceless and invisible (de Waal, 2008, p. 45; Dubgen, 2012, p. 75; Kapoor, 2012, p. 41). As Dubgen (2012) contends, humanitarian and philanthropic practices erode the self-consciousness of the people who are supposed to be ‘helped’ while at the same time affirming the self-image of the supposed ‘helpers’ through moralising discourse which tends to legitimize and to perpetuate political and economic injustice (p. 75).

2.6.2 A Neoliberal Project?

The literature which argues that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy are a neoliberal project claims that poverty is a feature of the global economic system that is often caused by people, including some who run or profit from the humanitarian aid agenda (Hickel, 2014, p. 1; Kapoor, 2012, p. 61). This literature argues that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy not only try to hide the causes of inequality, but also benefit from this deception (Kapoor, 2012, pp. 61-63; Kurasawa, 2013, p. 202). With their tendency to moralize the situation, celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy are a feature of capitalism which promotes individual solutions for structural problems (Kapoor, 2012, p. 3). As Muller (2013) asserts, celebrity humanitarianism is a phenomenon that is deeply seated in the broader logics of neoliberalism hence it does not confront the structural injustice which in some cases is responsible for poverty (p. 471). Echoing these sentiments, Giridharadas (2018) argues that the wealthy have preserved their power by engaging in good works, while making sure that the system that delivers the spoils to them remains intact (p. 30). He also points out that while engaging in philanthropic activities, the occupants of 'MarketWorld' do not query how their money is made and turn a blind eye to the link between their wealth and the extreme inequalities in the world, as well as the problems which they seek to address through their philanthropic endeavours (Giridharadas, 2018, p. 34). Often celebrity humanitarians and philanthropists, like the dwellers in Giridharadas's MarketWorld, do not confront the injustices that have caused the poverty they seek to combat.

Littler (2008) argues that celebrity humanitarianism is a kind of evasion as it concentrates attention on the global South while steering clear of the celebrities' complicity, that is, how their privilege might contribute to the spaces where suffering and

impoverishment occurs (p. 248). This results in the depoliticization of poverty. Kapoor (2012) also contends that depoliticization, which he defines as the curing of the symptom instead of the root cause, in effect, results in the prolongation of poverty. According to him, the rationale behind the depoliticized discourse on poverty is to keep the poor at bay. Philanthropic and humanitarian interventions provide just enough to address the worst manifestations of poverty without necessarily seeking to eradicate it altogether (Kapoor, 2012, pp. 35-36). Hahn (2007) also argues that contemporary celebrities, unlike those in the past who mobilized civil society to protest “against” Western political and economic domination, advocate “for” Western neoliberal economic and military involvement in Africa (p. 158). He contends that international development in the global South is seen as neo-colonialism and international development serves Western political and economic interests, and is not designed to improve the condition of the poor (p. 142).

Johnson (2018) also argues that high net worth individuals feel pushed to engage in philanthropic activities out of fear that extreme inequalities may jeopardize peace and stability and the free-market system which led to the creation of the wealth they are enjoying. She suggests that such reasoning is partially responsible for the proliferation of philanthropic foundations by the wealthy to strategically disburse their funds (p. 12). From this perspective, it can be argued that foundation funds do not necessarily go to those who need them the most, but to projects which ensure that the neoliberal system remains in place.

The praxis of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy upholds what has been termed “post-democratic” liberal politics in which generally unaccountable elites, including pop and movie stars, high net worth individuals, economists and scientists,

govern (Kapoor, 2012, pp. 3-5). This has resulted in celebrities holding sway on significant global policy issues like debt, poverty reduction, trade, and health, among others (de Waal, 2008, pp. 48-49; Kapoor, 2012, p. 3). This, therefore, implies that unelected private individuals and organizations have virtually usurped what primarily should be state/government responsibilities, thereby revealing a growing trend towards the neoliberalization of politics and economies (Kapoor, 2013, p. 3; Wheeler, 2013, p. 3). For example, wealthy individuals such as Bill and Melinda Gates through their foundation, the BMGF, and its involvement with the WHO, have the governing capacity to decide which diseases the world body should focus on, not because they represent the common will, but because they have accumulated a massive fortune (McGoey, 2015, p. 20; McGoey, 2021; Nickel and Eikenberry, 2010, p. 272). I argue that this ‘capturing’ of the WHO by the Gateses may preclude other important issues from reaching the agenda. This issue will be analysed in detail in chapter five.

The neoliberal character of celebrity philanthropic and humanitarian practices is also reflected in the global media space through which celebrity activists travel, which is formed by western viewpoints that uphold liberal ideologies of individualism, while, at the same time, promoting colonial approaches in rescuing the Third World (Duvall, 2010, p. 14). Kapoor (2012) also explains that Bill Gates and George Soros are both products of the neoliberal de-regulation of financial markets in the 1980s and 1990s which was accompanied by the rise of the internet and information technology (p. 48). In true neoliberal fashion, which holds privatization as one of its tenets, Gates made his fortune by privatizing knowledge, which, as Kapoor argues, is something that should be a

common good. The monopolization of the software industry by Microsoft was made possible by the neoliberal intellectual property rights (Kapoor, 2012, p. 53).

Littler (2008) posits that the rise of celebrity philanthropy can be located in a broader and predominately western, neoliberal culture of individualization (p. 246). In other words, the scaling back of the state and the positioning of individuals as solutions to social ills has provided an opportunity for celebrity humanitarianism and celebrity to take root. Mitchell Dean (2003) aptly explains that “individualisation is the story of the decline of the state and its sovereign powers and the rise of the sovereignty of the individual over its own life” (p. 132). Private, unelected individuals in the form of celebrities and the super wealthy, have taken up what should essentially be public/state responsibilities. Celebrities and the superrich believe that the market is the solution to global poverty (Biccum, 2011, p. 1333). Consequently, the positioning of celebrity philanthropy as a potential solution to social and economic inequalities tends to exacerbate and at the same time highlight, those inequities (Littler, 2008, p. 246). But as celebrity do-gooding is largely a response to alleviate suffering, this practice is driven by a politics of pity which do not confront the political questions of cause, effect, and social justice (Littler, 2008, p. 247). Muller (2013) argues that being based on compassion towards certain types of ‘victims’ rather than on mutual support, some celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic initiatives play an important part in strengthening the ‘pathos of assistance’ which has become a dominant way of governing those lives are classified as being precarious. As Muller explains, this governance style is premised on the mobilization of sympathy rather than the recognition of rights (p. 471). In addition, some celebrity humanitarian praxis, in suggesting that one can show sympathy simply by

carrying out a commercial transaction on a computer (for example in the Product RED), the logic of a capitalist system that is centred on unequal terms of exchange is bolstered, and with it, an image of 'Africa' that is mostly dominated by stereotypes of disaster from the media (Muller, 2013, p. 471). Muller (2013) also suggests that celebrity humanitarian engagement which avoids tackling inequity and injustice legitimizes the current global order and reproduces its neoliberal subjectivity (p. 470).

Celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy are also a means by which the inequalities between the global North and South are maintained and reproduced. As Lisa-Ann Richey (2016) has argued, north and south are not necessarily geographic descriptions, but rather, references to inequalities and perceived hierarchies between the two regions (p. 5). But for Lilie Chouliaraki (2013), celebrity humanitarianism is being performed in a what she calls the "post-humanitarian" age where solidarity with the poor is motivated by neoliberal logics of consumption and utilitarianism and in which doing good for 'others' depends on doing well for yourself (p. 5). Therefore do-gooding is not so much about a desire to assist the other in need as it is about how it makes the benefactors feel, thereby limiting the possibility for them to become ethically and politically motivated cosmopolitan citizens (Chouliaraki, 2013, p. 14). According to Chouliaraki (2013) contemporary post-humanitarianism substitutes the voice of distant others and their point of view with narcissistic self-indulgence, while avoiding the bigger issues of inequality and justification for action (p. 17).

2.6.3 The Various Roles of Celebrity Humanitarians and Philanthropists

Another predominant argument in the critical literature demonstrates how celebrities who engage in humanitarian and philanthropic work take on various roles. Humanitarian work has made celebrities like Bono and Bill Gates into international political actors, who meet with world leaders to discuss problems affecting Africa, such as poverty, HIV/AIDS and debt (Cooper, 2008, p. 3; de Waal, 2008, pp. 45, 48-49; Duvall, 2010, p. 34; Kapoor, 2012, p. 14; Muller, 2013, p. 471). This, in turn, puts them in the limelight, thereby raising their profiles. For example, as Duvall (2010) notes, Bono's meetings with world leaders such as Tony Blair, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, Nelson Mandela and others, and his activism at the World Economic Forum meetings where he has campaigned for debt relief for poor countries, resulted in him being named one of the 'Persons of the Year' by *TIME Magazine* alongside Bill and Melinda Gates in 2005 (p. 34). Bono was also nominated for the Nobel Prize on three occasions and has received an honorary knighthood for his humanitarian work (Andersson and Calvano, 2015, p. 128; Duvall, 2010, p. 34).

Celebrity activists engage in what Andrew Cooper has been termed celebrity diplomacy, as they serve as diplomats who promote developmental projects, while at the same time asserting western liberal ideals about self-help and nation-building (Cooper, 2008, pp. 2-10). This is seen in the work of Angelina Jolie as a UNHCR Goodwill ambassador, in which she has focused on building schools and infrastructure, or in Bono's work as the co-founder of Debt, Aid, Trade, Africa (DATA), the precursor to the One Campaign (Duvall, 2010, p. 170). It is noteworthy that the work of these two celebrities has expanded beyond what Duvall mentions. Jolie was appointed professor in practice at the London School of Economics and Political Science in 2017. She also

campaigns against sexual violence through the Preventing Sexual Violence Initiative, which she co-founded in 2012 with the then British Foreign Secretary, William Hague, and for women and children's rights (LSE, 2020). However, it can be argued that it was her celebrity status which gave her access to the halls of power in the first place, and in turn, the opportunity to do all this work. As Cooper (2008) points out, political leaders have a fascination with entertainers and popular culture (pp. 42-43). Celebrities, therefore, take advantage of that fascination to get close to politicians and people in power and to engage with them on issues close to their own hearts. Bono, who Cooper describes as "the talisman of celebrity diplomacy" is an example of that (Cooper, 2008, p. 36). Bono has met with a range of political leaders from G8 heads of state, African leaders as well as the Pope. His own communication skills are also attributed to his ability to expand and refine the repertoire of celebrity diplomacy (Cooper, 2008, pp. 45-49). Celebrity diplomats work within the parameters of formal politics, as representatives of institutions and as informal mediators between formal political actors from the public and private sectors (Duvall, 2010, p. 34; Richey and Brockington, 2020, p. 46). Cooper (2008) also points out that for all their individualistic star power, celebrity diplomats are immersed in the formal state structures (p. 18).

Richey (2016) also points out that in light of the various roles that celebrities take on in the course of their humanitarian activities, which include acting as ambassadors and fundraisers, and the diverse sites of engagement, it is imperative to examine their role in the context of North-South power relations. This argument is premised on the understanding that celebrities gain power because of their ability to reach audiences, building authority and legitimacy thereby influencing local and international governance

processes (Richey, 2016, p. 13). My fieldwork supports this position by showing how some of the BMGF and ONE projects are conducted in South Africa and across sub-Saharan Africa region.

Celebrity diplomats like Bono and Bill Gates, who engage in humanitarian and philanthropic work, are globally mobile elites who are characterized by their belief in neoliberal policies and their spatial and political identification with the international system, rather than with their localities (Andersson and Calvano, 2015, p. 124). They can easily shift between the public and private sectors, changing roles as government advisors, business consultants, think tank intellectuals and experts on certain issues in service of their own group's interests. These celebrities exemplify what Andersson and Calvano (2015) call the "perceived mobility of impact" by using their wealth to construct a perception that market-driven solutions to global social issues are more effective than the efforts of governments and other stakeholders (p. 123). However, in circulating narratives of business solutions, celebrities engaged in philanthropic and humanitarian work conceal the complex nature of development issues and the hazards of faulty interventions (Budabin, 2020, p. 70). Bono's fame as a rock star has granted him access to spaces of power and garnered him publicity and the attention of world leaders. His persona as a pop artist has given him his perceived status as a political outsider who exists independently outside of mainstream politics, yet he interacts frequently with the corporate and political elite, rallying them around his preferred causes (Andersson and Calvano, 2015, p. 128; Cooper, 2008, pp. 48-49, ONE, 2018; Yrjola, 2009, p. 1). Bono's ability to influence the globally mobile elite's perspectives on global social issues has been dubbed the "Bono effect" (Andersson and Calvano, 2015, p. 128). One could argue

that this is his own brand of celebrity diplomacy which has boosted his role as a celebrity humanitarian. Cooper (2008) states that Bill Gates' attendance at the 2005 World Economic Forum at Davos also made him a principal agent of celebrity diplomacy (p. 79). Gates used that meeting to rally corporates to get involved in public health issues (such as HIV/AIDS, TB, malaria), arguing that governments could not solve them alone (Cooper, 2008, pp. 81- 83).

Celebrities are better able to engage with the media in a manner that corporate leaders and diplomats may not be able to, providing access to a much greater audience through the diverse channels and non-traditional outlets (Cooper, 2008, p. 7). However, in answering my research questions, I also interrogate why should these people, who have become active global politicians on their own accord, without a mandate from the public, lead in the formulation of global social policies, whose interests are they serving and at what cost to those whose causes they have chosen to champion.

2.6.4 The 'Violence' of Celebrity Humanitarianism and Philanthropy on Beneficiaries

Another main argument in the critical literature highlights the effect of celebrity philanthropic and humanitarian praxis on the beneficiaries. I refer to the repercussions of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy on recipients as 'violence' because these practices are often undertaken in ways that do not always take into account the agency and specific needs of those to be helped as the 'helpers' assume they know best. As such, these practices violate the dignity of the recipients. As Edwards (2008) notes, the objectives and aspirations of the globally mobile elite do not necessarily correspond with those of the people being helped. Celebrities select causes according to how they will

provide added value to their brand, which means that some issues which do not appeal to the target market are sidelined, even if they are vital to the beneficiaries. At the same time, some issues which are good marketing vehicles tend to receive a disproportionate amount of interest and attention (Edwards, 2008; Stole, 2006 in Littler, 2008, p. 243). When this happens, those who have a genuine and pressing need become the losers. Inayatullah asserts that in some cases, celebrity philanthropy exacerbates the vulnerability of the poor as celebrities select causes close to their hearts, influence decision making and shape society in a manner they believe is suitable (2009, p. 451). When the givers of aid do not listen to those they are helping, they commit an 'epistemic injustice' in which "the hearer wrongs the speaker in his capacity as the giver of knowledge..." (Fricker, 2007, p. 5). In this way, the beneficiaries of aid's social disadvantage produces an "unjust epistemic disadvantage" (Fricker, 2007, p. 4).

Foundations also focus on issues which are of interest to themselves and not necessarily what is most needed by those being helped. Robert Arnove suggests that foundations such as the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations and the Carnegie Corporation have used their grants to influence the growth and development of African societies through the strengthening of strategic cultural and political institutions. The leading way in which this has been achieved is through assistance to African educational institutions as well as other social science and public administration training centres (Arnove, 1980, p. 225). Education and social science research may not necessarily be the areas of greatest need in the countries where the foundations operate, but they are areas of strategic interest for the foundations themselves.

Payton and Moody (2008) contend that foundations justify their actions by taking the view that it is better to build ‘capacity’ rather than merely providing charity (p. 143). While this may be a logical fact, there is no doubt that influencing education is also a good way of swaying policy. For example, the power exercised by BMGF over the global health sector through the foundation’s stake in the WHO is akin to Foucault’s governmentality; “the population is the subject of needs, of aspirations, but it is also the object in the hands of the government, aware, *vis-à-vis* the government, of what it wants, but ignorant of what is being done to it” (Foucault, 1991, p. 100). As will be discussed in chapter five, in some instances, the way celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy are conducted manifests as a form of governance.

Bishop and Green (2008) argue that some of the giving by celebrities is ego-driven. These authors posit that the danger with such giving is that it will not go to the most needy, but to the most prestigious (p. 38). In Barnett’s view, because humanitarianism is paternalistic, it is dedicated to helping others, but doing so without taking into consideration the wishes of those who are deemed to be in need. This lack of consent is justified on either urgency or that the needs of those being assisted are obvious (Barnett, 2011, p. 14). However, I argue that it reduces the beneficiaries of humanitarian aid to children whose guardians know best what they need. Barnett (2011) further argues that while humanitarians claim to be in solidarity with those they are assisting, the fact is the relationship is characterized by inequalities as reflected by the paternalistic nature of humanitarian practices. Moreover, he suggests that humanitarianism can generate new forms of dependency and obligation as the ‘gift’ often comes with obligations (Barnett, 2011, p. 34).

Kumar and Dieter (2008) argue that celebrity involvement in philanthropic and humanitarian causes trivialises politics by bringing less substance and more superficiality, potentially diverting civil discourse towards solutions that may not represent long term remedies to the very serious policy issues (pp. 260-261). Furthermore, the use of the euphemism of 'partnership' in development initiatives overshadows the actual power division that exists between the givers of aid and those being assisted, which in turn, inhibits the recognition of 'partners' as equal counterparts (Dubgen, 2012, p. 73).

Littler (2008) demonstrates that the intended beneficiaries of celebrity philanthropy are short-changed as the involvement of celebrities in humanitarian and philanthropic projects does not result in more money going to the needy, particularly in contrast to the money that is gained by the stars themselves or corporations through initiatives such as cause-related marketing. Cause-related marketing is a strategy whereby corporate brand identities link with not-for-profit organizations for "good causes" to produce a particular product for a particular campaign (Littler, 2008, p. 242). The Bono-led Product (RED)'s American Express RED Card campaign in which American Express donates 1 per cent to Product (RED) is a good example of an initiative in which the company rakes in huge profits and only a small amount goes to the humanitarian project, as previously noted (Littler, 2008, p. 242). In this way, poverty or a needy situation (HIV/AIDS in the case of the Product (RED) campaign) becomes a vehicle through which the rich get richer, by reaping profits while purportedly seeking to assist.

While the Product (RED) Campaign purports to be helping end the HIV/AIDS pandemic in Africa, it hides the complex realities of the African context which is shaped

by global policies that govern trade, intellectual property and debt. For instance, the trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights (TRIPS) agreement ensures that big, mostly Western-based pharmaceutical companies reap profits while maintaining disparities in access to essential medicines (O'Manique & Labonte, 2008, p. 1562).

Product (RED) Campaign promotes shopping by Western consumers on the pretext that it helps to keep African AIDS sufferers alive, and even includes an impact calculator on its website to enable consumers to keep track of how many people they are helping. But, as O'Manique and Labonte (2008) observe:

There is no impact calculator tabulating the relational injustice of the economic institutions that privilege some (largely middle and upper class, and in developed countries) consumers able to buy (RED) while increasing risk and vulnerability to HIV and other diseases among those unable to afford even life's necessities. The implacable logic of this injustice is hidden in high-gloss advertisements in which looking good (fashion), making good (profit), and doing good (charity) become a feelgood endorsement of an unhealthy status quo. The seemingly just consumer supplants the just citizen and social justice itself is commodified. (p. 1562)

Linsey McGoey critiques the notion that those who have made the wealth are best able to allocate it to be put to good use, which seems to be prevalent in most private philanthropic foundations. She argues that the new global elite concentrates on philanthropy as a way to change the world, while resisting higher taxes as a more democratic manner of distributing some of the wealth which has resulted from new technologies (McGoey, 2015, pp. 9-24). McGoey (2015) is particularly critical of philanthrocapitalism and points out that “through embracing philanthrocapitalism... self-

interest is championed as the best rationale for helping others” (p. 20). She also claims that the BMGF focuses almost entirely on potentially profit-making “silver bullet” solutions, like vaccines rather than more public health oriented approaches such as campaigns against obesity (McGoey, 2015, pp. 26-27). McGoey (2015) criticizes BMGF’s role at the WHO and FAO, arguing that the foundation’s giving is a way of not only amassing wealth, but also influencing policy in those organizations (p. 19).

Kohn (2013) makes the case that the narrative used by celebrity philanthropists and humanitarians, which portrays the superrich as sacrificing their own wealth in order to save the poor, could serve ideologically to support notions of western superiority, thereby justifying more authoritarian forms of global governance and intervention (p. 194). In such a situation, the underprivileged would end up suffering even more. Kohn (2013) approaches the issues of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy from a postcolonial perspective which demands that the privileged must take responsibility for the global inequities, and to do so without degrading and dehumanizing the poor (p. 196).

Fassin (2013) posits that humanitarianism has culminated in the “humanitarian reason” which he defines as “the principle under which moral sentiments enter the political sphere” (p. 37). He argues that humanitarian reason is based on “a fantasy of an international moral community and a redemptive solidarity” (Fassin, 2013, p. 36). Fassin (2013) contends that humanitarian reason is the basis of what can be referred to as a ‘humanitarian government’ (p. 37). He defines a humanitarian government as “the administration of human collectivities in the name of a higher moral principle that sees the preservation of life and the alleviation of suffering as the highest value of action” (Fassin, 2007, pp. 150-151). In other words, government is not necessarily an attribute of

states, but a rationalized activity that can be carried out by various agents in different contexts towards many different objectives (Fassin, 2007, p. 151). Humanitarian governance also applies to celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic activities where desperate situations appear to justify the actions taken by celebrities who advocate on behalf of those in need. But in so doing, states and individuals have tended to pursue their own goals. For example, states have invaded other states under the pretext of the “Responsibility to Protect” doctrine which was adopted by the UN in 2005 which challenged national sovereignties (Fassin, 2013, pp. 40-41).

Belloni (2007) argues that humanitarianism is derived from the unequal power relations between the West and the less developed world, and the manner in which it (humanitarianism) is practiced tends to reproduce that inequality (p. 454). He also argues that humanitarianism is not altruistic because it is not designed to enhance the human condition by challenging the structural circumstances which result in misery and suffering, but rather to contain the transmission of disorder from war-torn poor countries to the developed world (Belloni, 2007, p. 464). A similar argument is advanced by Mark Duffield (2007) who contends that although development is couched in terms of morality and concern to improve the condition of others, in reality it is about reducing poverty in order to prevent future instability and securing the way of life of the global North (p. 2). As the then British Prime Minister, Tony Blair declared in 2005, “famines and instability thousands of miles away lead to conflict, despair, mass migration and fanaticism that can affect us all. So for reasons of self-interest as well as morality, we can no longer turn our backs on Africa” (Blair, 2005, cited in Duffield, 2007, p. 2). There is no effort to address the root causes of poverty and recurring war, but the focus is centred on immediate needs

of individuals or groups (Belloni, 2007, pp. 456-457; Duffield, 2007, p. 3). These are some of the issues which will be discussed in greater detail in later chapters with specific attention to celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy as I aim to analyze how these are conducted on the ground through my two case studies.

Philanthropic initiatives by foundations also affect the beneficiaries by acting as “cooling out” agencies, and thereby delaying and obstructing more robust structural change (Arnove, 1982, p. 1). In other words, the work done by foundations alleviates poverty and prevents radical action by victims, resulting in the sustenance of the status quo. Arnove (1982) argues that philanthropic foundations serve ruling class interests and that the modest assistance to disadvantaged groups focuses on institutionally safe and uncontroversial issues, and thereby co-opting reforms that might potentially challenge, or perhaps even dismantle, underlying structures of social inequality (pp. 1-2).

Foundations are also accused of attaching too many conditionalities to their funding, thereby eroding the autonomy of the beneficiaries (McGoey, 2015, pp. 25-30; Reich, 2018, p. 7). As Reich (2018) notes, foundations are donor-directed, meaning that the employees, who are on the ground, (and by extension, the beneficiaries) cannot determine the mission of the organization (p. 7). Those on the ground may be best positioned to know how the foundation should operate in a specific location to have the greatest impact. However, it is also wishful thinking to imagine that foundations would just disburse money without ensuring that it is indeed used for its intended purpose. This is particularly important in light of the allegations of misuse of funds and other acts of corruption which are oftentimes levelled against some governments of developing countries, which are beneficiaries of philanthropic initiatives. Reich also contends that,

“philanthropy sits uneasily with an egalitarian norm...it is not often a friend of equality, can be indifferent to equality, and can even be a cause of inequality” (Reich, 2018, p. 69). From this perspective, there is no justice in philanthropy. This is an issue that is at the core of this dissertation and will be analyzed in later chapters as I argue that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy do not lead to long-term poverty reduction; but instead, they can serve to entrench the domination of Africa by the West and perpetuate inequalities.

2.7 Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed the literature on the history of humanitarianism, which traces the evolution of this practice since its inception in Elizabethan England in the 16th century. Initially based on the two core values of community and compassion, other factors such as the expansion of the economy and technological advancements which enhanced the awareness of need of distant others, promoted humanitarianism. In the 1950s, the establishment of the UN goodwill ambassador programme launched the beginning of the involvement of celebrities in humanitarian work. The history of philanthropic foundations also shows that they emerged following the suffering of the poor in the wake of industrialization. Some authors also suggest that the founders of foundations sought to keep down rebellion which might have threatened their way of life and the systems which had made the industrialists so rich. The chapter also reviewed literature on the emergence of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, which is part of the evolving history of humanitarianism. The rise of the study of celebrity which has culminated in the study of the involvement of celebrities in humanitarian activities was

also discussed. While the study of celebrity started in the 19th century, the contemporary intellectual interest in the concept of celebrity began in the late 1970s and has grown with celebrity involvement in politics and humanitarian and philanthropic issues in recent years.

In addition, the chapter analyzed literature covering the two sides of the debate on celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. On the one hand, there is literature which takes cosmopolitan and liberal perspectives. This literature lauds celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy as progressive practices in which celebrities use their fame and fortune for the betterment of those who are less fortunate or are in need, no matter where they are in the world. On the other hand, the critical literature takes postcolonial and geopolitical perspectives. This literature rejects the ethical premise of the cosmopolitan approaches and argues that celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic initiatives are embedded in neoliberal logics which serve to reinforce and reproduce the social and economic inequities that exist in the world. Critical perspectives also emphasize the pursuit of personal agendas by some celebrities through involvement in humanitarian and philanthropic work, at the expense of the supposed beneficiaries.

In this dissertation I largely draw from these critical perspectives. Critical approaches reject the separation of ethics and the political; in so doing, they reveal the power dynamics that play out in celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic activities. As explained in the introduction of this dissertation, these initiatives are mostly directed towards the global South, especially Africa, a region which has been discursively constructed and represented as the face of poverty. In their efforts to assist the region, celebrities do not seek to delve beyond the apparent poverty and to address the structural

inequalities and injustices that contribute to poverty and need. Despite the history of colonialism, exploitation and oppression of the South by the West, celebrity humanitarian endeavours do not seek to redress this. Rather, poverty is constructed as a white man's burden and celebrities' activities can be viewed as sustaining those unequal power relations. Celebrity humanitarians promote neoliberal imperialism as they advocate market solutions to social problems, while at the same time serving western economic and security interests, as will be shown in the following chapters.

While I do not totally discredit cosmopolitan approaches – for instance, the role of celebrities in drawing global attention to disasters is certainly positive and the fact that they address urgent and immediate needs as will be shown in chapters three and four – these approaches tend to take an apolitical view on issues, moralizing instead of pointing out the structural inequalities which exist in the global world order. Those inequalities have resulted in a relatively few people amassing massive wealth, while the majority live in poverty. Liberal-cosmopolitan approaches do not acknowledge the role that the capitalist system in which celebrities belong has played in the history of the beneficiaries and partners of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy; from slavery to colonialism to the current global political economic order.

In my analysis of this wide-ranging literature, I have addressed my preliminary research questions surrounding the emergence of celebrity humanitarianism, and the importance and nature of discursive constructions of 'saviours' and 'victims' in narratives of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. But while the literature reviewed here makes a sound critique of celebrity humanitarianism and celebrity philanthropy, little of it is supported by empirical research on how celebrity philanthropic

and humanitarian initiatives are implemented and how they are viewed by recipients. How are these projects executed on the ground, how do they impact the local recipients and how do those local recipients view and understand the projects? These studies are vital for any informed critique. Philanthropy is a big and growing part of our lives and society (Payton and Moody, 2008, p. 22). Thus, celebrity involvement in humanitarian causes is likely to continue to expand in the foreseeable future. This means, no matter how we view celebrities, whether positively or negatively, their work at the intersection between culture and formal politics requires scrutiny, as Richey and Brockington suggest (2020, p. 43).

Although the existing critiques of celebrity humanitarianism and celebrity philanthropy are convincing, my research aims to fill in the literature by undertaking both a critical theoretical analysis and an empirical analysis of the actual effects of the work of ONE and the BMGF in South Africa and in selected countries across sub-Saharan Africa. Situating ONE and the BMGF within the broader poverty alleviation and development work in these countries required an empirical investigation of what these organizations actually do, informed by these theoretical debates. These case studies illuminate the impact of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy on the lives of their projects' targets in South African and across the Sub-Saharan sub-continent. The first case study, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, will be discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 3: The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

3.1 Introduction

In order to understand the work of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) in South Africa, in particular, and across sub-Saharan Africa, in general, it is

important to understand various aspects of the foundation, including its origin and organizational culture, as these are crucial to its running and general operation. This chapter discusses the interviews carried out with the representatives of the foundation and of the foundation's partners/beneficiaries, as well as the background of the foundation, followed by its organizational culture. The next section analyzes the foundation's work in South Africa in order to answer the research questions on the benefits and limitations of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy to development and the extent to which these practices have contributed to development and the improvement of quality of life in that country and in sub-Saharan Africa. The foundation partners with several organizations in that country to carry out its projects both within South Africa and also across the continent. The foundation's regional head office is located in South Africa; this is one of the reasons I identified the foundation as an appropriate case study. Finally, the chapter critically analyzes some health and non-health related projects and programmes across other African countries in which the BMGF is involved. Based on this research, I argue that though the BMGF is helpful and welcomed by the recipients for providing much needed funding, the foundation's work is fraught with inequalities and negative power dynamics and does not result in long-term development. Further, the foundation does not challenge the structural injustices which often are cause of the poverty it seeks to combat.

3.2 The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation: Background

The BMGF is a product of an amalgamation of different philanthropic initiatives by the Gates family. The initial one was the William H. Gates Foundation which was founded by Bill and Melinda Gates in 1994, with a relatively modest endowment of \$94

million. That foundation focused solely on global needs as well as those of the US Pacific Northwest community (BMGF, 2020). In 2000, the William H. Gates Foundation merged with the Gates Library Foundation, an organization that sought to provide internet access to all Americans through public libraries, and the Gates Learning Foundation, to become the BMGF. At that time, Bill and Melinda donated \$16 billion to the newly formed foundation, whose headquarters was set up in Seattle (BMGF, 2020). At the end of 2020, the foundation had an endowment of about \$50 billion (BMGF, 2021). At the helm of the BMGF are Bill Gates and his former wife, Melinda French Gates as co-chairs. But, as Schurman (2018) observes Bill Gates, “has a lion-size personality and presence within the foundation” (p. 182).

Gates was born into a middle class Seattle family (Cooper, 2008, p. 83). His father was a lawyer and his mother a school teacher (Lesinski, 2009, p. 7). He attributes his interest in philanthropy to “...a responsibility to give something back” because he feels he was lucky “...in terms of circumstances, the country he was born in and the time he grew up etc.” (Bishop & Green, 2008, p. 47). Gates also attributes his and his former wife’s philanthropic inclination to his mother who told Melinda in a letter at the time of their wedding that “from those to whom much is given, much is expected...” (Gates, 2007, n.p.). For her part, Melinda French Gates attributes her education in the values of social justice to the Catholic school she attended. She is also passionate about uplifting women (Gates, 2019, pp. 9-10). Both believed that all lives have equal value but realized that that was not the case in the world – some places were impacted by poverty and disease more than others. Fighting inequities was therefore, the motivation behind the formation of their foundation (Gates, 2019, p. 11). In 2007, Gates also underlined his and

his then wife's mutual desire to do good and fight poverty and inequality in the world as the driving motivation behind their philanthropic activities (Gates, 2007). The couple's first trip to Africa in 1993 brought them face to face with the poverty that plagues parts of the continent and the desire to do something eventually led to the launch of the Gates Foundation in 1994 with the goal of "... saving children's lives..." and the first big investment of the foundation was in vaccines (Gates, 2019, pp. 14-15). As one interview respondent pointed out, the BMGF's focus on women and children is due to French Gates's influence; Gates, in contrast, was described in more traditionally masculinist terms as a "technology guy" (FRI representative, January, 2021).

In 2006, the foundation received a \$31 billion donation pledge (which would be disbursed over the following decades) from Warren Buffett. Buffett, along with Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates, was one of the three trustees of the BMGF Trust, up until his resignation in June 2021. The Trust manages the Foundation's endowment, which in 2018, amounted to \$49.8 billion. Between its resources and its partnership-oriented approach, the BMGF has not only become the biggest private philanthropic foundation in the world, but it is arguably "*the* most influential of the new development actors" (Richey and Ponte, 2014, cited in Schurman, 2018, p. 181- emphasis in the original).

The BMGF is divided into six main programmes: Global Health; Global Development; Global Policy and Advocacy; Global Growth and Opportunity, Gender Equality and the United States programme (BMGF, 2020). The founding ethos of the foundation is the idea that fresh thinking, new knowledge and creative interventions could transform the lives of billions of people (Opening Gates Magazine, 2017, p. 3).

One of the mantras of the BMGF is “all lives have equal value” and the goal is to combat diseases that disproportionately affect the poor, preventing them from reaching their full potential (BMGF, 2018, n.p.). As Bill Gates said in 2005, “until we reduce the burden on the poor, so that there is no real gap between us and them, global health will always be our priority” (quoted in Okie, 2006, p. 1085). As such, the foundation seeks to ensure that all children, no matter where they are born, receive the opportunity that leads to healthy and productive lives (BMGF, 2018). The BMGF describes itself as both an “outcome investor” (BMGF, 2014) and a “strategic philanthropist” (BMGF, 2011).

The BMGF has a large footprint in global health. By drawing attention to global inequalities, the Gateses have attracted funding from others and have popularized the involvement of the wealthy and famous in efforts to find solutions to global issues. The donation by Buffett to the BMGF, mentioned above, is one example of that trend (Okie, 2006, p. 1085) and Bono’s establishment of the ONE Campaign is another. As a former official at the Centre for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Helene Gayle, who also worked for the BMGF suggested, “I think people watch what the Gateses do and assume that if they’re doing it, it’s not only a smart humanitarian move, but a smart business move. They have put global health on the front burner like never before” (Okie, 2006, p. 1085). The foundation is a major partner of the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (GAVI) alongside other organizations such as the World Health Organization (WHO), UNICEF and the World Bank (GAVI, 2021). Moreover, some health experts are of the view that the foundation’s work in global health has made other donors increase their funding. One is quoted as saying “without Bill Gates, we would never have had the Global Fund (on HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria). And for sure,

there would be no PEPFAR (the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief)" (Okie, 2006, p. 1087). Okie, who is a medical practitioner, argues that in the area of malaria control, the size of the foundation's grants has enabled it to support research and create partnerships among academia, governments and industry much more effectively than other institutions have. Companies have been incentivized to develop drugs and vaccines to be used in poor countries because the foundation contributes by paying the cost for the development. As the representative of the South African National Department of Health (NDH) noted in an interview, ensuring affordability is one of the areas where the BMGF has the greatest impact in South Africa with regards to HIV and TB. He noted that,

They [BMGF] put a lot of money into research funding, which we can't. And they are able to, for example, take money from the foundation and give it to a start-up company in India or China to develop something, whether it's a diagnostic, an app, and they can then say, because we funded it, we can avail it free of licensing to every country which wants to use it- access at affordable prices because the companies that develop this don't need to recoup their investments in the research because that's what people argue all the time. (NDH representative, March, 2020)

However, some observers have argued that the BMGF disproportionately supports top-down health programmes by concentrating on a range of specific diseases, rather than working to strengthen health systems (Butler, 2019, p. 8). The focus is primarily on infectious diseases rather than other diseases like obesity, cancer and diabetes that may require longer-term investments in health care systems. The focus on specific diseases is reflected in the foundation's 2016 budget- of the total \$4.6 billion, \$3.9 billion was allocated to global health, global development, global policy and advocacy. Of this

amount, \$1.08 billion was used to address four health conditions: polio, HIV, TB and malaria; \$458 million was for vaccine delivery and development. However, there was no amount specifically targeted at improving health systems, by targeting the tertiary education of general health practitioners in low-income countries, or some schemes to keep health practitioners who flock to the global North in their countries of origin (Butler, 2019, pp. 8-9). Butler quotes Storeng, a former colleague of Bill Gates, as saying that he (Gates) “often” told him in confidence that “...he is vehemently against health systems... he basically said it is a complete waste of money, that there is no evidence that it works, so I will not see a dollar or cent of my money (sic) go to strengthening health systems” (Butler, 2019, p. 9). The way the foundation operates is largely determined by its organizational culture.

3.3 Organizational Culture

One of the key features of the BMGF’s organizational culture is that by recruiting bright, high-achieving professionals into an organization that is run by a powerful and revered leader, the BMGF inculcated in their staff a mentality to “manage up” (towards Bill Gates) rather than down (towards the foundation’s partners). As Schurman (2018) notes, Bill Gates is revered within the foundation as he is regarded as being “super brilliant” (p. 182). Consequently, “no foundation employee, even at the most senior level, wants to be wrong, or go up against Bill’s convictions and larger-than-life personality” (Schurman, 2018, p. 182). Butler (2019) also observes that “when Bill speaks, people listen,” adding that with Bill Gates at the helm, the foundation has surrounded itself with “an aura of uncriticizability” (p. 8). It is important to note that though both Bill Gates and

Melinda French Gates are co-chairs of the BMGF, it is Bill who tends to appear as the one at the top as the above-mentioned observation by Schurman confirms. This may be a result of the fact that, in the early years of the foundation it was Bill who was the public face of the organization, as Melinda felt she was not knowledgeable enough at that point to be its public voice (Gates, 2019, pp. 13-14). But, her stance changed when she decided to speak out publicly for family planning (Gates, 2019, p. 21). However, despite that, most critics and analysts tend to view Bill Gates as the head of the foundation, reflecting the gender dynamics at play.

One interview respondent also expressed the view that staff at the BMGF have difficulty in criticizing Bill and Melinda French Gates:

They [Bill and Melinda] have surrounded themselves with great staff and I sometimes worry that the staff are overly anxious to, kind of do their bidding, which I think speaks to keeping their jobs. But that's the case in any organization. Sometimes people struggle to point out where principals can be wrong because maybe that's not a welcome concept. (March, 2020)

Nevertheless, this interview respondent also observed that both Bill and Melinda were open to others' ideas, noting that "I thought that they were both incredibly smart in their questions in really trying to get to grips with the problems at hand. And they are very open to hearing what others think" (March, 2020).

Speaking about the influence that Bill Gates has over the foundation, one research participant noted in an interview that,

They [Bill and Melinda] have particular interest and I think they can take a stance, a view in terms of what the long-term direction of the organization should be. I

don't think operationally they are hands on, but I think they take a very deep interest in the overall strategy of the organization. And I think that can have both positive and a negative effect in a celebrity-driven philanthropic organization.

(February, 2020)

Speaking about this same issue, a former official of the Clinton Health Access Initiative (CHAI) observed in an interview that,

I think the danger of any philanthropic thing is how much influence does the founder have, versus the influence of the people who are actually running the day-to-day strategic focus of the organization. So, I think there is usually a tension there, that I think is always tough to manage. Again, speaking about the Gates Foundation specifically, I think they have been very careful in who they select to work with, I think they really do their homework of, you know, who has influence, who are the right people to talk to. (February, 2020)

The foundation has been described as being characterised by a “culture of smartness” (Schurman, 2018, p. 182). In other words, the foundation values and hires staff who are seen as ‘smart’ and analytically-minded, which is something observers have attributed to Bill’s corporate background and is regarded as a carry-over from his role in the Microsoft Corporation. In his first Annual Letter in 2009, in which he announces the foundation’s vision for each year, he pointed to “building teams of smart people with different skill sets” as one of the “magical elements” that link his previous work at Microsoft and his work at the foundation (BMGF, 2009, p. 1, cited in Schurman, 2018, p. 182). These organizational-cultural aspects have resulted in the BMGF staff privileging expert knowledge and professional qualifications over other kinds of knowledge,

including small-holder farmer knowledge, community familiarity and small experiential knowledge (Schurman, 2018, p. 181) and in other areas the foundation is involved in, like the medical research and health sectors.

As Schurman (2018) argues, the culture of smartness serves to drive a wedge between the Gates staff and the people on the ground, with the result that they (Gates staff) cannot listen and learn from those they seek to assist, even though many express a genuine desire to do so (p. 181). Indeed, the Gates' staff's willingness to listen was reportedly reflected by the new CEO of the foundation, Mark Suzman, during his visit to South Africa, in early 2020, barely a few weeks after assuming that position. As the Tutu HIV Centre representative noted in her response to a question on allegations of agenda-setting by the BMGF, "He showed a great deal of insight into that allegation and he repeatedly stated, certainly to my organization, that they want to hear what others think and they want to hear how they can be more responsive to in-country needs. So I think there is insight, certainly at the level of the CEO" (Tutu HIV representative, March, 2020). The lack of listening/hearing on the part of the BMGF staff results in some of the foundation's recipients, such as those in the agricultural programme, being treated as passive objects of development rather than complex, knowledgeable social actors (Schurman, 2018, p. 181).

Another major characteristic of the BMGF's organizational culture, and one which has significant consequences for the way the foundation "does development" is the foundation's "obsession with having impact on a large scale" (Schurman, 2018, p. 181). As Schurman (2018) explains, this has a dual manifestation: firstly, it makes the foundation prefer to partner with big, international organizations that can develop and

manage megaprojects. Secondly, it manifests in the foundation's desire to ensure that its grants can be "scaled up" – meaning that they can be expanded into new and different social, biophysical and geographical domains (Schurman, 2018, p. 181). The corollary is that grantees expand their projects beyond their organizational capacities and into areas where they have little know-how. At the same time, small, local organizations or individuals which are knowledgeable and more in touch with the grassroots, tend to be overlooked (Schurman, 2018, p. 181). Some of the interview respondents complained about the BMGF's preference to cooperate with big, mostly American organizations:

they channel way too much money through American organizations when there are African and other organizations that can do it much better. There is this huge dependence on American consultants coming here to create background things. That, I think is often a waste of money. It does not build capacity. (February, 2020)

That respondent further remarked that, "If you [BMGF] are trying to solve problems in Africa, it would be better, where you could, to throw that money at African organizations to do the same" (February, 2020). It should be noted that according to *The Nation*, which analyzed 30 000 grants donated by the foundation in the past 20 years, 88 per cent of the donations, amounting to US\$63 billion went to organizations in the US, Canada, Australia and European countries (Schwab, 2021, October 6). In 2009, *The Lancet* also highlighted that the BMGF "funds the rich to help the poor" in its global health work (Schwab, 2021, n.p.).

The BMGF is also a big believer in strategic planning. As Schurman (2018) cites a former senior official in the BMGF Agricultural Programme who observed that "people

spend a lot of time on strategy in the foundation. In my five or six years there, I think we did three different strategic plans. It's very heavy... on looking at goals, and figuring out how to get to the goals.... You've got a whole strategy section in the Global Development group whose *only* job is to do strategy” (Schurman, 2018, p. 185, emphasis in the original). The former CEO of the foundation, Jeff Raikes, in 2013 revealed that he had in excess of 30 separate teams working on strategy (Raikes, 2013 cited in Schurman, 2018, p. 185). Not only does the foundation have a highly strategic management approach, it also views its philanthropic activities as investments. “We give money to people to implement our strategies,” reported the BMGF Johannesburg office representative in an interview. She also stated that, “The foundation does not implement strategies, but uses partners for implementation” (BMGF representative, January, 2020). But as Schurman (2018) argues, this reliance of the foundation on strategic planning leads to a top-down approach to development that apportions to the foundation a great deal of decision-making power and control, while at the same time reducing the importance of local context and participation (p. 185). Indeed, the former official of the CHAI noted in an interview that some of the big organizations with which the BMGF partners seem to have a particular narrative they want to hear, which may not necessarily reflect the actual situation that prevails on the ground which the local people want to tell. That interview respondent noted,

I think the downside of that is that by out-sourcing that work to someone else, such as your McKinseys and Bairns, and the Boston Consulting Group (BCG), it comes at the detriment of them [BMGF] actually then understanding the issue. I found in my last interactions with BCG very specifically, just as an example, they

seem to have a very specific story they want to tell and they try to find someone who can tell that story. They are really trying to sell a product to them [BMGF] as opposed to saying let me do a proper investigation and understand it. And so I think the danger of using consulting companies can be that you get the product they think you want, as opposed to you really understanding the environment and what the needs are. (former CHAI representative, February 2020)

The BMGF's strategic management culture is encapsulated in a document called *The Strategy Lifecycle, A guide (The Guide)*. The Guide notes that the foundation engages in catalytic philanthropy which is based on the development of "...robust and flexible strategies. These are strategies that articulate the causal pathway to impact; outline the investment and programmatic activities aligned with that pathway; measure the results of these investments and activities over time; and can be adjusted based on results, experience and lessons learnt" (BMGF, 2011 cited in Schurman, 2018, p. 186). Both the chosen strategies and the implementation plan are tightly linked to the programmatic goals set by the foundation. According to the BMGF, goals set out what the foundation seeks to achieve with strategic planning. As Bill Gates explains:

Unlike business, where profit is the "bottom line", foundations and government programmes pick their own goals.... Given a goal, you decide what key variable you need to change to achieve it - the same way a business picks objectives...like customer satisfaction - and develop a plan for change and a way for measuring the change. (Gates, 2013, p. 3)

One can deduce several pertinent points about the BMGF strategic plan. Firstly, the strategy is developed at the foundation's headquarters in Seattle, rather than at the

local or national level where strategies are implemented. For example, when probed in an interview about how the BMGF formulates its strategies, the foundation's representative in Johannesburg showed irritation and refused to answer the question. This was after she had said that "the BMGF works with partners to implement its 'strategies'" (BMGF representative, January 2020). Secondly, in identifying the strategies to address the problems, the BMGF pays attention to its technology orientation. For instance, as the representative of Farm Radio International (FRI) observed in an interview, "From what I can tell, Bill is interested mostly on the health side [of the foundation] and mostly on the technical solutions side. He is a software engineer, he is a tool guy, a fix problems with technology guy, and that's his vice, and I think he recognizes that that's his vice" (January, 2021). The BMGF uses its grant portfolios to build partnerships which will help it to "achieve impact", akin to the results-based management system which has directed the work of many aid agencies on the definition, management and measuring of results since the 1990s (Hatton & Schroeder, 2007, p. 426). As Schurman (2018) states, "the whole effort resembles a complex military operation in which the mission and goals are specified by the top brass, while the targets of these interventions live thousands of miles away" (p. 186). In fact, the 'impact' oriented strategy of the BMGF has led the foundation to focus on only 10 'priority' countries in Africa, where, as the information on the foundation's website says "... we believe we can have the greatest impact" while also doing some work in 45 countries across the continent (BMGF, 2020). Thirdly, the BMGF's strategic planning culture involves thinking in terms of "scalability" of projects and technologies. The emphasis on scaling up represents a key concern in all the foundation's programmes and permeates through the foundation's organizational culture

(Schurman, 2018, p. 186). As Schurman (2018) observes, focusing on a project's scalability instead of analyzing what works in a specific situation leads to an approach that is over-generalized and often unsuitable (p. 186).

Some grantees are encouraged or incentivized to engage in activities that they are not necessarily prepared to do, just to please the foundation. But such an approach can be counterproductive. For example, Schurman (2018) cites a Kenyan grantee based in Nairobi who had been asked by the foundation to expand his project to Tanzania, a place he knew little about and in which he did not have any contacts (p. 186). According to some scientists, the BMGF adopts an excessively mechanical approach to scale, which ends up influencing grantees (Schurman, 2018, p. 186). This observation was corroborated in the interview with the representative of the Tutu HIV Centre who observed that, "it's natural when this amount of money is coming to a region that it is linked to a particular agenda, that people frame their request to favorably put them in a position for that funding. Yes, it will change behavior, without doubt" (Tutu HIV Centre representative, March, 2020). A final consequence of the top-down, strategic planning orientation of the BMGF is that locally-based, bottom-up initiatives which may potentially contribute to the foundation's goals of poverty alleviation and bringing health to all, may not meet the mark as they are context-specific and therefore not attractive enough to be funded (Schurman, 2018, p. 186).

Another aspect of the organizational culture of the BMGF is for the project officers to be heavily involved with the grantees and to play a directive role in the projects, especially at the initial stage. The planning culture at the foundation shapes how proposals are drafted, thereby inevitably dictating the work that the grantee will have to

do (Schurman, 2018, p. 190). As an attestation to this fact, the representative of the Aurum Institute reported in an interview that “With the clinical trials that we got funding directly from them [BMGF], we had weekly update calls where they actually joined the calls... but in terms of providing the weekly updates etc, they would provide input as to how they think things could be better. They do have high expectations...” (Aurum Institute representative, March, 2020). Schurman (2018) also quotes a representative of a US-based NGO which is a grantee of the foundation as saying, “...they have an extremely hands on culture...They were in constant contact with us when they were working on the grant, going through it on a very detailed basis with track changes saying ‘this would improve it’, ‘would that reduce it?’” (Schurman, 2018, p. 190). It is clear that through their suggestions, the BMGF project officers are closely involved in project formulation. Schurman (2018) further cites a BMGF official with years of experience in the agricultural programme who explains how closely the foundation follows grantees and influences their work saying, “the Gates Foundation...has this internal tension between grant making and implementing projects. So constantly you have programme officers who are much more comfortable going in and rolling up their sleeves and doing the work” (p. 190). This results in grantees feeling and acting more like contractors than independent organizations (Schurman, 2018, p. 190). The BMGF also influences the behaviour of grantees by setting targets which the latter must meet. The foundation is fraught with specifically defined targets that grantees are expected to meet. As Schurman (2018) observes in the case of the agriculture programme, “...these take a numerical form: number of farmers reached with improved seeds, number of women’s groups formed, number of farmer videos screened” (p. 190). Such a results-based management

approach has been criticized by many international development practitioners who view it as a donor-imposed requirement that diverts time, resources and energy away from the actual practice of development work (Hatton & Schroeder, 2007, p. 426). The agricultural projects are reported to be so focused in terms of their activities that there is no possibility for either adaptation or experimenting and learning, and by so doing, the BMGF is doing exactly the opposite of what it hopes to achieve in its programmes. The foundation's emphasis on setting, measuring and attaining specific goals has been perfected into a science, as Schurman puts it (2018, p. 190). In fact, the "scientization" of development, by adopting a positivist and empirical approach, is one of the major characteristics of the BMGF's work in the international development field (Schurman, 2018, p. 190).

Nevertheless, I am not arguing that the BMGF exercises complete control over its partners and beneficiaries by dictating how they should think or what they should do. On the contrary, many of the research participants I interviewed expressed appreciation for the foundation's flexibility and willingness to listen. For example, the representative of the Aurum Institute also noted:

I think they want justification to ensure that they get best value for their money, because they do invest a lot of money. I have never experienced them as being unreasonable. An instance is where we have gone back to provide justification, to provide explanations, they were willing to engage with us. But I won't say that we always reached the decision that we hoped for, but a reasonable agreement can be reached. I have never experienced them as not being willing to listen...(Aurum Institute representative, March, 2020)

However, it is apparent from the other examples above that the foundation's 'hands-on' approach to grant-making represents a top-down donor influence that inevitably pushes partners and beneficiary grantees in certain directions. This is done through the foundation's suggestions on what the partners/ beneficiaries should do and how they should do it, and also by expecting them to meet strict targets. I argue that, in this process, the voices of those partners and beneficiaries are drowned. It is also important to note that there are other deeper and broader issues to interrogate here: for example, how is it that individuals like Bill Gates can amass such enormous wealth in the first place?; how much corporate tax has been paid by Microsoft over the years?; and why is the BMGF so reluctant to improve health-care systems and so keen on focusing on diseases and research and development? These questions will be dealt with in detail in chapter five. Let us now turn to the BMGF's work in South Africa.

3.4 Why the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation? Its Work in South Africa.

In developing countries, the BMGF claims to focus on "improving people's health and well-being, helping individuals lift themselves out of hunger and extreme poverty" (BMGF, 2020, n.p.). The BMGF's website carries a message that describes the character of those behind it and what their goal is: "we are impatient optimists working to reduce inequity" (BMGF, 2020, n.p.). Indeed, one of the research interview participants alluded to Bill Gates's impatient optimism with regards to the impact that the foundation is having in South Africa saying,

I think there are very specific places where the Gates Foundation has impacted well-being and life. I think *not* sufficiently for Bill, as I sometimes feel quite sad for him,

because I think he really does want to make major impact, but by major impact I mean he wants to see a vaccine that works, really see a drop in incidents, really see a change in the outcomes of HIV in the region. All of this is incremental, so it's harder to tease it out. (March, 2020; my emphasis)

In South Africa, the BMGF established its office in 1999 before it became a fully-fledged foundation in 2000. The foundation's Johannesburg office is the regional headquarters for Africa which oversees smaller national offices Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and in the Nigerian capital of Abuja and the foundation's work in 47 countries across the continent (BMGF, 2018, p. 2).⁶ These projects are undertaken in collaboration with national governments and other local partners (BMGF, 2018, p. 2), including non-governmental organizations (NGOs), research organizations, and other multilateral organizations such as the WHO, the African Development Bank (AfDB) and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). The foundation claims to gauge South Africa's progress on the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) which the South African government adopted in 2015 (BMGF, 2018, p. 2).

According to the BMGF's South Africa brochure, that country was chosen as the regional headquarters of the foundation for several reasons, including the fact that it is

⁶ The BMGF has five focus countries in Africa; Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria and South Africa. It is not clear how these countries are chosen. The website says that "we focus on countries where we believe we can have the greatest impact" (BMGF, 2021, n.p.). It is important to note that Ethiopia is the headquarters of the African Union (AU), Nigeria is the most populous country in Africa and like South Africa, also suffers from high maternal mortality rates, among other health-related challenges. Ethiopia and Nigeria both host the foundation's offices. Also noteworthy is the fact that on the issue of tobacco control, there are 10 focus countries including the five mentioned above and Benin, Gabon, Gambia, Mauritania and Uganda, as was revealed by one interview respondent. That respondent explained that she believed that these priority countries were selected on account of the high prevalence of tobacco use in those countries. She added that South Africa and Nigeria might also have been chosen because of their large populations (February, 2020). As already noted in chapter one, I was not able to conduct an in-person interview with the representative of the foundation to probe this issue. The website is also vague on its criteria for selecting focus countries.

one of the most prosperous countries on the continent where innovation thrives. However, the benefits of that innovation are inequitably distributed as reflected by the country's Gini coefficient, which is the highest in the world (BMGF, 2018, p. 3). Moreover, South Africa's Human Capital Index score, which is the World Bank measurement of the effectiveness of a country's investment in the health and education of all its people, is 0.41, which is relatively low for an upper middle income country (BMGF, 2018, p.3). South Africa hosts a lot of vaccine development work needed to protect children in that country, across the continent and globally. The BMGF supports projects related to improving, inventing or studying the impact of vaccines for HIV, TB, influenza and other diseases. The BMGF country brochure also announces that one of the foundation's most strategic investments in South Africa is the \$30 million, 5-year investment in a local vaccine manufacturer called Biovac to develop a new vaccine for Africa against group B streptococcus, one of the leading causes of infections in infants on the continent. Biovac is reported to be one of the only three companies in the world and the only one in Africa to manufacture such a vaccine (BMGF, 2018, p. 7).

South Africa is also a leader in health research and development on the continent, but that notwithstanding, a large section of its population is plagued by HIV/AIDS and TB. In fact, in 2018, HIV was the foremost contributor to mortality in the country, and South Africa had the largest HIV- positive population in the world (BMGF, 2018, p. 5). The BMGF has donated \$3 billion to the Global Fund since its formation in 2002. The Global Fund in turn has donated almost \$1 billion to South Africa over the years including \$100 million in 2018 alone (BMGF, 2018, p. 7). Indeed, the representative of the South African National Department of Health (NDH) confirmed in an interview that the BMGF

leverages its funding through other philanthropies in medical research and the strengthening and implementation of health programmes. He also emphasized the role of the BMGF in funding research, which the South African government is unable to do. He specifically cited an HIV study and a contraception study which amounted to \$100 million, which he said that his government would not have been able to do on its own (NDH representative, March, 2020).

South Africa is the centre for the BMGF HIV and TB research and development and delivery work. In this work, the foundation focuses on technological solutions in supporting research to develop new drugs, vaccines and diagnostics for HIV, TB and other diseases (BMGF, 2018, p. 7). In this regard, the foundation has donated funds to the South African Medical Research Council (MRC), the University of Cape Town (UCT), the Reproductive Health Institute at the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits RHI) and the Aurum Institute, among others. With regards to TB, the foundation cooperates with the NDH and other experts in the TB Think Tank to identify gaps in caring for TB patients.

With regards to the funding of early studies on diagnostics, the BMGF has been involved in funding the development of TB medication. The NDH representative revealed in our interview that the foundation had financed a lot of the development work on ‘genexpert’, a molecular test for drug insensitive and drug-resistant TB. The foundation funded that project through an organization called FIND which is based in Geneva. As the NDH representative observed, “That’s important for us because we have a big TB problem in this country and we want to diagnose people with a great deal of sensitivity and specificity and get them on treatment as quickly as possible” (NDH

representative, March, 2020). This interview respondent also said that the National Health Department had partnered with the BMGF to significantly bring down the price of a TB drug. The foundation acts as a guarantor for South Africa when the country negotiates lower prices with pharmaceuticals. He explained as follows:

we will go to a company and say to them, we will guarantee you a thousand units of this drug and therefore you must bring the price down. But there is no guarantee that countries can deliver on that number because it depends on a whole range of things. The BMGF will then come in and say, we will guarantee that if South Africa doesn't reach that number of patients, we will pay the difference between \$400 and \$800. So that's what they are good at doing and that's what we have been working with them on. (NDH representative, March 2020)

The BMGF is involved in five of the eight goals of the South African National HIV, TB and STI Strategic Plan for the period 2018 to 2022. This means that the foundation is supporting the uptake of proven HIV prevention tools, including oral pre-exposure prophylaxis and male circumcision. In its HIV work, the foundation also supports initiatives to reduce infection rates among adolescent girls and young women through an initiative called *DREAMS*. According to the BMGF website, the initiative is not only designed to address the HIV scourge but also to improve gender equality, which is one of the issues that the foundation tries to promote through its programmes. Another similar programme the BMGF is supporting which promotes adolescent girls' health, safety and school completion is the *Girls Achieve Power (GAP)* programme.

The BMGF also works with the South African Medical Research Council (MRC) to fund research as noted above. The MRC representative noted that her organization's

relationship with the foundation was mainly around co-funding of projects. She explained that the council leverages the funds from BMGF. She described the partnership as “David and Goliath” scenario because of the foundation’s financial might *vis-à-vis* her organization. But she also added that the MRC, as a government research agency, had lots of political power as well. The MRC representative described the work that the BMGF is doing with her organization as “transformative” and also praised the foundation for its open access policy. She described this policy as “democratizing science”, explaining that “Yes, so they say you mustn’t pay to view. You pay to publish, not pay to view. So if you pay to publish, it means that the whole world can view your science and takes away the barriers and democratizes science” (MRC representative, March 2020). In this regard, she explained that the foundation was bridging the knowledge equity gap, “That’s understanding how to bridge the inequity gap, the gap between lack of knowledge and knowledge” (MRC representative, March, 2020). It is noteworthy that as early as 2006, as a condition for receiving grants for HIV vaccine research, 165 scientists from 19 countries had to agree to share their data in a central repository. As the then Director of the BMGF’s Global Health Programme, Tadataka Yamada, noted, this was a way of ensuring that as many people as possible in the global South benefitted (Okie, 2006, p. 1088).

Another research organization in South Africa which is working with the BMGF is the Tutu HIV Centre which operates under the ambit of the University of Cape Town. The representative of the centre noted that in her organization’s interaction with the foundation, the latter has funded niche projects and programmes in HIV and TB research. As she put it,

When I look back on the kinds of money we have had, it's usually been seed money for a new idea to gather more information to be able to go into something else, or it's been an interesting idea that it would be impossible perhaps to get the usual institutional grant money for. (Tutu HIV Centre representative, March, 2020)

That participant described the BMGF as a group of well-intentioned people who want to do good in the world, and specifically Bill and Melinda as “extraordinarily generous”, and more than just philanthropists. They want to learn more about where their money is being used and how best to use it. The representative of the Tutu HIV Centre said that she thought the BMGF had had great impact on HIV self-testing issues in the country.

The area of clinical trials for HIV and TB therapy is another area the BMGF is working in within South Africa because, as already mentioned, that is where the country is experiencing the greatest health burden. The trials are carried out by the Aurum Institute. As the representative of the institute noted,

The BMGF has also funded a lot of infrastructure. With trials set up, the BMGF has invested a lot of money in establishing infrastructure and that's not something that you get from a lot of funders.... So there has been a lot of support from the BMGF in terms of capacity building and infrastructure. (Aurum Institute representative, March, 2020)

In this instance, the respondent was referring to the establishment of clinical trial sites and the equipment installed there. In her assessment of the projects that her organization is doing which are funded by the BMGF, the representative of Aurum Institute noted that:

So not all the trials that the BMGF invest in are successful, but the knowledge gained from the trials that have been conducted, as well as the capacity development that has gone along with it, I think that's made a huge difference in communities. For example, in preparation for HVTN702 HIV vaccine clinical

trial, they established a whole number of new clinical trial sites. So these are sites that had never conducted HIV vaccine trials before, where the infrastructure was covered, facility, equipping the pharmacy, getting approvals, etc. . . . , getting the labs set up, getting the community mobilized, getting them educated, getting participants in- that infrastructure was not there and now that the vaccine trial was not successful, those sites have the capacity to take on any trial because the sites were set up to such a high standard that they can attract funding from any other funder. And in these small communities, it means job creation for nurses, for the community teams, for doctors, but it also means education for those participants coming in, where they get counselled on how to prevent infection, how to be safe, how to continue to protect themselves etc. So I think there are other ways where the communities have seen a huge benefit, not just as a result of a positive outcome of a trial. (Aurum Institute representative, March, 2020)

The research work which the BMGF funds in South Africa is also carried out by the Ezintsha, which is a subdivision of the Wits RHI. The representative of Ezintsha expressed the view that “they [BMGF] do good work. It’s quite thoughtful work in the main” (Ezintsha representative, February, 2020). He also noted that his organization, which also focuses on HIV/AIDS research, would not be able to do the work that it is doing if it did not receive funding from the BMGF and the other donors who contribute to its budget.

The BMGF also funded a maternal health research programme in the South African National Department of Health through a partnership with the Praekelt Foundation (a South African family foundation) from 2016 to December 2019. The project, which was called *Mom-Connect*, was based on the premise that end users need to have agency in order for them to make their own decisions around their health outcomes. The Praekelt Foundation was contracted to research the ways to identify, support and get feedback from breastfeeding mothers and channel that information to service providers. The ultimate aim was to improve the support that those mothers were receiving from the health care system. As the representative of the Praekelt Foundation put it, “a lot of this is

around patient equity, patient engagement with the health system” (February , 2020). He also praised the project that his foundation carried out in collaboration with the BMGF as being “recipient-led or deeply inspired by the recipients”, which he said was very rare (Praekelt Foundation representative, February, 2020). He noted that the BMGF had taken a contrarian view from other donors such as UNAIDS, DFID and USAID, who want the projects they finance to be led by the government, as the foundation wants to hear from the patients themselves.

The Clinton Health Access Initiative (CHAI) is another organization which is supported by the BMGF to carry out projects in the field of health in South Africa. A former CHAI official noted in our interview that the CHAI’s relationship with the foundation was a two-way street where sometimes, the CHAI approached the BMGF to seek funding, and other times, it was the BMGF which approached the CHAI with proposals for work it wanted done (former CHAI representative, February, 2020). The CHAI is involved mainly in assisting the National Department of Health to develop systems to provide access to antiretroviral treatment for HIV/AIDS patients and this work is being sponsored by, among others, the BMGF. The foundation also funds the TB programme which is run by the CHAI. The former official of the CHAI observed that, as a funding partner, the BMGF was not afraid to refuse to fund some programmes the foundation believed did not serve its objectives, unlike other donors who

get trapped into that cycle of doing things that they really don’t want to because they want to preserve the broader relationship. And what I found with the Gates Foundation is that they are more often willing to say no, I am not going to do this because I don’t think it has strategic value, but I am happy to talk to you about

this other issue that I think will be of a more strategic value. (former CHAI representative, February, 2020)

She praised the BMGF for its role in pushing organizations to be more innovative and to think outside the box. She argued that funding of innovation was important, even though it might not lead to anything in the end. She also noted that “The Gateses have a less hands-on approach, in South Africa specifically. I mean a lot of their senior staff would obviously come here quite often, but not them specifically, no” (former CHAI representative, February, 2020).

The Tobacco Control project that the BMGF is funding in South Africa is run under the ambit of the University of Cape Town (UCT). The co-operation between the foundation and the UCT began in 2012, initially through the American Cancer Society at the behest of the BMGF. Explaining how the relationship began, the representative of the UCT noted in our interview that “We offered a workshop to delegates from Kenya in January of 2011 and one of the Gates people was there...she was so impressed that she said that they would actually want to sponsor more of this, and they would want to commit some money to it” (UCT representative, February, 2020). The representative of the UCT also explained how the funds were channelled saying, “The money came from Gates to the American Cancer Society. They kept a portion and we received a substantial portion of that” (UCT representative, February, 2020). Since 2015, the assistance from the BMGF for tobacco control-related research is channelled through the African Capacity Building Foundation (ACBF) which is the African Union’s specialized agency for building sustainable human and institutional capacity to support the continent’s

development (ACBF, 2020). The representative of the UCT also praised the manner in which the BMGF operates with regards to the funding saying,

The good thing about Gates Foundation money is that the requirements that are put on to us are not too onerous. We don't have to show them time sheets, what we do with our time. So we have got the freedom and the liberty to think, to strategize, to apply for other funding sources that maybe a little bit more focused than what they want us to do. (UCT representative, February, 2020)

However, he also revealed that in the beginning the relationship with the BMGF was quite difficult, explaining that,

They wanted to check everything. We felt like we were treated like children and all the rest of it. But over time we said we are actually competent, we are capable of doing the programmatic work, but we also cross the T's and dot the I's, the sort of programme management side of things. So we give them our reports, and the reports are good and all the rest of it. So within that kind of context, you do build trust over time. We have never felt specifically that the Gates Foundation has undermined our trust. (UCT representative, February, 2020)

Expressing gratitude for the role the BMGF and Bloomberg foundation are playing in tobacco control, the UCT representative noted that,

Both Bloomberg and Gates plough lots of money into tobacco control, both of them about a billion dollars each, so essentially lots of money and to be completely blunt, if it were not for those two men and Mrs. Gates, we would not be where we are at the moment. So they have funded a lot of very good work into tobacco control. (UCT representative, February, 2020)

In academic institutions like at UCT, the BMGF supports research and also awards graduate scholarships to M.A. and Ph.D. students whose work is aligned to tobacco control research. At Sefako Makgatho Health Science University, which is based in Pretoria, the ACBF and BMGF are financing the tobacco industry monitoring capacity building to equip governments with the appropriate knowledge and skills to push back at the tobacco industry. The ACBF representative explained in our interview that, “the other unfortunate thing about the tobacco industry is that they have the money to sue, so they can sue governments. So, you need to have the appropriate facts and figures to counteract its work” (ACBF representative, February, 2020).

The BMGF’s involvement in tobacco control interventions in Africa followed an announcement in 2005 by Tadataka Yamada, the then Director of the BMGF’s Global Health Programme, that the foundation would venture into efforts to reduce smoking and tobacco use in developing countries. Yamada suggested at that time that the BMGF would reinforce initiatives for countries to sign the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control - a treaty that requires signatories to increase taxes on tobacco products, ban sales to minors and regulate advertising and take other measures (Okie, 2006, p. 1088). In 2008 the BMGF committed \$125 million over a five-year period towards tobacco control in Africa and around the world. At that time, the BMGF announced that it would “help prevent the tobacco epidemic from taking root in Africa”. Bill Gates was quoted as saying, “Tobacco-caused diseases have emerged as one of the greatest challenges facing developing countries” (BMGF, 2020, n.p.).

The BMGF’s work in South Africa includes capacity building in the form of training of medical personnel in management. This project is being carried out in partnership with

the Foundation for Professional Development (FPD) which is based in Johannesburg. Instead of a few doctors going to the US for management training courses, the FPD is sponsored by the BMGF to partner with academic institutions to train doctors in South Africa and around the continent, and offer qualifications in health management. By January 2020, a total of eight thousand doctors had undergone the health management training offered by the FPD. The FPD representative observed in our interview that the BMGF-funded project was coming to an end at the end of 2020, after which the project would be taken over by the National Department of Health. He also observed that there would be a transition period of one year (FPD representative, February, 2020).

It is important to note that, in 2006, following the \$31 billion donation to the BMGF by Warren Buffett, the foundation's Global Health Programme, under the leadership of Yamada, added a new focus on human resources development. Yamada noted at that time that the foundation was interested in worker-training projects that would improve health care delivery (Okie, 2006, p. 1088). The FPD programme therefore falls under this.

Moreover, the BMGF is working with the NDH to improve the South African Health Products Regulatory Authority (SAHPRA), to assist it to become an effective regulator and to address a product application backlog which exists in the country (BMGF, 2018, p. 7). With regards to medicines delivery, the foundation set up the Africa Resource Centre (ARC) which cooperates with the NDH to improve the supply chain and access to medicines. The ARC has reduced the logistical burden on medical facilities by developing new collection locations for medicines (BMGF, 2018, p. 7).

The BMGF is also involved in other projects within South Africa which are not health-related. These include agriculture and sanitation and hygiene. Even though the

South African agricultural sector is not a major driver of the country's economy, the BMGF believes the science and technology expertise that exists there makes South Africa the headquarters for agriculture research and development for the continent (BMGF, 2018, p. 3). For that reason, the foundation is supporting research to improve crop productivity (BMGF, 2018, p. 8). On sanitation and hygiene, the foundation funds the development and commercialization of off-grid toilet technologies under a project called sanitation appropriate for education (SAFE) which is led by the Department of Basic Education (BMGF, 2018, p. 3).

As of February 2020, the foundation had over 250 'investments' in South Africa worth about US\$400 million. It is important to note that BMGF refers to its funding for projects as 'investments'. From my interview with the BMGF representative, to the foundation's reports, the term 'investment' is used to refer to financing of projects. This is significant as it shows the business nature of the organization's philanthropy. This also reflects a wider trend in development towards a 'business case' approach. This trend is especially evident in the area of gender and development, which has, for the past two decades or so, been pushed as 'smart economics'. 'Smart economics' rationalizes investing in women and girls for more effective economic outcomes and poverty reduction rather than removing structural inequalities, which needs to be done by several stakeholders including women themselves, development institutions and society at large (Chant and Sweetman, 2012, pp. 518-519). These issues will be discussed in depth in chapter five. In 2018 alone, the foundation disbursed US\$75 million. As noted above, the foundation uses local partners to implement projects. In other words, the BMGF funds

local organizations who are on the ground, who in turn carry out the projects and report back to the foundation periodically (BMGF representative, January, 2020).

3.5 The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation's Work Across Africa

Apart from the work the BMGF is doing in South Africa, the foundation is also working in other countries throughout Africa in different sectors, including health and agriculture, through national and multilateral organizations. One of the main multilateral organizations that the foundation is partnering with on the continent is the WHO Regional Office which is based in the capital of the Republic of Congo, Brazzaville. In our interview, the representative of the WHO Regional Office noted that while the BMGF was one of the biggest financiers of the WHO globally, there were some programmes through which the foundation is funding the regional office directly. She observed that her organization's engagement with the BMGF was guided by the foundation's areas of interest and also by the WHO's own interests. She explained that,

And once we understand what a partner's areas of interest are, we can then approach them and link up with them on those areas of interest. For example, here in the region, we know that they [BMGF] have an interest in the area of vaccine development, reform processes in different organizations, nutrition, maternal and child health. So understanding all those areas of interest that they have, our engagement with them tends to follow their areas of interest. But also not just their areas of interest, but whether that is a priority for us in the region as well.

(WHO Regional Office representative, February 2020)

She also explained that in formulating a proposal to the foundation, the WHO ensured that it understood the foundation's interests, being cognisant of the fact that if the proposal does not align with that, then it will not be accepted. The representative of the WHO noted that her organization also tried to leverage the BMGF's interest in its "darling countries" – those priority countries for the foundation and to work with the foundation in those countries:

And also if they have a particular country that they are interested in working in, because any partner has their reason for having what we call their "darling countries", so if we know that they have an interest in working in the DRC, in Ethiopia, in Nigeria, then we will look at those countries and see from our own perspective, what our priorities that align with theirs are. And then we make that engagement with them, and then once we show interest, we now know what format it is that they want in terms of proposal development, and we follow those development proposal formats. (WHO Regional Office representative, February, 2020)

The representative of the WHO Regional Office described her organization's relationship with the BMGF as "very candid...if we are not doing well, they tell us exactly where we are not going right. It's a valued relationship because there is a lot of mutual respect, and it's unlike some donor-recipient relationships where you [recipient] are made to grovel" (February, 2020). She also added that unlike some bilateral donors who want to be seen in their partnership with the regional body, the BMGF was modest. She explained that, "I would consider them as one of the partners who doesn't really blow their horn that much when they have given you money. But of course, we do acknowledge them as any good

partner” (WHO Regional Office representative, February, 2020). On the conduct of the co-chairs of the BMGF, Bill and Melinda Gates, the WHO representative noted that,

The people that we see more often are their directors and their programme people.

Those are the people we deal with on a day-to-day basis, rather than themselves.

Bill and Melinda Gates send their letters to all partners that they work with. So I do receive the letter from Bill and Melinda on what their vision is for the year.

(WHO Regional Office representative, February, 2020)

The fact that the WHO Regional Office deals with the BMGF programme officers “on a day-to-day basis” suggests that the foundation exerts a tremendous amount of influence on the regional organization. The representative of the WHO also described both Bill and Melinda Gates as genuine philanthropists who are interested in solving global issues. She noted that they do not only use their personal wealth, but also their influence and partnerships to solve various problems around the world. In this regard, the BMGF mobilizes other advocates, including influential community leaders in countries where the foundation is doing projects, such as religious leaders, volunteer organizations and employers. The foundation also partners with other organizations such as Rotary International, UNICEF, UN Foundation and the Global Poverty Project, to carry out projects like polio vaccinations. The foundation uses traditional and social media to raise awareness about polio eradication and immunization activities in donor countries, as well as in those countries where polio is a health threat (BMGF, 2020).

The representative of the WHO Regional Office revealed that the BMGF has been heavily involved in the preparatory work for the Africa Medicines Authority, a regional medicines regulatory body which the WHO is in the process of setting up.

The other area in which the foundation has played a major role in partnership with the WHO is family planning, specifically as Africa has problems of high maternal mortality among adolescents. Adolescent pregnancies are a major factor in maternal mortality in the region. The BMGF has also been involved in the definition of core capacity of country offices in Africa. Refuting allegations of agenda-setting which have been levelled against the foundation, the WHO representative noted that those who make such accusations should provide proof. She also said,

I find it difficult because most organizations would have a board, whether you are talking about UNICEF, UNFPA, WHO, we have an executive board that determines the direction that the organization takes, that audits the organization, that asks all the difficult questions about where the resources have gone. So, if you have an executive board, and then you have a partner, a philanthropist that gives money, I take it that it would not be possible for the organization to completely go rogue and go east because one philanthropist has given you money, versus what the rest of the partners who contribute to your budget, including the member states, have said that's where you should go. (WHO Regional Office representative, February, 2020)

The BMGF's Global Health programme and the WHO are also involved in polio eradication efforts in Nigeria where the government has implemented a National Emergency Plan that is being headed by the Head of State. For the foundation, eradicating polio was an important milestone for the Decade of Vaccines (2010-2020), a shared commitment by all countries to ensure that every person enjoys the benefits of vaccines by 2020 (BMGF, 2020). This is why Bill Gates personally intervened by

speaking to the Nigerian President when there was resistance to the programme in that country, as noted above. Apart from its support of the development of vaccines, the BMGF also contributes by ensuring the affordability of the vaccines and in their supply, delivery and communications infrastructure to expand their use (BMGF, 2020; NDH representative, March, 2020).

Bill Gates claimed in an interview in 2013 that in the previous two decades, the number of children who died in Africa each year had been cut by half (Gates, 2013). However, separating people from their cultural background and reducing them to data has a tendency of creating the illusion that mere decrease in numbers implies a process of ending poverty. What gets silenced in this conceptualization of poverty is that the objective of simply securing survival does serious violence to the poor in the act of saving them (Pasha, 2014, p. 442). The lure of numbers that depends on the reducibility of human experience to quantifiable data makes social relations hazy (Pasha, 2014, p. 443). As Pasha aptly observes, “the comforting logic that statistical decline in the number of the extreme poor justifies international aid as one of the effective ways to end poverty rationalizes the status quo” (2014, p. 443).

The BMGF also works with African multilateral organizations like the AfDB and NEPAD, which have offices in South Africa, though they have their head offices elsewhere on the continent. The AfDB’s headquarters is located in Cote d’Ivoire and the NEPAD at the African Union in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. With the AfDB, the foundation is involved in some of the five priority areas for the Bank which are: food security; infrastructure development; energy security; value-addition, and governance and

institution-building (AfDB representative, February, 2020). The BMGF is also working with the AfDB on water and sanitation issues. In 2011 the foundation donated \$12 million for the development of sanitation pilot projects in several countries in sub-Saharan Africa in collaboration with the AfDB. In 2018, the foundation donated another grant of \$14.5 million for the establishment of the Africa Urban Sanitation Investment Fund. The Fund was tasked with carrying out a feasibility study for sanitation projects to attract investments from the private and public sectors. The projects are targeted at the urban poor who mostly lack sanitation (BMGF, 2020; AfDB representative, February, 2020). The representative of the AfDB noted that the partnership of the Bank and the BMGF in hygiene and sanitation issues was coincidental as sanitation and hygiene was a priority for the Bank and an area the foundation also had an interest in. Consequently, it was easy to negotiate the partnership agreement.

The BMGF is also co-financing the African Digital Financial Inclusion project together with the AfDB, the government of Luxembourg and the French Development Agency. This project is designed to accelerate digital financial inclusion across Africa with the goal of ensuring that 332 million more Africans, more than half of whom are women, are included in the formal economy (AfDB representative, February, 2020; AfDB, 2020). However, this project only addresses market failures which inhibit women's access to digital financial services whereas women's wider economic empowerment requires the elimination of structural barriers, as already noted.

The NEPAD has been partnering with the BMGF since 2005 to implement the Africa Science, Technology and Innovation Strategy (NEPAD representative, March, 2020). The cooperation began at a time that the NEPAD was looking for funding partners

and the BMGF was also seeking projects to finance on the continent. The representative of the NEPAD noted in an interview that his organization receives a lot of funding from the foundation, saying “to be honest, they [BMGF] are the number one philanthropic organization that funds us” (NEPAD representative, March, 2020). He explained that the foundation had played a key role in the harmonization of the medicines regulatory authorities on the continent, resulting in the establishment of regional regulatory systems which assess applications for the evaluation of technologies and products; “if there is a drug that is meant for the Southern African Development Community (SADC) region, it takes just one sitting of all the SADC member states and once they make a decision, the medicines will get to all the countries. Those systems are now in place” (NEPAD representative, March, 2020). Relating the relevance of the harmonization to the current COVID-19 pandemic, the representative of NEPAD explained that if a vaccine were to be discovered and it needed to be distributed to all countries in Africa, as soon as possible, there is a mechanism in place to do so, “that was through the sponsorship of the BMGF” (NEPAD representative, March, 2020).

It should be noted, however, that following the discovery of the COVID-19 vaccine, delivery in Africa has been abysmal and the BMGF has not been as supportive as one would have expected in light of this praise. By the end of February 2021, just over a million doses had been delivered to Ghana and Cote d’Ivoire through the COVAX Facility, a wide-ranging coalition of organizations involved in public health, including the BMGF, which was established at the beginning of the pandemic (Zewdu, 2021, March 2). Following the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, the BMGF has provided the Africa Centre for Disease Control (CDC) with *only* US\$20 million, according to the

foundation's Africa Director, Cheikh Omar Seydi (Seydi, 2021, July 28, my emphasis). Furthermore, Bill Gates has not been supportive of low-income countries' efforts to be allowed to manufacture COVID-19 vaccines to enable cheaper and quicker delivery to these countries. On April 25, 2021, in response to a question on the proposal which was before the World Trade Organization to waive patent restrictions on COVID-19 vaccines, Gates disagreed with the proposal, claiming that there were no safe manufacturing facilities in poor countries. But that was not true (McGoey, 2021). India has many factories that manufacture medicines and some of those could potentially be involved in the manufacture of the COVID-19 vaccines (Allison, 2021, January 30). Nevertheless, on May 7, the BMGF rescinded to temporarily support the lifting of patent protections (Cheney, 2021, May 7). That waiver was necessary to enable cheaper and quicker facilitation of vaccine delivery to low-income countries.

The BMGF has also been involved in evaluating the safety of vaccines in Africa through an initiative called the Africa Vaccine Regulatory Forum (AVRF), according to the representative of the NEPAD. It is important to note that among the allegations that have been levelled against the BMGF is that the foundation tends to rely solely on vaccines without attempting to address other socio-economic problems which may result in people succumbing to certain diseases. As Butler argues, in its global health programmes, the BMGF does not seek to address social inequalities which in some cases exacerbate the situations which the foundation seeks to combat (Butler, 2019, p. 9). This issue will be addressed in depth in chapter five.

The other area where the NEPAD is cooperating with the BMGF is in biotechnology. The representative of NEPAD lamented that,

our systems are flooded with fear-oriented messages and as a result, you can't get products into our countries. In 2007 we started a programme on biotech products. We needed to have a fully-fledged system to support member states on these biotech products, and this we now have through the support from the BMGF for the past 12 years. (NEPAD representative, March, 2020)

The NEPAD representative commended the advocacy role that Bill and Melinda Gates have played in some countries in Africa where there is need for intervention. For example, there was strong resistance to the uptake of the polio vaccine in Northern Nigeria, “but it took Bill getting himself on the ground in Nigeria. He talked to the President of Nigeria and they agreed on a strategy and on a package” (NEPAD representative, March, 2020). The representative of NEPAD also lauded the BMGF for its availability and willingness to listen to grantees. Furthermore, he praised the foundation saying, “Their [BMGF] grant agreement is only six pages long and is very straight forward” (NEPAD representative, March, 2020). The only critique that the NEPAD representative had against the foundation was that there are some programmes that are run strictly in the priority countries, and some of its programme officers wanted to focus only on those priority countries. The NEPAD wanted to focus on all the 55 countries on the continent (including the Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic, which is recognized as a state by the African Union). He, however said that other programme officers were flexible and willing to work anywhere.

Another multilateral African organization supported by the BMGF is the ACBF (which is headquartered in Harare, Zimbabwe). The representative of the ACBF observed that the partnership with the BMGF allowed her foundation to do two things. Firstly, it

allowed the ACBF to fund civil society organizations working on public health issues, specifically tobacco control in South Africa and across the continent. Secondly, it allowed the continental body to diversify its source of funding. Through the ACBF, the BMGF is supporting 12 civil society organizations (CSOs) in 12 African countries, and several academic institutions like the UCT and Sefako Makgatho Health Science University, also in South Africa. The CSOs include the African Tobacco Control Alliance which is based in Togo, and the Centre for Tobacco Control in Africa, which has its headquarters in Uganda. These CSOs do advocacy work and the ACBF, through funds from the BMGF supports advocacy to ensure that each government which has ratified the WHO Tobacco Control Framework Convention, passes a tobacco control law. Civil society organisations also engage in advocacy campaigns to ensure that after this tobacco control legislation is adopted in various states, it is actually implemented. The ACBF representative also explained that initially, the work her organization was doing with the sponsorship from the BMGF focused on the BMGF's priority which include Benin, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Kenya, Mauritania, Senegal, South Africa and Uganda. In response to a question on why these were 'priority' countries, the ACBF representative observed that,

we believe that these were chosen as core countries because of the issue of prevalence. There is a map that is always produced by the WHO on the prevalence of tobacco use in Africa. So, they also targeted those countries that have a higher prevalence of tobacco use so that the intervention can be impactful.

(ACBF representative, February, 2020)

The ACBF representative also admitted that her organization was new in the area of tobacco control, and therefore appreciated the guidance from the BMGF to concentrate on the foundation's priority countries. As she put it, "...initially they gave us priority countries because we were new to tobacco control, and they wanted for us not to waste time deciding which countries we were going to work in" (ACBF representative, February 2020). As already noted, this respondent believed that the priority countries were selected on account of their high prevalence of tobacco use. Praising the BMGF, the representative of the ACBF noted that without the foundation's assistance, her organization would not have been able to do the work it is doing in tobacco control. She went as far as saying:

maybe ACBF would never have ventured into tobacco control...the markets for tobacco have been developed in America and Canada, but because that smoking population is dying, they are coming to Africa as a new market because people in Africa have no awareness of the harmful effects of tobacco. Therefore, the intervention by the BMGF came at the most opportune time to curb the tobacco epidemic to ensure that what has happened in the developed world does not happen in Africa. (ACBF representative, February, 2020)

The ACBF representative disclosed that in Africa, only the BMGF was involved in funding tobacco control activities. She commended the BMGF for its flexibility and the fact that it does not have onerous conditionalities which are a common characteristic of most donor organizations. She explained that after initially being directed to work in the priority countries, in the second phase of the project, the ACBF could work wherever it chose to work. She added that "yes, they [BMGF] might guide you here and there, but

they give you that flexibility to do what you feel is right for you as ACBF” (ACBF representative, February, 2020). Explaining the flexibility and lack of bureaucracy in the BMGF, the ACBF representative revealed that “...all it took to get a million-dollar grant application is a single email, whereas with other donors you have to write numerous formal letters, with lots of hierarchies” (ACBF representative, February, 2020).

The representative of the ACBF reported that the BMGF had a hands-off approach with regards to the ACBF tobacco control projects. The foundation has a senior programme officer who is based in Seattle and meets with the ACBF once a month. The programme officer is a decision maker in her own right, which means that requests by the ACBF are responded to timeously.

Apart from supporting tobacco control activities in Africa through partnership with the ACBF, the BMGF funds the *Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids* to support projects that develop and deliver “high impact, evidence-based tobacco control interventions in Africa” (tobaccofreekids, 2020). These projects are spread throughout the continent from Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, DRC, Ethiopia, Kenya, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Togo and Uganda.

The BMGF’s Agricultural Development Programme is also working in some countries on the African continent. The programme, whose overall goal is to support inclusive agricultural transformation in sub-Saharan Africa and Asia, has four strategic goals: to increase agricultural productivity for small holder farmers; to increase small holder farmer household income; to increase equitable consumption of a safe, affordable, nutritious diet throughout the year and increase women’s empowerment in agriculture. The BMGF sees agricultural transformation as being anchored in government investment

into the rural sector. In the foundation's view, this can increase agricultural production as well as enable small holder farmers to transition from being simply subsistence farmers to commercial farmers, who produce surplus crops for the market and are increasingly supported by the private sector. This has shown to, as the BMGF argues, in turn, increase income and encourage growth in other non-farm rural sectors, such as retail and transportation (BMGF, 2020). However, this argument is contested by a growing body of literature and analyses. For example, Timothy A. Wise's assessment of that Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) – an international non-profit launched by the BMGF and the Rockefeller Foundation in 2006 with promises to double yields and incomes for 30 million farmers and curb food insecurity – has shown that the project has not resulted in any significant improvement in the focus countries or in food security (Wise, 2020, p. 1). Other studies have also shown that AGRA initiatives are designed to connect African food production and consumption to the international food chain which is controlled by a few multinational corporations (Thompson, 2012, p. 345). Thompson also argues that AGRA projects facilitate the accessing of the continent's genetic wealth without the sharing of benefits and an acknowledgement of those who developed it (Thompson, 2012, p. 345).

In Africa, the BMGF is running major agricultural projects in three of its priority countries: Ethiopia, Nigeria and Tanzania. The Agricultural Development programme has been involved in Ethiopia since 2006, and in 2010, partnered with the government to set up the Agricultural Transformation Agency. The agency provides government ministries with evidence-based solutions to increase production and profitability across the country. The programme is also working to increase private sector participation and to include

more women in the agricultural sector (BMGF, 2020). The inclusion of women, which is a cornerstone of the agricultural strategy and the foundation as a whole, is meant to facilitate their empowerment and also to ensure the nutrition needed for children to lead healthy and productive lives (BMGF, 2020). However, it is apparent that the efforts by the foundation do not address the structural changes needed to uplift women in all facets of life. While the BMGF's initiatives are important and no doubt appreciated by the women, they are not transformative in terms of gender equality in that there is no holistic concern for women's development, except as economic agents. Furthermore, it is important to point out that there is a lot of debate on what women's 'empowerment' really means (Chant and Sweetman, 2012; Chant, 2016). This issue will be discussed in greater detail in chapter five. In its nutrition programmes the BMGF also works with organizations such as Global Nutrition Report, Action Against Hunger and Save the Children to generate better nutrition-related evidence, policies and advocacy efforts (BMGF, 2020).

In Nigeria, the BMGF has been working within the agricultural sector since 2007 to improve value-chain development, soil treatment and the fortification of food crops like sweet potatoes and beans. The foundation is working with the Nigerian government, especially the Ministries of Agriculture and Health, to improve food supply systems by enhancing collaboration between agriculture and nutrition sectors and improving production and delivery of nutritious foods, using market-oriented approaches to ensuring the safety and affordability of nutritious foods. As in the other countries, the aim is also to empower women (BMGF, 2020).

In Tanzania, since 2007, the BMGF has been involved in the strengthening of the cassava value-chain, policy environment and market development for staple food crops. A key objective of the foundation's work in this country is to facilitate the integration of women into the economy to slow population growth and also improve nutritional outcomes. A new sweet potato variety which is enriched with Vitamin A is now widely available in Tanzania and other countries in the region, as a result of the BMGF's interventions (BMGF, 2020). The foundation is also involved in supporting reform of the seed system and investment in livestock. The Nutritious Food Systems Initiative focuses on Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Nigeria and Tanzania. This programme provides technical assistance to agricultural programmes to integrate special nutrition interventions and achieve better nutrition results (BMGF, 2020).

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the first case study of this dissertation, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The chapter began by analyzing the origins of the foundation before examining the foundation's work in South Africa and various countries throughout sub-Saharan Africa and with regional and multilateral organizations. This analysis, which was based on existing literature and interview data, paid close attention to my research concern which was to learn more about how celebrity philanthropic activities are conducted on the ground and how they are viewed by their recipients. As noted above, many of the recipients are happy with the assistance they receive from the foundation. However, my analysis reveals that the BMGF's approach does not lead to significant long-term development and poverty reduction. Rather, it is flawed in that the technical

aspects of health, for example, tend to be isolated from the wider socio-political and economic issues. Consequently, not enough attention is paid to the more complex matters of health delivery or the larger structures of inequality and patriarchy (Kapoor, 2012, p. 56).

Even though the BMGF advocates government involvement in some of its projects, such as rural agriculture, ultimately the foundation's interaction with government and its refusal to fund some projects specifically requested by the government shows that the neoliberal project is alive and well. The foundation's activities can be viewed as a manifestation of inclusive neoliberalism. The 'partnership' between the foundation and its recipients, is clearly an unequal one from the interviews and literature reviewed in this chapter. The response of the BMGF to the COVID-19 pandemic in Africa, with the foundation's initial resistance to proposals on the relaxation of patents which would have helped the continent in the production of vaccines was reflective of its (the foundation's) philanthrocapitalist nature. Even though the BMGF eventually conceded to the temporary waiver of the intellectual property rights, its reputation as a profit-maximizing organization had been confirmed.

The BMGF's activities of fighting extreme poverty, lobbying governments for better policies, leading the fight against HIV/AIDS, TB and other preventable diseases with the ultimate aim of improving the lives of the poor, are similar to those of the ONE Campaign, the other case study of this dissertation. In its mission statement, the BMGF claims to "partner with governments, the public and private sectors... to change public policies, attitudes and behaviours to improve lives" (BMGF, 2019). Similarly, ONE states that it aims to "educate and lobby governments to shape policy solutions that save

and improve lives” (ONE, 2018). The background and work of ONE is discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.

Chapter 4: The ONE Campaign

4.1 Introduction

The preceding chapter was an analysis of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation - the first case examined in this dissertation. This chapter analyses the second case – the ONE Campaign (ONE), co-founded by rock star and humanitarian, Paul ‘Bono’ Hewson. Although very different in their backgrounds, in some areas of policy orientation, and ‘as celebrities’, Bono and Bill Gates have taken on a closely entangled set of activities (Cooper, 2008, p. 80). As Cooper (2008) aptly characterizes the relationship between the work of ONE and the BMGF: “the buzz generated by Bono has been wedded to the bite that enormous wealth allows” (p. 80). Furthermore, Melinda French Gates has referred to the “joint cause” between the BMGF and Bono (Tyangiel, 2005, cited in Cooper, 2008, p. 80). This chapter examines the ONE Campaign, analyzing its background and origins, *modus operandi*, its work in South Africa and on the African continent in general, as well as in other countries, such as in the United States (US) and the United Kingdom (UK), where the organization has carried out campaigns on issues affecting Africa. The chapter also addresses the connection between ONE and the BMGF. The main rationale for including both of them in this dissertation is to show the power of celebrity that is brought by their leaders. Bill Gates, Melinda French Gates and Bono were named *TIME Magazine*’s 2005 Persons of the Year for their philanthropic work, as already noted. Though Bono and Bill Gates differ in their style; Bono is more cool and less ‘geeky’ and technocratic and while he is a more public celebrity given his rock star status, he and Gates share the trait of “media savviness” (Cooper, 2008, n.p.). Bono, as James Traub described him in *The New York Times Magazine* in 2005, is considered a “one-man state who fills his treasury with the global currency of fame” (cited in Cooper, 2008, p. 37).

Bono's influence on the global stage can hardly be overstated. Headlines like "Can Bono Save the World?" (*TIME*, 2002, March, 4) have become common in the past 30 years. His activism began in 1984 when he was part of *Band Aid's* charity recording of the song "Do They Know It's Christmas?" followed by his performance at the *Live Aid* concert in 1985. That year, Bono spent several weeks in Ethiopia with his wife Ali, assisting in an education and relief project (Playingforchange, 2021). He was also involved in the *Jubilee 2000 Campaign* for Third World debt cancellation during which he spoke before the United Nations, the US Congress and met with key statesmen such as Pope John Paul II and Bill Clinton (Cooper, 2008, p. 36; Playingforchange, 2021). Bono has had three Nobel Prize nominations and an honorary knighthood for his humanitarian work (Andersson and Calvano, 2015, p. 128). He has perceived credibility, power and status as the 'original celebrity' in the pantheon of stars involved in international development (Goodman, 2008, p. 109). Bono has also been described as "the archetypal celebrity diplomat who bridges the gap between Hollywood and corporate categories" (Cooper, 2008, p. 3). Therefore, this dissertation seeks to analyze the work of the anti-poverty advocacy organization he co-founded, in order to examine the phenomena of celebrity humanitarianism and celebrity philanthropy and their contribution to development and the improvement of life for the population in South Africa, and in sub-Saharan Africa, in general. I will focus on this analysis in chapter five.

As with the other case study, the BMGF, discussed in the previous chapter, the material on ONE and its work used in this chapter comes from various sources, semi-structured interviews, the organization's website and the websites of ONE's partner organizations, scholarly literature and media publications.

The chapter proceeds as follows; the first section discusses the origins of ONE, showing the link between this organization and the other case study, the BMGF. The section also discusses how ONE operates. The next section focuses on ONE's activities in Africa as a whole, followed by a section on the organization's work in South Africa, specifically. ONE has carried out more campaigns in other parts of the continent than in South Africa. The next section examines the work of the organization in other parts of the world where it conducts campaigns which are designed to address issues in Africa. For example, some of ONE's advocacy work is carried out in Western capitals, such as in Washington and London, with ONE members lobbying governments and political leaders in those countries for various legislation that is deemed to be beneficial to Africa. Moreover, ONE often uses meetings of leaders of developed countries to campaign for various issues related to Africa, such as debt relief. The final section of the chapter examines the organization's work vis-à-vis international multilateral organizations like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), again to campaign on behalf of low-income African countries. The examination of ONE, and indeed, of the other case, the BMGF, is premised on the fact that the two organizations are situated within the poverty alleviation and development work of South Africa and sub-Saharan Africa as a whole, and is meant to show what these organizations are doing on the ground. This chapter seeks to determine whether ONE's involvement in South Africa and the continent has resulted in the improvement of life and development, which are the stated goals of the organization.

4.2 Background of the ONE Campaign

The ONE campaign is a global non-profit advocacy and campaigning organization that is fighting to end extreme poverty and preventable diseases by 2030, particularly in Africa (ONE, 2020). This is the key difference between it and the BMGF which is a grant-making organization and indeed, between this advocacy organization and other international development organizations. The ONE Campaign originated in discussions between Bono and Bill Gates in 2002 about the need to improve the awareness of the American population about extreme poverty around the globe. Bono and Gates first met in 2002 at the World Economic Forum⁷ meeting which was held in New York City that year in an act of post 9/11 solidarity. That year, Gates agreed to donate \$1 million to assist in the launch of an anti-poverty advocacy organization called Debt, AIDS, Trade, Africa (DATA) (Bishop & Green, 2008, pp. 194-195), which Bono created together with Melinda Gates, Bobby Shriver, George Soros, Ed Scott, Bob Geldof and Jamie Drummond. DATA focused on deploying celebrities and other influential individuals to lobby world leaders to take action on specific development issues (BMGF, 2020). As Bishop and Green (2008) state, “the investment (\$1 million from Bill Gates) marked the coming of age of the celebrity philanthropist- christened by *TIME* magazine as the ‘celanthropist’” (p. 195).

⁷ It is noteworthy that the World Economic Forum (WEF) is an increasingly important and well-connected transnational actor in the global political economy. The transnational politics that the WEF engages in are not formally legitimized by states, but they are undergirded by unorthodox sources of power and authority (Friesen, 2020, pp. viii-2). It has become a launching ground for numerous activities to address challenging problems in the world – “improving the state of the world” and works alongside NGOs and other civil society organizations in this endeavour (Friesen, 2020, p. 2). This is where celebrity humanitarians like Bono and the Gateses have come in to also contribute to these efforts. However, it is also a site to discuss the unintended adverse consequences of capitalism in a way that preserves the system as participants have the opportunity to debate the fundamental principles without being dismissed as unknowledgeable (Friesen, 2020, p. 4).

It is important to note that Bono and Geldof's working class/lower middle class and postcolonial Irish background strengthened their claims for the representation of Africans in contrast to Gates's upper middle-class origins. As argued by Zine Magubane (2008), "...Bono and Oprah's public rhetoric often ties their own personal history and experience to the history and experience of the people they want to help. Oprah invokes her race and gender and Bono the history of Irish colonial dispossession" (p. 102.1).

In 2004, Bono, politician and activist Bobby Shriver and former international development worker Jamie Drummond merged DATA with several other organizations to form the ONE Campaign. The formation of ONE benefited from significant financial backing from the BMGF (BMGF, 2020). According to ONE's website, the organization's name was inspired "by the belief that one voice, coming together with many others – the political left and right, business leaders, activists, faith leaders and students – can change the world for the better. The name was also influenced by ONE's first US campaign in 2004, which called on the US government to allocate an additional one per cent of its budget towards the fight against extreme poverty" (ONE, 2020).

The ONE Campaign is not a grant-making organization and does not solicit funding from the public or receive government funds. On the contrary, ONE's budget is funded almost entirely by foundations, individual philanthropists and corporate partners (ONE, 2020). In fact, in Africa, the BMGF is one of the organization's biggest funders (conversation with former ONE official #1, January, 2020). In 2020, BMGF grants awarded to ONE amounted to a total of US\$135 million. Other foundations which fund ONE include the Rockefeller Foundation, Bloomberg Philanthropies, Dangote Foundation, Open Society Foundation and Caterpillar Foundation. Corporate entities

which fund ONE include Coca-Cola, Johnson and Johnson and Bank of America, while individual donors include the co-founders of the organization, Jamie Drummond and Bono and the CEO, Gayle Smith (ONE, 2020). The funders who are listed on ONE's website have donated a minimum of \$5000 (ONE, 2020). It is worthy of note that some observers suggest that Bono is not a generous donor of his own money to his causes. Those observers argue that he is good at mobilizing and disbursing the resources of his more wealthy backers, such as Bill Gates and George Soros, through activities organized by ONE (Cooper, 2008, p. 120). However, Bishop and Green (2008) quote Bono as saying that he keeps the details of his philanthropic giving private for religious reasons (Bishop & Green, 2008, p. 47). Indeed, a former official of ONE attested to Bono's religiosity in a conversation saying "Bono is a down-to-earth family man and a devout Christian whose entourage on his trips always includes a chaplain" (former ONE official #1, January, 2020). However, Bono praises Warren Buffett and Bill Gates for giving publicly noting, "there are moments which may come in future where it is a political act to put your money on the table. The extraordinary thing that Bill and Warren have done. They have changed the rules of the game" (Bishop & Green, 2008, p. 47). By saying that Gates and Buffet have "changed the rules of the game", Bono means that by publicising their donations, these two individuals have spurred others into giving as well. Also noteworthy is the caveat on the Financials page of ONE's website that "some of our donors have asked for confidentiality and we respect this request" (ONE, 2020, n.p.). In light of the information above regarding why Bono keeps his donations under wraps, it can be assumed that Bono would be one of those donors who requested for confidentiality. However, in the 2015 ONE Annual Report, which lists donors who

contributed US\$25 000 or more, Bono's name is included (ONE Annual Report 2015, p. 45).

The ONE Campaign is also funded by Merck, one of the biggest pharmaceutical companies in the world and part of Big Pharma, a nickname for the global pharmaceutical industry. Big Pharma is one of the most hated industries in the US, behind the tobacco industry, the oil and gas and chemical industries, and has a reputation of fraud, bribery and scandal (Compton, 2021, September 13 n.p.). It is telling that Big Pharma uses lobbyists to spread its influence in the US government. (Compton, 2021, September 13). In 2004, Merck announced a recall of its pain relief medicine, Vioxx, four years after evidence of the drug's health risks had been revealed. In 2011, the company pleaded guilty to criminal charges related to the marketing and sales of Vioxx and agreed to pay US\$950 million to resolve its misconduct (Compton, 2021, September 13). This clearly reveals Merck's checkered reputation, a fact which ONE does not seem to mind in accepting donations from it.

As an advocacy organization, unlike the BMGF, ONE does not engage in any philanthropic work like raising money for specific projects, such as schools or hospitals. Rather, ONE advocates for government programmes which it believes will improve the lives of people living in poverty (ONE, 2020), an approach which is akin to the post-Washington Consensus concept of country-ownership and participation under the poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs). As previously discussed, this can be viewed as "inclusive neoliberalism" insofar as it seeks to co-opt its critics through the claim that developing countries now "own" their poverty reduction strategies and therefore are responsible for conducting the development projects (Ruckert, 2006, p. 62). As Ruckert

(2006) puts it, inclusive neoliberalism “... therefore fits nicely within the wider neoliberal project, which is based on accumulation by dispossession (Harvey, 2003)...” (p. 63). The ONE Campaign states on its website that it believes that governments are the biggest source of funding for many anti-poverty and global health programmes, but those programmes are always at risk as government budgets tighten or priorities change. In such cases, ONE members assist with increasing awareness of the impact of these programmes, and when they are at risk of being abolished, they lobby for their continued funding. These include programmes like the United States President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) and the Global Fund. These programmes fund on-the-ground projects (ONE, 2020). It would seem that ONE is seeking to make the state more accountable. Moreover, ONE strives to ensure that governments deliver anti-poverty programmes to their populations. However, its other programmes, especially those which are geared towards ‘empowerment’, seem to put the responsibility of pulling communities out of poverty on individuals, especially women. This is an issue which will be analyzed more thoroughly in chapter five.

The ONE Campaign boldly announces on its website that “we believe that the fight against poverty isn’t about charity, but about justice and equality” (ONE, 2020, n.p.). ONE also states that it “aims to lobby governments to shape policy solutions that save and improve lives” (ONE, 2018, n.p.). Furthermore, the website also notes that ONE is a “global movement campaigning to end extreme poverty by 2030 so that everyone, everywhere can live a life of dignity and opportunity” (ONE, 2020, n.p.). In addition, a Board member of ONE, Mimi Alemayehou, Managing Director of Black Rhino Group,

an investment platform focused on the development and acquisition of energy and infrastructure assets across Africa, explained what the organization represents:

People, not programs or budgets or statistics, are the essence of what ONE stands for. The key to ending poverty is realizing that development isn't about charity or top-down interventions. It's about empowering people and ensuring they have access to the tools to build their own better future. This belief is at the heart of everything that ONE does, which is what makes it such a compelling organisation. (ONE, 2019, n.p.)

According to the information on the BMGF website, because of the personal friendship between Bill Gates and Bono, cooperation between ONE and the BMGF is extraordinarily close. Bono's views on poverty and development are shared by Gates. As the senior programme officer at the foundation who manages ONE grants, Carol Welch, put it, "ONE is a cross-cutting advocacy partner, in terms of both geographies and issues. We have a high level of strategic overlap and coordination" (BMGF, 2020, n.p.). That cooperation involves the sharing of information, aligning messages, collaboration of events and regular communication between ONE and the BMGF's Global Policy and Advocacy division (BMGF, 2020). Welch applauds ONE for having done "a very good job of converting anonymous action - such as people clicking to sign a petition - into people becoming activists" (BMGF, 2020). She added, "that sort of boldness and new approach is cutting edge for our field" (BMGF, 2020, n.p.). Welch suggests that the partnership between the BMGF and ONE will continue to grow stronger in the future. "Going forward it's about a continual deepening of the relationship, and getting smarter together about how we do advocacy and help sell our issues to the general public"

(BMGF, 2020, n.p.). Furthermore, the long-time CEO of the BMGF, Patty Stonesifer, described Bono as one of the foundation's most important partners because of the realization that the foundation could not rely on technological solutions alone, but needed to influence public opinion and thereby shape the right policy context. Stonesifer noted that she did not initially realize how much advocacy her organization would have to engage in (Bishop & Green, 2008, p. 204). For his part, Bono recalled that it was difficult to convince Bill Gates of the need for advocacy:⁸

Bill wasn't really about advocacy. We had to tell the most successful businessman on earth that there was more value in getting governments to prioritize these interventions than doing it himself. It can be very hard to convince someone with such deep pockets that he can't do everything himself. (Bishop & Green, 2008, p. 204)

Bono's close relationship with Gates was also on show at a TED Talk delivered by Bono in 2013, where Gates tweeted, "I'm in!" – referring to Bono's use of facts, data and technology in the fight against poverty – a concept he coined "factivism" (Bono, 2013, March 14). The two men also held a joint interview at the Forbes 400 Summit on Philanthropy in June 2013. At that meeting, Bono stressed the importance of the BMGF in sharing ideas on combatting extreme poverty saying, "I couldn't do anything that I do without the Gates Foundation. We couldn't move, neither ONE nor (RED)" (Mitchell, 2017, p. 121). Founded by Bono in 2006 to engage businesses and people to fight HIV/AIDS, Product (RED) is ONE's sister organization. The organization partners with

⁸ It is important to note that Bill Gates eventually got an appreciation of the importance of advocacy and the BMGF has a Global Policy and Advocacy division which oversees government affairs, economic policy, advocacy and philanthropic partnerships to further the foundation's goals around the world (BMGF, 2021).

iconic brands to generate finances for the Global Fund through red-branded goods (ONE, 2020).

The ONE Campaign not only benefits from the BMGF in terms of funding, as already noted, but also from the foundation's wide network of global partners, as well as from the foundation's expertise in the areas of monitoring, evaluation and effective use of data. The then chief operations officer (COO) of ONE, Luis Guardia noted that, "our internal business processes have evolved to become more data-informed and analytical. Our business environment is constantly changing. With better systems for internal monitoring and evaluation, we are reaching a new level of maturity" (BMGF, 2020). Gates's influence on Bono in this regard was apparent in Bono's response to having been designated a new numbers enthusiast by the media;

That's just me pretending to be Bill. I'm Irish, we do emotion very well. You're just experiencing some of it, and it can go on and on and on. I've learned just to be an evidence-based activist. Cut through the crap. Find out what works. Find out what doesn't work. (Lane, 2013, in Mitchell, 2017, p. 121)

However, one interview respondent, a former official of the CHAI, pointed out what she saw as the difference between ONE and the BMGF. Noting that Bono's name recognition bought him a lot of clout, she further explained that,

but if I had to compare between the two [BMGF and ONE], I would say that the Gates Foundation has been a lot more successful in translating that name recognition into something very powerful. I think it's because what Gates has done over time which I think maybe ONE.org has not done so well is Gates has really expanded the scope of what they were doing. Whereas ONE for me is still

very much a single issue focus. Not that I am saying there is anything wrong with that, you can't be all things to all people. And I know that ONE's focus is poverty. I am not dismissing it, or saying it's better or worse, but I am just saying in terms of impact, I think Gates has been more successful because it hasn't been so single issue. (Former CHAI representative, February, 2020)

In terms of leadership, all three co-founders of ONE – Bono, Shriver and Drummond – are on the organization's Board of Directors. Also included on the Board are individuals with experience in advocacy and activism, policy, politics and business. These include: former UK Prime Minister, David Cameron; Former US Secretary of the Treasury, Lawrence Summers; former US Senator, Kelly Ayotte; Aliko Dangote, CEO of the Dangote Group and Chairman of the Dangote Foundation; Mo Ibrahim, Chairman of the Mo Ibrahim Foundation; Cheryl Sandberg, COO of Facebook; Susan Buffett, Chairperson of the Sherwood Foundation and the Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation, and the CEO of the African Leadership Institute, Jackie Chimhanzi, to name a few (ONE, 2021). It is important to note that some of these Board members are African, reflecting the diversity of the leadership of the organization. These include Aliko Dangote and Mo Ibrahim, among others. Dangote is a Nigerian global philanthropist and one of the richest Africans in the world, who founded the biggest private philanthropic foundation in Africa, with an endowment of \$1.25 billion. Ibrahim is a British-based Sudanese academic and business leader who in recent years has played a major advocacy role on issues of African development and governance (ONE, 2020). Chimhanzi is a South Africa-based Zimbabwean academic. In 2015, ONE's Board of Directors also included the Managing Director of the BMGF's Global Policy and Advocacy Programme, Joe

Cerrell, and the then President of the BMGF's Global Policy, Advocacy and Country Programmes, Mark Suzman, another African from South Africa (who is now the CEO of the foundation). This further illustrates the close ties between ONE and the BMGF.

Furthermore, the Board of ONE included the Board Chairperson of the global alliance for vaccines and immunization (GAVI), Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala and the CEO of McKinsey Social Initiative (ONE Annual Report, 2015, p. 45). Apart from ONE's closeness with the BMGF, the foundation also has strong links to GAVI and McKinsey. The BMGF is a founding partner of GAVI, "an international organization which brings together public and private sectors with the shared goal of saving lives and protecting people's health by increasing equitable and sustainable use of vaccines" (GAVI, 2021), and one of its largest funders with contributions amounting to \$4.1 billion in December 2020 (GAVI, 2020).

The BMGF is also connected to McKinsey as revealed by a former official of the CHAI in an interview. That interview respondent complained that the BMGF's outsourcing of work to American consulting companies such as McKinsey and the Boston Consulting Group tended to distort the information that eventually got back to the foundation. Bob Geldof, who has become a recognized 'expert' in humanitarian and philanthropic issues, is one of the advocacy movement's members and advisor. As part of his process of self-education on these issues, Geldof realized the need to network at the elite level, targeting people like the then British Prime Minister, Tony Blair, with whom he discussed Africa's development challenges. Geldof also made trips to the continent, taking a crew of BBC journalists. During one such trip, he shot the documentary "With Geldof in Africa" (Cooper, 2008, p. 57). However, trips such as these ended up focusing on Geldof himself, rather than the issues on the ground that he had purportedly set out to highlight.

It is important to note that of the three founders of ONE, Bono, the celebrity, is the most visible. He features in the organization's promotional videos and also uses his celebrity status on the music stage for his anti-poverty activism. As David P. Marshall puts it, "...the celebrity is a voice above others, a voice that is channelled into the media systems as being legitimately significant" (Marshall, 2014, p. xlviii). This description fits Bono perfectly. Moreover, as Daley (2013) aptly observes, "the aura of celebrity ensures that Bono can be called to address the UN Security Council, the US Senate and meet the business at the World Economic Forum" (p. 384). Therefore, for Bono, celebrity is a form of "currency" that not only gives him publicity wherever he goes, but also access to some of the world's most powerful leaders (Goodman, 2008, p. 106). For example President George W. Bush stated in an interview with *Fox News* that he and Bono "became pals because we shared a common desire to help others on the continent of Africa" (Andersson and Calvano, 2015, p. 128). Bono understands that international meetings create a perfect site for his brand of public advocacy. Therefore, he regularly attends World Economic Forum meetings and G8 summits, where he interacts with prominent members of the corporate and political elite (Carnegy, 2002 cited in Andersson and Calvano, 2015, p. 128). Bono also plays a crucial role in mobilizing many celebrities in ONE. As Huliaras and Tzifakis (2010) contend, "celebrities mobilize celebrities", noting that this was true of Bono (p. 261). Hollywood stars like Brad Pitt, George Clooney and Tom Hanks, among others, often participate in campaigns mounted by ONE (Huliaras and Tzifakis, 2010, p. 261).

The ONE Campaign uses numerous methods to reach out to the general public and publicise its messages and encourage advocacy actions. The organization frames its

messages in ways that attract the general public as well as specific targets, like national governments or the leaders of the G20 who are expected to take action to address issues of concern. As already mentioned, ONE does not solicit for donations, stating on its website that, “we are not asking for your money, we are asking for your voice” (ONE, 2020). Members of ONE use their voices and their political clout to urge their government representatives to support effective programmes that encourage development and make a tangible difference in the fight against extreme poverty and disease.

Members of ONE, who work on a voluntary basis, come from the general public as the organization presents itself as the voice of the wider population. They include celebrities, artists, activists, religious and business leaders, students and scientists. They make use of technology and social media to educate the public about global health and development issues and to change perceptions about aid and its impact (ONE, 2020), and also to recruit new members. Bono, who himself mixes his work as a rock star with his activism (often using the concert stages to rally support for his activist endeavours), has described ONE’s members as “an invisible army who will make the new world better than the old one” (ONE Annual Report 2015, p. 20). ONE Youth Ambassadors are selected each year from the UK, Ireland, Belgium, France, Germany and Italy to enhance the organization’s mobilization at grassroots level and advocacy goals throughout Europe (ONE, 2020). In Africa, ONE Champions work to advance ONE’s goals through lobby meetings, campaigning and raising awareness about issues the organization is engaged with (ONE 2015 Annual Report, p. 3). In Canada and the US, ONE field organizers are responsible for coordinating campaign efforts and lobbying parliamentarians and members of Congress, respectively, and also convene community awareness events. In

the US, ONE Campus chapters raise awareness of extreme poverty among students and encourage them to take part in ONE's advocacy campaigns, such as lobbying for investments and better American international development policies. The question arises, however, as to what exactly 'better' means. Better for whom? These campaigns attribute the problems faced by Africans to the inefficiency and corruption of African political leadership without acknowledging the role of the neoliberal policies imposed by the international financial institutions in the heyday of structural adjustment programmes which resulted in increased impoverishment of people. These issues will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.

In 2008, the ONE Campaign was considered to be the second biggest pressure group after the National Rifle Association (NRA) in the US, with 2.5 million members in its database (Bishop & Green, 2008, p. 206). In 2015, ONE's global membership stood at more than 7 million people (ONE 2015 Annual Report, p. 3).

4.3 Why ONE Campaign? ONE's Work in Africa

The ONE Campaign was selected as a case study because it was co-founded and is largely led by one of the most influential celebrity humanitarians of our time, especially in the areas of development and anti-poverty matters. Bono's use of his celebrity as a galvanizing tool has contributed to his success in maximizing publicity for the ONE Campaign and other causes he cares about (Cooper, 2008, p. 49). The linkage between some of the work of ONE and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the other case study in this dissertation, also made ONE an appropriate choice. Both organizations seek to fight against extreme poverty and preventable disease. They also seek to lobby governments to come up with better policies. The BMGF claims to "partner with

governments, the public and private sectors...to change public policies, attitudes, and behaviours to improve lives” (BMGF, 2019, n.p.). Similarly, ONE aims to “educate and lobby governments to shape policy solutions that save and improve millions of lives” (ONE, 2018, n.p.). The fact that the two organizations are led by iconic celebrities is important in the context of this dissertation as I seek to do an empirical investigation of what they are doing on-the-ground, especially in light of these stated objectives.

In 2015, ONE’s African membership stood at 2.8 million people, most of whom were in Nigeria. In fact, Nigeria was the second largest country in terms of membership, only behind the US. Moreover, at that time, ONE had more members in Africa than in the whole of Europe (ONE 2015 Annual Report, p. 9; p. 3). The extent of ONE’s following on the continent of Africa for which it seeks to advocate, also contributed to the choice of the organization as a case study. The fact that ONE is a membership organization differentiates it from the BMGF and also means that its members assume some power in advocating for the causes they care for.

As with the BMGF, ONE’s regional headquarters located in Johannesburg oversees other smaller national offices in Abuja, Nigeria and Dakar, Senegal (ONE, 2020). The African regional head offices were established in 2010 and headed by the Africa Executive Director, Siphso Moyo, an American-trained Zimbabwean economist, who had previously worked for the African Development Bank, the United Nations and the World Bank. Moyo is a member of the Global Agenda Council (Africa) of the World Economic Forum (Global Ambassadors, 2020). It could be argued that Bono’s closeness to the World Economic Forum influenced the choice of Moyo as Executive Director for Africa. Moyo is quoted in *Vanguard* newspaper of Nigeria as saying,

In 2010, when I set up ONE in Africa, its Africa membership stood at about 75,000. By 2015, we had succeeded in smashing the odometer by growing that number to 3.5 million members, larger than the global membership in Europe and America.... (Adesulu, 2018, March 16, n.p.)

It is important to note the discrepancy between the membership figures in ONE's 2015 Annual Report and those given by Moyo. Once again, as with the figures for the global membership, it would appear that the correct figure is unknown. This suggests that the organization might not have as many members as it claims to have. Equally important to note is the fact that since the establishment of the ONE African headquarters, Bono has only visited once in 2019, accompanied by ONE CEO, Gail Smith and ONE Board Chairperson, Tom Freston, to meet with former ONE staff to discuss past work practices and their employment conditions between 2011 and 2015 (conversation with former ONE official #1; ONE, 2019). This followed revelations by former ONE staff to the media about the unprofessional work conditions they had been subjected to in the period 2011 to 2015.

In November 2017, allegations of workplace bullying at the ONE Africa regional offices in Johannesburg surfaced, including from one staffer who alleged that she had been demoted for having refused to have sex with a Tanzanian member of parliament. Others also claimed to have been belittled by being called names and made to work on domestic tasks at a manager's home. The former ONE staff shared their grievances on social media, claiming that the organization's top management had failed to protect them. Bono apologized, admitting that the advocacy movement had failed to protect some of its employees. He accepted responsibility saying "I need to take some responsibility for that.

We are all deeply sorry. I hate bullying, can't stand it" (Press Association, 2018, March 10). Gayle Smith, the CEO of ONE also acknowledged that an investigation conducted by her organization had discovered evidence of "unprofessional conduct" as well as bullying and belittling of staff between 2011-2015. The investigation also found that the issue had not been adequately addressed or resolved by the executive management at that time. Smith believed that the ONE Board had also not been properly or fully apprised of the situation (Press Association, 2018, March 10).

For her part, Siphso Moyo, against whom the allegations of unprofessional conduct were leveled, accused ONE's top management of not being willing to engage in open discussions, especially on matters affecting the organization's staff in Africa. In a criticism obviously aimed at Bono, she claimed that, "they pander to the global ethos and ideals of ONE's more famous co-founder but mostly white managers have essentially hijacked the essence of the organization and replaced it with their myopic agenda" (Adesulu, 2018, March 16). Moyo and other former employees accused the top management of the organization of harassment, intimidation and corporate servitude which includes disregard of their complaints by the global leadership team (Adesulu, 2018, March 16). In a general criticism against ONE, Moyo said, "they must apologize to Africans for their patronizing attitude and organizational disregard for Africa's peculiar development priorities whilst covertly promoting an unhealthy neocolonial, quasi-imperialist agenda" (Adesulu, 2018, March 16, n.p.).

Notably, this concern is also raised by Dambisa Moyo, the author of *Dead Aid: Why Aid is not Working and How There is a Better Way for Africa*, not only in relation to ONE but also to the BMGF. She claimed that Bono and the ONE Campaign had

criticized the launch of her book on the advocacy movement's website (Chu, 2009, n.p.). In 2013, Bill Gates also spoke negatively against Moyo in a talk with *ABC TV*'s Q&A at the University of New South Wales, claiming that Moyo, a holder of a Ph.D in economics from Oxford University, did not know much about aid, and that her book promoted evil (Gates, 2013, May 29). Although I do not support Moyo's neoliberal solutions for poverty, I argue both ONE and Bill Gates's dismissive attitude of her views reflects their lack of respect for her experience as someone who was born on the continent they are trying to assist.

In terms of funding of the African chapter of ONE, according to Siphon Moyo, "...together the American and European offices wielded over 95 per cent of the ONE annual budget, while the Africa office made do on shoestring resources..." (Adesulu, 2018, n.p.). These figures may not be accurate, especially because of the context in which they were given – the news article was a refutation of allegations of misconduct levelled against Moyo by former employees of ONE. However, the figures give an idea of the allocation of the organization's budget, showing that European and American offices received the lion's share. Africa's diminished stature within ONE is also illustrated by the fact that Bono had never visited the regional headquarters since its establishment until there was a crisis. This issue will be discussed in greater detail in chapter five.

As already noted, ONE does not engage in any philanthropic work like raising money for specific projects. Rather, the organization's members assist with increasing awareness of the impact of global health and anti-poverty programmes, including programmes like PEPFAR and the Global Fund which fund specific projects on-the-

ground (ONE, 2020). Indeed, the representative of the South African MRC noted in an interview the important role Bono had played in the establishment of PEPFAR:

I did meet Bono when he first came out here when he was thinking about the HIV antiretroviral programme. He came and I was running a clinic in Soweto at the Chris Hani Baragwanath Hospital. We got a whole lot of HIV-infected women and their children and he sat around and talked to them. And these women told him that they needed treatment. They wanted to survive and I like to think that the voices of those women were heard and their wishes of a long life were channeled by him to the powers that be. (MRC representative, March, 2020)

Alex de Waal also contends that without the two celebrities, Bono and Geldof, it is unlikely that President George W. Bush would have set up PEPFAR, and in 2008, expanded its budget to \$85 billion for the next five years, making it the largest ever aid commitment for a single disease (de Waal, 2008, p. 49).

The only exception where ONE gives a grant is the ONE Africa Award. This is an annual grant which is given to an African civil society organization which demonstrates commitment and success in advocacy to promote the attainment of one or more of the sustainable development goals (SDGs). Sustainable development goals targets include halving extreme poverty, reducing the spread of HIV/AIDS and providing universal primary education. The US\$100 000 award, funded by the Howard G. Buffett Foundation, recognizes, rewards and aims to advance the work of organizations founded by Africans and based in Africa dedicated to advancing development goals in Africa. For example, in 2018, the ONE Africa award went to Dext Technology, a Ghanaian company for its innovation science set – a mini science lab that contains materials and components

to enable students to carry out basic experiments. Science in Ghana is usually taught in the abstract because of lack of funding (Rhodes, 2018, October 11).

As already noted, ONE's campaigns are diverse and they incorporate mass grassroots mobilization with targeted insider advocacy. In Africa, members are engaged mostly through mobile phones (ONE 2015 Annual Report, p. 9). According to ONE, in recent years, the organization and its partners have played a crucial role in encouraging governments to support programmes and policies that make a tangible difference in combatting extreme poverty and disease (ONE, 2020). By December 2020, these advocacy efforts had helped 10.7 million people living in sub-Saharan Africa to have access to life-saving HIV/AIDS medication, up from only 52 000 in 2002. Deaths due to malaria had been reduced by 66 per cent in sub-Saharan Africa since the year 2000, and 60 million more children were going to primary school compared to the year 2000 (ONE, 2020). With regards to aid, ONE contends that it strives to ensure that aid programmes support effective investments such as the Global Fund and the GAVI (ONE, 2020).

It would appear that ONE puts itself in a position to decide which particular investments are 'effective'. In this case, both the Global Fund and GAVI are organizations with which both ONE and the BMGF are closely connected. As already mentioned, the BMGF was involved in the setting up of the GAVI and Bono plays a major role in raising funds for the Global Fund through ONE's sister organization Product(REDF) (ONE, 2020; Jeffreys & Allatson, 2015, p. 24). The ONE Campaign describes the Global Fund as "one of the most effective global health partnerships on the planet" (ONE, 2021).

In a 2005 interview with *NBC News*, Bono responded to a question on whether aid and debt cancellation would do any good while the continent remained plagued by disease, civil war and corruption by saying,

This is the number one problem facing Africa, corruption; not natural calamity, not the AIDS virus...so no one is talking about aid in the old sense...you just route the aid away from the governments and through the NGOs on the ground.

(*NBC News* ' Meet The Press, 2005, June 26, n.p.)

The statement above illustrates how Bono and ONE view governments on the African continent and also the advocacy organization's approach to how aid should be disbursed in the region. This issue will be analyzed in greater detail in chapter five.

In Africa, ONE partners with governments and local leaders, entrepreneurs and activists to advocate for sustainable development and economic growth, and to demand greater transparency in the extraction of resources and in poverty-fighting programmes. The organization also says it supports efforts to call for greater democracy, transparency and accountability because it believes good governance and an active civil society are prerequisites for development (ONE, 2020).

The statement above can be interpreted as overt political activism from an organization that claims to be apolitical. In a 2013 Podcast, on 'factivism' a word Bono coined from 'fact' and 'activism' to describe "a type of contemporary humanitarianism blending evidence-based practices with passionate commitment and advocacy for a cause" (Mitchell. 2017, p. 110), he describes the corruption of some African governments as a disease. He claims, *inter alia*, that technology will expose government corruption. He also indicates that this approach will be victorious because it is inherently apolitical

(Mitchell, 2017, p. 119). Bono, and indeed, other celebrity activists, forge public relations with both conservative and liberal political parties. They believe that they are able to step back from politics, talk straight to business and to the leaders of the G8 countries and solve the world's problems through aid and consumption (Daley, 2016, p. 379).

The ONE 2017 DATA Report suggests that African countries are receiving a declining share of global resources. The report further indicates that the African continent, in which half of the world's extremely poor people reside, was being most affected by donor countries' renegeing on their overseas development aid (ODA) pledges, low levels of foreign direct investment (FDI) and decreasing domestic revenues. The CEO and President of ONE, Gayle Smith, is quoted in the report as saying that failing to capitalise on Africa's demographic dividend would have a global impact – affecting both wealthy and poor countries – with more instability and population movements. She called for increased investments from aid, private resources and domestic resources to fund the education, employment and welfare of Africa's increasing youth population which, according to leading economists is critical for raising the least developed countries out of poverty and building long term prosperity (ONE 2017 DATA Report, 2017).

From the above statement by the CEO of ONE, there is a suggestion that not doing enough to help low-income countries has a bearing on international security, as it will result in instability and population movements. This is language often used by Bono to nudge world leaders to act on certain issues, as already noted. This framing constructs Africa as an ever-present security risk – a terrorist hub. It is also apparent that Bono locates political will in the West, especially the UK and the US, and views Africa as a place that lacks the right kind of politics, hence the existence of extremists there.

The ONE campaign has been involved in various agricultural initiatives to reduce hunger on the continent and to improve economic development. These include the *Grow Africa* programme which was launched in 2011, and which seeks to increase private sector investment in agriculture, and accelerate the implementation and impact of investment commitments (interview with the NEPAD representative, March, 2020). This is an issue that I will return to and analyze in detail in chapter five. The objective of the programme is to enable countries to realize the potential of the agricultural sectors for economic growth and job creation, particularly among small-holder farmers, women and the youth (Grow Africa, 2020). In response to a question on whether he done any work with ONE in an interview, the representative of NEPAD noted that,

Not me in particular, but we have a programme called *Grow Africa* which was basically initiated by Bono but that is now domesticated within the NEPAD agency and the AU agencies. It's funded fully by the agency but otherwise it came in through the ONE Campaign. (NEPAD representative, March, 2020)

In December 2011, ONE launched the *Hungry No More* campaign in Africa. The campaign was prompted by the famine in the Horn of Africa which ONE attributed to the lack of political will on the part of African leaders. The campaign, therefore focused on challenging them to demonstrate their commitment to addressing famine and other agricultural-related issues on the continent (ONE, 2020). Advocating for support for the campaign, Moyo, the then Africa Executive Director observed that:

Farming is vital to African economies, where 70 % of the population derives its livelihood from the soil. At the same time, agriculture development is crucial to poverty reduction, where food security is tied to the Millennium Development

Goals (MDGs) and especially MDG-1, which is to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger. This campaign intends to elevate this issue on the global political and public agendas because there is a powerful connection between the Horn of Africa crisis and agriculture, and it is a shame that we still debate famine in the 21st century. We also need to help ensure African governments keep the promises they have made so that we can break the cycle of famine on the continent. While the food crisis in the Horn of Africa tragically illustrates the impacts of drought and conflict, it also brings to the fore the effects of neglecting agriculture and local food systems. (Moyo, 2011, December 19)

The campaign urged African leaders to fulfill the Maputo Declaration on Agriculture which called on all governments to allocate 10 per cent of their national budgets to agriculture and rural development; target investments in small-holder farmers, especially women, and encourage long term private funding for the agricultural sector and for African leaders to be transparent and accountable about measures they are taking to achieve the Maputo Declaration (Moyo, 2011, December, 19).

In another African agriculture initiative, in January 2014 ONE launched the *Do Agric It Pays* campaign in Addis Ababa during the African Union Summit. The campaign called on African governments to keep their promises to invest in agriculture and support small scale farmers. Over two million Africans joined ONE during this campaign in sending a message to their political leaders by signing the *Do Agric* petition. Referring to the *Do Agric* campaign in a World Bank/ONE Report entitled *Levelling the Field: Improving Opportunities for Women Farmers in Africa*, the Africa Executive Director at that time, Siphon Moyo, noted that

Integral to the campaign is a desire to achieve real socio-economic transformation policies that will narrow the gender gap, seeking to ensure that the benefits of investments in agriculture are equitably shared and that women's increased productivity will reap rewards for the whole sector. (World Bank/ONE, 2014, p. 5)

The *Do Agric* campaign became the biggest mobilisation in ONE's history to that date (ONE, 2020). The campaign also included the Canadian non-profit organization, Farm Radio International (FRI), which focuses on using radio to help African farming communities improve their farming practices by sharing information (FRI, 2021) and the BMGF. In fact, the campaign is an example of the collaboration between ONE and the BMGF. As the representative of FRI clarified this collaboration in our interview,

BMGF introduced us to the people at ONE who said let's do a radio-generated survey on farmers to find out from farmers what their most pressing needs are. So we worked with them to design a series of radio programmes- I think 4 or 5. I forget how many stations were involved. I think 3 or 4 or 5 radio stations in which a certain issue is discussed on radio around agriculture and then farmers were asked to vote on what they thought was most important, what their views were on different issues and so we were able to gather views from about 6000 farmers on what their most pressing needs were, especially with regards to accessing markets for their produce. They [ONE] actually had a local partner in Tanzania that they worked with, but I don't remember the name of it. So we worked with them, we produced the results and then they organized a big event in Dar es Salaam with the President at which their findings would be presented with the farmers there,

broadcasters there, all saying that this is what the farmers say are their priorities.

(FRI representative, January, 2021)

At the AU Summit in June 2014 in Malabo, Equatorial Guinea, African leaders reaffirmed their plans to allocate 10 per cent of their national budgets for the improvement of the agricultural sectors in their countries (ONE, 2020). According to ONE, the campaign was a great victory for millions of small-scale farmers and those people who depend on these commitments (ONE, 2020).

Another agriculture-related project ONE has been involved in on the continent of Africa is the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA), which ONE joined in 2019 to mobilize multi-sectoral support for inclusive agriculture transformation (ONE, 2020). The AGRA is an African-based, African-led farmer-centred organization “working to put small-holder farmers at the centre of the continent’s growing economy by transforming their farming from a solitary struggle to survive, to a business that thrives” (ONE, 2019, July 16). The partnership between ONE and AGRA was designed to improve and drive in-country advocacy among various actors, from civil society, the private sector, farmers’ organizations and government to push forward the agricultural transformation agenda and fulfill commitments from Heads of States which are being tracked by a scorecard (ONE, 2019). At the signing of the partnership agreement in Accra, Ghana, ONE CEO and President, Gayle Smith, said: “We are delighted about our partnership with AGRA, together we will call on our leaders to invest in the agriculture sector to create millions of jobs, and food security for our communities by working with smallholder farmers, especially women and youth” (ONE, 2019, n.p.). The ONE-AGRA partnership also brings together ONE and the BMGF, as AGRA is one of the

foundation's biggest beneficiaries on the continent. The BMGF grants to AGRA in 2020 totalled \$380 million. In addition, two BMGF employees sit on AGRA's Board (BMGF, 2020). The fact that two BMGF officials are included on the AGRA Board suggests a much deeper collaboration between the foundation and AGRA which goes beyond just funding. It can be assumed that Board members contribute to AGRA's policy making. This is an important point in light of allegations of undue influence that are often levelled against foundations, such as the BMGF. Furthermore, there are a lot of critiques of AGRA (see Wise, 2020; In On Africa [IOA], 2011, June 27) as promoting a technology-driven model which helps companies but not farmers, for example a 'green revolution' which has left many farmers reeling in poverty in places like India.

In West Africa, ONE is involved in initiatives to 'empower' women, who make up nearly half of the labour on cocoa farms, yet struggle to support their families with their wages. ONE believes, in line with current development thinking, that empowering women farmers will go a long way towards ending poverty and gender inequality. For that reason, the organization partners with the enormous agribusiness company Cargill in a programme called the *Cargill Cocoa Promise*, to make cocoa production more sustainable, create a more transparent supply chain and help farmers thrive. The programme works directly with both cocoa farmers and communities to improve livelihoods (Alexander, 2018, September 21). According to ONE, access to training, financial services and resources allows women to have equal access to farming opportunities which results in higher income and improved livelihoods (Alexander, 2018, September 21). Moreover, ONE claims that empowering women in agriculture not only

leads to increased food security, but also to better education for children and improved health and nutrition for children (Alexander, 2018, September 21).

As previously noted, ONE uses a ‘smart economics’ rationale for empowering women, which takes a narrow view of gender equality, and often fails to recognize the care and community work done by women (Chant and Sweetman, 2012, p. 218) when advocating for things like ‘equal access to farming opportunities’. This issue will be examined in greater detail in chapter five. Importantly, Cargill, America’s largest privately-owned company, has been named as the “worst company in the world” by Mighty Earth, an international environmental protection advocacy organization (Mighty Earth, 2019). In a report entitled “*The Worst Company in the World*”, Mighty Earth chronicles how Cargill, the leviathan of the global agribusiness, has taken advantage of the rise of anti-environment presidents in Brazil and the US and corrupt governments in South East Asia and West Africa to obtain vast quantities of palm oil, cocoa and other raw materials without taking into consideration the manner it was produced (Mighty Earth, 2019, p. 4). Cargill has taken over large tracts of land and converted them into chemically dependent industrial scale monocultures to produce cheap meat, palm oil and chocolate. This has caused environmental degradation as well as loss of livelihood for small scale farmers. Cargill also has a reputation of distributing contaminated beef to supermarkets and exploiting its workers and farmers (Mighty Earth, p. 6). However, ONE does not publicise any of this in its *Cargill Cocoa Promise* campaign. Cargill is one of the ONE Campaign’s donors and is also connected to the BMGF. In recent years, the foundation has teamed up with Cargill in efforts to come up with ‘clean’ meat- tissue

engineering which allows people to enjoy plant-based meat without the environmental and ethical issues (Morgan, 2018, March 23).

In line with its smart economics approach, ONE believes that focusing on women and girls is a crucial prerequisite in the fight against poverty. According to the *Annual Report 2015*, it is estimated that if women farmers were provided with the same access to productive resources as men, the number of people living with chronic hunger worldwide would be reduced by 100 to 150 million people (*ONE Annual Report, 2015, p. 15*). The ONE Campaign also claims that investing more in the health of women and children could result in a nine-times return in economic and social benefits. Therefore, the organization urges governments to commit to a minimum level of spending to deliver basic services, including health and education to those people who are most affected by poverty in the poorest countries, and to also increase productive investments to boost economic growth and jobs (*ONE Annual Report 2015, p. 15*).

Related to the above-mentioned initiative, in October 2017, on the eve of the International Day of the Girl, a report by ONE revealed that the toughest place for girls to get an education was in South Sudan, followed by the Central African Republic and Niger. According to that report, in South Sudan, 73 per cent of the girls of ages 6 to 11 are not in school and in the Central African Republic, there is only one teacher for 80 students (ONE, 2017). The CEO of ONE, Gayle Smith, described this situation as a crisis that perpetuates poverty. She also noted that the goal should not just be about getting more girls into school, but it was important to think about the women these girls would grow up to become – educated, empowered and employed (ONE, 2017).

It is important to note that there is debate in gender and development on whether investing in women for economic purposes should be the main focus rather than promoting gender equality because it is ethical and responds to women's demands. While advocacy for more spending on women's health and education is obviously good, it is also apparent that some of the projects advocated by ONE, such as the *Cargill Cocoa Promise* noted above, can lead to the exploitation of women. Equally problematic is the fact that from the above, women's health is thought of in terms of economic returns, as noted above where ONE claims investing more in the health of women and children could result in a nine-times return in economic and social benefits. Women are entitled to health benefits just like their male counterparts, and that should be the basis of the advocacy. This issue will be critically analyzed in greater detail in chapter five.

The ONE Campaign also runs an ongoing campaign to call for the replenishment of the Global Fund. In 2019, the campaign kick-started the World Health Assembly in Geneva. ONE members sent letters to African ministers of health chairing the African Group meeting, urging them to make a statement of support for the replenishment of the Global Fund and to make bold commitments to the Fund. In the run-up to the African Union Health Ministers' meeting, ONE lobbied the AU to include the issue of the replenishment of the Global Fund on the agenda. Consequently, the ministers adopted a decision which urged member states and partners to honour their commitments to the replenishment of the Global Fund, in accordance with the AU Assembly Declaration of February 2019 (ONE, 2019). This is an illustration of the inclusive neoliberal agenda insofar as ONE and the BMGF appear to give African governments ownership and responsibility of the issues affecting their countries. But, as is also apparent in some of

the projects for which ONE lobbies, there is an emphasis on the private sector partnering with governments. This issue will be explored in greater detail in the following chapter.

In 2015, ONE launched the *Global Partnership on Sustainable Development Data*, a 15-year strategy to map the data gaps and fill them in through new funds for statistical agencies combined with innovation. The ONE Campaign believes the lack of credible data is an impediment in the fight against extreme poverty. Therefore, the organization mobilized governments, donors and businesses to convince them of the existence of this problem. The World Bank, Facebook, the US and Kenyan governments, Mastercard and others joined ONE at the Addis Ababa UN Conference on Financing for Development in July 2015 and at the UN General Assembly where the *Global Partnership on Sustainable Development Data* programme was launched. This was followed by the *Connectivity Declaration* in September 2015 which was made by Bono, CEO of Facebook, Mark Zuckerberg, and others to advocate for internet access for the world's poorest. The ONE Campaign argues that, while internet access does not seem like a top priority on the level of access to nutrition, medical care and clean water, the internet can be an essential tool for empowering the poor to lift themselves out of poverty (*ONE Annual Report, 2015, p. 41*). For example, using the internet, mothers can learn more about nutrition of their babies, and check clinic opening times, while farmers can access long range weather forecasts and market their produce (*ONE Annual Report, 2015, p. 41*). The *Connectivity Declaration* calls on world leaders to address the competition policies that keep internet costs high and to invest in infrastructure and education that will make widespread internet access a reality (*ONE Annual Report, 2015, p. 43*).

The *Make Naija Stronger* campaign was launched by ONE in 2016 to call on the Nigerian government to implement the National Health Act, including allocating more resources and greater spending to ensure that all Nigerian citizens, especially the poorest, are able to access health care (ONE, 2016). At that time Nigeria accounted for one in every eight children's deaths globally. Every day, the country lost more than 2 000 children to diseases, while 158 women died from pregnancy or child-birth related illnesses (Borgenmagazine, 2020; ONE, 2016). Moreover, according to ONE, at that time, Nigeria had the second highest HIV epidemic in the world, with 3.2 million infected people (ONE, 2016). In 2018 Nigerian President Buhari signed the 2018 budget with N55.1 billion (US\$143 million) for the basic health care provision fund, for the first time since the enactment of the National Health Act in 2014 (*ONE 2017 DATA Report*, ONE, 2020; Borgenmagazine, 2020). The ONE Campaign attributed this to the intense lobbying its members had engaged in (*ONE 2017 DATA Report*, ONE, 2020). *Borgen* magazine, which is published by the Borgen Project, a humanitarian organization which works to make poverty a focal issue for US foreign policy, states that ONE's "initiatives have made a real change in Africa through government and private sector interaction and demonstrate the ability of NGOs to make an impact" (Borgenmagazine, 2020, n.p.). This is another example of inclusive neoliberalism insofar as ONE advocates the private sector's participation alongside the role of the government.

In August 2016, Nigerian businessman and ONE Board member, Aliko Dangote and Bono launched a new partnership between the Dangote Foundation and ONE in a bid to tackle some immediate and on-going problems in Nigeria. Bono and Dangote mentioned in a press conference that the partnership would strengthen civil society in

Nigeria. Moreover, it would support the country and the continent's economic transformation by focusing on the most vulnerable citizens, especially women and girls who bear the brunt of poverty and help to empower those most at risk from extreme poverty and extreme climate change (ONE, 2016). Dangote, Africa's richest person and a ONE funder noted that,

I'm investing in ONE and partners across Nigeria to strengthen civil society and help the government respond to our ongoing health needs and the urgent malnutrition crisis in north east Nigeria. ONE's extensive network of youth groups and its 2.3 million members will help bring international attention to and action on these issues. All of us can and must do more. (ONE, 2016, n.p.)

For his part, Bono also observed that,

I'm proud to be standing alongside Aliko Dangote, whose Foundation works for the future of Nigeria and Africa through its young people. The youth of Nigeria, Africa and indeed, anywhere, are like rocket fuel – there are no limits to how far they can go, but let's make sure it's in the right direction. Let's harness their positive energy and prevent them from turning to extremism by investing in their education, employment and healthcare. It is far better to support people now, than pay the price with conflict later. President Buhari knows this, as do African democratic leaders across the continent. In fact, leaders around the world from America to Europe are waking up to the need for massive investments in African youth to prevent future instability. (ONE, 2016, n.p.)

The partnership between ONE and the Dangote Foundation also supported the ONE's *Make Naija Stronger* campaign.

4.4 The ONE Campaign's Work in South Africa

As already mentioned, the ONE Campaign's Africa regional head office is located in Johannesburg and this office oversees the work of smaller national offices across the continent. However, according to former employees, the organization does not do any work with the South African government (conversation with former ONE official #1 and former ONE official #2, January, 2020). In conversations with former ONE officials, they were not able to explain definitively why the advocacy movement chose to locate its regional headquarters in Johannesburg when it was not doing any work directly with the government in that country. They, however, proffered several reasons, including that Johannesburg is an affluent city with good internet connectivity, which is essential for the kind of work in which ONE is engaged. As already noted, ONE's campaigns are carried out largely through social media; hence the need for a good internet service. The other reason was that Johannesburg's affluence makes it a comfortable place in which to live (former ONE official #1, January 2020). One of the former officials also suggested that Johannesburg was chosen as the regional head office by the inaugural Africa Executive Director of ONE who was from Zimbabwe (former ONE official #2, January 2020). It is also important to note that an investigation by a journalist of the British newspaper, *Mail on Sunday*, Ian Birrell, in 2018, revealed that the ONE Campaign did not pay taxes in South Africa – despite campaigning strongly against tax evasion – and that there were allegations that foreign staff were employed on tourist visas (Birrell, 2018, 10 March).

Nevertheless, ONE has carried out some activities with partner organizations in South Africa. The representative of Praekelt Foundation noted in an interview that “We have worked with One.org for a long time. I know Jamie (Drummond), who is the

Executive Director, well. So that's Jamie who I work with" (Praekelt Foundation representative, February, 2020). That interview respondent also remarked that:

What's interesting about ONE.org and the BMGF is that the initial impetus from the start will come from the personal ambition to have positive change from the founders, and that can have a really amazing grounding effect for an organization, in the long term. (Praekelt Foundation representative, February 2020)

He compared some of the work he was doing with the BMGF to the work he had done with ONE, saying that the organization depends on doing its advocacy campaigns with end-users as opposed to donors. The representative of the Praekelt Foundation also observed that one of the things that organizations like ONE can do well is to invest in global goods. He was referring to ONE's campaigns for universal access to healthcare, electricity, the internet and the like, in low-income African countries.

From 2016 to 2019, the Praekelt Foundation had worked with ONE on a project called *MomConnect*, a mobile phone-based programme that delivered health messages to new mothers and expecting mothers. Under that programme, mothers could sign up for weekly text messages about their pregnancy and other health-related updates and information about their pregnancies and their babies and register the births once the babies were born (Detoro, 2016, December 5). This project was launched against the background of the fact that every year 1 500 women and 34 000 babies die during childbirth in South Africa. *MomConnect* was a solution developed by the National Department of Health with the support of the BMGF and ONE to tackle this situation by providing essential information and support that is crucial to a healthy pregnancy and birth. ONE's role was to lobby members to call on their leaders to make universal

internet access a reality (Detoro, 2016, December 5). The BMGF provided the funding (Praekelt Foundation representative, February 2020). With more than one million users, *MomConnect* extended its use to Facebook Messenger to chat with users, thereby making it more accessible to 75 per cent of South Africans who use Facebook on their mobile phones. According to ONE, not only did that help to reach more people, but it also made it more affordable and enabled *MomConnect* users to send longer, more detailed, messages (Detoro, 2016, December 5).

The *Poverty is Sexist* campaign, which was launched on International Women's Day in 2015, was carried out in South Africa and across the continent. It was a culmination of ONE's discussions with some of the world's most influential women, including Melinda Gates, Sheryl Sandberg, the COO of Facebook and Helene Gayle, President and CEO of the Chicago Community Trust. As the *ONE 2015 Annual Report* notes,

This powerful campaign built on some facts we learnt about ONE's members - that women members took the hardest actions and took more actions; and some policy we learnt about those living in extreme poverty. Women and girls are hardest hit – which is ironic, indeed tragic, given that investing in them is the best way to beat poverty. The backbone of this accountability movement is female".
(ONE Annual Report 2015, p. 9)

In other words, poverty and gender inequality go hand-in-hand. As the *ONE Annual Report* put it, women and girls in the most poverty-stricken countries suffer a double hardship of being born poor and being born female; "put simply – poverty is sexist" (*ONE Annual Report 2015*, p. 14). This slogan, however, suggests some kind of willful

agency on the part of an agent – a person or an organization. However, poverty’s gendered nature is in-built into its structural, historical and discursive base.

The *Poverty is Sexist* campaign involved a petition which was signed by more than 700 000 people across the African continent, including more than 600 000 new members. The ONE Campaign presented the petition to five African Heads of State who were among those attending the African Union Summit in Johannesburg, South Africa. That summit adopted a set of policy decisions based on that petition, to ‘empower’ women (*ONE Annual Report 2015*, p. 3). The petition was accompanied by an open letter to world leaders which was penned by 36 of the world’s most influential women, asking them to act to end gender inequality. (*ONE Annual Report, 2015*, p. 25).

4.5 The ONE Campaign’s Work in Other Countries

The ONE Campaign prides itself as having achieved a milestone in its fight to end extreme poverty through improving Africa’s power infrastructure and increasing the continent’s access to electricity through its campaigning work in support of the Electrify Africa Act. The legislation was signed into law on 8 February 2016 by President Barack Obama. The ONE campaign articulates its goal as helping sub-Saharan African countries to modernize their power infrastructure and increase their access to electricity, which, in turn would save lives, strengthen education, alleviate extreme poverty and accelerate both growth and development. The Act facilitates public-private partnerships (PPPs) in the provision of energy in Africa. ONE started lobbying for the Act in 2013 by working with bipartisan legislators of the US House of Representatives and the US Senate. From the time the Bill was introduced to when it was passed, ONE members lobbied to raise

awareness of energy poverty in Africa and to demonstrate support for the proposed legislation (*ONE 2015 Annual Report*, pp. 33-39).

Another energy-related campaign carried out by ONE in the US is the *Life Empowered* campaign to raise awareness among students, their teachers and parents about the energy deficit in Africa. This campaign is reported to have reached about one million people through lesson plans and take-home work for parents (*ONE Annual Report, 2015*, p. 39). The ONE Campaign members also posted advertisements at charging stations at Washington's Reagan International Airport to show travellers that not everyone has easy access to electricity to charge their devices that they take for granted (*ONE Annual Report 2015*, p. 39).

It is important to note that the Electrify Africa Act and the *Life Empowered* campaign fall into one of the priority sectors of the AfDB's Light Up Africa programme, which focuses on energy security for the continent. As noted in an interview with the representative of the AfDB, the Bank has five priority areas, referred to as 'high fives': Feed Africa - food security; Integrate Africa - infrastructure plus regional integration issues; Light Up Africa - energy security; Industrialize Africa - issues around value-addition and Improve the lives of Africans - a broad programme which involves a wide range of issues around governance and institution building (AfDB representative, February, 2020).

The ONE Campaign also boasts of having successfully lobbied to get the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development (BUILD) Act passed into law in the US in October 2018, thereby opening doors to increased private sector investments in Africa. The BUILD Act was designed to facilitate more American private sector

investment in Africa by making it easier for American entrepreneurs to do business there (Urban, 2018, April 10). The BUILD Act created a new development finance corporation to support private projects and investments that would help people in “fragile” countries in Africa. According to ONE, these investments helped to set up infrastructure, increase access to electricity and create jobs (Urban, 2018, April 10). When the Act was passed it was projected that it would bring a total of \$30 billion in private sector investments to the African continent in the fight against poverty (Urban, 2018, April 10).

It is noteworthy that according to a promotional video-clip posted on the ONE website, because of the interest paid on its loans and other fees, once the BUILD Act was fully implemented, it would in effect put money back into the US Treasury each year (ONE, 2018). This, therefore, suggests that the BUILD Act was not only about improving the lives of Africans, but also about creating investment opportunities for the American businesses, which would, in turn, increase the income of the US Treasury.

In the UK in 2015, the UK International Development Bill was passed, making into law the government target of allocating 0.7⁹ per cent of the Gross National Income in international aid. This followed the launch of the *Say You’ll be There* campaign by ONE, in August 2014. That campaign involved ONE members urging British MPs to support the Bill. (Hill, 2015, March 9). As Hill notes on the ONE website, “Khalid Ahmad, a Youth Ambassador from London, took the message of 0.7 and the International Development Bill right to the heart of his local community. He convinced members of his local mosque to back the Bill and to write to their local MP to make sure he turned up and voted in support of the legislation” (Hill, 2015, March 9, n.p.). Another Youth

⁹ The Pearson Commission Report (1969) set the target of 0.7 per cent of the gross national product overseas development aid by donor countries which was adopted by the UN.

Ambassador from Durham, Ellie Ratcliffe publicised the ONE message by writing an article in the local newspaper, the *Oxford Mail* newspaper (Hill, 2015, March 9).

4.6 The ONE Campaign's Work With Multilateral Organizations

In 2009, ONE launched the *IMF Gold* campaign, to urge the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to use the profits from a proposed sale of gold to assist the world's poorest countries to manage the financial storm which was triggered by the 2008 global financial crisis. ONE lodged a petition which received 50 000 signatures from ONE members, to the then IMF Managing Director, Christine Lagarde. The petition was delivered by Bob Geldof, an advisor to ONE, in April 2009. As a result, the IMF approved a sale of 403 metric tonnes of gold in its possession in a move that was projected to raise \$13 billion in cash to replenish its coffers for lending to low-income countries which were badly affected by the global economic downturn. Moreover, the IMF delivered a raft of new assistance to low-income countries, including an undertaking to give interest-free loans until 2011 and to permanently lower interest rates thereafter (ONE, 2020; Borgenmagazine, 2020).

In 2014, ONE launched a campaign to expose the siphoning of resources from developing countries, dubbed the *Trillion Dollar Scandal*. In a report, ONE showed that one trillion dollars is being drained from developing countries each year through illicit deals and the use of shady companies. According to the report, the siphoning often involves money laundering, corrupt deals for natural resources, drug trafficking and other clandestine activities (ONE, 2014, September 3). According to ONE, "if countries were able to crack down on these deals, recover the money, and tax it at normal rates, it could

raise enough money to save an average of 3.6 million lives a year through spending on basic health systems” (ONE, 2014, n.p.). In order to put an end to the channelling of money from developing countries, ONE mounted a campaign to get world leaders to act on it by enacting new transparency laws. ONE took its campaign to the G20 Summit in Brisbane, Australia. More than 88 000 signatures were appended to a petition which was delivered to the G20 governments in the run up to the summit; more than 15 000 people sent tweets to the Finance Ministers of the G20 in the period leading up to the summit; ONE Youth Ambassadors across Europe embarked on awareness raising activities, engaging policy makers and journalists to secure media publicity for the campaign. The result was that ONE gained media coverage in more than 50 countries, including 16 of the G20; the G20 agreed to work on a plan to combat tax avoidance by multinational corporations; endorsed a global standard for the automatic exchange of tax information, and pledged to begin exchanging information among themselves and with other countries. The G20 also undertook to crack down on secret company ownership by implementing the G20 High Level Principles on Beneficial Ownership Transparency (ONE, 2014). However, policy adoption is one thing, and implementation is another. As previously noted, ONE has no mechanism to insure that policies which are adopted get to be implemented as planned. This issue will be explored in greater detail in chapter five.

4.7 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the ONE Campaign, the second case study in this dissertation, demonstrating how closely linked the organization is to the other case study,

the BMGF. The ONE Campaign plays an advocacy role for some of the foundation's projects. The chapter also discussed the origins of ONE, its *modus operandi*, and activities in South Africa and in other countries across the continent. The organization's work in Western countries to raise awareness of issues pertaining to Africa was also analyzed.

An analysis of ONE's work shows that the advocacy movement has had some positive impact in lobbying African governments to adopt certain policies, such as investing more in healthcare and agriculture. Furthermore, efforts to stop the siphoning of resources from developing countries were successful as they resulted in the G20 agreeing to crack down on secret company ownership which facilitated such illicit activities. The *IMF Gold* initiative which saw the institution providing assistance to low-income countries at concessionary rates was also good, in that it provided urgently needed aid. Campaigns to ensure wider access to electricity for citizens of sub-Saharan Africa are also commendable. However, as I will argue in the following chapter, a close examination of some of the organization's activities from a neoliberal imperialism perspective shows that the projects are conducted in ways that entrench structural inequalities and injustices and may serve to reinforce the domination of Africa by the West. The ONE Campaign's links with the private sector and business is problematic as the movement does not acknowledge that these are driven by profit maximization and not necessarily ensuring public good. While it is possible that private sector players can benefit while at the same time serving the public good, ONE's actions, nevertheless show that the organization is immersed in the neoliberal capitalist system. Furthermore, I argue that ONE does not confront the structures of the global political economy which result in

some regions, such as sub-Saharan Africa being so economically behind that they need to be ‘rescued’ by American businesses. These issues will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.

The empowerment of Africans which the ONE Campaign touts as one of its objectives, is not apparent. What is clear, though, is Bono’s elevated status in the organization. He is a charismatic, white ‘saviour’ figure who even refers to himself as a “little Jesus” (Bono, 2013, March 14), thus laying bare his messianic attitude. While the organization recognizes that women bear the brunt of poverty, its women’s empowerment activities are not focused on gender equality. Rather, the message appears to be that investing in women is a smart move as it results in better economic outcomes. Indeed, some of the projects advocated by ONE, such as the *Cargill Cocoa Promise* actually expose women to abuse by a company which has a history of ‘short-changing’ workers and destroying the livelihoods of small-holder farmers. Viewed through a neoliberal imperialism lens, ONE’s advocating for Cargill’s involvement in West Africa can be interpreted as Western economic interests and not a desire to uplift Africans out of poverty. These issues will be examined in greater detail in the following chapter.

Chapter 5: Results and Discussion - Reimagining Celebrity Humanitarianism and Philanthropy

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I present a critical analysis of the dissertation's empirical findings, and discuss their relationship to the existing literature on celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy. The discussion seeks to answer the research questions: what are the benefits and limitations of celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic organizations for development and to what extent have celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy contributed to development and the improvement of quality of life for the population of South Africa and of sub-Saharan Africa?

The chapter is organized as follows: in the first section, I discuss the emergent themes from the research findings; in the next section, I examine the key findings and elucidate them in light of the research questions above. In the following section, the focus is on the implications of the results for theory and research. This is followed by section on insights which emanated from my findings. The conclusion summarizes the main points articulated in the chapter and sets out my central argument that although celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy are helpful and can lead to some short-term positive outcomes, their activities generally fail to address, and indeed may reinforce, deep-seated structural injustices and inequities in the global political economy and thus do not contribute meaningfully or substantively to long-term development goals in the region. In recognizing the positive outcomes of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, I depart from much of the critical literature which takes a wholesale critical view of these practices; in so doing, I recognize both the real on the ground exigencies of the beneficiary communities, as well as the agency of their members. For instance, some

interview participants revealed that they would not have been able to conduct their work without the funding they received from the BMGF (ACBF representative, February, 2020; UCT representative, February 2020; NEPAD representative, March, 2020). As such, the fact that the foundation represents the sole source of much-needed funding for many projects and organizations cannot be overlooked. Nevertheless, the lack of democratic accountability and position of superiority of celebrity-led philanthropic and humanitarian organizations *vis-à-vis* their recipients and/or partners are viewed as problematic, as indicated by the comments of a number of my respondents.

5.2 Emergent Themes

A number of themes emerge through analysis of the research findings presented chapter three (BMGF) and chapter four (the ONE Campaign). The main themes are threads which run through most of the responses from the interview participants and the secondary literature, while the underlying ones are issues which were brought up by at least one or two of the respondents. In light of the nature of my research, it is important not to overlook matters simply because they were raised by a small number of research participants, as doing so might distort the overall result of the whole investigation. I begin with the main themes.

5.2.1 Approval of Celebrities in Humanitarian and Philanthropic Work

All interview respondents expressed the view that celebrities played an important role in humanitarian and philanthropic activities. Several reasons were given for the favourable appraisal of celebrities' involvement in humanitarian work, including that celebrities not only provide much-needed funding, but also the importance of their voices

and influence in terms of advocacy. The BMGF was regarded as a funding partner whose conditionalities were not onerous compared to other similar funding organizations. Moreover, the foundation was perceived as operating on the basis of mutual respect, and generally in areas of mutual interest with its beneficiaries and partners. The foundation was also viewed as a candid partner which not only had high expectations, but one which did not shy away from telling its beneficiaries where they were falling short of those expectations. Bill Gates, Melinda French Gates and Bono were perceived as well-intentioned, philanthropic individuals who care for the world and have a genuine desire to bring forth solutions to global problems. Furthermore, the Gateses were considered to be extraordinarily generous. The involvement of both the BMGF and ONE in some of the projects was reported to have resulted in an improvement of life for the population. Representatives of those organizations which were working with the BMGF observed that, without the assistance from foundation, they either would not have been able to carry out their projects, or their projects would have been on a much smaller scale.

The ONE Campaign was commended for its role in trying to give end users in the health care system agency in the *MomConnect* project. Some interview respondents also commended Bono and ONE for supporting the setting up of the *Grow Africa* project. The strong connection between ONE and the BMGF, which emanates from the personal friendship between Bill Gates and Bono, was also evident from the conversations and literature on the two organizations (Bishop and Green, 2008, p. 204; BMGF, 2020; ONE, 2020; former ONE official #1 conversation). While ONE's role is advocacy, the BMGF provides funding. The foundation is one of the biggest funders of the ONE Campaign's work in Africa, and the two organizations work on similar issues, such as women and

girl's empowerment through greater participation in commercial agriculture, and maternal and child health through projects such as *MomConnect* and the Global Fund. The ONE Campaign has advocated not only to get developed countries to increase aid to Africa, but also for American private investment to get involved in the provision of electricity and infrastructure development on the African continent. These campaigns were reported to have achieved success since the US government passed the Electrify Africa Act in 2016 and the BUILD Act in 2018. Moreover, the organization has run advocacy projects to hold African governments to account by urging them to deliver on policies that would promote agricultural production through more private sector investment, that would make health care accessible to all. Again, the ONE Campaign's website announced that those campaigns had been successful.

5.2.2 Underlying Themes/ Concerns Raised

In addition to these positive observations there were also a number of concerns raised by respondents. Those who worked with the BMGF described the difficulties the foundation staff face in criticizing Bill Gates, who is a larger-than-life figure in the foundation. This is indicative of the top-down/technocratic approach which removes the possibility of deliberation or dialogue. It is noteworthy that following the divorce between Bill and Melinda French Gates, the media has been awash with similar sentiments, pointing out that Bill Gates could even be dismissive of his wife in meetings, reflecting his unwillingness to listen to anyone (Glazer & Safdar, 2021, May 9). Some research participants were also concerned about the lack of accountability of the BMGF in which only Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates made the decisions.

The BMGF's over-reliance on American firms to work in Africa on matters that African organizations can probably do better was also a cause for concern for some interview participants who said that such an approach did not build capacity in the African institutions which are side-lined. Several respondents expressed the view that agenda setting by the BMGF was an issue of concern. However, some justified it by explaining that, in order to enhance their chances of being awarded grants, applicants tended to tailor their proposals to match the funder's interest, rather than the BMGF explicitly demanding that specific projects be pursued. Furthermore, some felt that the BMGF does not invest in areas it does not see value, even though there were requests for assistance.

Similarly, the power imbalance between the BMGF and its local partners was a concern voiced by some interview respondents, with one respondent describing it as a "David and Goliath situation" (March, 2020). While some participants believed that the BMGF had a hands-off approach, others, such as those running clinical trials, noted that the foundation was heavily involved in directing their operations. In addition, the BMGF was viewed by some research participants as having lost its tolerance for failure and was no longer willing to carry out risky and innovative projects but was operating like government-funded development agencies such as PEPFAR or USAID which are bureaucratic and risk-averse.

There were also some concerns regarding the ONE Campaign. Some former officials of the advocacy movement accused the leadership of ONE of being averse to Africans who spoke up for themselves (former ONE official #1, Jan, 2020; Adesulu,

2018, March 16). This revelation was particularly crucial as it came from former insiders who were familiar with the operations of the organization.

There were also some dissenting voices on celebrities' humanitarian and philanthropic work in general. Those participants who expressed skepticism about celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy challenged the myth of the 'self-made' man – in other words, billionaire philanthropists claim that they became rich 'all on their own', through hard work, without the support of publicly-funded education, infrastructure, subsidies, and other forms of support. This is, of course, false. Not only did these billionaires benefit from tax breaks and the like, they also benefitted from labour exploitation. Each of the findings is discussed in detail below.

5.3 A Critical Analysis of Findings and Interpretation

The work of the BMGF and the ONE Campaign was appreciated by all the interview respondents, as already noted. Most of them mentioned that they would not have been able to afford to do the work they were doing, or their projects would have been at a much smaller scale, if they had not received funding from the BMGF. In the case of ONE, the organization's advocacy was credited for the establishment of Grow Africa and the wider availability of HIV/AIDS drugs to more people in South Africa and around the continent. This finding substantiates the literature which suggests that philanthropy is a force for good (Cooper, 2007; Linklater, 2001; 2007; Jeffreys & Allatson, 2015). Cooper (2007) argues that celebrity humanitarians, whom he refers to as "celebrity diplomats" can be an innovative, positive force in "changing the world" by establishing new diplomatic links across contexts (pp. 5-7). This argument is reflected in

the response by one of the interview participants who attributed the formation of the PEPFAR to Bono's intervention (MRC representative, March, 2020). In the early 2000s, prior to his campaign to lobby the US government to set up PEPFAR, Bono had spent time in South Africa gathering information from HIV/AIDS sufferers about their needs. He used this information to convince the US government to commit more funds to AIDS matters in Africa.

Linklater (2001; 2007) suggests that celebrity humanitarianism is driven by a cosmopolitan ethic which holds that all interests deserve equal treatment. In other words, from a cosmopolitan perspective, it does not matter whether those who need assistance are near or far: what matters is that situations of need should be addressed.

Cosmopolitans see an obligation to help wherever a need exists because they feel a friendship towards the rest of the human race. Issues of gender, race or ethnicity do not matter. Rather, cosmopolitanism supports the Kantian notion of the equality of human beings (Linklater, 2001, p. 264). Indeed, this cosmopolitan spirit is echoed in one of the mantras of the BMGF - "all lives have equal value" (BMGF, 2020) and in ONE's self-description as a "global movement campaigning to end extreme poverty by 2030 so that everyone, everywhere can live a life of dignity and opportunity" (ONE, 2020). Some participants observed that the amount of money which the BMGF was willing to commit to HIV research, to the tune of US\$100 million in South Africa alone, was testimony to the foundation's caring nature. Moreover, those respondents pointed out that the government would never have been able to come up with such a vast amount for HIV research. Importantly, this money was donated to address the high HIV prevalence in South Africa. Other participants noted that their BMGF-funded projects had resulted in

the reduction of tobacco use not only in South Africa, but in other countries across the continent which were part of the foundation's programmes. In this case, the research participants were emphatic that without the funding assistance from the BMGF, they would not have been able to embark on tobacco control projects in the first place. The BMGF has identified tobacco-related diseases as one of the greatest challenges facing developing countries (BMGF, 2020).

Jeffreys and Allatson (2015, p. 26) and Cooper (2007) posit that celebrity humanitarianism promotes global citizenship which is philanthropic because it is motivated by a love for humanity, global interests and a desire to combat inequities. Some of my interview respondents also attested to the caring nature of the individuals behind the BMGF and ONE: Bill and Melinda Gates and Bono, respectively (MRC representative, March, 2020; Tutu HIV Centre representative, March, 2020). Celebrity-funded projects, such as clinical trials which were funded by the BMGF had resulted in greater availability of medical drugs for HIV, tuberculosis and malaria, three of the most prevalent diseases in South Africa. All participants said that their projects had improved the quality of life for their recipients. Some respondents noted that even though some of the trials were unsuccessful, the process of running those trials had benefitted local communities in numerous ways. The benefits they noted included job creation for nurses, doctors, community teams, and education for trial participants who had to be counselled on how to stay safe and prevent contracting the diseases and how to continue to protect themselves. The BMGF-sponsored clinical trials were also beneficial to the communities in terms of the knowledge gained and infrastructure development, which in turn, set up these communities as attractive sites for further projects.

Most participants welcomed and commended the role played by celebrities in humanitarian and philanthropic work. These participants pointed out that celebrity humanitarians not only use their money to solve the world's problems, but they also use their fame and influence. Celebrities were reported to be particularly effective in the area of advocacy because their messages have traction. The respondents explained that celebrities had a way of framing issues that could reach a wider audience and attract visibility. This finding is consistent with Marshall's (2014) assertion that celebrity status gives a person some discursive power in society, and that a celebrity is "a voice above others" that is channelled in the media as being significant (p. xlviii). Marshall's objective in *Celebrity and Power* is neither to critique nor to praise the celebrity, but simply to analyse what he sees as the power of celebrity and how it is articulated. However, the celebrity's elevated status can be anti-democratic. Democracy is about representation, accountability, participation, deliberation and inclusion. Having a voice above others could effectively mean that other voices are silenced and celebrities' voices, no matter how trivial or misguided, are amplified. The finding on celebrities' advocacy capabilities also corroborates the arguments made by several scholars regarding the power of celebrities, including Bishop and Green (2008, p. 7), Cooper (2008, p.7), Deng and Jeffreys (2018, p. 230), and Littler (2008, p. 241). Celebrity advocacy results in greater awareness and in turn more attention to an issue (Deng & Jeffreys, 2018, p. 234). Bono's activism on debt cancellation culminated in the *Jubilee 2000* campaign, even before ONE was formed. Since then he continues to lobby for the eradication of extreme poverty through the ONE Campaign. The BMGF has also brought the world's attention to HIV/AIDS which continues to affect many people in sub-Saharan Africa, by funding

trials and other research in South Africa. The foundation has also shone some light on other issues such as maternal and child health and women's empowerment.

The BMGF's open access policy was lauded by some research participants as transformative and as a policy that removes barriers and democratizes science. The foundation's insistence on free access to research it funds was viewed by these respondents as an investment in global goods which strives to enable scientists in the developing world to catch up with the rest of the world. Noddings (2005) suggests that celebrities are a positive force in philanthropy as they encourage global citizenship, which is driven by both local and global interests, arguing that

the concept of global citizenship is philanthropic in as far as it refers to a form of cosmopolitan and ethical citizenship that is motivated by both local interests (love of family, communal fairness and self-interest) and global interests (care for humanity and an active responsibility to tackle socio-economic inequality and protect the environment. (cited in Jeffreys & Allatson, 2015, p. 26)

However, there were some respondents who voiced an uneasiness with the power Bill Gates wields within the BMGF. These participants expressed the view that the staff within the foundation were there to do his bidding, sometimes to the detriment of the foundation's partners. In other words, Bill Gates was considered to be so smart that no one dared to criticize him, even if they believed that he was wrong. As one participant put it, "their [Bill and Melinda Gates] opinion is incredibly strong and powerful" (March 2020). Consequently, as an individual, Bill Gates holds enormous sway over how the foundation is run, and by extension, how it operates on the ground. Furthermore, that respondent observed that, "Sometimes people struggle to point out where principals can

be wrong because maybe that's not a welcome concept" (March 2020). This is consistent with the literature that refers to the great influence that Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates have over the BMGF, and through the foundation, the influence they have over national and global institutions such as the WHO (Edwards, 2008; McGoey, 2015, p. 19; 2021; Nickel & Eikenberry, 2010, p. 272). It is important to note that the programme officers who have difficulty speaking up against Bill Gates are the ones on the ground, and thus are closer to the issues and are expected to understand them better. It would therefore make sense that they should advise their principal and correct him, where necessary. However, according to some respondents, criticism is not welcome. Butler (2019) also refers to the "aura of uncriticizability" which characterizes the BMGF (p. 9). This has resulted in the foundation doing what it believes is right, such as using American firms to do groundwork in South Africa before disbursing funds. Bishop and Green (2008) cite Bono's own difficulties in trying to convince Bill Gates that he needed to engage in some advocacy to get governments involved in the work he was doing. Bono attributed Gates' unwillingness to listen to others to the fact that he has so much money, he believes he can do everything on his own (p. 204). This suggests that Gates' abundance of money has bestowed on him the notion that he knows everything. As McGoey (2015) argues, the BMGF is there to impart knowledge, based on the power the foundation wields. It is not there to understand (p. 241). Powerful individuals, like Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates are not beholden to any social contract, which obliges them to engage with voices less powerful than their own. The public policy which is enacted through tax codes in America, has allowed and encouraged a relatively small group of very wealthy people and their advisors to hold much more power over the shape

of society than the majority of the population in the middle and lower classes (Odendahl, 2007, pp. 11-12). Regressive tax policies have enabled the rich to grow richer as they pay little in taxes compared to the growth of their wealth. This means that funds that should be distributed for the public good through the treasury are withheld and disbursed by the rich themselves in ways they prefer through their philanthropic foundations. Further, the super-rich are not accountable to anyone but themselves. Even though celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy might be doing good work which is welcomed by beneficiaries, it is nevertheless critical to ask the hard questions about principle and practice. Those individuals who hold a vast amount of power, such as the Gateses, and their foundation, sometimes commit “testimonial injustice” (Fricker 2007) to those who try to advise them, when they do not listen to them. Fricker (2007)’s concept of testimonial injustice describes how a hearer can wrong a speaker in his capacity as a giver of knowledge (p. 5). In other words, there is testimonial injustice if prejudice on the part of the hearer causes him to give the speaker less credibility than he would have otherwise given. Therefore, when the BMGF leadership and/or programme officers fail to take heed of their beneficiaries’ preferences and advice, a testimonial injustice is committed.

Some respondents criticized the BMGF’s use of American consulting companies, such as McKinsey and the Boston Consulting Group (BCG) to do research in South Africa, instead of engaging local firms or academic institutions to do the same. Those participants were of the view that it would have been better for the foundation to fund local organizations to do the groundwork as they were more knowledgeable about the issues and understood the in-country dynamics better. Furthermore, some interview

respondents believed that the American firms held biased ideas about the issues they were researching, and instead of embarking on thorough investigations, they tended to seek whoever would corroborate their preconceived notions. The corollary was that their reports did not reflect the actual situation on the ground, and the programmes which were designed using reports authored by those companies were oftentimes inappropriate. This issue goes back to the culture of smartness which drives a wedge between the BMGF staff and the local organizations, where the latter do not feel that they are heard, even though the former may express a willingness to listen (Schurman, 2018, p. 181). There was frustration on the part of these respondents that if the BMGF was trying to solve African problems, they should fund African organizations to do so, rather than bring in American ones. The respondents also believed that the BMGF showed that it trusted American organizations more than it did local ones, but those American firms gave the foundation information they thought the foundation wanted to hear. This raises the question of how the foundation can get to the root of the problems it seeks to address if it does not have accurate information. Those on the ground know best how the foundation can operate in that locality to have the greatest impact (Reich, 2018, p. 7).

While it is obviously a good thing that the BMGF was able to commit so much money into HIV/AIDS issues in South Africa, and into other projects in that country and across the continent, the question arises as to why the foundation has so much money and how this money was made in the first place. As Kapoor argues, Gates amassed wealth by privatizing knowledge, “something that should have been an integral part of the commons” (2012, p. 53). Microsoft’s monopolization of the computer software industry was facilitated by the protection and enforcement of the intellectual property rights

Kapoor (2012, p. 53). The BMGF also gets tax exemptions under the 1913 income tax law through which the Treasury Department created a single category in the tax code for exempting philanthropies. Tax exemption has not only nurtured philanthropy in American society, it has actually entrenched it (Zunz, 2012, p. 4). However, in so doing, organizations such as the BMGF deprive the treasury of tax revenues that could be spent on redistributive welfare, which could be used for the common good, rather than for what the foundation wants. Furthermore, the US tax system disproportionately rewards the rich, a fact Bill Gates acknowledged on December 30, 2019 in a post: "... the distance between top and bottom incomes in the United States is much greater than it was 50 years ago. A few people end up with a great deal – I've been disproportionately rewarded for the work I've done – while many others who work just as hard struggle to get by" (Murdock, 2020, January 13, n.p.). In that same post, he expressed support for a tax system in which those who earn more pay a higher percentage in taxes saying "... I think the rich should pay more than they currently do, and that includes Melinda and me" (Murdock, 2020, January 13, n.p.). This acknowledgement of the unfairness of the US tax system by Bill Gates does not, however, necessarily mean that he was taking action to address the inequalities that result from such a system. Indeed, he continues to enjoy the benefits of such a skewed system. In August 2021, his fortune stood at US\$152 billion (Duffy, 2021, August 2), up from \$115 billion in 2020. In comparison, the annual gross domestic product of Ethiopia, a country with a population of 112 million people is US\$96 billion (Allison, 2021, January 30). Tax avoidance means less money for the Treasury – money that could be used for wider social benefit.

5.3.1 Agenda-setting

The issue of agenda-setting was noted as a concern by some interview respondents. Agenda-setting refers to the influence that the foundation brings to bear on its partners/ beneficiaries and the issues they should focus on (Budabin & Richey, 2018, pp. 261-262). Some respondents admitted that there was agenda-setting on the part of the BMGF, though they pointed out that it was not done directly. Rather, agenda-setting occurred subtly when grant applicants designed their proposals in ways that positioned them favourably for the funding. Others noted that the danger of funders changing the policy direction of their beneficiaries was one that was not unique to the BMGF or foundations, but it existed with regards to any big donor. Another participant admitted that her organization's engagement with the BMGF tended to follow the foundation's areas of interest to ensure that funding was available. While this may be normal practice with any source of funding, some literature suggested that in the case of the BMGF, grantees were sometimes incentivized to engage in activities which they were not prepared for, simply to please the foundation and to obtain funding. Foundations behave as if they know best what the grantees need, and in so doing, shape society in a way they see fit. Some issues which are close to the hearts of the celebrities tend to receive disproportionate interest and attention (Edwards, 2008; Littler, 2008, p. 243). While in some cases this results in the hollowing out of the self-confidence of the beneficiaries, often the beneficiaries look for ways that they can work together with the celebrities in their areas of interest. Some interview participants said that it would be a shame if the beneficiaries were hung up by the fact that the providers of funds have their own preferences. It was important to find ways of working with them. However, in so doing, the power imbalance between the givers and receivers is amplified. Even though the

foundation claims to be in ‘partnership’ with local organizations it works with, such euphemism hides the real power imbalance that exists, which consequently prevents the recognition of the partners as equal partners (Dubgen, 2012, p. 73). In some cases, the agenda-setting by the BMGF is more blatant -for example in the case where officials of the foundation sat on the board of the Alliance for a Green Revolution of Africa (AGRA). The AGRA is one of the foundation’s biggest beneficiaries in Africa, receiving a total of \$380 million in grants in 2020 alone. The presence of BMGF officials on the AGRA board suggests that the cooperation between the two organizations goes beyond funding. As Board members, the two BMGF officials contribute to policy formulation within AGRA. Furthermore, it is unlikely that those contributions would be rejected, given the extent of the foundation’s financial assistance to the AGRA.

Several respondents revealed that the BMGF was heavily involved in projects which it funded. This involvement takes various forms, from assistance with grant proposals (which can be a way of agenda setting), to participation by foundation programme officers in the actual projects which they finance by giving guidance on the day-to-day running of those projects. Some respondents noted that BMGF programme officers attend weekly meetings of the projects they are funding. Therefore, while most of the respondents said that the BMGF’s conditionalities were not onerous, the heavy involvement of its programme officers in the running of some projects would suggest that the foundation is largely guiding which direction the projects should go. As such, while there may not be too many conditionalities, the BMGF still ensures that things work the way it wants because of the involvement of its officers with the projects. Schurman (2018) asserts that the strategic planning culture at the foundation, especially at the initial

stages of projects, shapes how proposals are drafted, and in so doing, inevitably dictating the work the grantee will have to do (p. 190). One of the interview respondents also alluded to the hands-on approach of the foundation, pointing out that at the beginning of her BMGF-funded project, BMGF programme officers gave “direction here and there” (Feb, 2020). It is also noteworthy that this project had been initiated by the foundation and the ACBF had responded to a call for proposals to implement it suggesting a vested interest by the foundation. Another interview participant also stated that her organization worked with the BMGF programme officers “on a day-to-day basis” (Feb, 2020). While this might have been just a figure of speech, it all the same indicates the heavy involvement of the programme officers. Reich (2018) suggests that foundations are largely donor-directed, meaning that those on the ground, who may be best positioned to know how the foundation should operate in order to be effective, cannot determine the mission of the organization (p. 7). With regards to ONE, because I was not able to interview any one from that organization, and because there is scant literature on the organization, it is not clear how the organization’s top management interacts with those who actually do the lobbying on the ground.

5.3.2. Power Imbalance

The power imbalance between the foundation and the partner organizations in South Africa was one of the issues which came up from several interview participants. Though respondents said their interactions with the BMGF were based on mutual respect, they also admitted that the power disparity between themselves and the foundation was great. As such, local organizations accept this unequal power relationship as inevitable

and try to work with it. It also emerged from the research findings that the BMGF is a candid partner with high expectations and does not hesitate to point out where the local partners are going wrong. While at face value this might appear to be a positive attribute (as indeed, the respondents saw it that way), this is something the foundation can do because of the superior position it holds *vis-à-vis* the local partners. Notably, of the respondents who mentioned the power imbalance, only one noted that her organization was able to raise its concerns when it felt that the foundation's thrust was no longer serving its interests. However, that participant explained that the reason her organization was able to do so was because it is a government agency, and as such it had a lot of political clout.

Indeed, it can be argued that the unequal power relations between the West and the developing world is the premise upon which humanitarianism is built; the manner in which humanitarianism is practiced, moreover, tends to reproduce that inequality. From this perspective, it has been argued that humanitarianism is not motivated by altruism and transnational morality (Belloni, 2007, p. 454). From the findings, the way the BMGF interacts with its partners would suggest that there is no attention paid to overall North-South inequality. Equally, there does not seem to be a redistribution of wealth in a manner that would radically change and/or eliminate the conditions that necessitated the need for philanthropy in the first place. Rather, the local partners highlighted the mutual respect between themselves and the BMGF and that the Gateses had been extraordinarily generous with "their" money. Several participants also noted that Bill Gates "cares for the world". However, I insist that this is another way that the inequality is perpetuated, when the recipients feel that they are objects of the generosity of Bill Gates and Melinda

French Gates. While interview respondents referred to the resources of the BMGF as belonging to the Gates family, it is in fact, not all “their” money. American private foundations, like the BMGF, are tax-exempt, as noted above. As such, a substantial portion of the wealth of these organizations has been diverted from the public treasury where its use would have been determined ultimately by voters. As Joanne Barkan argues, the industry of big philanthropy is privately governed, but it is subsidized by the public purse (Barkan, 2013, p. 637). McGoey (2015) also contends the new global elite (the likes of Bill and Melinda Gates) focuses on philanthropy as a way to change the world, while resisting higher taxes as a more egalitarian way of distributing wealth which has resulted from new technologies (pp. 9-20). Reich (2018) suggests that philanthropy can be unconcerned about inequality and can even be the cause of inequality in some cases (p. 69).

Among the interview participants, only a few asked the hard questions of how these people got so rich in the first place. Those respondents raised the issue in response to a question on their views on the role of celebrities in humanitarian and philanthropic work. They were adamant that before we sing praises of the celebrities’ do-gooding, let us ask how they made their money in the first instance, and at the same time seek to understand their agenda. As noted above, Kapoor (2012) argues that Gates supports patents, not only for the software sector but also for the medical drug industry. Gates is quoted as saying, “I think if you invent drugs, you should be able to charge for them”(Rimmer, 2010, p. 328, quoted in Kapoor, 2012, p. 53). Interestingly, my research findings reveal the BMGF as an organization that supports an ‘open access policy’. The

representative of the South African Medical Research Council praised the foundation for this saying;

The good thing about the Gates Foundation is their open access policy and their insistence that anything that is commercialized from their funding should be made available at a global level. So those are wonderful aspirations to have. And that's what I focus on, their access policy and affordable pricing and global access. I think that's important and those are good values to have. (March, 2020)

Another respondent lauded the foundation's capacity to bring down the prices of tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS drugs, through what he called 'forward funding', which he said had resulted in the wider availability of treatment drugs for South African AIDS and TB sufferers. From this participant's perspective, although Gates is an ardent supporter of intellectual property rights (IPRs), he is occasionally willing to loosen that stance and be lenient to accommodate an urgent need. As previously noted, South Africa suffers from a heavy HIV and TB burden (BMGF, 2018). The BMGF's contribution in this instance is helpful and very much welcomed by the recipients. Therefore, while it is true that Gates and the BMGF are strong supporters of IPRs, as already noted, the voices on the ground reveal that in some cases, there is a deviation from this position. However, on COVID-19 vaccines, Gates initially resisted the waiver of the TRIPS agreement before caving in to international pressure.

Nevertheless, this does not take away from the fact that this philanthropic practice entrenches the foundation's superior position, while at the same time it imposes the burden of gratitude on the recipients. Private individuals, like Bill Gates, should not be able to determine the health outcomes of the millions of people who live in South Africa

and other developing parts of the world, just because of the power that their wealth has bestowed on them. In other words, it is worrisome when Gates and the BMGF have such a disproportionate influence on the public good. As Reich (2018) aptly observes, “Big philanthropy is definitionally a plutocratic voice in our democracy...an exercise of power by the wealthy that is unaccountable, non-transparent, donor-directed, perpetual and tax-subsidized” (quoted by Madrigal, 2018, June 27).

The power that celebrity humanitarians wield tends to make them believe that they are knowledgeable even about issues that they know little about and some respondents expressed concern about this. Those participants emphasized that that could have disastrous outcomes. In some cases, celebrities ended up trivialising issues of great importance and overshadowing the real experts, as one participant revealed had happened at a global HIV/AIDS conference held in Thailand in 2004. In that case, celebrities were given slots to speak during prime time, while the experts were relegated to the end of the day, when some conference participants had already left. In other cases, some celebrities’ superficial understanding of issues has resulted in those celebrity activists misleading people altogether. This claim is supported by Cooper (2007, p. 13) and Kapoor (2012, p. 23) who refer to the adverse effects of Bob Geldof’s misrepresentation of the accomplishments of the 2005 Gleneagles G8 Summit on debt cancellation. Geldof claimed that there had been substantial debt cancellation and increased aid to Africa. Neither of these two had, in fact, happened.

5.3.3 The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation's Strategic Funding Approach

Several research participants observed that the BMGF does not invest in areas it does not see as valuable. As previously noted, the foundation's funding is very strategic. As such, projects which the foundation does not recognize as being of strategic value are not funded. These include projects which may be requested by politicians for political expediency and those which the BMGF believes should be financed by the national government. This finding supports the claim by Barkan (2013) who argues that some of the mantras of big philanthropy are "strategic giving", "return on investment" and "venture philanthropy" (p. 639). The bottom line in this kind of philanthropy is that it is based on a business model. Indeed, Gates himself, in an article he co-authored with Barbara Kiviat, suggests that funding by the private sector cannot simply be an act of generosity, but there should be an incentive for them to do so (Kiviat and Gates, 2008). Therefore, the giving by the BMGF (which works in tandem with some private companies and multinational corporations) is not only about addressing an existing need, but also about whether the foundation sees value, or rather profit, in funding such a venture. It is clear from the responses that the beneficiaries of the BMGF held the pragmatic view that whatever resources were availed by the foundation should be taken and used. For some, these resources represented the only source of funds. However, this philanthropic model is problematic as it can reproduce and entrench the inequities which are the origin of the need for philanthropy.

5.3.4 The ONE Campaign's Work

With regards to the ONE Campaign, as already noted, most of the information was gathered from secondary literature, the advocacy movement's website and partner

organizations. This information indicates that in Africa, the movement has carried out advocacy work in several areas, mainly agriculture; health and women and girls' empowerment. The agriculture-related advocacy pushed the agriculture agenda among various actors, including the government, the private sector and farmers organizations in order to ensure the transformation of the sector into a vibrant part of the economy.

African governments were urged to deliver on their commitment to allocate 10 per cent of their national budgets to agriculture. ONE attributed the famine in the Horn of Africa region in 2011 to the lack of political will on the part of African leaders. Kapoor (2012) suggests that, in their saviour fantasies discourse, celebrities construct Africa as a deviant continent and the West as dominant. Such constructions therefore justify interventions in Africa in the form of aid and guidance (p. 39).

The idea behind the agriculture advocacy was also to ensure greater productivity, more job creation in agriculture, promotion of small-holder farmers and youths in the agricultural sector and equal access to farming opportunities for women. It was argued that extending better opportunities to women in farming would lead to higher incomes and improved livelihoods. Empowering women in agriculture also meant better education for children, and improved health and nutrition for families. In essence these campaigns were designed to make business people out of farmers, and also to 'empower' women by making them economically active through farming. Investing in women was seen as having better economic outcomes. The opening up of business opportunities and entrepreneurship is a crucial aspect of neoliberalism. As Mark Duffied argues, part of the mainstream development agenda is to produce appropriate, entrepreneurial subjects in the global South, which have the ability to withstand the vagaries of the international market

(2007, p. 4-12). It is important to note that this 'entrepreneurial subject' has been particularly focused on women. As explained by Katherine Rankin (2001), "neoliberal orthodoxy has assumed a distinctively feminised character, as development interventions increasingly target women as the desired beneficiaries and agents of progress" (p. 19). The 'smart economics' approach which rationalizes investing in women and girls for enhanced economic prospects is praised as an effective way to fight poverty.

The pursuit of women's empowerment and gender equity are crucial aspects of the ONE Campaign's, and indeed, contemporary anti-poverty initiatives in which female agency is touted as a solution to indigence in the developing countries. This 'feminization of poverty' has resulted in women and girls being given great visibility in development discourse not only as the main victims of economic deprivation, but also as the driving force in poverty reduction (Chant, 2016, p. 2). In sub-Saharan Africa, only 34 per cent of girls complete lower secondary school, while 42 per cent of boys do (*ONE Poverty is Sexist Report*, 2017, p. 4). The ONE Campaign claims that the lack of quality education for girls means that they will more likely become victims of child marriages, become more vulnerable to diseases like HIV/AIDS and more likely to die young. Failure to provide quality education for girls also causes extreme poverty and preventable diseases for entire communities. In sub-Saharan Africa, fertility rates for women with a secondary school education are 3.9 births, compared to 6.7 for women who have not been to school at all (*ONE Poverty is Sexist Report*, 2017, p. 5; 9). It is against this background that ONE launched the *Poverty is Sexist* and the *Girl Power* campaigns. In the advocacy movement's view, the fact that women bear the brunt of poverty means that 'poverty is sexist'. The solution, therefore, is investing more in girls' education and ensuring that

more of them are in school as an effective way of guaranteeing that they would grow to be empowered women. Fewer girls in schools means the perpetuation of poverty. The ONE Campaign's initiatives are in line with 'smart economics' orthodoxy; empowered women and girls will not simply gain rewards for themselves, but also for their families, communities, nations and indeed, the whole world (Chant, 2016, p. 16). Indeed, the *Poverty is Sexist* campaign annual report has as its subtitle, "*Why Educating Every Girl is Good for Everyone*" (*ONE Poverty is Sexist Report*, 2017, p. 1). However, it is important to note that gender inequality is a relational issue which cannot be addressed simply by empowering women, but it needs wider engagement by and with the wider society and government institutions (Chant and Sweetman, 2012, p. 218). The gendered nature of poverty is built into its structural, historical and discursive base. It appears that for ONE, investing in women is not justified in terms of their rights or their fundamental equality, but in terms of productivity, poverty reduction and cost-effectiveness.

Campaigns for electricity infrastructure development (Electrify Africa Act and *Life Empowered Campaign*) and increased private sector investment in Africa (BUILD Act) carried out in the US involved ONE advocating for Africans from afar. Bono and ONE's sensitivity to Africa's energy deficit and the call for more American private sector investment in power development would appear to be consistent with the literature that suggests humanitarianism is motivated by the cosmopolitan love for humanity (Linklater, 2001, p. 264; Linklater, 2007, p. 27). For ONE's activists in the US, it did not matter that those who suffered from lack of electricity were located far away from them on the African continent. What mattered was that they were people who deserved the convenience that electricity offers. But coupled with this cosmopolitan concern was a

commercial drive for American entrepreneurs to invest in the provisioning of public goods in Africa. The Electrify Africa Act, for example, facilitates public-private partnerships in the provision of energy on the continent. The BUILD Act at its inception was expected to result in about \$30 billion being invested in Sub-Saharan Africa by American private sector players. Further, once the project was fully operational, it was expected to bring significant income into the American Treasury through fees and loan charges (ONE, 2020). Therefore, according to these two pieces of legislation, American business was expected to participate in the provisioning of African public goods, while at the same time they would be making profits for themselves. Kiviat and Gates (2006) refer to this involvement of business and the market in solving social problems as creative capitalism, while Bishop and Green (2008) call it 'philanthrocapitalism'. Kiviat and Gates (2006) argue that market incentives and supportive government policies should be used to tap into the creativity, expertise and profit-maximising focus of businesses to expand the benefits of capitalism and speed up the work of governments (pp. 1-2). Kapoor (2012) suggests that when celebrities (and by extension, their activism) advocate on behalf of people in the developing world on various issues, they reduce the Other into a docile observer unilaterally representing her/his desires and needs. Such representations by celebrity philanthropists mean that the West is constructed as dominant and Africa as a rogue continent (Kapoor, 2012, p. 2) and I argue that this reinforces relations of domination between the two regions.

The ONE Campaign's other work in the US, the UK and the G8 countries was to call for more aid for Africa. This work was led mainly by celebrities as well as youths in the form of youth ambassadors, ONE Champions and field organizers (ONE, 2020). It

has been argued that campaigns such as these are important because they potentially promote issues of global socio-economic equity by reaching a wider audience, especially young people in the West who feel that their governments are not doing enough to address poverty around the world (Cooper, 2007, p. 7; Bishop & Green, 2008). In 2009, in the *IMF Gold* campaign, Bob Geldof submitted a petition to the then Managing Director of the IMF, Christine Lagarde, showing the power of celebrity status to afford access to global power brokers (Marshall, 2014, p. xlviii; Richey, 2016, p. 11). Geldof is a ‘celebrity diplomat’ who cannot be ignored, including by those leaders who want to be seen to be playing their part to address global poverty (Cooper, 2007; Kapoor, 2012, p. 13; Muller, 2015, p. 479). While ONE was asking for more assistance to poor countries reeling from the effects of the 2008 global economic crisis, the organization did not call on the IMF or other international financial institutions to alter their approach to the global economy and ‘development’. Rather, the message was that it was sufficient to disburse money to poor countries, without paying attention to the structural injustices which caused the financial crash in the first place. Indeed, in the early years, celebrity humanitarianism tended to portray international development as relatively simple- gather money, cancel debt, end poverty, and bring global justice. Geldof himself is known for the call, “just give us your money!” during the Live Aid concert of 1984 (Lockhart, 1985). But this approach overlooks structural inequities including unfair trade regulations which are biased in favour of developed countries, and tax evasion, especially by transnational corporations (TNCs).

The role of ONE activists in lobbying the British government to enact the International Development Bill in 2014, allocating 0.7 per cent of the GNI to

international aid can also be seen as part of the organization's efforts to ensure more aid for Africa. While on the surface, this appears to be a positive move that would benefit the continent, again ONE's activism was rather 'short-sighted'-increase aid, end poverty, bring global justice (ending poverty and the attainment of global justice are aspects included in the organization's mission statement). The ONE Campaign celebrated the enactment of the Bill as a huge success when, in effect, it might not have been. Aid, by its nature, is not perpetual. Therefore, it does not guarantee that its recipients will be permanently lifted out of poverty. One interview respondent made this point with regards to funding by the BMGF. Kapoor (2012) suggests that celebrity humanitarianism provides just enough to address the worst manifestations of poverty without seeking to outrightly eliminate it (pp. 35-36). This argument can be applied to the international development aid which the ONE Campaign demands from West. Further, in advocating for more aid for Africa, the leadership of ONE, including Bono himself and the CEO, Gayle Smith, have tended to link aid with security, and suggesting that less aid to the continent would result in an increase in terrorism which would affect the West (Magubane, 2007, p. 5; ONE DATA Report, 2017). I argue that ONE engages in a criminalisation of African states, coercing prospective supporters into backing the movement by suggesting that terrorism is round the corner, while at the same time it appeals to the benevolence of the hegemonic states of which the leadership of the advocacy movement is part. I also argue that such conduct re-entrenches the divide between those who give/ develop and those who receive aid/ development. Duffield (2007) suggests that international development aid is not designed to accord the same quality of life to the global South as that of the West. Rather, it is designed to ensure that

instability that may emanate from lack of development aid is contained and at securing the way of life of the global North (p. 2).

In the *Trillion Dollar Scandal* campaign, ONE sought to lobby G20 leaders to agree on mechanisms to prevent the siphoning of money out of Africa and other developing parts of the world, through various ways, such as shady mining deals. The ONE Campaign also urged the leaders of developed countries to crack down on secret company ownership, tax evasion by some multi-national corporations (MNCs) and other practices which prejudiced developing countries of revenue to the tune of one trillion dollars annually. That campaign resulted in an agreement by G20 countries to implement the High Level Principles on Beneficial Ownership Transparency (ONE, 2020). But this campaign was hypocritical given ONE's own tax avoidance history in South Africa. The ONE Campaign staff is alleged to have worked for the initial five years following the establishment of the organization's regional head office in that country on tourist visas, and the organization itself was not registered as an international organization (conversation with former ONE official #1; Allison, 2018).

Bono himself was exposed as a "tax rogue" in 2017 when the *Paradise Papers* revealed that he had chosen to invest in a company based in Malta, a country with ultra-low tax. That company had incorporated a Lithuanian company, but paid no tax at all despite having made profits. The company later relocated to the British island of Guernsey, a tax haven which charges zero-tax on company profits. While Bono did not create any artificial structures in order to avoid paying tax on his income, he however, took advantage of and supported ultra-low tax jurisdictions and elaborate structures for tax avoidance (Goff, 2017, November 7, n.p.). In 2006, Bono's band, *U2* moved its

headquarters from Ireland to the Netherlands following the Irish government's decision to tax royalties. Prior to that, artists were not required to pay tax on royalties (Goff, 2017, n.p.; Kapoor, 2012).

Furthermore, ONE advisor and celebrity member, Bob Geldof has also been embroiled in a tax avoidance scandal. A report by the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists revealed that 8 Miles, an investment fund owned by Geldof, was among hundreds of firms based in Mauritius reaping as much profit as possible from Africa and India, then depriving their governments of tax revenue through accounting distortions (De Haldevang and Rohrlich, 2019, July 23). 8 Miles invests exclusively in African start-up businesses. The draft business plan for the company reportedly explains that one of the main reasons for setting up subsidiaries in Mauritius was that the island was "...an offshore jurisdiction with a wide network of double taxation treaties in interesting markets" (De Haldevang & Rohrlich, 2019, July 23, n.p.). It therefore appears that 8 Miles was avoiding paying taxes due to the African governments and people the company aimed to assist (De Haldevang & Rohrlich, 2019, July 23). And, as Goff (2017, November 7) rightly observes, "... it is these things which were so harmful not only to ordinary people in developed countries but also to the developing world" (n.p.).

It is also important to note that pledges made by states, such as the G20's High Level Principles on Beneficial Ownership Transparency, are not always fulfilled. If the 2005 Gleneagles G8 Summit African debt cancellation is anything to go by, much was promised (De Waal, 2008, p. 49), but little was delivered (Kapoor, 2012). In other words, pledges which governments make under pressure from celebrity humanitarians, and advocacy movements like the ONE Campaign, are not always honoured even though they

are celebrated as achievements. Indeed, sometimes it is expedient for governments to pledge something, as revealed by some African ministers of health at the 2016 Conference for the Replenishment of the Global Fund in Montreal. Failure to pledge something would mean that countries would be excluded from being funded by the Global Fund.

Other activities which ONE carried out in recent years include the *Connectivity Declaration*, which was launched in September 2015 to campaign for wider internet access for the poorest of people. That project included another ‘billionaire philanthropist’, Mark Zuckerberg and others. The campaign urged world leaders to address policies that keep internet costs high and out of the reach of many poor people, and to invest in infrastructure and education that would result in widespread internet access (*ONE Annual Report, 2015*, p. 43). While acknowledging that the need for internet accessibility might not be as great a need as food, healthcare and clean water, to pull people out of poverty, ONE argued that the internet would assist farmers to get long range weather forecasts, so that they would know when to plant their crops and also market for their produce, as well to give mothers easy access to information on health care facilities and nutrition for their children. However, it is important to note that the ONE Campaign’s work is carried out mostly through social media and mobile phones. It is therefore crucial for the organization that its membership has access to the internet. Consequently, my suspicion is that the call for internet access for the poor was also motivated by the organization’s self-interest. Mastercard and Facebook are some of the partners that the ONE Campaign works with (ONE, 2020), and inevitably, they stand to

gain when more people use their services. Universal internet connectivity would also mean better business prospects for internet service providers.

The ONE Campaign also launched campaigns designed to put pressure on African governments. One was 'Factivism' - a term coined by Bono referring to the use of facts in activism - against the alleged corruption and lack of democracy, accountability and transparency of African governments (Mitchell, 2017, p. 119). Another was the ONE-Dangote Foundation project to strengthen Nigerian civil society, which, in turn, would hold the government accountable. The underlying theme in this kind of advocacy is the denigration of African governments which are viewed as corrupt, and therefore, responsible for the state of indigence some of their countries are in. In fact, in a TED talk in 2013, Bono argued that the disease of corruption must be cured by facts, where citizens demand democracy, transparency and accountability through using technology. Bono's message was that technology would expose the corruption of governments and therefore bring them to book (Mitchell, 2017, pp. 118-120).

While the demand for responsible politics on the part of African governments might seem justified and indeed, commendable, their criminalization is part of the scaling back of the state, while the individual rises to prominence over its own life, in this case, by calling out the alleged government corruption. At the same time, individuals such as Bono, have risen to provide a "Marshall Plan for Africa", to "liberate" the continent and to "build" it (Bono, 2004, cited in Repo and Yrjola, 2011, p. 53). Littler (2008) suggests that the rise of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy can be located in the broader neoliberal culture of individualisation (p. 246). Individualisation denotes the decline of the state and its sovereign powers and the rise of the sovereignty of the individual over

her own life (Dean, 2003, p. 132). It has been argued that the ‘hyperindividualization’ of celebrity is itself incompatible with democracy. The power of celebrity can pull resources towards a particular cause that appeals to them and away from others. The positioning of celebrity humanitarianism as a potential panacea to inequalities, in fact, tends to exacerbate and accentuate those divisions (Littler, 2008, p. 246). Both the BMGF and ONE, in their mission statements, claim to be fighting inequalities. However, as is illuminated by the research findings, none of the assistance provided by these two organizations comes close to bridging the inequality gap. Indeed, what they do is to reveal those inequities. Few of the programmes are designed to capacitate governments to perform their role of providing public goods. In fact, one interview respondent reported that the BMGF does not fund projects to improve health-care systems, but focuses on diseases, specifically HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria (March, 2020).

The ONE Campaign’s involvement with companies which trample on workers’ rights, such as Cargill, or are out to make huge profits at any cost, like Merck, substantiates the argument by Hahn that the international development agenda is not designed to benefit those in the global South, but rather is designed to serve Western economic interests (Hahn, 2007, p. 142). As an advocacy organization which claims to be fighting to end extreme poverty and inequities, ONE’s partnership with Cargill, which has a reputation of underpaying its workers and environmental degradation throws doubt on the advocacy organization as an ethical entity. The ONE Campaign’s acceptance of funding from such tainted firms like Cargill and Merck, which are bent on making profits and not seeking to benefit the poor, reveals that the movement is willing to turn a blind eye to unethical practices of its funders and partners. Indeed, ONE’s own ill-treatment of

its staff reflects double standards. Although the organization mounted various campaigns, the advocacy movement itself, as well as its leaders, are characterized by inconsistencies and double-standards.

5.4 Implications for Theory and Research

In light of the research findings described above, how should we think about celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, and their implications for development? While it is clear that celebrity humanitarianism can have positive impacts, these short-term gains may belie a more insidious truth – that celebrity humanitarianism is ultimately undermining the democratic accountability, agency and long-term development of developing countries and their populations. Indeed, it may even be argued that celebrity humanitarianism itself is a neocolonial practice, which perpetuates colonial relations of domination. In order to explore this further, this section uses the conceptual framework of neoliberal imperialism (Daley, 2013, p. 376; Hahn, 2007) and postcolonialism to analyze the implications of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy as ‘philanthrocapitalism’, focusing specifically on its expansion of neoliberal capitalism; lack of accountability and humanitarian governance.

Specifically, I build on the work of Dubgen (2012), Kohn (2013) and Daley (2013) who address the concentration in Africa of Western celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic activism. For Dubgen and Kohn, celebrities focus on Africa because of the poverty and famine that plagues the region and for Daley (2013), this attention is motivated by the perception that the continent is outside modernity and the colonial legacy that constructs it as a white man’s burden (p. 376). The two celebrity-led

organizations under discussion in this dissertation, the BMGF and the ONE Campaign, concentrate their attention on the African continent. In fact, in its mission statement, the ONE Campaign clearly states that “whether lobbying political leaders in world capitals or running cutting edge grassroots campaigns, ONE pressures governments to do more to fight extreme poverty and preventable disease, *particularly in Africa...*” (ONE, 2020; my emphasis). The BMGF also focuses on Africa, among other regions in the world (BMGF, 2020). It is indisputable that the continent of Africa is plagued by famine and disease. This would therefore justify the attention that is paid to the region. However, when viewed historically through the prism of the imperial history of the West on the continent, and the nature of the humanitarian and philanthropic intervention, Western activists’ work can be seen as reinforcing global power hierarchies in which Western powers are portrayed as humanitarian ‘saviours’ while enforcing ‘accumulation by dispossession’ in the periphery (Daley, 2013, p. 377). Daley (2013) argues that celebrities act as brokers who make market relations acceptable in Western countries through consumption and in the peripheral countries through humanitarian and philanthropic interventions (p. 377). The ONE Campaign’s projects such as the BUILD Act and the Electrify Africa Act aptly illustrate this argument and how these activities should be interpreted as a form of neoliberal imperialism. The ONE Campaign champions these two pieces of legislation for bringing American private investors to Africa “to increase investments in the region” as part of the promotion of the continent as a place of massive economic opportunity (ONE, 2020). However, the opportunity is presented as being for supporters in the global North, thereby reflecting not only the unequal power relations that exist between the

global North and Africa, but also the purpose that the continent of Africa serves- an economic opportunity.

5.4.1 Neoliberal Imperialism and Postcolonialism

I interpret my findings through the conceptual framework of ‘neoliberal imperialism’ (Hahn, 2007) – to show that celebrity humanitarianism constructs development in a way which makes it consonant with the logics of neoliberalism and which replicates and re-inscribes patterns of colonial domination. For example, Bono and Bill Gates regularly advocate for public-private partnerships (PPPs) in which Western firms play a key role. In so doing, Bono and Gates, through their organizations, facilitate commercial intervention by American companies in Africa and can be viewed as acting on behalf of the West. This can be understood as a ‘repackaging’ of traditional forms of imperialism as a new form of politics – one that is collaborative and empowering for participants. Indeed, humanitarian and philanthropic initiatives by the ONE Campaign and the BMGF are presented as collaborative and empowering, especially for women who are the target of some of the projects of both organizations. In South Africa, part of the BMGF’s focus is to ‘empower’ women and girls by engaging in a gender awareness project called DREAMS – a public-private partnership to reduce HIV infection rates among adolescent girls and young women. As previously noted, South Africa has a high HIV infection rate. In light of this, there may be need to consider how these short-term benefits could be retained, while also transforming these organizations in the long-term.

For example, the NDH interview participant reported that the BMGF had refused to fund a project to revamp the patient records system, to make it digital. The foundation

said that the project should be funded by the government. An electronic patient record system project would have had a larger impact, as it would facilitate easy access to patients' records from anywhere in the country, which would, in turn, improve the health outcomes of patients. That would mean that the issue of the hospital not having a patient's medical history, which is a currently a common problem when patients seek treatment from different locations, would become a thing of the past. With an electronic patients' record system, records would be available electronically from any part of country, after the patient's initial visit to a public health institution. Funding such projects may be one of the ways that the BMGF could have a more extensive and transformative effect. But, more importantly, advocating for a more equitable global system in which low-income countries do not have to rely on the benevolence of philanthropic organizations like itself. The BMGF could withdraw its support for the TRIPS agreement which nurtures the disparities in access to essential medicinal drugs between developed countries and their developing counterparts.

Hahn (2007) suggests that in the West, there may be a perception that the international development agenda is philanthropic and a positive force (p. 161). While most interview respondents said that the work of the BMGF and ONE was beneficial and addressed pressing needs, upon closer examination, I argue that the projects were also serving Western economic and political interests. From the perspective of neoliberal imperialism, the sway which the BMGF holds over its projects and the preference for the use of American firms to do groundwork for projects in Africa can be viewed as serving American economic interests. The fact that the BMGF comes up with strategies which it then hands over for implementation by partners on the ground, as revealed by the

representative of the foundation in an interview (January 2020), suggests a kind of control, albeit subtle, on the part of the foundation. Schurman (2018) indicated that the BMGF favours strategic planning and conducts its projects like a military operation where the goals of the mission are determined by the leadership while the targets are located far away (pp. 185-186). My own research findings also reveal the foundation's inclination towards strategic planning, as noted above. In so doing, in some cases the foundation tends to ignore the viewpoints of those on the ground, who are being assisted. These beneficiaries suffer from what Miranda Fricker calls an "unjust epistemic disadvantage" as a result of their social disadvantage (2007, p. 4). In other words, an "epistemic injustice" is done to those whose points of view are not heard but are regarded as only beneficiaries and/or implementers of strategies. From my findings, in situations where the BMGF seeks partners to implement its strategies, it assumes that it knows best what should be done. Indeed, some interview respondents reported that the foundation has "highly competent staff" (MRC representative, March 2020; Tutu HIV Centre representative, March, 2020). The foundation may, therefore, have a sense of duty to share its knowledge and enhance the lives of others. Nevertheless, this way of imparting knowledge, which appears to silence the recipients, can be seen as an epistemic injustice. Consequently, even though recipients/beneficiaries accept this, my view is that they make the pragmatic decision to work with the foundation on its terms, even though they are aware of the problematic nature of their cooperation.

Additionally, my interview results show that the BMGF is sometimes heavily involved with the grantees and projects, especially at the beginning. Several respondents revealed that at some point foundation officials were overbearing: "...In the beginning

our relationship with them was quite difficult. They didn't trust us. They wanted to check everything. We felt like we were treated like children and all the rest of it" (February 2020). Another noted that "...initially, they directed us to countries... Yes, they might guide you here and there..." (February 2020). Yet another said that, "With the trials that we got funding directly from them [BMGF] we had weekly update calls where they actually joined the calls. For this year so far, I think we have had two visits and there are other two visits planned for April" (March 2020). Another interview respondent expressed the view that Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates were more than just philanthropists, that they wanted to know more about how and where their money was used. It can be inferred that the BMGF's heavy involvement with the grantees' work is a result of a lack of trust and therefore the foundation wants to drive processes as it sees itself as being more competent. From a postcolonial perspective, this shows the unequal relations between the donor and the recipient. When viewed through a postcolonial theoretical frame, the statement above, "we were treated like children..." (February 2020) suggests the infantilization of non-Western societies, which is a key characteristic of postcolonialism (Kapoor, 2012; Nair, 2017, p. 1; Repo and Yrjola, 2011, p. 54).

In some instances, a result of the top-down strategic planning orientation was that local, down-up initiatives which could potentially contribute to the BMGF's poverty alleviation efforts and bring healthcare to the wider South African population, did not meet the mark as they were context-specific and not attractive enough to be funded. Schurman (2018) made the same observation in his study. The denial of funding for the electronic patients' records system mentioned above, is a case in point. According to the NDH representative, the proposed project would have revolutionized the whole health

system. Furthermore, the government had requested assistance from the BMGF because this was a project it could not afford to finance on its own (NDH representative, March, 2020). In this case, community familiarity and small experiential knowledge was rejected, as Schurman (2018) suggests happens when expert knowledge is taken as superior. Furthermore, in his study, Schurman (2018) finds that in some instances, the BMGF staff does not listen to its partners on the ground, and this results in the latter being treated as docile objects of development, rather than complex, knowledgeable social actors (p. 181). This was evident in my own research. Some interview respondents observed that the BMGF opted to work with large American companies rather than small, locally-based firms which have a more in-depth knowledge of the area and issues (interview with former CHAI representative; EZINTSHA representative, February 2020).

The nature of Bono and Gates's engagement with the US government with regards to ONE and the BMGF's projects on the African continent reflects celebrity humanitarianism's neoliberalism. Both ONE and the BMGF are intervening to fill the gap that has been left by the receding state in the wake of neoliberalism. The way in which Bono's ONE Campaign engages with Western and African governments is revealing of the negative view the organization has of African political leadership and the faith the same organization has in Western governments. For example, ONE lobbied the American government to create laws that allow private sector players in that country to participate in the service provision and general economy on the African continent. The movement also campaigned for the British government to enact the International Development Act to allocate 0.7 per cent of its GNI to aid. However, when it came to African governments, ONE berated them for corruption and also demanded greater

democracy, transparency and accountability as the movement believes that these attributes and an active civil society are prerequisites for development (ONE, 2020). These demands are similar to those constantly being made by Western governments to their African counterparts.

In launching its partnership with the Dangote Foundation in Nigeria to strengthen the civil society in that country, the ONE Campaign also stated that failing to support Africa's young population would result in more instability and population movements. Though it was not explicitly stated, such a development would inevitably affect Western countries as well. The message of the advocacy organization was that supporting Africa would prevent terrorism. From a postcolonial theoretical perspective, Bono and the ONE Campaign assume that the US has the political will to create the right policies which would enable African governments to keep their youth populations in check, while they themselves are portrayed as corrupt and incompetent. From the above, there is nothing inherently wrong with supporting Africa's young people; in fact, it is a positive move which is welcomed. The ONE Campaign's suggestion that failure to do so would have security repercussions portrayed the continent in negative light, thereby strengthening the division between Africa and the West.

Postcolonialism suggests the continuation of colonialism long after the formal abolition of that practice (Seth, 2013, p. 20). The political and economic approach of postcolonialism suggests that colonialism produced an enduring system of global inequalities (Kohn, 2013, p. 190). Those inequalities are evident in my findings on the ONE Campaign, in which Africans form a large part of the membership, and yet, according to the former Africa Executive Director, Siphso Moyo, the region was allocated

the least amount of the organization's operational budget (Adesulu, 2018, March 16). In addition, since the establishment of the ONE Campaign regional head office in Johannesburg in 2010, Bono, the most visible leader and celebrity of the movement, only visited that office once. The reason for his visit was to apologize to former staff members for the alleged bullying they had endured during the period 2011 to 2015, which had brought the advocacy movement much negative media publicity (former ONE official #1, January 2020). Given the circumstances surrounding Bono's visit to the Africa office, in the company of the CEO of the organization, Gayle Smith, it is clear that the trip was meant to spruce up the image of the ONE Campaign and not about the work the movement is doing in the region. Given the extent of the media coverage of the bullying scandal, and the negative attention it brought not only to ONE but to its celebrity co-founder Bono, who is its public face, it could be argued that the trip itself was a public relations exercise. This suggests that in terms of importance, Africa is not a high priority. In other words, the region does not appear to be that important within the global advocacy movement, in spite of Africa having a larger membership than the whole of Europe (*ONE Annual Report 2017*, p. 3; p. 9). The discrepancy between the treatment of the African chapter of ONE and the others can be seen as a reflection of the core-periphery relations based on developmentalism that view certain spaces, such as the West as superior centres of progress and the origin knowledge and the ability to protect global others (Daley, 2013, p. 389).

It is evident that the BMGF takes a blanket approach to the continent of Africa. In its policy of scalability of projects and technologies, the foundation fails to recognize that what works in one African country might not work in another (Schurman, 2018, p. 186).

The representative of the NDH explained in an interview that the reason why the foundation would not assist in some areas was that the BMGF "...will support things that multiple countries can benefit from, that are innovative, that are either in diagnostics, a new drug or new ways of doing things" (NDH representative, March 2020). This conduct by the foundation can be understood through a postcolonial lens. The homogenization of the continent is an aspect of postcolonialism in which the continent is objectified and the historical experiences of its peoples ignored (Dubgen, 2012, pp. 74-75). Related to this concern was the allegation that the BMGF's staff turned a deaf ear to their partners/recipients who were implementing projects on the ground. For example, in the agriculture program, there had been an expansion of projects beyond their organizational capacities, into areas where they have no expertise. One farmer from Kenya was advised by the foundation's staff to expand his business to Tanzania, a country he had little knowledge about and no contacts (Schurman, 2018, p. 181). In such instances, the farmers were treated like passive objects of development instead of the complex, knowledgeable social actors they really are (Schurman, 2018, p. 181). Such treatment of grantees can happen because of the power imbalance that exists between the BMGF and its beneficiaries.

5.4.2 Humanitarian Governance

The excessive sway which the BMGF wields over the grantees has made some of them feel more like contractors rather than independent organizations. Some of the influence is in the form of target-setting for the grantees. These targets are mostly in numerical form. The BMGF prides itself in being goal-oriented (Gates, 2013, p. 3). Some

of the interview respondents attested to this, noting that the foundation had high expectations and accountability. This aspect of the foundation can be viewed as a form of humanitarian governance, where the funding of projects can be interpreted as way of “the administration of collectivities in the name of a higher moral principle that sees the preservation of life and the alleviation of suffering as the highest value of action” (Fassin, 2007, pp. 150-151). Humanitarian governance is not practiced by states alone, but rather, by various other non-state actors, including celebrities. My research found that the BMGF did not impose itself on any of its partners and beneficiaries. On the contrary, it was actually welcomed as it is a provider of much-needed funds and, in some cases, expertise. In some instances, those beneficiaries initiated the relationship with the foundation by applying for grants. In other cases, it was the other way round, where the foundation put out calls for proposals. However, as noted above, in some situations, the foundation tended to exert too much influence on grantees, in ways that illuminate the unequal power relations that exist between the foundation and its beneficiaries.

Humanitarian governance also best describes the great influence that the BMGF wields in the WHO because of the financial support the foundation renders to the global health agency. The BMGF is the biggest funder of the WHO Africa regional office. The representative of the WHO Africa regional office admitted in an interview that, “our engagement with them [BMGF] tends to follow their areas of interest... And whenever we develop the proposals, they are in line with their interest, because if it’s not their area of interest, they won’t fund them...” (February 2020). Even though the WHO representative added that the UN agency also follows its own priorities in its interaction with the foundation, her earlier revelations were illuminating of how much sway the

foundation holds. As such, Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates have become authorities within this organization, thereby raising the concern of lack of accountability.

The concept of humanitarian governance can also be a lens through which to view the way the ONE Campaign seeks to ensure that African youths, in Nigeria, for example, receive education, employment and social welfare to engage in economic activities that enable them to be economically independent. That way, they are prevented from threatening the stability of their own country as well as of the other parts of the world. It can be argued that the advocacy movement's activism, in this instance, aimed at enhancing the lives of Africa's young people not only for the good of Nigeria and the continent but also for the West, as there would be no instability. As Duffield (2007) suggests, international development is not about raising the quality of life of populations in the global South to the level of their Western counterparts, but about ensuring that instability does not infiltrate the West (pp. 68-69). Framing Africa as a potential security menace is problematic as it perpetuates the image of the continent as poverty and conflict-ridden. Nowhere does the ONE Campaign acknowledge that the situation Nigeria and the continent find themselves in is not necessarily or entirely of their own making, but could also be a result of the historical oppressive and exploitative colonial relations as well as the on-going forms of disadvantage in the contemporary global political economy. Although they campaign for debt relief and against the draining of Africa's resources, their other activities such as tax-avoidance and tax-evasion undermine those efforts.

The strategy of linking of development aid to security that the ONE Campaign employs can be construed as humanitarian governance – using humanitarian intervention

as a form of governance to ensure the survival of the Western liberal order (Duffield, 2010, p. 61). Therefore, the poverty that the advocacy organization seeks to combat may also serve as a pretext for such governance. The *Hungry No More* campaign, and indeed, most of the projects by the ONE Campaign and some of the BMGF, can be understood from a humanitarian governance perspective, which reveals what Duffield (2007) calls “a liberal conception of trusteeship” (p. 7). This trusteeship is imbued with liberal notions of guaranteeing freedom by supporting households and community organizations in their bid for economic autonomy and self-reliance (Duffield, 2007, p. 8). The *Girl Empowerment* campaign to get more girls into schools so that they can grow into empowered women who are able to be gainfully employed, the *Poverty is Sexist* campaign, and the *Cargill Cocoa Promise* campaign to allow women to get equal access to farming opportunities, are a few examples of projects designed to support households’ quest for economic independence and self-reliance through supporting women. The BMGF also conducts projects to improve gender equality, including supporting girls and women’s health and also ensuring school completion by girls. The rationale of these projects is so that women can be economically independent and also better look after their families.

Further, the work of the BMGF and the ONE Campaign can be viewed in terms of humanitarian governance as the two organizations are mainly concerned with human security, “...an enlightened way of thinking that broadens security beyond states to include other threats to life, for example poverty, environmental pollution, population displacement and infectious diseases, such as HIV/AIDS” (Duffield, 2007, p. 113). Fighting poverty and diseases, especially HIV/AIDS and others, such as TB and malaria,

is at the core of the work of the BMGF and ONE. These activities can be classified as constituting human security and it can be argued that they form part of the governance exercised by humanitarian and philanthropic organizations, specifically the two under discussion.

Moreover, human security involves a recognition of the role of individuals and communities in taking care of themselves (Duffield, 2007, p. 113), which many of the projects promoted by the ONE Campaign and the BMGF do. In fact, on its website the BMGF boldly announces that in developing countries, the foundation focuses on improving people's health and well-being and "helping individuals *lift themselves out of extreme poverty and hunger*" (BMGF, 2020, my emphasis). The ONE Campaign's the *Do Agric, It Pays* campaign, the ONE-AGRA partnership and the BMGF's *Girls Achieve Power (GAP)* project, are some of the projects which are designed to ensure that individuals take responsibility for their own well-being. It is noteworthy that most of these programmes also tend to be couched in terms of women empowerment, which in turn is supposed to result in increased food security, better education for children and nutrition and ultimately better economic outcomes. For example, the ONE Campaign looks at women in economic terms, claiming that investing in women's health would result in nine times economic and social benefits (ONE, 2020). This use of a capitalist lens to evaluate women's development is a feature of neoliberalism which Daley (2013) aptly describes as resulting in the commodification of all that has never been regarded as commodities (p. 377). The emphasis of the ONE Campaign and BMGF projects on self-reliance reveals the neoliberal logic of these programmes. Furthermore, even though the recipients and partners were grateful, I nevertheless argue that the activities of ONE and

the BMGF are not the answer as they do not address the structural inequalities which lead to some countries having to rely on philanthropy to lift them out of poverty.

The ONE Campaign's denigration of African political leaders is particularly evident in the *Hungry No More* campaign of 2011 which attributed the 2008-2009 famine in eastern Africa to the alleged incompetence and lack of political will of the region's political leaders (ONE, 2020). The *Hungry No More* campaign encouraged long-term private funding for the agricultural sector, and for African leaders to be transparent and accountable about the measures they were taking to fulfil the *Maputo Declaration* of committing 10 per cent of their national budgets to agriculture (ONE, 2020). The call for governments to invest more in agriculture is a shift from early forms of neoliberalism to inclusive neoliberalism, which gives governments more ownership and responsibility for some of the projects (Ruckert, 2006). However, inclusive neoliberalism is by no means a complete turn away from neoliberalism, rather, it simply coopts critics, but ultimately entrenches the same policies, as is reflected in some of the work of ONE and the BMGF, which undermines government involvement in the economy. These two organizations advocate for the involvement of private sector players in the provision of public goods, MNCs and the AGRA project, suggesting an entrenchment the neoliberal ethos. The advocacy movement's silence on the role of the 2008 global economic crisis in the wider global political economy, which might also have affected the region's economic prospects, and by extension, the agricultural sector shows a lack of sensitivity and acknowledgement of the global crisis' impact on the region. This selective politicization of hunger ignores the global institutional arrangements that keep these African countries in situations of hunger and impoverishment.

No matter how well-intentioned Bono, Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates are, the nature of some of their projects suggests that these celebrities could be seen as part of what Daley (2013) describes as a network of governance of others who are perceived to be outside of the realm of modernity (p.390). Further, given these humanitarian and philanthropic celebrities' status as cultural elites and products of global capitalism, they do not challenge the inequalities of global power relations, but rather, they co-operate with them to produce new disciplinary networks of governance of the global civil society (Daley, 2013, p.390). Even though Bono and ONE use the language of justice in their campaigns, they do not always 'walk the talk'. Bono's tax-avoidance scandals reflect his own unwillingness to contribute to democratic distribution in the form of taxes. Furthermore, his and ONE's frequent portrayal of Africa as an international security threat does not do justice to the continent; rather such a depiction tarnishes it as a terrorist hub.

5.4.3 Neoliberalism and Neoliberal Discourse

Some of the projects led by the BMGF and the ONE Campaign tend to promote individual entrepreneurial skills and freedoms, and the private sector, while the state is relegated to a smaller role. Harvey (2005) argues that this is how neoliberalism operates (p.2). These two organizations can thus be seen as agents of neoliberalism. For example, the ONE Campaign's *Connectivity Declaration* advocated for internet accessibility for the world's poorest people, claiming that internet access was essential for empowering them to lift themselves out of poverty. The movement lobbied world leaders to address competition policies that maintain internet costs at high levels. The internet itself is part

of the new technology that arose with the onset of neoliberalism in the 1980s (though ironically it was developed with state funding, within the U.S. military industrial complex). The internet forms the bedrock of the ONE Campaign, which relies mostly on social media and mobile phones for its advocacy work, especially in Africa. Therefore, in championing for internet access for the poor, with all the other much more pressing needs the continent's poor have, it can be assumed that the advocacy movement is actually working to advance neoliberalism. The internet can increase the access of the world's poor to formal financial services, such as savings accounts, loans and insurance. In fact, the BMGF funds financial inclusion projects in Africa, which are carried out in partnership with the AfDB and other stakeholders. These programmes are aimed at the inclusion of Africans, including women and rural consumers, into the formal economy, through the use of digital payment platforms (BMGF, 2020). It can be argued that they are neoliberal programmes which are ultimately aimed at economic growth and not necessarily personal enhancement of the beneficiaries. While it is good that the poor can transact in the formal economy, it does not necessarily mean that their position will be significantly improved. On the contrary, financial services for the poor may further impoverish them when they pay fees and other charges associated with the formal economy (Rankin, 2001). Financial inclusion programmes require internet accessibility. Therefore, in light of the intertwined nature of the relationship between the ONE Campaign and the BMGF, I view this as a collaboration between the two which will enhance the foundation's micro credit programmes, while widespread internet connectivity also benefits ONE whose activities are carried out through social media.

Other projects promoted by the BMGF and ONE, including the promotion of public-private partnerships in sanitation projects by the foundation, and in the provision of electricity and industrial infrastructure development on the African continent through initiatives like the Electrify Africa Act of 2016 and the BUILD Act of 2018, reveal the neoliberal inclination of the two organizations. At its enactment, the BUILD Act was expected to result in \$30 billion worth of investments by American companies in Africa, as well as the establishment of a development finance corporation to support private sector investments in African countries. The corporation, once fully operational, would bring money into the Treasury through loan fees and charges. Similarly, the Electrify Africa Act was put in place to facilitate the participation of American private sector players in the energy sector of Africa. Therefore, though these legislations were touted as vehicles for fighting poverty in Africa, they also served to create business opportunities for US companies, which would, in turn, enhance the American economy and increase income for the US Treasury.

The *IMF Gold* campaign, conducted by the ONE Campaign in 2009, resulted in the IMF approving the sale of 403 metric tonnes of gold in its possession, in order to generate money for lending to low-income countries. The gold sale was expected to raise US\$13 billion to loan to low-income countries affected by the global economic downturn in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis. As a result, the IMF delivered a package of new assistance to those countries at zero per cent interest until 2011 and permanently reduced rates thereafter (ONE, 2020). This concession to poor countries by the IMF would appear as positive development. However, it is important to note the conditionalities that characterize IMF loans such as trade liberalization, privatization and deregulation. These

conditionalities have led to massive unemployment and hardship in many IMF recipient countries (Stiglitz, 2002). Furthermore, the disbursement of loans to low-income countries meant that those countries were being pushed further into debt, thereby exacerbating the cycle of poverty. The concession by the IMF to poor countries neither acknowledged nor addressed the imbalance in the global economy which disadvantages those countries and perpetuates chronic indigence.

Neoliberalism is advanced, in part, through discourse which frames the alleviation of poverty as a moral objective and self-interest but ignores the reasons for the existence of poverty (Biccum, 2011, p. 1339). Celebrities have a tendency to depoliticize poverty issues and at the same time, proffer neoliberal solutions. For instance, the ONE Campaign and Bono advocate the market as the solution for getting people out of poverty, but they do not acknowledge the state's role in providing public goods. In a promotional video, Bono describes ONE as the "NRA [National Rifle Association] for the poor" and "commerce as the greatest player in taking people out of extreme poverty..." (Bono, 2017). His rationale is that commerce creates employment and "...when people have work, they can sort out their own problems" (Bono, 2017). It can be assumed that, in drawing a parallel between the NRA and ONE, Bono means that they are both powerful lobby groups. As already noted, in 2008, the size of ONE's national membership was only second to that of the NRA, with 2.5 million people (Bishop and Green, 2008, p. 206). Importantly, many people criticize the NRA for the influence it has over government (because the association has so much money). The same criticism could be levelled at ONE (despite the fact that many American liberals would argue that ONE does 'good' while the NRA does 'bad').

Neoliberal discourse also presents Africa's problems as moral issues and results of poor political leadership, as in the Hungry No More campaign. As mentioned above, that project attributed the famine in the Horn of Africa region to a deficit of competence and political will on the part of African leaders. At the same time, the advocacy movement's solution to this issue was to advocate for long term private investment in the agricultural sector and for African leaders to be more accountable and transparent about the measures they were taking to allocate 10 per cent of their national budgets to agriculture (ONE, 2020). Other advocacy campaigns which employ explicit neoliberal discourse are the *Grow Africa* campaign, *Do Agric, It Pays* campaign and ONE-AGRA campaign, among others. All of these call for increased private investment in agriculture. Importantly, it should be noted that these projects may have some positive aspects. However, greater involvement by the private sector in African agriculture does not necessarily guarantee food security for the majority of the population on the continent. For example, several critics have noted the negative effects of the AGRA on small-scale farmers who have been pushed out by agribusiness and how reforms have not necessarily resulted in increased production (Aminzade, 2014; Ghosh, 2020; Wise, 2020). Similarly, greater involvement of American private players in the electricity provision on the continent, as called for in the Electrify Africa Act of 2016 and *Life Empowered* campaign, does not necessarily mean that the poor will have access to electricity. The discourse leaves out the crucial issue of affordability of that resource once it is being provided by private players who seek to make a profit. After all, private investors get into business not for the love of humanity, but for financial gain.

Even though both the ONE Campaign and the BMGF use the rhetoric of justice and equality – “we believe that the fight against poverty isn’t about charity, but about justice and equality” (ONE, 2020), and the foundation purports to be combatting “the greatest inequities in our world” (BMGF, 2020) – there are no attempts to address the causes of poverty. On the contrary, the construction of some of the appeals makes them sound like charity is being sought for the poor. For example, Bono’s appeal to the American Congress to consider a 1 per cent of the national budget aid for Africa as a “tithe” (Duvall, 2010, p. 181). In addition, as is evident, the ONE Campaign’s calls to policy-makers in London and Washington is for “more attention” to Africa, not a demand for radically changed policies. For instance, Bono asks for more aid and debt relief. He does not question the structures of the global economic system (Goodman, 2008, p. 262). Of course, debt relief is good for African countries. But what would be even better would be to fight for a more level and just global political economic playing field where no country should have to rely on aid. Furthermore, the same Western countries should rather be asked to compensate African countries for the exploitation and robbery of its human capital and natural resources. As Walter Rodney (1981) argues, during the 400 years of the slave trade, almost 12 million Africans were shipped as commodities to the New World, thereby robbing the continent of able-bodied women and men (cited in Oloruntoba & Falola, 2020, p. 3). Celebrity humanitarian narratives intersect with neoliberal discourses as they justify partnerships as meaningful approaches to peace and development (Budabin, 2020, pp. 63-64). The advocacy for PPPs by the ONE Campaign in the areas of infrastructure development in the context of the Electrify Africa Act and the BUILD Act, can be viewed as part of these neoliberal discourses. Celebrities like

Bono and Bill Gates are well positioned as visible figures to present concise and persuasive arguments that justify market solutions. Furthermore, these solutions to development challenges are publicised in both official circles (such as Congress in the US) as well as mass-market locations, such as coffee shops, supermarkets and airports. Market solutions advanced by the likes of Gates and Bono are shared by state actors, like USAID and the US State Department which support and seek the expansion of PPPs abroad (Budabin, 2020, p. 70). The ONE Campaign's *Life Empowered* campaign to raise awareness of Sub-Saharan Africa's energy deficit was carried out at phone charging stations at airports. The institutional embrace of PPPs and the traction of celebrity neoliberal discourses in elite spheres is further evidence of celebrity influence (Budabin, 2020, p. 70). Although the discourses employed by the BMGF and ONE may have resulted in PPPs which are appreciated in Africa, they neither reveal the causes of the issues being tackled through American private sector intervention, nor acknowledge that the activities of these companies may not bring about an enduring solution to the continent's problems. As such, I argue that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy do little to address the issues they purport to tackle. Rather, these activities may serve to entrench the divide between the givers and those being assisted.

5.4.4 Lack of accountability

The privatization of the provision of public goods under neoliberalism leads to a transference of authority from elected governments which are mandated to ensure universal service provision to private players who are mainly concerned about profit accumulation (Larner, 2000, p. 8). Furthermore, shifting from public to private delivery

takes decision-making out of the public sphere and potentially ignores considerations of the public interest (Edwards, 2008). The way in which celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy are practiced has meant that traditional civic duties are being replaced by “alternative forms of virtuous participation” and that celebrities are in effect, engaging in politics (Wheeler, 2013, p. 2). This is accompanied by a lack of accountability by those new players as no one elected them to office, and therefore they are under no obligation to be accountable to the electorate as governments are. The American companies whose participation in African economies is facilitated by the various legislations advocated by ONE are not accountable to the African electorates whom they serve. Equally, the ONE Campaign and the BMGF and their leaders in the roles which they play in the continental bodies like the WHO, are not accountable to anyone. Bill Gates, in particular, exerts great influence in the WHO, where his foundation is the largest donor at the African regional office, and through the funding of the African Vaccine Regulatory Authority (AVRA), which evaluates the safety of vaccines on the continent. As was revealed by the representative of the WHO Africa regional office in an interview, the world body follows the interests of the foundation in order to ensure that it gets funding (February 2020). Given such a scenario, it can be inferred that in the area of vaccines, the foundation may also have its own interests it may want to advance, and the AVRA might have to comply in order to position itself favourably for funding. The BMGF also provides funding to the medicines regulatory authorities of several countries in Africa, including South Africa. It can be assumed that through this funding, the BMGF (and by extension, Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates) “have the capacity to decide which diseases are eradicated, not because they represent the collective will of the public, but because of the amount of

power they wield due to their massive wealth” (Nickel and Eikenberry, 2010, p. 272). In other words, philanthropic foundations, such as the BMGF, have the resources to shape public policy, but they have no accountability to the public or to the people who are directly impacted by their projects. When a foundation project fails, the subjects of the experiment or the general public can suffer, but the ‘do-gooders’ can just move on to the next project (Barkan, 2013, p. 637).

Indeed, the lack of accountability was a concern which was raised by one of the interview respondents who articulated that, “The other challenge with the BMGF is that they are not accountable to anybody. It’s the two of them that make decisions. They have a board, but it’s the two of them that make decisions” (March 2020). That respondent further explained that having only two individuals make decisions of such a powerful organization could be a double-edged sword;

It’s good if you want agility, if you want things to move quickly. Like they did now with corona virus. They just released \$100 million to the corona effort without having to go to any board, you don’t need to have a business plan. So the agility is good. The bad thing is that if they decided no, we are not funding the corona virus response, for whatever reason, then the BMGF would not fund it, never mind what the board says. (March 2020)

The explanation above indicates that though the beneficiaries of the BMGF are aware of the adverse effects of the lack of accountability, they are equally cognisant of the advantages of having just two individuals make major decisions on behalf of their foundation. As such, none of the respondents suggested that philanthropies should be abolished, even though some voiced apprehension about the conduct of these

organizations. However, as McGoey aptly observes, “private philanthropy in general can be a threat to democratic accountability and a just society” (2021, May 4, n.p.).

From the research results, it is therefore clear that while the respondents were aware that the BMGF lacks accountability, they were grateful for its funding. Nevertheless, I argue that this help does not go far enough to address deeper issues of inequality. In fact, philanthropy is sometimes practiced in ways that bring in profit for the foundations, a concept called ‘philanthrocapitalism’.

5.4.5 Philanthrocapitalism

Philanthrocapitalism refers to “philanthropy...understood as an ‘investment’ and is configured as a hybrid concept. It therefore loses the ‘traditional’ notion of giving unselfishly to transform into ‘marketized’ philanthropy...” (Mediavilla and Garcia-Arias, 2019, p. 862). In our interview, the representative of the BMGF referred to the projects the foundation is conducting in South Africa and across the continent as “investments”. Similarly, the ONE Campaign refers to women’s health programmes as “investments in women’s health”. Bill Gates also openly supports ‘philanthrocapitalism’, which he refers to as “creative capitalism” (Kiviat & Gates, 2008). In an article he co-authored with Barbara Kiviat for *TIME Magazine*, Gates argued that private firms needed to earn some return for their philanthropic activities (2008, pp. 6-7). Although Gates was referring specifically to private corporate entities, the same rationale is used in the BMGF as was suggested in the interview with the foundation’s representative in South Africa. This therefore means that the foundation and/or companies working with the foundation, may be accruing some benefits, visible or hidden, material or otherwise, from the projects they

carry out in South Africa and across the continent. In situations where there are no explicit material gains, it can be assumed that the profit for Gates and the foundation lies in the power they wield over certain projects, for example, the WHO, AVRA and AGRA. It can be argued that economic growth/profit is the rationale for the foundation's philanthropic endeavours. Consequently, the question of their long-term benefits and who ultimately benefits from their work arises.

Some of the ONE Campaign's programmes discussed in this dissertation facilitated gains for private companies, even though those programmes were also serving the public good. The ONE Campaign is also credited for ensuring widespread availability of HIV/AIDS drugs in South Africa and across the continent under the Global Fund and the GAVI. South Africa has one of the highest HIV infection rates in the world and as such, the disease is a huge health challenge in that country, as previously noted (BMGF, 2018). One of the interview participants recalled how Bono had personally engaged with AIDS sufferers in the South African township of Soweto in 2000 (before the establishment of ONE) to hear their story. That participant believed that that action by Bono contributed to the establishment of the PEPFAR programme (MRC representative interview, March, 2020). The ONE Campaign cites as one its achievements that a lot more AIDS patients on the continent are able to access medication (ONE, 2020). It should be noted that life expectancy in South Africa in 1999 when the BMGF started operating there (before it became a fully-fledged foundation) was 57.144 years and in 2004 when ONE started its operations was 53.444. But in 2019 it had risen to 64.131 (World Bank, 2021, n.p.). The dip in 2004 was attributed to the prevalence of HIV/AIDS which killed many people and the rise to the 64.131 years, can be accredited to the

widespread availability of life-saving antiretroviral medication made possible partly through ONE's advocacy and BMGF's funding. Therefore, greater access to HIV treatment was indeed a positive development, as lives were saved. However, ONE's activities can still be viewed in terms of philanthrocapitalism. Companies involved in raising money for the Global Fund under the Product (RED) campaign, profit from that fund-raising opportunity when they sell red-branded goods and donate only 1 per cent of the proceeds to the Global Fund (Littler, 2008; O'Manique & Labonte, 2008). For example, the American Express RED Card campaign donates 1 per cent to Product(RED). However, American Express is ranked by Interbrand as the 14th most valuable brand in the world, and is the 174th largest corporation globally, according to *Fortune* business magazine. In light of this, the 1 per cent donation is a paltry amount, especially when measured against the amount of added value accruing to American Express and its associated celebrity endorsers from the association with the campaign (Littler, 2008, p. 242). Therefore, even though the projects benefited the people on the ground, the monetary gain which accrued to the companies involved was much greater than what was donated to the fund-raising project.

The above notwithstanding, some interview respondents revealed that celebrity-led projects were welcome and much appreciated, regardless of the problematic manner in which they were implemented. In the next section I dwell further on these voices.

5.5 Insights From the Voices on the Ground

Some of my research findings seemingly cannot be interpreted in light of the theoretical frame I have chosen for this dissertation, and the comments of respondents do

not always support the critical literature on celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, and specifically on the BMGF and the ONE Campaign. As previously noted, most of the interview respondents expressed appreciation for the work that the BMGF and ONE (where applicable) were doing and articulated the view that it was helpful work which had improved the lives of many. Some disclosed that they may not have been able to do their work without the funding from the BMGF. Others said that their work would have been at a much smaller scale. While Schurman (2018) suggests that the foundation is unwilling to listen to its grantees, some of my interview respondents expressed the opposite view (Tutu HIV Centre; Aurum Institute; NEPAD; ACBF). These participants said that they had never experienced the BMGF as being unwilling to listen, although, in some instances, they did not always reach a desired decision. Most of the respondents reported that the BMGF's conditionalities were not onerous, contrary to some literature (McGoey, 2015; Reich, 2018; Cody, 2012), and that the foundation had played a major role in ensuring patients' access to medication for HIV, TB and malaria, through the National Department of Health.

Furthermore, the foundation had also contributed to tobacco control in Africa through funding research at various institutions in South Africa and around the continent. According to the BMGF (2020), "tobacco-caused diseases have emerged as one of the greatest challenges facing developing countries". While this is indeed a fact, until the funding provided by the foundation and then by the Bloomberg foundation, no work was being done on tobacco control in Africa. In applauding the positive role the BMGF is playing in the area of tobacco control, the representative of the ACBF pointed out in an interview that not only were people dying from tobacco-related causes, but tobacco also

bred a cycle of poverty. That interview respondent observed that there is a lot of child labour in tobacco cultivation on the continent, which results in those children being denied the opportunity to go to school. The work of the BMGF in tobacco control thus appears to be altruistic and solely for the sake of saving lives, without any gain accruing to the foundation or firms associated with it. After all, a total of 8 million people worldwide die annually of tobacco-related causes (ACBF representative, February, 2020). From this perspective, the BMGF's interaction with the ACBF, UCT and other organizations on tobacco control, cannot be interpreted as neoliberal imperialism.

Moreover, the BMGF-funded tobacco control project cannot be interpreted in terms of philanthrocapitalism. From my findings, it appears that there is no profit to be made from the tobacco-control projects being funded by the foundation. The BMGF and the Bloomberg foundation are the only two organizations that are involved in tobacco control globally (ACBF representative, Feb, 2020). As such, there was lot of praise for the former, which operates in Africa. The Bloomberg foundation was reported to be working primarily in Asia. In fact, in her response to the question on the role of celebrities in philanthropic work, the ACBF representative stated that,

We really appreciate the role of Bill and Melinda Gates for just thinking of Africa. Because there is not much money for tobacco control globally. The sole sponsors of tobacco control are Bill and Melinda Gates and Bloomberg. But only the Gateses are in Africa. (February 2020)

Furthermore, the lack of accountability did not seem to be a concern in this instance. As noted above, some interview participants pointed out that if it was not for the BMGF and the Bloomberg foundation, there may not have been any tobacco control

initiatives on the continent. These interview respondents acknowledged that tobacco control was not the BMGF's core interest, and yet the foundation had been very generous. Therefore, even though it was the BMGF which initiated the tobacco control programme on the continent, it was an issue that was very relevant and consequently, it was welcomed by the recipients.

Another area where my findings on the BMGF's work are contrary to some critical studies is in the foundation's open-access policy. Some interview respondents praised the foundation for ensuring that the research it funds is available to all who are interested, free of charge. This data-sharing policy was seen as a way to help bridge the knowledge inequity gap between scientists in the developed world and their counterparts in the developing world. In 2006, as a condition for receiving \$287 million in grants for HIV/AIDS vaccine research, 165 scientists in 19 countries had to share their data in a central repository (Okie, 2006, p. 1080). In 2014, the BMGF announced that from January 2015, researchers it funds must make open their resulting papers and data sets immediately after publication, and must also make that research available for commercial reuse. At that time, the BMGF announced that it would pay the necessary publication fees (which are usually to the tune of thousands of dollars per article) (Van Noorden, 2014). Further, the representative of the MRC disclosed in an interview that, "if you are developing a drug with the Gates Foundation money, you have to ensure that there is going to be global access and affordable pricing" (March 2020). The representative of the South African National Department of Health revealed that the BMGF's intervention had ensured the decrease of the price of TB medication from US\$800 to US\$400 a month per patient. These research findings are inconsistent with the literature which claims that the

BMGF keeps prices of products it funds high and out of reach for developing countries (McGoey, 2015).

Clearly, the ONE Campaign's *MomConnect* and *Make Naija Stronger* programmes gave Africans some agency at several levels. The campaigns were conducted by people on the continent, and the results of the campaigns were implemented by people on the continent. In the case of the *MomConnect* project, it was the expectant and new mothers who made use of mobile phones to seek more information about their conditions and their newborn babies. In the case of the *Make Naija Stronger* campaign, it was the ordinary Nigerian citizens who lobbied their government to implement the National Health Act by allocating more resources to healthcare. While Bono and the leadership of ONE may have initiated the idea to run the campaign, the lobbying was ultimately conducted by Nigerian citizens themselves. Therefore, Nigerians were not docile observers but active participants in issues that affected them. Equally, the role of the African ministers of health in advocating for the replenishment of the Global Fund shows them taking charge of the health issues of their people by calling on those with resources to contribute to the Fund. In this case, the ONE Campaign lobbied the AU health ministers to ensure that they were seized with this issue during their meetings, and, in turn, the ministers did their part by including the matter in their final communique (ONE, 2020).

While neoliberal imperialism is illuminating in some sense, a framing of imperialism inherently tends to deny the agency of those portrayed as subjects to that imperial power. It is also important to remember the urgent need and assistance that is facilitated by ONE and the BMGF. South Africa has a huge HIV/AIDS problem. In 2018,

South Africa had the largest HIV-positive population in the world (BMGF, 2018, p. 5). As such, the BMGF and ONE's involvement in HIV/AIDS issues in that country were most welcome and helpful. The NDH representative confirmed that the BMGF had partnered with his department to bring down the price of HIV and TB drugs, as already noted. In light of this, there may be need to consider how these short-term benefits could be retained, while also modifying these organizations in the long-term, as suggested above.

The ONE Campaign also exposed what it called the *Trillion Dollar Scandal* in 2014. The advocacy movement claimed that one trillion dollars was being siphoned from Africa and other developing countries annually through illicit deals and the use of shady companies. The result of the movement's lobbying was that the G20 countries agreed to work on a plan to combat tax avoidance by multinational corporations, endorsed a global standard for the automatic exchange of tax information and pledged to begin exchanging information among themselves and with other countries. The G20 also undertook to crack down on secret company ownership by implementing the G20 High Level Principles on Beneficial Ownership Transparency (ONE, 2020). This finding therefore does not appear to reflect neoliberal imperialism as the advocacy movement focused on, *inter alia*, curbing tax evasion by transnational corporations, to ensure a fair taxation system that would enable developing countries to receive what is due to them, and the companies to receive what is legally due to them as well. Therefore, ONE's efforts in the *Trillion Dollar Scandal* campaign proved to be beneficial for developing countries.

Importantly, some of the projects conducted by the BMGF and the ONE Campaign were in line with the priorities of the AfDB whose mandate is to promote

sustainable development in its member countries, thus contributing to poverty reduction. As noted by the representative of the AfDB in an interview, the Bank has 5 priority areas which include food security; infra-structure development; energy security; industrialization and, finally governance and institution building. In light of this, the projects by ONE and the BMGF were appreciated by the continental bank as they were supporting its priorities. It can also be argued that, because of the need that exists on the continent, the beneficiaries of the BMGF and ONE take a pragmatic approach of working with the two organizations, regardless of the problematic nature of their engagement. As was revealed by some of the interview respondents, the BMGF was the only source of funds for their projects. In view of this, it is important to avoid a blanket critique of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy as this fails to take into account the immediate and pressing needs of the societies in which the projects take place. It is also apparent from the contrast between the findings and the literature that the foundation, in some instances, employs different tactics in its engagement with beneficiaries. However, the projects that are undertaken by the BMGF and ONE do not tackle the deep-seated structural inequities at the core of the global political economy which keep African countries in conditions of need. To be able to do this, celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy must be reimagined.

5.6 Conclusion

My findings show that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy have evolved in recent years, working to fill the gap created by the withdrawal of the state or its failure to provide public goods in the current neoliberal global political economy. Of the two

case studies, the BMGF has played an enormous role especially in the area of global health – HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis. The ONE Campaign has also been involved in the health sector through advocating for fund-raising for HIV medicines to enable greater access to treatment by AIDS sufferers. The movement's advocacy for people in sub-Saharan Africa follows the afore-mentioned neoliberal reforms in the region. However, the striking feature of the current trend of celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic activities is their close relationship with capitalism. The celebrities studied in this dissertation do not hide their endorsement of the system, which Bill Gates calls “creative capitalism” (Kiviat & Gates, 2008). Bono and Gates see no contradiction between capitalism and philanthropy, hence their cooperation with Western MNCs whose reputations are marred with exploitation of the poor. Current celebrity philanthropic initiatives do not confront global structures, some which are responsible for the poverty they seek to fight.

My research found that celebrity-led humanitarian and philanthropic projects in South Africa and across the continent were welcomed by the interview respondents as they serve urgent and pressing needs. From my findings, there was also a general appreciation for the work of the BMGF and the ONE Campaign. In particular, the BMGF was reported to be providing much-needed funding, without which some projects would not have been possible, while others would have been at a much smaller scale. Consequently, the involvement of the BMGF and ONE had resulted in the improvement of life for some people.

This positive local response to celebrities in humanitarian and philanthropic activities was a crucial finding as most of the critical literature would not acknowledge this. Therefore, while I argue that, overall, celebrity humanitarianism is problematic, it can bring much-needed funding for immediate needs. However, it also emerged that the BMGF's use of American firms to do work in South Africa was a concern for the respondents, who felt that that practice was misguided, given that there were African organizations who could do the same work. Respondents expressed the view that it would have been better for the BMGF to rely on local agencies. Such an approach would also assist in building capacity in South Africa and across the region. Agenda-setting by the BMGF was also an issue that was voiced by several interview participants, although it was made clear that this was not practiced directly, but through applicants tailoring their grant proposals in ways that tallied with the foundation's interests, in order to enhance their chances. Similarly, the power imbalance between the foundation and its beneficiaries and partners was raised as an issue of concern. The lack of accountability by the foundation in which only Bill and Melinda Gates make the decisions emerged as a concern for some respondents. Those respondents who were skeptical about celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy questioned the source of the wealth of philanthropists, including the Gateses. The BMGF's influence over grant recipients was reported as another down-side of the foundation as this sometimes led to inappropriate projects. The sway which the BMGF held over its beneficiaries was perpetuated by the uneven power relationship between the foundation and the beneficiaries, and this tended to reproduce the inequalities that exist in the global political economy. Therefore, although celebrity humanitarianism was welcomed, its approach is ultimately depoliticizing, insofar as it

serves to efface the historical origins and contemporary political and economic causes of systemic poverty and inequality.

With regards to the ONE Campaign, the major theme that emerged was the movement's advocacy for health and women's empowerment, especially in the agricultural sector. The organization also lobbied for increased American private sector investment on the continent, increased British aid and concessionary loans for low-income from the IMF following the 2008 financial crisis. However, I contend that even though the advocacy movement's smart economics approach may have enhanced women's economic opportunities, it followed a neoliberal logic of creating 'entrepreneurial subjects' (Duffield, 2007) in the global South. The opening up of business opportunities for American investors in Africa also formed a core part of ONE's advocacy. The other underlying negative theme was the accusation levelled against the leadership of the movement that it was averse to Africans who spoke up for themselves.

Thus, while celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy provided much needed financial assistance and raised awareness of issues, a critical analysis of those research findings shows that celebrity-led projects tend to address symptoms rather than the causes of poverty, just like traditional aid projects. Moreover, short-term gains of celebrity humanitarianism can disguise the fact that celebrity humanitarianism is ultimately undermining democratic accountability and the agency of African nations. It is therefore apparent that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy do not lead to long-term development; rather, they can serve to reinforce the dominance between the West and Africa and to perpetuate existing inequalities.

In the following and final chapter, I return to the debate between cosmopolitan and critical approaches and discuss it in light of my research findings. The chapter also seeks to establish what the implications of my findings might be to the practice of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy in general and to BMGF and ONE in particular. I conclude that these activities do not bring long-term development. Further, they do not address the structural injustices and inequalities which are often the cause of the indigence celebrities seek to combat.

Conclusion

1. Overview

This dissertation has engaged in a critical analysis of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy by examining how these activities are conducted on the ground and how they are perceived by their recipients and partners. This is in the context of increased involvement of celebrities in humanitarian and philanthropic activities over the past three decades, who focus their attention on indigence, diseases and other disasters around the world, particularly in developing countries. ‘Africa’, in particular, has been the focus of much of this activity, so much so that, scholars have referred to the ‘Africanization’ of poverty, where campaigns are based on empathy and tend to appeal to Westerners with relatively little consideration of the causes or nature of poverty (Harrison, 2010, p. 392). My dissertation, therefore sought to answer the following questions: what are the benefits and limitations of celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic organizations for development and to what extent have celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy contributed to development and the improvement of quality of life in South Africa and sub-Saharan Africa?

2. Summary of the Research Findings

As noted in the previous chapters, my findings show that the work of the BMGF and ONE has resulted in some improvement in the lives of the beneficiaries and partners. For example, funding by the BMGF has resulted in greater availability of medicines for HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria patients in South Africa and throughout the sub-

Saharan region. The BMGF was also reported to have less onerous conditionalities than other philanthropic foundations. Celebrities were welcomed as key players in humanitarian and philanthropic activities in terms of advocacy and/or providing financial resources which enabled the interview respondents' work to materialize and/or continue. With regards to ONE, which is not a grant-making organization, some participants noted the crucial advocacy role the organization had played in their projects.

That said, many of the respondents had substantial reservations about the activities of these organizations. Reading these findings through the lens of neoliberal imperialism and the wider critical literature allowed me to draw a number of conclusions regarding the impact of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy on development in the region. For example, agenda-setting by the BMGF, through grant applicants tailoring their proposals to match the foundation's interests has removed agency from the local people. Moreover, this tended to divert resources towards other areas which may not necessarily be the most important for the people on the ground. For instance, one participant expressed dismay over the rejection of his organization's application for funding for an electronic patient record system which the respondent believed would have had a transformative effect on the entire health system. The sub-contracting of American consulting firms by the BMGF to do work in Africa which could be done better by African institutions was another contentious issue expressed by some research participants. Those respondents viewed the foundation as undermining the agency of Africans themselves. I argue that such action by celebrities constitutes them as humanitarian subjects working for the benefit of African people. In addition, engaging foreign organizations to do work on the African continent which could be better

performed by locals would also suggest that the continent is ‘helpless’ and in need of that foreign intervention. Furthermore, the limited life-span of donor-funded projects emerged as another concern. Once donor finances dried up, if the projects were not integrated into government programmes, that would be the end. This demonstrates the focus of these ‘celebrity’ organizations on short-term, media-friendly issues, rather than long-term, incremental economic and political transformation.

My findings and arguments are generalizable to other celebrity-led philanthropic and humanitarian organizations as they generally operate in similar fashion. For example, celebrity-led philanthropic organizations such as George Soros’ Open Society Foundation, Michael Bloomberg’s Bloomberg Philanthropies and Howard G. Buffett Foundation, to name a few, are grant-making private foundations like the BMGF. They focus on a wide-range of issues including public health, education, the arts, governance and democracy promotion, the environment, agriculture and food security, justice reform and journalism (Open Society Foundation, 2022; Bloomberg Foundation, 2022; Howard G. Buffett Foundation, 2022). While Soros and Buffet may not have the notoriety of an individual like Bill Gates, they are still widely-known individuals who are very much at the fore-front, even though the day-to-day running of their foundations is in the hands of full-time staff. In their projects, they also partner with local organizations and have an entrepreneurial approach to giving as Kapoor (2012) aptly describes Gates and Soros (p. 48).

With regards to celebrity humanitarianism which is practiced by Bono and ONE, the findings and arguments are also generalizable to celebrity humanitarians, such as George Clooney and Ben Affleck, among others, who engage in advocacy work to raise

awareness of issues in Sudan and South Sudan, and in Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo, respectively. Clooney co-founded the advocacy organization, Not on Our Watch, with fellow actors Matt Damon, Don Cheadle, Brad Pitt, David Pressman and Jerry Weintraub in 2007. The organization (which changed its name to The Sentry in 2019, following a merger with The Sentry, another advocacy organization which was co-founded by Clooney) develops advocacy campaigns to bring attention to global crises (Philanthropy News Digest, 2022; The Sentry, 2019, March 20). Clooney and Cheadle have engaged with the American government on issues such as Darfur (De Waal, 2008, p. 46), in the same way that Bono engages with various governments to draw attention to causes he cares about. Affleck's Eastern Congo Initiative is both a celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic organization as it focuses on advocacy, giving grants and implementing projects in the Congo (Budabin, Rasmussen & Richey, 2017, p. 1995). Affleck also often takes his advocacy to the US Congress where he has appeared alongside Bill Gates to raise awareness about the poverty in Eastern Congo. Affleck has also advocated strategic partnerships between American companies and Congolese businesses, as a way to foster economic growth in the Congo (Budabin, Rasmussen & Richey, 2021). Like Bono, Affleck's advocacy has the support of wealthy foundations, such as the Howard G. Buffett Foundation, and also campaigns for the entry of American business into the Congolese economy through projects which are promoted as serving the Congolese people as well as making good business (Budabin, Rasmussen & Richey, 2021).

Celebrity humanitarians also use similar narratives which are characterized by colonial representations of African victims and Western saviours. Bono, Clooney, Affleck and indeed other celebrity humanitarians receive extensive media coverage.¹⁰

3. Practical Implications on Development

Celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic practices no doubt serve a purpose in South Africa and other African countries in the current context as revealed in the interviews. While celebrity humanitarianism has been evolving, especially over the past 30 years, little has been written on its impact (Huliaras and Tzifakis, 2010, p. 255). Similarly, the impact of celebrities in spaces where they carry out their activism and philanthropic activities has been under-researched (Huliaras and Tzifakis, 2010, p. 257; Richey, 2016, p. 9) and yet, as shared by some of the interview respondents, celebrity philanthropy is a big and growing part of contemporary society. Interview participants described celebrities in several ways, but all of which signified the perceived importance of these actors. Celebrities were described as “part of the modern world” (Tutu HIV Centre representative, March 2020); “influencers” (WHO representative, February 2020; MRC representative, March 2020; AfDB representative, February 2020); “attention pullers” (NEPAD representative, March 2020); and “they are here to stay” (Tutu HIV Centre representative, March 2020). As such, celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy cannot be completely dismissed because of their imperfections. As one interview respondent suggested, rather than point accusatory fingers at celebrities for the way they

¹⁰ That said, it is important to recognize that the ONE Campaign is a membership organization. The other examples of advocacy organizations provided above are not membership organizations.

conduct their activism, it is better to find ways of working with them (March 2020). After all, humanitarianism has become the key frame through which various celebrities measure each other's legitimacy in the current world (Repo and Yrjölä, 2011, p. 57). More and more, there is an expectation by governments, NGOs and fans that celebrities take a stance on a whole range of issues from poverty, to social injustice and climate change, to name a few. Furthermore, celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy are playing an increasingly important role in international politics and the wider conceptualization of the relationship between the global South and the global North (Muller, 2013, p. 478).

It has been suggested by proponents that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy require a 'social contract' between the wealthy and the rest of the population, stating out a clear set of rules for the former in order for them to know what they have to do to gain acceptance by society. For the citizenry, there should be a clear understanding of how society will interact with the rich if they adhere to the rules and a strong, transparent regulatory mechanism that would enable society to hold them to account (Bishop and Green, 2008, p. 262). Such a social contract would be useful in deciding how best to solve major global issues so that celebrity philanthropists, governments, corporates, NGOs and citizens can form partnerships in which each plays a part they are best suited and desist from getting involved in activities in which they have no expertise (Bishop and Green, 2008, p. 262). In other words, under a social contract framework, each party to the contract would be required to stay in their lane. Currently, it appears that when people have had success in one area, they think they can spread their knowledge elsewhere. Bill Gates' management style at Microsoft was transferred to the

BMGF, with the result that even the smartest of staffers would not dare to question Gates' decision because he is assumed to be "super smart" (Schurman, 2018, p. 182). Similarly, Gates' tendency to tackle global issues using technology can be assumed to be an overflow from his previous position at the technology firm. An equitable social contract might extend more grace to celebrity humanitarians and philanthropists than their fellow celebrities who indulge themselves free from criticism because they do not engage in such activities (Bishop and Green, 2008, p. 264). With regards to who and how such a social contract could be drafted and adopted, one way would be to set up a multi-stakeholder group including the celebrity humanitarians and philanthropists, government, corporate entities, civil society and community representatives to deliberate on these issues. However, the limitation with such a solution would be that the same negative power dynamics that have been discussed in this dissertation would play out in the multi-stakeholder group because the ultra-rich possess power that comes from their wealth. As such, it is unlikely that they would be willing to bow to the demands of others.

Critics have argued that super rich people such as Bill Gates should give more and live less lavish lives. Bill Gates, for example, has been called on to give away most of his money because he was able to create his wealth because of the favourable social condition with abundant social capital (including the rule of law, education, stability, etc.) (Singer, 2006, cited by Bishop and Green, 2008, p. 264). Presumably in response to these sentiments, in 2010, Gates, together with another billionaire philanthropist Warren Buffett, launched the Giving Pledge which they explained is "a commitment by the world's wealthiest individuals and families to dedicate the majority of their wealth to giving back" (Giving Pledge, 2021). However, a study by the Institute of Policy Studies

discovered that many of those super-rich people give to donor-advised funds (DAFs) and private foundations that are required to pay only a small percentage of their assets on charitable contribution every year. Private foundations are only required to spend 5 per cent of their assets, while there is no stipulated minimum on DAFs (Collins & Flannery, 2020, n.p.). When Bill Gates pledged to give away most of wealth in his life time when he co-founded the Giving Pledge, his net worth was US\$53 billion. In 2020, it had risen to US\$115 billion (Collins & Flannery, 2020) and to \$130 billion in January 2021 (Allison, 2021). And even though he does give to philanthropic causes, he does so in dribs and drabs, and in some cases insists on how the money is spent, as revealed by some interview respondents. Such giving creates a bottleneck in the distribution of their wealth, thereby allowing it to grow at a faster pace than their giving (James, 2021, October 20). In light of this, the giving pledge is, in effect, an exercise in smoke and mirrors and is clearly not designed to address the inequities that exist in the current world order. If it was, Gates would be giving more, and towards projects that are more transformative, such as strengthening the health systems in Africa through training of doctors and other interventions to help them to remain in their countries of origin and curb brain-drain. The study by the Institute of Policy Studies shows that Gates' wealth is growing at a much higher rate than he is giving it away.

Governments could create laws to force the super-rich to pocket less, such as higher taxation for the super-rich and corporations and to have states work together to crack down on tax-avoidance and tax-evasion. Moreover, governments should be responsible for big issues which the citizenry cannot tackle on its own, such as climate change, racism and the like. Institutions should be democratic and accountable. Contrary

to the neoliberal notion of individualization – that what we do alone is best - “let us value what we do together” as Giridharadas put it (2021, May 12). In other words, collective will in the form of the state should be valued more than the “personal heroics” (Kapoor, 2012, p. 65) of celebrities. The new approach should begin from the idea that we should cherish democratic national politics as the best way to shape the world, not elite-driven politics which is unaccountable (Giridharadas, 2018, pp. 226-227). Importantly,

the whole idea about having a polity, having a demos, is that there’s accountability within that demos. That’s what a political system ensures...The political system is not just Congress or the Supreme Court or governorships..., it is civic life. It is the habit of solving problems together, in the public sphere, through the tools of government and in the trenches of civil society. It is solving problems in ways that give the people you are helping a say in the solutions, that offer that say in equal measure to every citizen, that allow some kind of access to deliberations or at least provide a meaningful feedback mechanism to tell you it isn’t working”. (Giridharadas, 2018, p. 227)

A reform of the philanthropic sector would also protect philanthropic organizations from the undue influence of the wealthy donors, prevent the abuse of the taxation system, and encourage giving from all sectors of society. Reforms to maximize the public good in the philanthropic sector would also ensure that philanthropic donations are distributed to the most needy timeously (Collins & Flannery, 2020).

The BMGF and similar foundations could do their work in ways that benefit democracies rather than undermine them such as being more open to public scrutiny and

being more accountable to the public they serve. Tax exemptions and charitable contribution tax deductions for foundations which were created in America to encourage giving should be removed as they divert resources from treasury where they would be more democratically distributed (Barkan, 2013, p. 637). Furthermore, the BMGF should be engaged in long-range, risky experiments in social innovation that the government cannot afford to do and the market place is unlikely to do (Reich, 2018, quoted in Madrigal, 2018). With regards to the issue of the BMGF's preference for working with large American organizations to do groundwork in South Africa and around the continent, it would be better practice, as indicated in the interviews, to engage local institutions which are closer to and more knowledgeable about the issues. As one interview respondent suggested, "If you are trying to solve problems in Africa, it would be better, where you could, to throw that money at African organizations to do the same" (February, 2020). The use of local organizations would also build capacity locally. While acknowledging that there is a huge skills deficit in Africa, the afore-mentioned interview participant pointed out that the people employed by the BCG and McKinsey's to do fact-finding missions in South Africa were themselves novices. In addition, resorting to using American firms did not address the skills shortage in South Africa.

In the case of the ONE Campaign, instead of its lobbying the US government to create laws that facilitate expanded private sector participation in Sub-Saharan Africa's infrastructure building and the UK government to increase its aid to the continent, pressure should be put on these governments to address the structural political, economic and social realities at the root of the continent's underdevelopment. As Belloni aptly put it, "without addressing the root causes of underdevelopment, humanitarianism will

become a travesty” (2007, p. 474). In this regard, celebrities should seek to work with global social movements to challenge the institutions, laws and structures that are at the root of inequalities in the global economy.

Furthermore, as the ONE Campaign recognizes that women excessively bear the brunt of poverty, the advocacy movement should consider urging Western governments to support more transformative and potentially empowering activities for them. One such activity would be to support care work on the continent, rather than projects that seek to enhance business opportunities for Western players. Care responsibilities, which are disproportionately shouldered by women, need to be recognized as ‘work’ and investing in services and infrastructure that more equally share these responsibilities would be one way. Care work is a social good and its equitable division between men and women, and between government and businesses (Parkes, 2021, April 6) would allow women to participate fully in the labour market, thereby contributing more to their households’ income. This is not only good for the women, but also for their households and communities. It should be noted that a demand for the division of care work between men and women may be perceived by some governments as a form of imperialism. However, as an African woman who has experience in carrying out reproductive labour and also working outside the home, I believe that it would be a welcome intervention for women. The ONE Campaign could work with homegrown organizations engaged with these issues to circumvent such criticism. The ONE Campaign could also continue to lobby for the clamping down of tax evasion, and not let it be a once-off project as in the *Trillion Dollar Scandal*. Importantly, it would be better if the leaders of this advocacy movement led by example on the issue of taxes. The revelations about Geldof’s 8 Miles, Bono’s tax-

avoidance activities and ONE's own tax avoidance allegations, exposed the apparent hypocrisy of the anti-poverty advocacy movement.

The ONE Campaign should also consider lobbying Western governments not only with regards to Africa, but about their own domestic human rights. My research showed that where the advocacy movement has engaged with Western governments, it has been on behalf of Africa and its socio-economic and political problems, and not about how those Western governments might be implicated in African problems. However, it would be helpful to consider that “effective humanitarianism requires building a domestic human rights culture among the general populace” (Belloni, 2007, p. 474). While Belloni is referring specifically to ordinary humanitarianism, this applies to celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy as well. Inasmuch as the moral imagination of the citizenry is limited to national boundaries, then humanitarianism is likely to continue to be an afterthought whose main objective is to control the spillover effects of political instability to Western states (Belloni, 2007, p. 474). At the launch of ONE's partnership with the Dangote Foundation in Nigeria, Bono was very explicit that investing in that country's youth would prevent them from turning to extremism, and by extension, instability (ONE, 2020). While investing in the youth is indeed good for Nigeria and the continent at large, Bono's invocation of terrorism shows how he views Africa's young people – as a potential international security threat. Furthermore, in the same way the ONE Campaign has lobbied Western governments to create laws that purportedly enhance development in Africa, such as the Electrify Africa Act, and the UK International Development Act, the movement should advocate for these countries to

create legislation that takes into account the historical debt that the developed world owes to Africa because of slavery and colonialism.

Where the ONE Campaign has criticized African governments, it has been for alleged corruption, the lack of accountability and political will. But it would appear that in all its political activism, there has not been a demand for people's rights to be respected by their governments. While such actions may be viewed by some governments as interference in internal affairs of states, there may be instances where such pressure is warranted – for example in cases of genocide and similar human rights abuses. In such cases ONE could support local organizations working on those issues by lobbying for funding for them since the advocacy movement itself does not give grants. As noted in this dissertation, Bono has a proven track record of raising funds, whether from fellow celebrities, or through projects like Product(REDD). Furthermore, ONE could also assist local human rights groups by sharing insights on lobbying strategies, given its own successes. Mere humanitarianism that functions without explicit political vision and legal requirement may act as a disguised form of the political status quo (Slim, 2010, p. 3). But advocating for the rights of the people might be able to bring them some dignity as moral, political and legal equals. As currently practiced, celebrity humanitarianism is 'depoliticized' insofar as it would rather avoid conversations about the wider effects of global/neoliberal capitalism. It is apparent that there is a huge power imbalance which overshadows the inequalities that exist between the givers of aid and the recipients. The inequities prevent the recognition of 'partners' as equals (Dubgen, 2012, p. 73). Furthermore, my findings show that the uneven power relationship between the givers of aid the beneficiaries is a major feature of celebrity humanitarianism and celebrity

philanthropy, as it is of traditional development organizations. The stature of the ONE's African chapter *vis-à-vis* the others in terms of funding is a good example of this inequality. Moreover, ONE boasts that it is a grassroots advocacy movement, but its Board is made up of some of the elites of neoliberal economic governance (Daley, 2013, p. 391). Celebrity humanitarianism practiced by Bono and the ONE Campaign shows them acting as the "heroic saviours of others" (Zehfuss, 2018, p. 207 in Edkins, 2019, p. 87).

Another element that is quite prominent in the work of both the ONE Campaign and the BMGF is the use of statistics to measure the effectiveness/success of projects. For example, ONE claims to have increased the number of people with access to HIV/AIDS treatment through fund raising for the Global Fund and GAVI (ONE, 2020). The ONE Campaign boasts of a lot of impressive statistics of its achievements, such as the HIV/AIDS medication, 0.7 per cent of GNI international development by the British government, the sale of 403 metric tonnes of gold by the IMF which raked in \$13 billion for concessionary lending to low-income countries etc. The ONE Campaign, in 2015, joined the Global Partnership on Sustainable Development Data to fight against the lack of credible data. The then CEO of the organization, Michael Elliot, explained that:

We live in a world where millions of people matter so little that they are uncounted. Their births are not recorded; they can't access basic healthcare, enough food or an education. This year we expect ambitious new global goals to end extreme poverty, but if we don't deal with the crisis of inadequate data for monitoring and achieving the goals, we can't have full accountability or a clear

picture of progress. Fixing it needs political support, funding and practical action.
(ONE, 2015, n.p.)

International development might be better conducted if the givers of aid re-evaluate their motivation. Bono and Gates may have to motivate their giving, not by locating the receivers' deficiency, but by "coming to terms with their own lack" to borrow Naeem Inayatullah's words (2009, p. 453). When parties seek to overcome their own lack by engaging in cooperative searches for mutual enrichment, then this might result in sustainable good (Inayatullah, 2009, p. 453). When people like Bono, Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates decide to tackle problems affecting Africa, such as disease and lack of infrastructure, they basically gain the right to decide what the problems are or are not, and how best to deal with them (Giridharadas, 2018, p. 33). However, 'indifferent giving', in which the donor has nothing to do with the donation as soon as she/he has disbursed it, thereby preventing her/him from claims on that gift (McGoey, 2015, p. 245), might be a better way to conduct philanthropy. As shown in my research findings, in some instances, the BMGF continues to have a vested interest in how the funds the foundation donates are utilised. One interview respondent put it plainly, "they [Bill and Melinda Gates] want to know where their money is going" (March, 2020). Ultimately, this may crush grantees under the taxing weight of the foundation's good will. The expansion of some grantee projects to other countries of which they had no knowledge and in which they had no contacts, as discussed in this dissertation, is a case in point. If the real motivation for giving is to prevent others from getting entangled in relations of dependency and obligation, then the gifts should bring the respite of autonomy, as Linsey McGoey aptly puts it (2015, p. 245). Furthermore, the BMGF should consider changing

its funding policy which often uses US-based, tax-exempt organizations, as already noted. Some interview participants pointed out this practice as a downside of how the foundation operates. Those respondents noted that the foundation should resource African institutions to solve the continent's problems, and not bring in foreign organizations which lack in-depth knowledge of the problems on the ground.

Rather than focusing on vaccines and specific diseases, the BMGF should adopt a technological approach to financing the strengthening of health systems in order to increase government capacities as they are better placed to fight the systemic causes of poor health outcomes. A South African National Department of Health official noted in an interview that the foundation had turned down a request to fund an electronic patient record project which would have reformed the patients' records system (March, 2020). Butler (2019) states that Bill Gates is against the strengthening of health systems as there is no evidence that they work. The BMGF's approach to maternal health focuses on the use of antibiotics to prevent maternal deaths, despite advice from maternal health experts that general health system strengthening is required to reduce maternal mortality (Butler, 2019, p. 9). This is like a microcosm of the whole problem with how the foundation operates, according to the critical literature on the foundation (McGoey, 2015; 2021).

My research findings on the advocacy for public private partnerships by both the BMGF and the ONE Campaign have rather disturbing implications for the role of celebrity humanitarians as popular figures in politics. By choosing causes and formulating development interventions that attract both public and private support (such as the Electrify Africa Act campaign), celebrities distort dynamics in democratic politics

in favour of elite control and management, which lack expertise. The imbalance may prevent other pressing issues from reaching the agenda, and key stakeholders from participating in the debate and valid assessments. The championing of market solutions to both elite and mass audiences and their acceptance assures their appeal at the expense of “aid as usual” (Budabin, 2020, p. 70). Celebrities’ capacity to formulate and promote ‘one-size fits all’ solutions as done by ONE and the BMGF in some cases, reflects a worrisome trend where support for public-private partnerships is growing alongside dynamics of elite engagement. Poor strategies do not adversely affect celebrity humanitarians’ ability to continue ‘do-gooding’ and their ability to mobilize financial and political support ensures that their platform for testing interventions remains (Budabin, 2020, p. 70).

My findings show that the way that Bono, Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates conduct their work in South Africa and across the continent does not target systemic or structural problems, but what Žižek calls “secondary malfunctions” (Žižek, 2009d, p. 10, cited in Kapoor, 2012, p. 64), including health, poverty, technocratic policy-making, state corruption, among others. In other words, these celebrity humanitarians address the more outwardly visible or “subjective” issues, rather than the slower, more tortuous and less noticeable structural or “objective” violence of social inequity, corporate monopoly, dehumanizing working conditions, unequal land tenure policies and the like (Kapoor, 2012, p. 64). Kapoor and others also note how celebrity humanitarianism tends towards ‘spectacularization’ which also works to bring attention to the celebrities themselves while their solutions do not necessarily represent effective, long-term answers for complex policy issues (Kapoor, 2012; Chouliaraki, 2013; Jeffreys & Allatson, 2015).

From my interviews and the literature reviewed, Bono and the Gateses do not lack the common touch. These celebrities were described as ordinary, down-to-earth people, ‘just like us’, albeit “very smart” (in the case of Bill Gates) (Butler, 2019, p. 8; Schurman, 2018, p. 181; representative of EZINTSHA, February 2020; MRC official, March 2020; WHO representative, February 2020). Research participants attributed Bill Gates’ success in business to his culture of smartness. Equally, Bono’s success in advocacy was attributed to his desire to want to contribute to a better world (MRC representative, March, 2020; Praekelt Foundation representative, February, 2020). In the process, the power, influence and sometimes unscrupulous practices of these business leaders are sanitized and/or go unscrutinised, thereby naturalizing and familiarizing corporate neoliberalism (Kapoor, 2012, p. 64). Bill Gates’ “spectacular giving” (Kapoor, 2012, p. 64) constructs him as a celebrity super-hero who is “extraordinarily generous” (Tutu HIV Centre representative, March, 2020; WHO Africa representative, February, 2020), thus providing him with an instantly recognizable brand. Gates’ giving can be viewed in terms of the neoliberal reduction of the state’s role. His benevolence, as with that of the many philanthropic foundations which were formed in the wake of neoliberalism, fills a gap in the state social funding.

The problem, however, is that private decisions are being made for public goods (health care, poverty reduction). As Kapoor (2012) highlights, elites decide according to their own priorities, prejudices and idiosyncrasies, what causes matter, how much to spend on them and in what way (p. 65). Indeed, my research showed that the BMGF’s top brass, in some instances, does just that. Additionally, a case in point is Bill Gates’ initial resistance to proposals to waiver the TRIPS agreement to facilitate a quicker, open

and a more global response to the COVID-19 pandemic and the uninterrupted collaboration in the development, production and supply of vaccines which would also benefit low-income countries. However, in other cases, those in need have approached the foundation for funding. Some of the idiosyncrasies which have influenced the BMGF's projects is the belief by Bill Gates that health systems are inefficient, therefore, his foundation does not fund them (Butler, 2019, p. 9) as mentioned above. As already noted, ONE does not give grants, but Bono's persona is also of a down-to-earth, regular family man who wants to "understand the world more deeply...to contribute to a better global endeavour" (MRC representative, March 2020). Enlightened benevolence and individual heroics therefore replace collective will, with the neoliberal state relegated into gratefulness (Kapoor, 2012, p. 65).

My research suggests that celebrity humanitarians and philanthropists influence the formulation of social policies and those on the ground rarely contest these policies. Most of the interview respondents indicated that some of the projects they were conducting were results of calls for proposals by the BMGF. This therefore, means that the foundation had the ideas for those projects in the first place, and then set out to find implementers, by calling for proposals. Similarly, the ONE Campaign leadership determines the issues with which the advocacy movement engages. Moreover, as already noted, the general belief among the interview participants about the work of both the BMGF and the ONE Campaign was that it was good work. With regards to the BMGF, most interview respondents applauded the generosity of the founders with "their" money. These findings support the literature that people on the ground do not challenge the influence of philanthropists over social policies because we mistakenly think that

philanthropists' wealth is apolitical and only government funds are political (Nickel and Einkenberry, 2010, p. 271). It was clear from the interviews that the respondents assumed that the actions of Bono and the Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates were apolitical and purely altruistic. What was also apparent during the interviews was that respondents felt that they should not be critical of those who were funding them as that would be tantamount to biting the hand that was feeding them. Therefore, even after voicing some concerns in their relationship with the BMGF, for example, the respondents would add how grateful they were for the work of the foundation. One respondent categorically declared that "we should not look a gift horse in the mouth" (March, 2020). This attitude can explain the overall positive responses of the interview participants to the BMGF and Bono. In other words, beneficiaries of the BMGF and ONE bear a burden of gratitude that makes it difficult to be categorical about their concerns against the two organizations. Furthermore, it is clear that in spite of this gratitude, ultimately the work of the BMGF and ONE does not tackle the deep inequalities that exist in the global order, some of which have their origins in colonialism. Rather, as discussed above, it can serve to exacerbate those inequities and to reinforce the dominance of the West in Africa. This critique also applies to traditional state-led and NGO-led development but the main difference with celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic organizations lies in their lack of accountability which emanates from the celebrities' great stature in their organizations, and the contradiction between their vast personal riches and the poverty their organizations seek to combat.

Beyond establishing the manner in which that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy are conducted on the ground and how they are viewed by their receivers and

partners – this dissertation sought to show how these activities can perpetuate the inequalities between the West and Africa by positioning the individual as answer to social problems, while rolling back the state. Here I began with the debate between cosmopolitan/liberal and critical approaches. Cosmopolitan perspectives rely on universalist ethics to suggest that celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy are a moral good. From this perspective, humanitarianism is premised on the principle of humanity and aims to prevent and alleviate suffering wherever it may occur, as all humans have the same rights (Linklater, 2001; 2007; Bellamy, 2003). However, critical perspectives doubt this universalist moral view, mostly because it overlooks the effects and implications of power and politics – thus seeing humanitarian and philanthropic activities not merely as benevolent acts, but rather ways of governing and/or exploiting the beneficiaries (Moore, 2013). My research mainly drew from this critical perspective which reveal the power dynamics that are at play in celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic activities. I used the concept of neoliberal imperialism (Hahn, 2007) to analyze and identify ways in which both neoliberalism and imperialism have evolved in contemporary capitalism. Imperialism has shifted from being state-centric to being practiced by non-state actors including celebrities, NGOs, and multinational corporations. Similarly, neoliberalism has become less prescriptive and more inclusive in efforts to legitimate the underlying project – “inclusive neoliberalism” (Ruckert, 2006). However, this new approach still promotes the role of international donors, foreign players and elites to the detriment of local actors’ autonomy and agency. My analysis identified how celebrity humanitarianism and celebrity philanthropy emerged to fill the gaps created by the contradictions of neoliberalism and imperialism. This dissertation also explored the shifts in the discursive

role of celebrities in our culture – with icons like Bono becoming advocates for Africa and its development issues.

4. Contribution to Knowledge

My dissertation contributes to knowledge by going beyond the debate between cosmopolitan and critical theoretical approaches by conducting empirical research to show how celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic activities are carried out on the ground and how they are viewed by their beneficiaries and/or partners. Such empirical studies are few (Huliaras & Tzifakis, 2010, p. 257; Richey & Budabin, 2016, p. 2; Richey, 2015, p. 3; Scott, 2015), even though they are vital for any informed critique. It is this gap in the literature that my dissertation fills. Furthermore, though there is a vast body of literature on the BMGF, there is relatively little on the ONE Campaign, which proved to be a non-transparent organization which is not open to dialogue and critique. Yet, given the stature of this advocacy movement in the fight against extreme poverty and the role of its co-founder in celebrity humanitarianism and international development issues, it is important to subject them to scrutiny because their activities are an exercise of power. As Robert Reich aptly observed, "... in a democracy, any form of concentrated power deserves scrutiny...." (cited in Madrigal, 2018, June 27, n.p.). Therefore, my dissertation sheds some light on ONE, an organization which plays an increasingly important role in the fight against extreme poverty. Some scholars view celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic activism as a form of transnational political activism (Daley, 2013; Richey, 2016). As such, my dissertation makes a significant – and timely – contribution in establishing the benefits and limitations of such activism in recipient countries. Indeed, the importance and timeliness of my research was repeatedly affirmed

by some of the interview respondents who expressed this view during our interviews. Finally, my dissertation offers a more nuanced understanding of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy as these practices have become an important requirement for any successful celebrity (Littler, 2008, pp. 237-239). Celebrity humanitarianism is a crucial part of society (Payton & Moody, 2008, p. 22; Tutu HIV Centre representative, March 2020). Therefore, it would be helpful to reimagine how it is conducted in order to have a more transformative and long-lasting effect on the lives of those it seeks to assist.

5. Limitations and Future Research

There were also some limitations to my research process, the major one being the denial of access to ONE's offices to conduct interviews, despite an initial indication of willingness. This resulted in a heavy reliance on the information from the organization's website as there is scanty scholarly literature on the advocacy movement. This therefore affects my findings in that website-sourced material is obviously designed to portray the organization in the best possible light. However, in my analysis I embarked on a 'suspicious interpretation' which does not take anything at face-value but rather aims to uncover the underlying truths (Willig, 2014, p. 4). I was also not able to interview some South African government officials who worked in BMGF-funded programmes to understand their interaction with the foundation. In that case, I managed to glean some helpful information on those particular projects from other government functionaries I did manage to interview. In addition, my efforts to interview the UNDP officials in Johannesburg were unsuccessful. Again, in this case, I resorted to using information on the organization's website.

While my dissertation makes an important contribution to celebrity humanitarianism and philanthropy, there is yet scope for further research on these issues. While a lot has been written about Western celebrities and their activism in these areas, it is important to examine non-Western and/or non-white celebrity philanthropists and how their activities differ – or indeed mirror – what has been discussed in my dissertation. When I was conducting my interviews, some respondents wanted to talk about local celebrities. For example, in response to the question on the role of celebrities in philanthropic activities, one interview participant answered by referring to the role played by Zimbabwean business magnate and billionaire philanthropist, Strive Masiyiwa, especially in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. Another wanted to talk about musician and anti-apartheid activist Johnny Clegg’s Click Foundation, among others. Future research could seek to establish how such non-Western celebrity humanitarians and philanthropists are embedded in local customs, traditions and state formations. It is this issue that I hope to turn into my postdoctoral research project. In addition, while I explored the issue of gender briefly (Mostafanezhad, 2013; Repo & Yrjölä, 2011; Richey & Brockington, 2020; Yrjölä, 2009), more research is needed to examine the gender dimension of celebrity humanitarians themselves. The literature tends to allude to male celebrities – like Bono, Bob Geldof, Bill Gates – as participating in ‘bigger’ issues, while women celebrities such as Angelina Jolie, Madonna, Melinda French Gates are identified with women and children, even though they are involved in other issues. For example, Jolie is the professor of practice at the London School of Economics’ Centre for Women, Peace and Security. Furthermore, the literature on the BMGF tends to refer to Bill Gates as being at the helm of the foundation, even though Bill Gates and Melinda French Gates

are both co-chairs. Equally, most interview respondents also focused on Bill Gates in their discussion of the foundation and its work. Consequently, since this dissertation relies on interview data and secondary literature, it also concentrates on him even though it does discuss Melinda French Gates' role as well. The representation of female celebrity humanitarians is an issue which needs further research. Further, the 2021 divorce of the BMGF's powerhouse couple throws the future of the foundation into question. Even though, both Gates and French Gates have indicated that they will continue to work together as co-chairs of the foundation, if after two years either of them decides that this set up is no longer suitable, French Gates will step down from her position as co-chair and trustee, according to the BMGF CEO, Mark Suzman. If that happens, Gates would assume total control of the foundation and buy out his ex-wife, giving her "personal resources" for her own philanthropic work (Duffy, 2021, August 2). In view of this and the large role the foundation plays in global health, it is imperative that researchers maintain an interest in this organization. As noted above, French Gates contributes certain perspectives – such as the focus on women and girls – that Gates lacks, therefore losing her influence might weaken the foundation's impact in that regard. Finally, while I have sought to use the concept of neoliberal imperialism to analyze how celebrity-led humanitarian and philanthropic organizations operate on the ground and how they are viewed by their beneficiaries and/or partners, this is not a finished product. It is my hope that other scholars interested in celebrity humanitarianism will pick up the mantle and develop and explore this issue further. Thus, in closing, while my research has pointed out the inequalities and power dynamics at play within celebrity humanitarian and philanthropic projects, there is a lot more to be learnt on these activities. In a time of

increasing inequality between the rich and the poor, and the failure of the international community to address poverty and health issues in many parts of the world, including many countries in Africa, it is important that we subject the growing trends of celebrity humanitarianism and philanthrocapitalism to critical scrutiny.

References

- Aaltola, M. (2009). *Western spectacle of governance and the emergence of humanitarian world politics*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Adesulu, D. (2018, March 16). *ONE Campaign must reform, apologize to Africans, says Dr. Siphso Moyo*, Vanguard. Retrieved April 15, 2020, from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2018/03/one-campaign-must-reform-apologize-africans-says-dr-siphso-moyo/>
- Agade, H. (2019, October 9). *Johannesburg is the wealthiest city in Africa*. CTGN Africa News. Retrieved March, 8, 2020, from <https://africa.cgtn.com/2019/10/09/johannesburg-is-the-wealthiest-city-in-africa/>
- Alemayehou, M. (2019, December 20). *The key to ending poverty is empowering people*. ONE. Retrieved January 18, 2020, from <https://www.one.org/international/blog/ending-poverty-empowering-people/>
- Alexander, S. (2018, October 5). *YES! Thanks to you, the BUILD Act is now law*. ONE Campaign. Retrieved April 20, 2020 from <https://www.one.org/us/blog/build-act-is-law/>
- Alexander, S. (2018, September, 24). *This is how your favourite sweet empowers women*. ONE Campaign. Retrieved April 20, 2020, from <https://www.one.org/us/blog/build-act-is-law/>
- Allison, S. (2021, January 30). *Bill Gates, big pharma and entrenching the vaccine apartheid*. Mail & Guardian. Retrieved July 14, 2021, from <https://mg.co.za/health/2021-01-30-bill-gates-big-pharma-and-entrenching-the-vaccine-apartheid/>
- Aminzade, R. (2014). Does Africa need a green revolution?, *Inquiry*. Retrieved August 29, 2021, from <https://research.umn.edu/inquiry/post/does-africa-need-new-green-revolution>
- Andersson, L., & Calvano, L. (2015). Perceived mobility of impact: Global elites and the Bono effect. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 11(2), 122–136. <https://doi.org/10.1108/cpoib-10-2012-0046>
- Andrade, S. (2021, May 17). *The key details that have emerged about Bill Gates’ “irretrievably broken” marriage*. SLATE. Retrieved October 2, 2021, from , <https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2021/05/bill-melinda-gates-marriage-reporting-highlights.html>

- Andrejevic, M. (2004). *Reality T.V: The work of being watched*. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Arnove, R. (Ed.).(1982). *Philanthropy and cultural imperialism: The foundations at home and abroad*. Indiana University Press.
- Arquette, D. (2011). Celebrity-charity synergy: Fame will feed the poor. In J. Piazza (Ed.), *Celebrity, Inc.: How Famous People Make Money*, (chapter 10). Open Road Integrated Media.
- Ashman, S., Fine, B. & Newman, S. (2011). The crisis in South Africa: neoliberalism, financialization and uneven and combined development. *The Socialist Register*, 47. <https://socialistregister.com/index.php/srv/article/view/14326/11369>
- Auerbach, C., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative data : An introduction to coding and analysis*. New York University Press.
- Barkan, J. (2013). Plutocrats at work: How big philanthropy undermines democracy. *Social Research*, 80(2), 635–652. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24385621>
- Barnett, M. (2013). International paternalism and humanitarian governance. *Global Constitutionalism*, 1(3), 485–521. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2045381712000135>
- Barnett, M. (2011). *Empire of humanity: A history of humanitarianism*. Cornell University Press.
- Barnett, M., & Weiss, G. (Eds.). (2008). *Humanitarianism in question: Politics, power and ethics*. Cornell University Press.
- Barnett, M., & Weiss, T. G. (2008). *Humanitarianism contested: Where angels fear to tread* (Vol. 51). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203829301>
- Bayard de Volo, L., & Schatz, E. (2004). From the inside out: ethnographic methods in political research. *Political Science and Politics*, 37(2), 267–271. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096504004214>
- Becker, D. A. (2020). *Neoliberalism and the State of Belonging in South Africa* (1st ed. 2020.). Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-39931-3>
- Beckett, A. (2010, July 12). *Inside the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation*. The Guardian. Retrieved January 20, 2020, from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/jul/12/bill-and-melinda-gates-foundation>

- Bellamy, A. J. (2003). Humanitarian responsibilities and interventionist claims in international society. *Review of International Studies*, 29(3), 321–340. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210503003218>
- Belloni, R. (n.d.). The trouble with humanitarianism. *Review of International Studies*, 33(3), 451–474. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210507007607>
- Berg, E. (2007). Post-development theory in Africa. *Peace Review*, 19(4), 541–554. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10402650701681160>
- Berg, B. L. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Pearson.
- Bergman Rosamond, A. (2020). Celebrities as ethical actors: Individuals and cosmopolitan obligation. In B. Schippers. *The Routledge Handbook to Rethinking Ethics in International Relations* (1st ed., pp. 119–135). Routledge. . <https://doi-org.proxy.library.carleton.ca/10.4324/9781315613529>
- Biccum, A. R. (2016). What might celebrity humanitarianism have to do with empire? *Third World Quarterly*, 37(6), 998–1015. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2015.1120153>
- Biccum, A. R. (2011). Marketing Development: Celebrity politics and the “new” development advocacy. *Third World Quarterly*, 32(7), 1331–1346. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41300286>
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2018). South Africa brochure.
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (2021). *Foundation Fact Sheet*. Retrieved February 15, 2021, from <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/about/foundation-fact-sheet>
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2021). *Leadership*. Retrieved February 19, 2021, from <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/about/leadership?division=Executive%20Leadership>
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2021). *Africa*. Retrieved, January 20, 2021, from <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/our-work/places/africa>
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2020). *Tobacco control*. Retrieved March 2, 2020, from <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/our-work/programs/global-policy-and-advocacy/tobacco-control>
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2020). Agricultural development. Retrieved January 19, 2020, from <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/our-work/programs/global-growth-and-opportunity/agricultural-development>

- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2020). *Financial services for the poor*. Retrieved January 19, 2020, from <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/our-work/programs/global-growth-and-opportunity/financial-services-for-the-poor>
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2020). Retrieved January 19, 2020, from <https://www.gatesfoundation.org>
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2020). *Africa*. Retrieved January 19, 2020, from <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/Where-We-Work/Africa-Office>
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2020). *Foundation fact sheet*. Retrieved January 19, 2020, from <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/about/foundation-fact-sheet>
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2019). *A G7 partnership for women's digital financial inclusion in Africa*. Retrieved September 29, 2021, from https://docs.gatesfoundation.org/Documents/WomensDigitalFinancialInclusioninAfrica_English.pdf
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (2017). *The One Campaign*. Retrieved March 3, 2020, from <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/about/committed-grants/2017/01/opp1160061>
- Birn, A.-E. (2014). Philanthrocapitalism, past and present: The Rockefeller Foundation, the Gates Foundation, and the setting(s) of the international/global health agenda. *Hypothesis*, 12(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.5779/hypothesis.v12i1.229>
- Birrell, I. (2018, March 10). *Shame of Bono's charity bullies: Married female worker reveals how she was ordered to seduce a politician and was demoted when she refused*. The Daily Mail. Retrieved February 24, 2020, from <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-5486121/Bonos-ONE-charity-shame-South-Africa-staff-abuse-claims.html>
- Bishop, M., & Green, M. (2008). *Philanthrocapitalism : How the rich can save the world*. Bloomsbury Press.
- Blair, T. (2005, March 11). *I believe this is Africa's best chance for a generation*. The Guardian. Retrieved April 18, 2020, from <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2005/mar/12/internationalaidanddevelopment.hearafrica05>
- Bloomberg Philanthropies. (2022). What we do. Retrieved January 16, 2022, from <https://www.bloomberg.org>

- Bob, C. (2002). Merchants of morality, *Foreign Policy*. Retrieved April 9, 2020, from <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/>
- Boltanski, L. (1999). *Distant suffering: politics, morality and the media*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bond, P. & Ruiters, G. (2017). Uneven development and scale politics in Southern Africa: what we learn from Neil Smith, *Antipode* 49(1), 171 -189, <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12248>
- Bono. (2013, March 14). *The good news about poverty (yes, there's good news)*. TEDTalk. Retrieved February 19, 2020, from <https://youtu.be/BdDkF0Lw-ag>
- Boston University. (2020). Global philanthropy and development. Retrieved April 14, 2020, from <https://www.bu.edu/pardee/global-philanthropy-development/>
- Brigg, M. (2002). Post-development, Foucault and the colonisation metaphor. *Third World Quarterly*, 23(3), 421–436. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3993534>
- Brockington, D. (2015). Epilogue: The politics of celebrity humanitarianism. In L. A. Richey (Ed.), *Celebrity Humanitarianism and North-South Relations: Politics, place and power* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315721187>
- Brockington, D. (2015). Towards an international understanding of the power of celebrity persuasions: a review and a research agenda. *Celebrity Studies*, 6(4), 486–504. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2015.1087214>
- Brown, S. (2016). The instrumentalization of foreign aid under the Harper government. *Studies in Political Economy*, 97(1), 18–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07078552.2016.1174461>
- Brown, S., & Gravingholt, J. (Eds.). (2015). *The securitization of foreign aid*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137568823>
- Budabin, A. C. (2020). Caffeinated solutions as neoliberal politics: How celebrities create and promote partnerships for peace and development. *Perspectives on Politics*, 18(1), 60–75. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S153759271900241X>
- Budabin, A.C, Rasmussen, L.M., & Richey, L.A. (2017). Celebrity-led development organizations: the legitimating function of elite management. *Third World Quarterly* 38(9), 1952-1972. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2017.1322465>
- Budabin, A.C. & Richey, L.A. (2021). *Batman saves the Congo: how celebrities disrupt the politics of development*. University of Minnesota Press. Retrieved January 10, 2022 from <https://lccn/oc/gov/2020058651>
- Budabin, A.C. & Richey, L.A (2018). *Celebrity Narratives and celebrity engagement: the*

- case of Ben Affleck in Congo. *Human Rights Quarterly* 40 (2), 260-286.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/hrq.2018.0015>
- Budabin, A. C. (2014). Do Celebrity humanitarians matter? In M. Lynn (Ed.), *Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs*. Retrieved April 15, 2020, from
https://www.carnegiecouncil.org/publications/ethics_online/0100
- Bulmer, M. (1995). Some observations on the history of large philanthropic foundations in Britain and the United States. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 6(3), 275–291. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02354017>
- Burnham, P., Gilland, K., Grant, W., & Henry, Z. L. (2008). Comparative methodology. In P. Burnham (Ed.), *Research methods in politics* (2nd ed., pp. 69–95). Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Bush, G.H. (1988, August 18). *Address accepting the presidential nomination at the Republican National Convention in New Orleans*, The American Presidency Project. Retrieved September 29, 2021, from
<https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/address-accepting-the-presidential-nomination-the-republican-national-convention-new>
- Butler, C. D. (2019). Philanthrocapitalism: Promoting global health but failing planetary health. *Challenges*, 10(1), 24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/challe10010024>
- Chant, S. (2016). Women, girls and world poverty: Empowerment, equality or essentialism? *International Development Planning Review*, 38(1), 1–24.
<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.library.carleton.ca/10.3828/idpr.2016.1>
- Chant, S., & Sweetman, C. (2012). Fixing women or fixing the world? ‘Smart economics’, efficiency approaches, and gender equality in development. *Gender & Development*, 20(3), 517–529. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2012.731812>
- Cheney, C. (2021, May 7). Gates Foundation reverses course on COVID-19 vaccine patents, *Inside Development*. Retrieved October 11, 2021, from
<https://www.devex.com/news/gates-foundation-reverses-course-on-covid-19-vaccine-patents-99810>
- Chouliaraki, L. (2013). *The ironic spectator: Solidarity in the age of post-humanitarianism*. Polity Press.
- Chouliaraki, L. (2012). The theatricality of humanitarianism: A critique of celebrity advocacy. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 9(1), 1–21.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420.2011.637055>
- Chouliaraki, L. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity*. Edinburgh University Press.

- Chu, J. (2009, March 31). *Bono, beware: Dambisa Moyo on aid, microfinance and the problem of celebs in Africa*. Fast Company. Retrieved on February 3, 2020, from <https://www.fastcompany.com/1254598/bono-beware-dambisa-moyo-aid-microfinance-and-problem-celebs-africa>
- Cody, A. (2014). *The educator and the oligarch: A teacher challenges the Gates Foundation*. Garn Press.
- Collins, C. & Flannery, H. (2020). Gilded giving 2020: How wealth inequality distorts philanthropy and imperils democracy, *Institute for Policy Studies*. Retrieved October 16, 2021, from <https://ips-dc.org/gilded-giving-2020-how-wealth-inequality-distorts-philanthropy-imperils-democracy/>
- Compton, K. (2021, September 13). *Big Pharma and medical device manufacturers*, Drug Watch. Retrieved October 15, 2021, from <https://www.drugwatch.com/manufacturers/>
- Cooper, A. F. (2007). Celebrity diplomacy and the G8: Bono and Bob as legitimate international actors, Working Paper 29, *The Centre for International Governance*. Retrieved May 2, 2020, from <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/>
- Cooper, A. F. (2008). *Celebrity Diplomacy*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Cox, R. W. (1986). Social forces, states and world orders: Beyond international relations theory. In R. O. Keohane (Ed.), *Neorealism and its critics* (pp. 214–254). Columbia University Press.
- Dalby, S., Horton, S., Mahon, R., & Thomaz, D. (Eds.). (2019). *Achieving the sustainable development goals : global governance challenges*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429029622>
- Daley, P. (2013). Rescuing African bodies: celebrities, consumerism and neoliberal humanitarianism. *Review of African Political Economy*, 40(137), 375–393. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03056244.2013.816944>
- Darby, P., & Paolini, A. J. (1994). Bridging international relations and postcolonialism. *Alternatives: Global, Local Political*, 19(3), 371–397. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40644813>
- Dean, M. (2003). Culture governance and individualisation. In H.P. Bang (Ed.), *Governance as social and political communication* (pp. 117–139). Manchester University Press.
- De Haldevang, M., & Rohrllich, J. (2019, July 23). *How Bob Geldof's African investment fund avoids paying taxes to some of the continent's poorest countries*. Quartz Africa.

Retrieved January 13, 2021, from <https://qz.com/africa/1671301/bob-geldofs-african-fund-8-miles-used-mauritius-to-avoid-taxes/>

- Deng, G., & Jeffreys, E. (2018). Celebrity philanthropy in china: Reconfiguring government and non-government roles in national development. *The China Quarterly*, 237, 217-240. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305741018001364>
- De Soto, H. (1989). *The other path : the invisible revolution in the Third World* . Harper & Row.
- Detoro, R. (2016, December 5). *This mobile programme is helping moms and babies in South Africa*. ONE. Retrieved January 29, 2020, from <https://www.one.org/us/blog/this-mobile-program-is-helping-moms-and-babies-in-south-africa/>
- Devex. (2020). *One Campaign*. Retrieved January 30, 2020, from <https://www.devex.com/organizations/one-campaign-56278>
- De Waal, A. (2008). The humanitarian carnival: A celebrity vogue. *World Affairs*.171(2), 43–55. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20672853>
- Dieter, H., & Kumar, R. (2008). The downside of celebrity diplomacy: The neglected complexity of development. *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations*, 14(3), 259–264. <https://doi.org/10.1163/19426720-01403001>
- Drake, P., & Higgins, M. (2006). I am a celebrity, get me into politics: The political celebrity and the celebrity politician. In S. Holmes & S. Redmond (Eds.), *Framing celebrity: new directions in celebrity culture* (pp. 87–100,). Routledge.
- Dubgen, F. (2012). Africa humiliated? Misrecognition in development aid. *Res Publica*, 18(1), 65-77. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11158-012-9186-2>
- Duffield, M. (2007). *Development, security and unending war: Governing the world of peoples*. Polity Press.
- Duffield, M. (2010). The liberal way of development and the development–security impasse: Exploring the global life-chance divide. *Security Dialogue*, 41(1), 53–76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/096701060>
- Duffy, C. (2021, August 2). *Bill and Melinda Gates have finalized their divorce*. CNN Business. Retrieved October 15, 2021, from <https://www.cnn.com/2021/08/02/tech/bill-melinda-gates-divorce-finalized/index.html>

- Duquette, N. (2019). Founders' Fortunes and Philanthropy: A History of the U.S. Charitable-Contribution Deduction. *Business History Review*, 93(3), 553–584. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007680519000710>
- Duvall, S. S. (2010). From walking the red carpet to saving the world: global celebrity, media, and commodity activism. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. Retrieved November 23, 2019, from <https://proxy.library.carleton.ca/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/dissertations-theses/walking-red-carpet-saving-world-global-celebrity/docview/725715602/se-2?accountid=98>
- Easterly, W. (2007a, July 6). *What Bono doesn't say about Africa*. Los Angeles Times. Retrieved February 16, 2021, from <http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-oe-easterly6jul06,0>,
- Easterly, W. (2007b). *The white man's burden: Why the west's efforts to aid the rest have done so much ill and so little good*. The Penguin Press.
- Edwards, M. (2008, March 21). *Just another emperor? The myths and realities of philanthrocapitalism*. Nonprofit Quarterly. Retrieved March 18, 2020, from <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/just-another-emperor-the-myths-and-realities-of-philanthrocapitalism-2/>
- Epstein, C. (2014). Forum: Interrogating the use of norms in international relations: postcolonial perspectives. *International Theory*, 6(2), 293–310. doi:10.1017/S175297191400013X
- Escobar, A. (2011). *Encountering development : The making and unmaking of the Third World* . Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400839926>
- Fassin, D. (2007). Humanitarianism: A Nongovernmental Government. In M. Feher (Ed.), *Nongovernmental Politics* (pp. 149–160). Zone Books.
- Fassin, D. (2013). The Predicament of humanitarianism, *Qui Parle: Critical Humanities and the Social Sciences*, 22(1), 33–48. <https://doi.org/10.5250/quiparle.22.1.0033>
- Fine, B. & Rustomjee, Z. (1996). *The political economy of South Africa: from minerals-energy complex to industrialisation* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429496004>
- Foucault, M. et al. (1991). *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality: With two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*. University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality* (1st American ed.). Pantheon Books.

- Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*, Oxford Scholarship Online. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198237907.001.0001>
- Friesen, E. (2020). *The World Economic Forum and transnational networking*. Emerald Group Publishing.
- Gallagher, J., & Robinson, R. (1953). The imperialism of free trade. *The Economic History Review*, 6(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0289.1953.tb01482.x>
- GAVI. (2021). *The power of partnership*. Retrieved September 29, 2021, from <https://www.gavi.org/our-alliance/about>
- GAVI. (2020). *The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation*. Retrieved April 10, 2020, from <https://www.gavi.org/investing-gavi/funding/donor-profiles/bill-melinda-gates-foundation>
- Gates, B. (2013). 2013 Annual Letter. Retrieved January 19, 2020, from <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/ideas/annual-letters/annual-letter-2013>
- Gates, B. (2013, May 29). *Bill Gates' shocking personal attacks on Dr. Dambisa Moyo and dead aid*. ABC TV's Q&A University of New South Wales. Retrieved April 18, 2020, from <https://youtu.be/5utDdxveaJc>
- Gates, M. F. (2019). *The moment of lift: How empowering women changes the world*. Flatiron Books.
- Ghosh, J. (2020, December 21). *How the green revolution is harming Africa*. IPS Journal. Retrieved October 29, 2021, from <https://www.ips-journal.eu/regions/africa/how-the-green-revolution-is-harming-africa-4850/>
- Giving Pledge. (2021). *Home*. Retrieved October 5, 2021, from <https://givingpledge.org/Home.aspx>
- Giridharadas, A. (2021, May 12). *Philanthropy and the state: Who is funding what and why?* Online Talk. 'Who Owns What and Why?' (WOWAW) Event Series. Retrieved August 15, 2021, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fOAKNu7Y6f4>
- Giridharadas, A. (2019). *Winners take all: The elite charade of changing the world*. Alfred, A. Knopf.
- Glazer, E. & Safdar, K. (2021, May 6). *Melinda Gates was meeting with divorce lawyers since 2019 to end marriage with Bill Gates*, The Wall Street Journal. Retrieved October 9, 2021, from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/melinda-gates-was-meeting-with-divorce-lawyers-since-2019-to-end-marriage-with-bill-gates-11620579924>

- Global Ambassadors. (2020). The global ambassadors programme. Retrieved April 19, 2020, from <https://www.global-ambassadors.org/people/dr-sipho-s-moyo/>
- Godfrey, R.; Brewis, J.; Grady, J.; Grocott, C. (2014). The private military industry and neoliberal imperialism: *Organization*, 21(1), 106-125.
<http://oro.open.ac.uk/62351/1/62351.pdf>
- Goff, P. (2017, November 7). *Tax rogues like Bono are harming the world's poorest*. The Guardian. Retrieved October 10, 2021, from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/nov/07/tax-bono-harming-world-poorest-glastonbury-avoidance-paradise-papers>
- Goodman, M. K., & Barnes, C. (2011). Star/poverty space: the making of the “development celebrity.” *Celebrity Studies*, 2(1), pp. 69–85.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2011.544164>
- Goodman, M.K. (2010). The mirror of consumption: Celebritization, developmental consumption and the shifting cultural politics of fair trade. *Geoforum*, 41(1), 104–116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2009.08.003>
- Gray, D. E. (2009). *Doing Research in the Real World* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Griffin, P. (2010). Development institutions and neoliberal globalization. L. J. Shepherd (Ed.). *Gender matters in global politics: A feminist introduction to international relations* (pp. 218–233). Routledge.
- Griffiths, R. T. (2016). *Configuring the world: A critical political economy approach*. HIPE Publications.
- Grow Africa. (2020). *Who we are*. Retrieved March 20, 2020, from <http://www.growafrica.com/who-we-are>
- Hahn, N. S. C. (2007). Neoliberal imperialism and pan-African resistance. *Journal of World Systems Research*, 13(2), 142–178. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jwsr.2007.354>
- Halperin, S., & Heath, O. (2012). *Political Research: Methods and Political Skills*. Oxford University Press.
- Harrison, G. (2010). The Africanization of poverty: a retrospective on ‘make poverty history’, *African Affairs*, 109(436), 391-408, <https://doi.org/10.1093/afraf/adq025>
- Harvey, D. (2005). *The new imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Hatton, M. J., & Schroeder, K. (2007). Results-based management: friend or foe? *Development in Practice*, 17(3), pp. 426–432.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09614520701337160>

- Hershberger, M. (2004). Peace work, war myths: Jane Fonda and the anti-war movement. *Peace and Change*, 29(3-4), 549–579. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0149-0508.2004.00302.x>
- Hickel, J. (2014, November 19). *The death of international development: The development industry needs as an overhaul of strategy, not a change of language*. Al Jazeera. Retrieved April 20, 2020, from <https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2014/11/20/the-death-of-international-development>
- Hill, B. (2015, March 9). *Big campaign win: UK 0.7% target will become law*, ONE. Retrieved February 15, 2020, from <https://www.one.org/international/blog/big-campaign-win-uk-0-7-aid-target-becomes-law/>
- Holmes, S., & Redmond, S. (2010). A journal in Celebrity Studies. *Celebrity Studies*, 1(1), pp. 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392390903519016>
- Hope, K.R. Sr. (1997). *African political economy: Contemporary issues in development* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315479491>
- Horton, S. (2019). Financing the sustainable development goals: Beyond official development assistance. In Dalby et. al. (eds), *Achieving the sustainable development goals: Beyond official development assistance*, pp. 206-225, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Huliaras, A., & Tzifakis, N. (2010). Celebrity activism in international relations: in search of a framework for analysis. *Global Society*, 24(2), 255–274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600821003626567>
- Hutchings, K. (1999). *International political theory: Rethinking ethics in a global era*. Sage.
- Inayatullah, N. (2009). Why do some people think they know what is good for others. In J. Edkins & M. Zehfuss (Eds.), *Global politics: An introduction* (pp. 344-369). Routledge.
- In On Africa. (2011, December 27). *The 'keepers of seed': the impact of the 'Green Revolution' in Africa on female farmers*, Polity. Retrieved October 19, 2021, from <https://www.polity.org.za/article/the-keepers-of-seed-the-impact-of-the-green-revolution-in-africa-on-female-farmers-2011-06-27>
- James, G. (2020, October 20). *Bill Gates promised to give away his wealth. Well, that was bs. The so-called Giving Pledge made it seem like billionaires were philanthropists rather than fatcats*, Inc.com. Retrieved October 9, 2021, from <https://www.inc.com/geoffrey-james/bill-gates-promised-to-give-away-his-wealth-well-that-was-bs.html>

- Jeffreys, E., & Allatson, P. (Eds.). (2015). *Celebrity philanthropy*. Intellect
- Jeffreys, E., & Fain, S. (2008). *Celebrities, poverty and the mediapolis: A case study of the One Campaign*. London School of Economics Media and Humanity Conference, September, 3097851. Retrieved January 13, 2020, from <https://voices.yahoo.com/the-one-campaign-celebrity-poverty-mediapolis-3097851.html>
- Johnson, P. D. (2018). *Global philanthropy report: Perspectives on the global foundation sector*. Harvard Kennedy School, The Hauser Institute for Civil Society and the Centre for Public Leadership. Retrieved May 22, 2020, from https://cpl.hks.harvard.edu/files/cpl/files/global_philanthropy_report_final_april_2018.pdf
- Kapoor, I. (2012). *Celebrity humanitarianism: The ideology of global charity*. Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203082270>
- Kelly, S. P., Morgan, G. G., & Coule, T. M. (2014). Celebrity altruism: The good, the bad and the ugly in relationships with fundraising charities. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 19, 57–75. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1487>
- Kiviat, B., & Gates, B. (2008, July 31). *Making capitalism more creative*. Time Magazine. Retrieved July 15, 2020, from <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1828417,00.html>.
- Kohn, M. (2013). Postcolonialism and global justice. *Journal of Global Ethics*, 9(2), 187–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449626.2013.818459>
- Kurasawa, F. (2013). The sentimentalist paradox: on the normative and visual foundations of humanitarianism. *Journal of Global Ethics*, 9(2), 201–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449626.2013.818461>
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Sage.
- Larner, W. (2000). Neo-liberalism: policy, ideology, governmentality, studies in political economy. *A Socialist Review*, 63(1), 5–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19187033.2000.11675231>
- Lesinski, J. M. (2009). *Bill Gates: Entrepreneur and philanthropist*. Twenty-First Century Books.
- Linklater, A. (1998). Cosmopolitan citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 2(1), 23–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621029808420668>

- Littler, J. (2011). Introduction: Celebrity and the transnational. *Celebrity Studies*, 2(1), pp. 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2011.544152>
- Littler, J. (2008). “I feel your pain”: Cosmopolitan charity and the public fashioning of the celebrity soul. *Social Semiotics*, 18(2), 237–251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330802002416>
- Lockhart, P. (1985). Bob Geldof swearing on Live Aid. Retrieved June 20, 2020, from <https://youtu.be/bvCvNupAhYg>
- Madrigal, A. C. (2018, June 27). *Against philanthropy*. The Atlantic. Retrieved May 16, 2020, from <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2018/06/against-philanthropy/563834/>
- Magubane, Z. (2007, April 20). *Africa and the new cult of celebrity*. The Zeleza Post. Retrieved April 21, 2020, from <http://www.zeleza.com/blogging/popular-culture/africa-and-the-new-cult-celebrity>
- Magubane, Z. (2008). The (product) red man’s burden: Charity, celebrity and the contradictions of coevalness. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, 2(6), 102. 1–102. 25. https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A192353423/AONE?u=ocul_carleton&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=bc56ceb
- Mahendra, J. (Ed.). (2009, October). *Bill Gates gets Indira Gandhi Peace Prize*. Pratiyogita Darpan, 4(39), 388. Retrieved April 4, 2019, from <https://books.google.ca/books?id=k2Ual-NgAVMC&pg=PT165&lpg=PT165&dq=pratiyogita+darpan-+2009+-+bill+gates+gets+indira+gandhi+peace+prize&source=bl&ots=xLc3n2ntRW&sig=ACfU3U0fHwjLRtgEWlz4nFCNJIkwLxqHw&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiRtKJ6LH0AhVHj4kEHXLfBNcQ6AF6BAGPEAM#v=onepage&q=pratiyogita%20darpan-%202009%20-%20bill%20gates%20gets%20indira%20gandhi%20peace%20prize&f=false>
- Mallaby, S. (2002). The Reluctant Imperialist: Terrorism, Failed States, and the Case for American Empire. *Foreign Affairs*, 81(2), 2–7. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20033079>
- Manji, F., & O’Coill, C. (2002). The missionary position: NGOs and development in Africa. *International Affairs* (London). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.00267>
- Marshall, P. D. (1997). *Celebrity and Power: Fame in contemporary culture*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Matthews, S. (2004). Post-development theory and the question of alternatives: a view from Africa. *Third World Quarterly*, 25(2), 373 – 384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0143659042000174860>

- Mbembé, A. (2001). *On the postcolony*. University of California Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520917538>
- McGoey, L. (2021, May 4). *The people vs Bill Gates*. London Review of Books.
 Retrieved May 20, 2021, from <https://www.lrb.co.uk/blog/2021/may/the-people-v.-bill-gates>
- McGoey, L. (2015). *No such thing as a free gift: The Gates Foundation and the price of philanthropy*. Verso.
- McPhillips, D. (2020, May 29). *Gates Foundation donations to the WHO nearly match those from the U.S. government*. USNews and World Report. Retrieved June 15, 2020, from <https://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2020-05-29/gates-foundation-donations-to-who-nearly-match-those-from-us-government>
- Mediavilla, J., & Garcia-Arias, J. (2019). Philanthrocapitalism as a Neoliberal (Development Agenda) artefact: philanthropic discourse and hegemony in (financing for) international development *. *Globalizations*, 16(6), 857–875.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2018.1560187>
- Mighty Earthy. (2019). *The worst company in the world*. Retrieved October 11, 2021, from <http://www.mightyearth.org/wp-content/uploads/Mighty-Earth-Report-Cargill-The-Worst-Company-in-the-World-July-2019.pdf>
- Mitchell, K. (2016). Celebrity humanitarianism, transnational emotion and the rise of neoliberal citizenship. *Global Networks*.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280102252>
- Mitchell, K. (2017). Factivism’: a new configuration of humanitarian reason. *Geopolitics*, 22(1), 10–128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2016.1185606>
- Mohanty, C. T. (1991). Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourse. In A. R. Mohanty & L. Torres (Eds.), *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* (pp. 51–80). Indiana University Press.
- Moniz, A. B. (2016). *From empire to humanity: The American revolution and the origins of humanitarianism*, Oxford scholarship online.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190240356.001.001>
- Moore, T. (2013). Saving friends or saving strangers? Critical humanitarianism and the geopolitics of international law. *Review of International Studies*, 39(4), 925–947.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210512000368>
- Moran, M. (2013). *Private foundations and development partnerships: American philanthropy and global development agencies*. Routledge.

- Morgan, R. (2018, May 23). *Bill Gates and Richard Branson are betting lab-grown meat might be the food of the future*. CNBC. Retrieved July 14, 2020, from <https://www.cnn.com/2018/03/23/bill-gates-and-richard-branson-bet-on-lab-grown-meat-startup.html>
- Morvaridi, B. (2008). *Social justice and development*. Palgrave and Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230581999_1
- Moyo, D. (2009). *Dead aid: Why aid makes things worse and how there is another way for Africa*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Moyo, S. (2011, December 19). *Hungry no more in Africa*, ONE. Retrieved February 18, 2020, from <https://www.one.org/africa/blog/hungry-no-more-in-africa/>
- Müller, T. R. (2013). The long shadow of band aid humanitarianism: Revisiting the dynamics between famine and celebrity. *Third World Quarterly*, 34(3), 470–481. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2013.785342>
- Murdock, J. (2020, January 13). *Why Bill Gates' net worth is so high 20 years after stepping down as Microsoft CEO*. Newsweek. Retrieved February 18, 2021, from <https://www.newsweek.com/bill-gates-net-worth-wealth-since-microsoft-cascade-investment-bill-melinda-gates-foundation-1481482>
- Nair, S. (2017). Introducing postcolonialism in international relations theory. *E-International Relations*. <https://www.e-ir.info/2017/12/08/postcolonialism-in-international-relations-theory/>
- Nair, T. (2016). Deepening divides: Decentralized development and the ‘tyranny’ of participation. *Journal of International Development*, 28(4), 1323-1336. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.3233>
- NBC News. (2005, 26 June). *Transcript for June 26, NBC News Meet the Press*. Retrieved May 9, 2020, from <https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna83326>
- Nederveen, P. J. (2009). *Development theory deconstructions/reconstructions* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Nickel, P., & Eikenberry, A. (2009). A critique of the discourse of marketized philanthropy’. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 52(7), 974–989. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764208327670>
- Nustad, K.G. (2001). Development: the devil we know?. *Third World Quarterly*, 22(4), 479- 489. <https://doi.org/10/1080/01436590120071731>
- Odendahl, T. J. (1990). *Charity begins at home: Generosity and self-interest among the philanthropic elite*. Basic Books.

- OECD. (2018). Private philanthropy for development, *The Development Dimension*.
<https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264085190-en>
- Okie, S. (2006). Global health- the Gates-Buffett effect. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 355(11), 1084–1088. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp068186>
- Oloruntoba, S. O., & Falola, T. (eds.) (2020). *The Palgrave Handbook of African Political Economy* (1st ed. 2020.). Springer International Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-38922-2>
- O'Manique, C., & Labonte, R. (2008). Rethinking (Product) RED. *The Lancet*, 371(9624), 1561–1563. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(08\)60671-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(08)60671-6)
- ONE. (2021). *Electrify Africa*. Retrieved January 14, 2021, from
<https://www.one.org/international/take-action/victories/electrify-africa/>
- ONE. (2020). *IMF gold campaign*. Retrieved March 14, 2020, from
<https://www.one.org/international/take-action/victories/imf-gold-campaign/>
- ONE. (2020). *Do Agric, It Pays*. Retrieved March 14, 2020, from
<https://www.one.org/international/take-action/victories/do-agric-it-pays/>
- ONE. (2018, November 29). *Congress passes bipartisan bill to reauthorize PEPFAR, America's signature global AIDS program*. Retrieved January 20, 2020, from
<https://www.one.org/us/press/congress-passes-bipartisan-bill-to-reauthorize-pepfar-americas-signature-global-aids-program/>
- ONE. (2020). *Financials*. Retrieved March 18, 2020, from .
<https://www.one.org/us/about/financials/>
- ONE. (2020). *About ONE*. Retrieved January 5, 2020, from <https://www.one.org/us/about>
- ONE. (2020). *Make Naija stronger*. Retrieved April 19, 2020, from
<https://www.one.org/africa/take-action/make-naija-stronger/>
- ONE. (2019, July 16). *AGRA joins forces with ONE to advocate for more investments towards agriculture*. Retrieved March 19, 2020, from
<https://www.one.org/africa/press/one-and-agra-join-forces-to-advocate-for-more-investments-towards-agriculture/>
- ONE. (2019, April 12). *Former ONE Campaign staff attend private meeting with members of ONE leadership and Board in Johannesburg, South Africa*. Retrieved January 18, 2020, from <https://www.one.org/international/press/former-one-campaign-staff-attend-private-meeting-with-members-of-one-leadership-and-board-in-johannesburg-south-africa/>

- ONE. (2019, October 11). *Here's how ONE activists helped the Global Fund break records*. Retrieved February 10, 2020, from <https://www.one.org/international/blog/one-activist-actions-global-fund/>
- ONE. (2018). ONE explains: the BUILD Act// The ONE Campaign. YouTube. Retrieved April 19, 2020, from <https://youtu.be/3DuH7Irtlc>
- ONE. (2017). *Poverty is sexist annual report*. Retrieved February 11, 2020, from https://s3.amazonaws.com/one.org/pdfs/ONE_Poverty_is_Sexist_Report_2017_EN.pdf
- ONE. (2017). *The Toughest places for a girl to get an education*. Retrieved February 11, 2020, from https://s3.amazonaws.com/one.org/pdfs/IDG_2017_media_briefing_en_web.pdf
- ONE. (2017, October 3). *Bono: Ending poverty is the ONE thing we can all agree on*. YouTube. Retrieved March 9, 2019, from <https://youtu.be/EVWAuSKtrB4>
- ONE. (2016, August 29). Dangote and Bono launch poverty tackling partnership. ONE. Retrieved April 19, 2020, from <https://www.one.org/africa/press/dangote-and-bono-launch-poverty-tackling-partnership/>
- ONE. (2015, July 15). *Harnessing data revolution to drive sustainable development*. ONE. Retrieved April 19, 2020, from <https://www.one.org/africa/press/dangote-and-bono-launch-poverty-tackling-partnership/>
- ONE. (2015). *ONE annual report*. Retrieved March 12, 2020, from https://s3.amazonaws.com/one.org/pdfs/ONE_Annual_Report_2015.pdf
- ONE. (2014). *Trillion dollar scandal*. Retrieved April 19, 2020, from <https://www.one.org/africa/take-action/victories/the-trillion-dollar-scandal/>
- ONE. (2004, December 4). *ONE received \$3 million from Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation*. February 16, 2020, from <https://www.one.org/us/press/one-receives-3-million-from-bill-melinda-gates-foundation/>
- Open Society Foundations. (2022). *How we work*. Retrieved January 15, 2022 from <https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/how-we-work>
- Parkes, A. (2021, April 6). *From burden to benefit: reframing the conversation on care*, Oxfam Canada. Retrieved November 18, 2021, from <https://www.oxfam.ca/story/from-burden-to-benefit-reframing-the-conversation-on-care/>
- Partzsch, L. (2018). Take action now: The legitimacy of celebrity power in international relations. *Global Governance*, 24(2), 229-248.

https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A541439614/AONE?u=ocul_carleton&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=b39b707d

- Pasha, M. K. (2014). How can we end poverty? In Edkins & Zehfuss (Eds.), *Global politics: A new introduction* (pp. 436–448). Routledge.
- Payton, R. L., & Moody, M. P. (2008). *Understanding philanthropy : Its meaning and mission*. <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.proxy.library.carleton.ca>
- Peck, J. (2012). Looking a gift horse in the mouth: Oprah Winfrey and the politics of philanthropy. *Celebrity Studies*, 3(1), pp. 106–108.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2012.644725>
- Peterson, V. S. (2014). How the world is organized economically. In Edkins & Zehfuss (Eds.), *Global politics: A new introduction* (pp. 363–284). Routledge.
- Playing For Change. (2021). *Bono: biography*. Retrieved October 19, 2021, from <https://playingforchange.com/musicians/bono/>
- Philanthropy News Digest. (2022). Not On Our Watch. Retrieved January 17, 2022 from <https://philanthropynewsdigest.org/npo-spotlight/not-on-our-watch>
- Press Association (2018, March 10). *Bono apology after 'serious and multiple' bullying claims at charity*, The Daily Mail, Retrieved February 24, 2020, from <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/wires/pa/article-5486439/Bono-apology-multiple-bullying-claims-charity.html>
- Randall, D. K. (2008, November 24). *The truth about celebrity giving*. Forbes. Retrieved February 10, 2020, from https://www.forbes.com/2008/11/24/oprah-philanthropy-celebrity-biz-media-cz_dkr_1124charitycelebs.html?sh=2f4fc9d75dbf
- Rankin, K. (2001). Governing development: neoliberalism, microcredit, and rational economic woman. *Economy and Society*, 30(1), 18–37.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03085140020019070>
- Reich, R. (2018). *Just giving: why philanthropy is failing democracy and how is can do better*. Princeton University Press.
- Repo, J., & Yrjola, R. (2011). The gender politics of celebrity humanitarianism in Africa. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 13(1), 44–62.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2011.534661>
- Rhodes, M. (2018, October 11). *ONE Africa award 2018 – Dext Technology wins!* ONE. Retrieved May 14, 2020, from <https://www.one.org/international/blog/one-africa-award-2018-winner/>

- Richey, L. A., & Brockington, D. (2020). Celebrity humanitarianism: using tropes of engagement to understand North/South relations. *Perspectives on Politics*, 18(1), 43–59. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592719002627>
- Richey, L. A. (2015). Introduction: celebrity humanitarianism and North-South relations – politics, place and power. In L.A Richey (Ed.), *Celebrity humanitarianism and North-South relations: politics, place and power* (pp. 1-24). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315721187>
- Richey, L. A. (Ed.) (2015). *Celebrity humanitarianism and North-South relations: politics, place and power*. Routledge.
- Rieff, D. (1995). The humanitarian trap, *World Policy Journal*, 12(4), 1–11. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40209443>
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Sage Publications.
- Ruckert, A. (2006). Towards an inclusive-neoliberal regime of development: from the Washington to the post-Washington consensus. *Labour, Capital and Society*, 36(1), 34-67. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43158260>
- Saunders-Hastings, E. (2018). Plutocratic philanthropy. *The Journal of Politics*, 80(1), 149–161. <https://doi.org/10.1086/694103>
- Sawaya, F. (2008). Capitalism and philanthropy in the (new) gilded age. *American Quarterly*, 60(1), 201–213. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40068507>
- Schurman, R. (2018). Micro(soft) managing a ‘green revolution’ for Africa: The new donor culture and international agricultural development. *World Development*, 112(Complete), 180–192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.08.003>
- Schwab, T. (2021, October 6). *The Gates Foundation avoids a reckoning on race and power: can philanthropy decolonize? Only if wealthy donors grapple with the difference between giving away money and actually sharing power*. The Nation. Retrieved November 3, 2021, from <https://www.thenation.com/article/society/gates-foundation-colonialism/>
- Schwab, T. (2020, August 21). *Journalism’s Gates keepers*. Columbia Journalism Review. Retrieved August 30, 2020, from cjr.org/criticism/gates-foundation-journalism-funding.php
- Scott, M. (2015). The role of celebrities in mediating distant suffering. *International*

- Journal of Cultural Studies*, 18(4), 449–466.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1367877914530038>
- Seth, S. (2013). Postcolonial theory and the critique of international relations. In S. Seth (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and international relations: A critical introduction* (pp. 15-31), Routledge.
- Seydi, C.O. (2021, July 28). As COVID-19 cases surge, African institutions lead response efforts, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Retrieved October 9, 2021, from <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/ideas/articles/covid19-africa-variant>
- Silver, I. (2007). Disentangling class from philanthropy: The double-edged sword of alternative giving. *Critical Sociology*, 33, 537- 549 549.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/156916307X189013>
- Slim, H. (2002). Not Philanthropy But Rights: The Proper Politicisation of Humanitarian Philosophy. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 6(2), 1–22.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/714003759>
- Sözer, H. (2020). Humanitarianism with a neo-liberal face: vulnerability, intervention as vulnerability redistribution. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(11), 2163–2180, <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2019.1573661>
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents* . Norton.
- Stole, I. (2006, July 14). ‘Cause-related marketing’’: *Why social change and corporate profits don’t mix*. The Centre for Media and Democracy’s PRWatch. Retrieved, April 13, 2020, from <https://www.prwatch.org/node/4965>
- Street, J. (2004). Celebrity Politicians: Popular Culture and Political Representation. *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, 6(4), 435–452.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-856X.2004.00149.x>
- Time Magazine. (2005, December 26-January 5, 2006). *The good Samaritans: persons of the year: Bill Gates, Bono, Melinda Gates*, TIME Magazine. Retrieved March 18, 2019, from <http://content.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,20051226,00.html>
- Tobacco-Free Kids. (2020). The campaign for tobacco-free kids: About us. Retrieved February 26, 2020, from <https://www.tobaccofreekids.org/what-we-do>
- The Howard. G. Buffett Foundation. (2022). Focus areas. Retrieved January 15, 2022 from <https://www.thehowardgbuffettfoundation.org>
- The Sentry. (2019, March 20). *Not On Our Watch and The Sentry have merged*, The Sentry. Retrieved January 17, 2022, from <https://thesentry.org/2019/03/20/2498/not-watch-sentry-merged/>

- Thompson, C.B. (2012) Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA): advancing the theft of African genetic wealth. *Review of African Political Economy*, 39(132), 345-350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03056244.2012.688647>
- Thrall, A. T., Lollo-Fakhreddine, J., Berent, J., Donnelly, L., Herrin, W., Paquette, Z., Wenglinski, R., & Wyatt, A. (2008). Star Power: Celebrity Advocacy and the Evolution of the Public Sphere. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 13(4), 362–385. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161208319098>
- Tompkins-Stange, M. (2016). *Policy patrons: Philanthropy, education reform, and the politics of influence*. Harvard University Press.
- Tsaliki, L., Frangonikolopoulos, C. A., & Huliaras, A. (2011). *Transnational celebrity activism in global politics: Transnational celebrity activism in global politics*. Intellect Books Ltd.
- Turner, G. (2013). *Understanding Celebrity*. Sage Publications.
- Tyrangiel, J. (2002, March 4). *Can Bono save the world? Bono's mission*. TIME, 159(9). Retrieved March 23, 2019, from <http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,212721,00.html>
- UNDP. (2020). *Human development index ranking*, The 2020 Human Development Report. Retrieved September 14, 2021, from <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/latest-human-development-index-ranking>
- UNDP. (2021). *What are the sustainable development goals?* Retrieved October 11, 2021, from <https://www.undp.org/sustainable-development-goals>
- Urban, S. (2018, April 10). *What is the BUILD Act?*. ONE. Retrieved May 23, 2020, from <https://www.one.org/us/blog/build-act-questions-development-entrepreneur/>
- Ure, M. & Geldof, B. (1984). *Do they know it's Christmas?* Band Aid, Retrieved November 19, 2021, from <https://www.musixmatch.com/lyrics/Band-Aid/Do-They-Know-It-s-Christmas>
- Van Noorden, R. (2017). Gates Foundation research can't be published in top journals. *Nature*, 541(7637). https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A478132390/AONE?u=ocul_carleton&sid=AONE&xid=86a27b2d
- Veltmeyer, H. (2017). Civil society and development. In P.A. Haslam et al. *Introduction to international development* (pp. 221–239,). Oxford University Press.
- Watts, R. (2021, May 22). *Strive Masiyiwa, the first black billionaire to make the rich list*. The Times. Retrieved September 5, 2021, from <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/first-black-billionaire-rich-list-2021-v8kj6z73z>

- Wheeler, M. (2013). *Celebrity politics*. Polity Press
- Wheeler, M. (2011). Celebrity diplomacy: United Nations' Goodwill Ambassadors and Messengers of Peace. *Celebrity Studies*, 2(1), 6–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2011.543267>
- Willig, C. (2014). Interpretation and analysis1, In: U. Flick (Ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, pp. 136-150 (print): SAGE Publications Ltd.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446282243>
- Wilson, J. (2012). Cosmopolitan stars, interactive audience labor, and the digital economy of global care. *Television & New Media*,(15)2, pp. 104 – 120.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476412448469>
- Wise, T.A. (2020). *Failing Africa's farmers: an impact assessment of the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa*. Global Development and Environment Institute Working Paper 20-21. Retrieved September 14, 2021, from
https://sites.tufts.edu/gdae/files/2020/07/20-01_Wise_FailureToYield.pdf
- World Bank. (2021). *South Africa: Data*. Retrieved September 13, 2021, from
<https://data.worldbank.org/country/south-africa?view=chart>
- World Bank & ONE Campaign. (2014). *Levelling the Field : Improving Opportunities for Women Farmers in Africa*. World Bank. Retrieved May 15, 2020, from
<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/17790>
- World Health Organization. (2017). *Contributors*. Retrieved April 22, 2020, from
<http://open.who.int/2016-17/contributors/contributor>
- World Wealth Report. (2021). *HNWI market sizing: North America regains top position*. World Wealth Report. Retrieved January 17, 2022, from
<https://worldwealthreport.com/hnwi-market-sizing-north-america-regains-top-position/>
- Young, I. M. (2006). Responsibility and global justice: A social connection model. *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 23(1), 102–130. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265052506060043>
- Yrjölä, R. (2009). The invisible violence of celebrity humanitarianism: Soft images and hard words in the making and unmaking of Africa. *World Political Science Review*, 5(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1935-6226.1072>
- Zewdu, S. (2021, March 2). *With vaccine deliveries to Accra and Abidjan, the race for equity begins*. Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Retrieved October 15, 2021, from

<https://www.gatesfoundation.org/ideas/articles/covax-covid-vaccine-first-immunizations-africa>

Zehfuss, M. (2004). *Constructivism in international relations: The politics of reality*. Cambridge University Press.

Ziai, A. (2007). *Exploring Post Development Theory and Practice, Problems and Perspectives*. Routledge.

Ziai, A. (2004). The Ambivalence of Post-Development: Between Reactionary Populism and Radical Democracy. *Third World Quarterly*, 25(6), 1045–1060.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3993750>

Zunz, O. (2012). *Philanthropy in America: a history (updated)*. Princeton University Press.