

Malmö University  
Faculty of Culture and Society  
School of Arts and Communication

Date of Submission: 21.2.2018

THE RHETORIC OF CELEBRITY HUMANITARIANISM:  
THE CASE STUDY OF LESVOS

By

Orestis Galanis

A MASTER'S THESIS

Submitted to

Malmö University

In partial fulfilment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of

M.A. in Communication for Development

Submitted by:  
Orestis Galanis



Supervisor:  
Michael Krona  
Faculty of Culture and Society  
School of Arts and  
Communication  
Malmö University

## **Abstract**

Celebrities participate in performances from the zones of suffering in order to trigger emotions to their audiences and engage them in such causes. In this combination of critical discourse analysis and rhetoric analysis, the author analyses four cases of celebrities: Angelina Jolie, Mandy Patinkin, a group of actors from the popular series Game of Thrones and Susan Sarandon who visited refugee camps in the island of Lesbos to see the conditions under which, the refugees were living. The combination of those methods with Chouliaraki's (2013) work on humanitarian celebrities and Goffman's (1959) work about the presentation of the self in everyday life, is used to unveil how celebrities communicate and use their political power in order to evoke participation in the global north.

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Background</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Theoretical framework</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Literature review</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Emotion and performance</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Celebrity and performance</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Performance in everyday life</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Journalism and performance</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Forms of capital</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Method</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Critical Discourse Analysis</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Rhetoric</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Triangulation</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Analysis</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Case 1: Angelina Jolie</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Case 2: Mandy Patinkin</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Case 3: Game of Thrones actors</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Case 4: Susan Saradon</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Comparative analysis and discussion</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Limitations</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Future research</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Appendix 2</b>	<b>40</b>

## **Introduction**

Celebrities seem to be getting more and more involved with humanitarian action. Many Hollywood actors have been leading figures in this discourse the last few years. Angelina Jolie is an example of Hollywood celebrity who is famous for her humanitarian action (Chouliaraki, 2013; Mostafanezhad, 2015). Drawing from the activities of several actors, the aim of this work is to analyze humanitarian performances and how those performances are covered by certain media in order to attract people's attention and potential involvement to humanitarian actions.

More precisely, what is discussed in this work are the visits of Angelina Jolie, Mandy Patinkin, Susan Sarandon and several actors from the popular series Game of Thrones to the Greek island Lesbos, in order to witness the conditions under which the refugees were living. Most of the refugees were Syrian citizens that were forced to move from their country due to the emerging war. The visits took place back in 2015 when the everyday arrivals of refugees were on their peak.

In order to examine how celebrities perform and how they communicate their objectives through emotions, the methods that I adopt are critical discourse analysis as well as rhetoric. The text oriented form of critical discourse analysis, provides me with the analytical tools in order to break down and analyze a text, since it combines three different traditions. It works in a "three dimensional" way combining textual analysis, discursive practice analysis and social practice analysis as it is described by Fairclough (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002, p.65). Rhetoric is the most suitable framework to provide answers to the question of how celebrities perform in order to involve spectators of the global north to humanitarian action. The combination of analyzing the medium as well as the performance provides a more "in depth" analysis. From a theoretical point of view, I mostly use Chouliaraki's (2013) theory about the celebrity performances within the zones of suffering along with Goffman's (1959) theory about presentation of the self in everyday life. After analyzing separately the different cases a discussion follows where the results are compared and discussed.

## **Background**

According to UNHCR (UNHCR1, UNHCR2, UNHCR3), in the early 2015 a refugee crisis started in Europe. Between April 2015 and March 2016, over a million refugees fled to

Europe. The vast majority of the refugees were Syrian due to the emerging civil war in their country. The countries that faced this crisis, in the first place and in the most part, were naturally the countries on the "European borders": Greece and Italy in the most part. Spain faced the similar issue to a smaller extent. The focal point of this crisis was the Greek island of Lesbos. In 2015, 56% of the total arrivals in Greece passed by Lesbos (UNHCR3). As a result, some of the biggest refugee camps in Greece were created there in order to host as many incoming refugees as possible. On their journey to Europe, many refugees suffered tragic deaths, most of them drowning in the sea while trying to reach land. In 2015, over 3,700 people died and for 2016 the numbers were even worse (UNHCR3).

Those tragic facts led to worldwide recognition, since then the island of Lesbos became a media spotlight. Many celebrities visited the island to express their solidarity to the refugees. Mandy Patinkin visited Lesbos early December of 2015, Susan Sarandon later the same month (in fact, she had Christmas there), Angelina Jolie visited in mid-March 2016 and actors from the Game of Thrones cast visited late-June of the same year. Other kind of celebrities such as the Pope and the Queen of Jordan also visited Lesbos in mid-April of 2016. All visits happened while the issue was still at its peak and thousands of refugees were arriving each of those months.

## Theoretical Framework

### Literature Review

There has been much literature related to how celebrities communicate in humanitarian issues. Much of it is concentrated in Ann Richey's (2015) book "Celebrity humanitarianism and North-South Relations: Politics, place and power" where both the impact of celebrities in the South is discussed (Mostafanezhad, 2015; Rasmussen, 2015; Schwittay, 2015; Mupotsa, 2015; Hood, 2015) as well as what that means for the North (Budabin, 2015; Rosamond, 2015; Olwig & Christiansen, 2015; van Krieken, 2015). Several questions are answered throughout the book such as: "*how do celebrities mediate elite politics between North and South?*" (Schwittay, 2015; Budabin, 2015; Rosamond, 2015; Olwig & Christiansen, 2015), "*which publics are engaged in diverse places, through which celebrityized means and what does this mean for politics?*" (Rosamond, 2015; Olwig & Christiansen, 2015; van Krieken, 2015), "*how do celebrityized interventions impact local politics of development that take place in the South?*" (Mostafanezhad, 2015; Rasmussen, 2015; Mupotsa, 2015; Hood, 2015), "*how can the perspective of Southern celebrities shape our understanding of development practices?*" (Schwittay, 2015; Mupotsa, 2015; Hood, 2015) and "*how do humanitarian representations of power (concepts of "need" and agency) change in different places as celebrities try to "sell" a particular cause to a particular audience?*" (Mostafanezhad, 2015; Schwittay, 2015; Mupotsa, 2015; Budabin, 2015; Rosamond, 2015; van Krieken, 2015) (Ann Richey's, 2015, p.13).

Besides the general critical viewpoint of Ann Richey's book, many scholars of celebrity communication for humanitarian purposes have a critical points of view. Celebrities tend to be the focal point (Littler, 2008; Daley, 2013) of the discourse which is antidemocratic (Littler, 2008) since the issue is monopolized due to being centralized around a certain individual (Daley, 2013). Celebrities are trying to redress the system that are inevitably a part of and present themselves as the ones that attempt to close the gap (Littler, 2008). Daley describes the same point of view while highlighting the neoliberal objectives that are promoted. From an even more critical point of view, de Waal (2008) points out that, promotion through celebrities has the depressing outcome of hindering instead of helping, since public pays more attention in the story telling than taking action in order to improve the situation. Chouliaraki (2012) makes a similar remark about how celebrity communication does not necessarily lead to commitment.

There are also more optimistic approaches regarding celebrity involvement in humanitarian issues (Street, 2004; Dwight, 2006; Street, 2012; Cooper, 2007). Celebrities might have a positive impact since they inspire advocacy (Dwight, 2006). They can play a political role and cause positive impact. Since, in a sense, political representation includes many celebrity characteristics, celebrities are qualified to play this role (Street, 2004), in any case this statement requires further study (Street, 2004; Street, 2012). Furthermore, even though celebrities cannot provide large-scale solutions by themselves, their extended networking puts them in the advantageous position of redefining priorities in the agenda (Cooper, 2007). Even Chouliaraki (2012), while being critical, admits the improvement regarding the actual impact of relief between now and a few decades ago.

There are several celebrities mentioned in humanitarian-communication-relevant literature. Bono's actions evoked either positive (Cooper, 2007) or not negative comments (Ann Richey and Ponte, 2008). In contrast to Bono, George Clooney evoked either admiration (Dwight, 2006) or tough criticism for the Darfour case (de Waal, 2008). Angelina Jolie, (along with Bono and Clooney) is of the most common cases in the celebrity humanitarian literature. Even though she is recognized as an improvement in comparison to Hepburn from an impact point of view (Chouliaraki, 2012), she does not really evoke commitment to any cause being a part of the system she criticizes with her stance and does not provide clear political implications with her stance (Mostafanezhad, 2015). Madonna's presence in Malawi also acted as a distraction from the real issues in the area (Rasmussen, 2015). Other celebrities who are mentioned as contributors to the public discourse in humanitarian issues are Mat Damon, Brad Pitt and Don Cheadle (Dwight, 2006).

From a theoretical point of view, what stands out is Chouliaraki's (2012) theatricality of humanitarianism and the ironic spectator of the global north (Chouliaraki, 2013) as well as Driessens (2013) introduction of celebrity capital as a new form of capital. Based on Bourdieu's theory of capitals Driessens highlights the celebrity, the celebrity industry, the media, and the public as the four building blocks of celebrity capital.

A main problem of celebrity humanitarianism impact is best described in the following quote: *"celebrity humanitarianism is flawed from the start, because it will be unable to propose any foundational change (...), for all the co-optation and careful PR work, that politics, people and celebrity are simply too unruly to be easily contained. (...) For, if it is too well organized, celebrity humanitarianism entails bringing highly visible mediagenic people to places which need attention, but then requires them not to speak out on important political matters, and particularly not on some of the root structures and politics that*

*underpin injustice, want and inequality"* (Brockington, 2015, p.210-211). Meaning, that major changes cannot be achieved through celebrity communication because of the innate contradiction between the nature of the celebrity and the nature of the problem that they attempt to fix. Even if they wanted too they wouldn't be able to stress out the roots of the real issues.

## **Emotion and Performance**

The basis of my theoretical framework, in order to analyze these texts, is Chouliaraki's (2013) book on the ironic spectator of the global north towards the issues that the global south faces. As Chouliaraki (2013, p.1) claims emotion is a key factor in communicating solidarity. The spectacle of others being in a vulnerable position, calls individuals on acting morally. This brings individuals to a position of being skeptical towards taking action while they are open towards helping those who suffer (p.2).

In this discourse, the humanitarian imaginary plays a crucial role. Historically, the vulnerability of the human body manifests the realization of the common human nature between the global north and the global south, which as a result emerges the rise of humanitarian action in the global north (Chouliaraki, 2013). Hence, to promote humanitarianism to the western spectators, certain ways are implemented in order to communicate the message. Chouliaraki (2013, p.27) calls this *"the theatricality of humanitarianism"*. The following quotation of Chouliaraki (2013, p.27-28) describes shortly but very accurately the roots of humanitarianism: *"Humanitarianism has traditionally been founded on a theatrical arrangement that separates safe spectators from vulnerable others and communicates its moral message through the staging of spectacles of suffering. This is because humanitarianism derives its force from the heartbreaking spectacles of human suffering, which are made available for all to witness as potential benefactors"*. In other words, what appeals to emotion and draws attention is the spectacle of suffering per se which makes the audience potential saints

Emotion and performance are connected through the aspirational practices that are performed through those that act within the zones of suffering. Their goal is to shape the stance of the spectator through certain performances (which include vulnerable individuals) that use the humanitarian imaginary (Chouliaraki, 2013). It is of great importance to understand that there is a separation between those who suffer and those who watch. Acting within the suffering zone has a dual role of both *"moral education"* and *"political*

*legitimization of the world order*" as it is (Chouliaraki, 2013, p.80). In order to make this separation less visible, celebrities use (Chouliaraki, 2013, p.89) the strategy of "*humanization*" in order to "*domesticate their extraordinariness*" and make the audience feel closer to them.

## **Celebrity and Performance**

The individuals who happen to be performing within the zones of suffering many times are celebrities. This occurs because of the great symbolic power that celebrities own within the cultural industry. This enables them to convert it easily into a legitimate message (Chouliaraki, 2013). The combination of celebrity's personal witnessing of people suffering and their testimony about it, along with the star aura of a celebrity, partially bridges the gap between the spectator and the sufferer (Mostafanezhad, 2015).

The expertise of the celebrity communicating a certain message, sources from the more general public image of the celebrity (Chouliaraki, 2013). Chouliaraki calls this type of public image management, the 'persona' of the celebrity. The same idea is dominant in cultural business studies as well. A celebrity, in order to be a successful promoter of a product and –consequently- transfer meaning successfully, should be likable familiar and in a way connected to the product (McCracken, 1989). For example, Sean Penn's authenticity as a celebrity humanitarian strengthened by his long-term commitment to certain causes (Rosamond, 2015).

By having celebrities communicating such sensitive issues there are certain risks that come into play. When a celebrity chooses to communicate an issue, publicity comes along due to the celebrity's popularity. This might bring into light other related local issues that would have remained in the dark in other cases (Mostafanezhad, 2015). The popularity of certain celebrities might even influence general policies in certain matters like Ben Affleck's case (Budabin, 2015). The celebrity has in a way the ability of expressing those who suffer and set the agenda at the same time (Chouliaraki, 2013).

On the other hand, sometimes celebrities act as agents of NGO's responsible to compensate their political shortcomings (Chouliaraki, 2013). Besides that, the interest that celebrities bring to an issue, disappears shortly after they stop communicating it (Rasmussen, 2015). Finally, the way that humanitarian celebrities treat those who suffer in many occasions, is understood as helping victims that suffer due to someone or something else other than those who provide the aid (Van Krieken, 2015).

## **Performance in every-day life**

The theatricality that Chouliaraki discusses so extensively naturally brings the discourse towards the classic work of Goffman "the presentation of self in everyday life" (1959). Goffman focuses on the metaphor of the theater and the natural adoption of roles by individuals (they still use role-playing order to achieve goals). The humanitarian celebrity case is quite similar, there seems to be preparation and detailed planning of action.

The performance consists of several characteristics. First of all, the front (p.13) which refers to all the expressive equipment that an individual uses during the performance. The setting (p.13) refers to the external objects such as the background items, while the personal font (p.14-15) refers to the personal characteristics of an individual including from clothing to age. Personal font is also divided in manner (role) and appearance (social status) (p.15-16). The problem/challenge with the font is that, there is a limited number of fonts. As a result, individuals have a limited way to represent themselves. Each of those pre-constructed fonts comes with a certain interpretations. Consequently, when an individual changes font he/she changes all those conceptions at the same time (p.17). The result of not maintaining of expressive control or not handling fonts correctly is "*misrepresentation*" (p.37)

In the presence of others, individuals highlight elements that otherwise might not have been noticed. This is called "*dramatic realization*" (p.20). Several qualities are exaggerated while others are hidden in order to dramatize the situation. "*Mystification*" (p.44) is called what creates the distance between the performer and the audience, hiding inappropriate qualities of the performer leads to the creation of an idealized image. A goal of the performer is to promote the belief that he/she is related to the audience in an exaggerated way. The attempt of the performer to represent universally accepted values as part of his/her character is called "*idealization*" (p. 22).

Impression management, is a challenging task that requires maintenance of "*expressive control*" (p.33) by avoiding disrupting the performance with any kind of act that might result to inappropriate impressions (p.132-133). Most actions taken are not necessarily completely sincere or faked (pure acting). There is some truth to them, but in any case, they are exaggerated purposely. Acting falls into this category.

## **Journalism and Performance**

Journalism emphasizes the performance, separating those who act on the scene and those who are watching from a distance. Images, stories and emotion engage the audience as

the observers of the play (Chouliaraki, 2013). Reporters present themselves either, detached from a personal opinion or as individuals that retain a personal opinion based on personal experience which makes the opinion grounded and based on omnipresent witnessing. Those belonging to the latter category, sometimes even pick sides acting as judges (Chouliaraki, 2013, p.144-145). A proposed response to those practices is an ordinary witnessing which prioritizes the value of the facts per se (p.147).

Another proposed response is the introduction of new media, proposes a variety of voices which *“replaces objectivity with a proliferation of truth-claims none of which take epistemological priority over others– the impossibility of witnessing, in this class of news, resting precisely on the presentation of suffering as a ‘stream of other voices . . . dizzy multiplicity of interpretations of experience in the hope of achieving intimacy with violence”* (Chouliaraki, 2013, p.171). This way there is a recognition of tangible contributions about suffering in the global south (p.171). Those media, post-television, are more possible to engage the public into action.

In this study, journalism does not play a key role. Nevertheless, besides examining the celebrity's performance and rhetoric, I also examine -to a lesser extent- the medium in question. Consequently, since some of the media are some of the world's biggest publication the style and perspective of the journalists play a role. As celebrities are part of the system that caused the issues while they are the ones that also claim trying to fix it (Littler, 2008), same applies to the journalists (possibly to a smaller extent).

## **Forms of capital**

According to Bourdieu's (1986) classical theory there are 4 main capital types that determine the social status of an individual. Economic capital, social capital, cultural capital and symbolic capital. Economic capital is easily convertible into money and refers to the wealth of an individual (p.47). Social capital refers to the potential resources as an outcome of a social network (p.51). Cultural capital can be distinguished into three forms: objectified, institutionalized and embodied. Embodied refers to *“long-lasting dispositions”* such as body and skills, objectified to cultural goods owned by an individual such as clothes or anything that a person owns in general and institutionalized to qualities like education, where the access to a social status is provided by an institution (p.47). Symbolic capital is the type of capital that is apprehended symbolically (p.56). More simply it exists because everyone recognizes that it exists and it does not derive from elsewhere.

Conversions of capital forms are possible (p.53) especially when owning the most dominant capital form which is the economic capital (p.50). Nevertheless, conversions are possible from all kind of capitals to all types of capital (sometimes easier than others). As a result, when the right amount of time is devoted other forms of capital can be changed as well. Therefore, if an individual wants and puts on the effort, he/she can significantly raise types of his/her capital by converting the type of capital that he/she owns in a higher volume.

## Method

### Critical Discourse Analysis

There are many definitions about both discourse and discourse analysis (Phillips and Hardy, 2002). In this particular study, I choose to apply a critical discourse analysis over the more traditional Foucauldian method. This choice is very closely related to the nature of this study. Discourse analysis focuses more on groups of statements that provide a certain language to talk about certain topics at a certain period of time. Discourse is connected to production of knowledge through the use of language but it also entails meaning (like all practices) and as a result the discourse constructs the topic (Hall, 1997). Due to the fact that in this study I analyze only a few pieces of journalism, using such a method would force me to confront the disadvantage of limited statements in order to track the existing discourses.

On the other hand, a critical discourse analysis and more precisely Fairclough's three dimension text oriented critical discourse analysis provides me with the advantage of analyzing limited (linguistically) texts from three different perspectives *"in the sense that it connects texts to discourses locating them in a historical and social context"* (Phillips and Hardy, 2002, p.4). As Van Dijk (2001) describes, critical discourse analysis is an approach not only meant to describe and interpret a discourse. It also provides an explanation of why and how discourses work, especially when it is related to *"social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in social and political contexts"* (Van Dijk, 2001, p. 1). Furthermore, critical discourse analysis is functioning in a dialectic way among various disciplines and theories promoting theoretical and methodological development. In this sense, it is working in a transdisciplinary way (Fairclough, 2012).

According to Fairclough's approach there are three levels that can be analytically separated: text, discursive practice and social practice (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002, p.81). Text refers to a detailed textual analysis, where the linguistic characteristics of the text are analyzed. Even though there is focus in linguistic characteristics, I need to stress out the difference between intertextual and linguistic analysis. Instead of focusing in linguistic systems (grammar, phonology etc.), intertextual analysis focuses on *"how texts selectively draw upon orders of discourse"* (Fairclough, 1995, p.188). Discursive practice refers to how the text is produced and how it is received along with the discourses and genres that are included. Finally, social practice refers to the wider context in which the communicative

event that is analyzed is a part of. A social practice is the wider context, the network of discourses that the discursive practice is a part of. Jorgensen and Phillips (2002, p.70) describe how these three levels of analysis work together as: "*The general purpose of the three-dimensional model is, then, to provide an analytical framework for discourse analysis. The model is based on, and promotes, the principle that texts can never be understood or analyzed in isolation – they can only be understood in relation to webs of other texts and in relation to the social context*". Language and verbal communication belong to the micro-level of social order while power and dominance relations between social groups belong to the macro-level. Critical discourse analysis may bridge the gap between those two approaches (Van Dijk, 2015). The advantage of the three-level analysis is the bridging between the micro-level and the macro-level of analysis. This happens not only through a three-level analysis but also by examining individuals are parts of larger groups.

## **Rhetoric**

Rhetoric traditionally is described as the art of persuasion. The rhetor is someone who engages with the audience in an attempt to persuade them. In order to examine rhetoric, we have to take into consideration the whole communicating situation including the rhetor as well as the text and the audience (Pigrum, 2008).

Rhetoric is a suitable analytical framework for this study due to the persuasive nature of the discourse around celebrities who are involved in humanitarian actions. Whether choosing oral speech, images, videos or written text as long as there is a persuasive discourse, rhetoric is applicable (Leach, 2000). Rhetorical analysis (Leach, 2000) has several aspects. The rhetorical situation is characterized by its exigence which "*is an imperfection marked by urgency*" (p. 212). It is also characterized, by the time that a rhetoric event takes place which is called *kairos*, as well as by how appropriate the rhetoric event is which is called *phronesis* (Leach, 2000, p.212). *Audiences* vary, based on how immediate communication is (there is an obvious difference between oral and written communication). Based on these characteristics rhetoric is separated into three main genres (Leach, 2000). Forensic rhetoric, which refers to the past and is usually used in law courts, deliberative rhetoric, which refers to the future and is usually used in politics, and epideictic rhetoric, which refers to contemporary issues and is usually used when judging or praising an individual (Leach, 2000, p.213).

Traditionally rhetoric is divided into five canons. The first canon is *Invention* and refers to the form of communication in relevance to the arguments. *Invention* is divided into

*Ethos, Logos and Pathos.* *Ethos* refers to the given quality of the speaker, *Logos* refers to the quality of the arguments and *Pathos* refers to emotional appeal of the argument. The second canon is *Disposition*, and refers to exploring how the discourse is organized from various perspectives (Leach, 2000). The third canon is *Style*. *Style* can be divided into many categories and refers to the personal style that defines both the creation and the reception of a discourse. Two of the most important concepts are: *Metaphor and Analogy* where meaning is transferred from one concept to another, and *Metonymy and Synecdoche* which are “*figures of speech where the part stands for the whole*” (Leach, 2000, p.217). The two last canons are *Memory*, which refers to the level of access that the speaker has to his/her content, and *Delivery*, which “*explores the relationship between the dissemination of a work and its content*” (Leach, 2000, p.217). In McQuarrie’s and Mick’s (1996, p.426) approach in advertising language, the main characteristics of expression are *Repetition (rhyme, chime, alliteration, anaphora, epistrophe, epanalepsis, anadiplosis)*, *Reversal (antimetabole, antithesis)*, *Substitution (hyperbole, ellipsis, epanorthosis, rhetorical question, metonym)* and *Destabilization (metaphor, pun, irony, paradox)*. Repetition and reversal excess regularity, as a result they constitute *Scheme*, while substitution and destabilization represent *Trope* as they have a certain degree of irregularity and they are clearly allegorical (McQuarrie and Mick 1996, p.426).

From a clearly visual perspective, images being cultural products, as such they should be examined (Scott, 1994). Visual analysis is particularly popular within marketing studies on advertisements’ analysis (McQuarrie and Mick, 1996; McQuarrie and Mick 1999; Bulmer and Buchanan-Oliver, 2006; Phillips and McQuarrie, 2004), where a rhetoric approach might be useful due to the complexity of advertisements (Bulmer and Buchanan-Oliver, 2006). The main characteristics of images in advertisements are the richness of image operation and the complexity of the visual structure (Phillips and McQuarrie, 2004). Visual structure refers to the way that the advertised product is represented physically (present, replaced, existing along another object) and meaning operation refers to how connected those two objects are (associated similar or opposite) (Phillips and McQuarrie, 2004).

## **Triangulation**

Triangulation refers to the combination of different methods, theories, observers and empirical materials in order to produce a more accurate, comprehensive and objective representation of the object of the study. When those combinations lead to similar conclusions, usually there is higher validity to the study (Moisander and Valtonen, 2006).

In this study, in order to achieve triangulation, I use more than one method (Hackley, 2003) by using both rhetoric and critical discourse analysis. In some texts, I use more of the one than of the other. The combination of the two seems to provide more depth in my analysis. The rhetoric perspective covers the performance of the celebrity while with critical discourse analysis it is easier to examine the role of each medium in this act. Since my research question focuses on how celebrities try to involve the audience in humanitarian actions, rhetoric is the obvious choice. Nevertheless, this should be examined from various perspectives in order to provide the needed depth.

This way I attempt to achieve what Atkinson and Hammersley (2007) describe as how the goal of triangulation, which *"is not the combination of different kinds of data per se, but rather an attempt to relate different sorts of data in such a way as to counteract various possible threats of the validity of our analysis"* (p. 184). Different approaches and perspectives that might appear through different methods of data collections are called disjunctures and instead of searching for the source with the greater validity all approaches should be used to highlight all different perspectives (Arnould and Wallendorf, 1994).

## **Analysis**

Trying to reply to the research question stated above I chose to analyze four cases of celebrities. More celebrities visited the refugee camps during the period of time that the number of incoming refugees peaked. I chose those four cases based on the fact that the protagonists are Hollywood celebrities originating from the Global North. This means that their behavior has a certain degree of cultural consistency which helps me to draw some more grounded conclusions. Including other celebrities as the Pope –who is a leading figure of a religious group- or the Queen of Jordan –who is a political person from middle East- would complicate those results. On the other hand, such a decision would broaden my scope, but given the capacity of this study, that would not be a wise choice to make.

The choice of texts in each case is based on various factors. The first one is the behavior of each celebrity which leads to a certain amount of accessible sources. When there were not many (in terms of number or terms of richness) material to work with “I took what I could”. Of course, how much material was available is connected to how popular each case was. As a result the four cases that emerged are some of the most (if not the most) popular cases of Hollywood celebrities during the period of time that they occurred. Consequently, popularity of the cases/main characters was another factor. The third factor is an attempt to combine various perspectives and raw material types such as videos, articles and photographs. In each case of some piece of material used, the first factor also played a role. To sum up, I would say that I chose a coherent “type” of main characters while trying to combine various material types referring to them, depending on how accessible those material types were.

### **Case 1: Angelina Jolie**

In Angelina Jolie's case I only analyze one piece of media which is a description of her visit by the online version of a Greek newspaper. In Jolie's case I choose to analyze only one piece of media which does not include any video. Jolie did not create any media of her own. Instead, she allowed the reporters to broadcast and communicate her actions. For that reason, one popular piece of media can be representative of her actions and how those were transmitted. For that reason, since Jolie is not acting directly, in this case I use only CDA in an attempt to decode how she performs based on how a third party describes her actions.

The name of the newspaper is "Kathimerini" and the name of its online version is "ekathimerini". The title of the article is "Refugee conditions in Greece 'deteriorating' says

Angelina Jolie" and constitutes of a 515-word text and one picture. In the picture, Angelina Jolie is surrounded by refugees and reporters "fighting" to get as close to her as possible. The



Angelina Jolie surrounded by refugees and journalists

main character of the picture -besides Jolie-, is a young man trying to have a "selfie" with her. Even though, as I mentioned before this is a piece of text written for a Greek newspaper, the text is written in English and the source used is French.

The text includes many short paragraphs that refer to various aspects of Jolie's visit. More precisely, there are references to her stylistic preferences, to some of her comments, to her interactions with other individuals that were present, and to her visit to the Greek prime minister. Besides the references to Jolie, there are also comments about the refugee crisis in general as well as to the greater international implications of the crisis. Finally, some statements of a refugee named Bichal, are also included.

## **Analysis**

From a textual perspective, the style of writing is rather careful. The author tries to stick with the description of facts. The straight use of dialogues does not allow any types of transitivity or modality in the biggest part of the text. Modality is *"the speaker's degree of affinity with or affiliation to her or his statement"* (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002, p.83). The

author is very careful when referring to numbers using the word "some" before each number showing that it is a rough estimation and does not get him/her committed to that statement to a greater degree. In some other numbers (all refer to a number of people), the word "over" is used the number showing that the minimum possible number is used in an attempt not to exaggerate.

Transitivity is "how events and processes are connected (or not connected) with subjects and objects" (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002, p.83). In the opening, there is the following statement: "Angelina Jolie turned the spotlight of celebrity Wednesday onto the plight of thousands of refugees". The author tries to avoid transitivity by referring to the agent (Angelina Jolie) highlighting who is responsible for which action. As a result, he succeeds avoiding transitivity. The use of the word "spotlight" constitutes a metaphor which shows how celebrities can bring popularity towards a topic because their own popularity (Mostafanezhad, 2015). The word "plight" can be argued to have some modality characteristics. Nevertheless, the rest of the article backs this statement up.

Besides the opening statement that includes a metaphor, which is open for interpretation, the rest of the text is merely a description of facts and dialogues. From those descriptions three identities emerge, the first one is Jolie's and the second is the collective identity of the refugees. I will analyze those identities in the following segment about discursive practice since their analysis goes beyond simply a linguistic analysis. Nevertheless, what textually needs to be highlighted is how the collective identity of the refugees is expressed dialogically through the example of "Bichal". The author describes the refugees as a group and then uses Bichal's statements back up the description. Even though, examples are needed in order to describe roughly the situation since it is impossible to interview a big number of people, there is no way that one refugee can represent accurately a group of thousands.

The main concern of the discursive practice level of analysis is how text is produced and how it is consumed (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002). The text is written for the English version of a Greek newspaper and uses a French source. Therefore, even though the text is produced in Greece, the target audience is mostly non-Greek readers, since Greeks may easily have access to the Greek version of the newspaper.

Back to the analysis of the refugees identity, they appear to be vulnerable and there are certain references to children which are the most vulnerable group. Such references highlight the vulnerability of the human body play a crucial role in the humanitarian imaginary and the emotions that are resulted of this spectacle of suffering (Chouliaraki,

2013). Jolie play a key role here because of her "performativity" as a humanitarian celebrity. She acts as a theatrical figure (she happens to be an actress in real life as well) to communicate the suffering of the refugees (Chouliaraki, 2013) and the interaction with children -who represent a very vulnerable group- makes her message even clearer.

Jolie's "performativity", or in other words her "persona", can be described as very successful. In communicative terms she is the ideal messenger. Her expertise was built through the management of her public image as a celebrity (Chouliaraki, 2013), since she is related to similar causes over the last few years. Long commitment is proven to bring a stronger sense of authenticity connected to the humanitarian celebrity as it is shown from Sean Penn's case (Rosamond, 2015). Connected to Jolie's performance is also the reference to her clothes: "*dressed in a black T-shirt and trousers*", which can be described as 'simple' in comparison to how individuals are used to see Jolie when she appears on the red carpet. According to Chouliaraki (2013, p.89) this is a strategy of "*humanization*" that celebrities use in order to "*domesticate their extraordinariness*". It is only natural that she would not appear in a dress among the refugees but this is also a part of the role. Jolie's ability to communicate the message she wants at the highest level, is also proven from the fact that she pays a quick visit to Greece and part of her agenda is to meet the prime minister. It is really interesting to think of how many individuals get to meet country leaders without having scheduled their meeting months in advance.

The fact that the author of the article needs to make the remark of how Jolie is dressed shows that from his perspective individuals are used to Jolie being dressed in another way. The fact that in this communicative event there are elements that are drawn from earlier events is called 'intertextuality' (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002).

In the social practice level of analysis the aim is to analyze discourse that exist over the discursive practices as well as the relationship between the two (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002). The two main discourses that 'float' over the text are the economic crisis that currently Greece faces and the migration crisis that affects all Europe (but first and foremost Greece).

The migration crisis is the very reason that this text was written in the first place. If there was no migration crisis there would not exist neither problems regarding passing the borders nor problems related to the conditions of the camps. The fact that this piece of journalism is written from a Greek newspaper highlights why there is a reference to people that claimed "to have been mistreated by FYROM border guards". That is also why there is a reference to the EU strategy about how to deal with the migration crisis. The visit of Jolie

was an opportunity for Greek media to make their already European problem even more well known.

The already great problem of migration crisis gets even worse from the economic circumstances that the Greek state confronts. In this regard, the management of the whole situation becomes a matter of international politics. Greece, a country that happens to be in the centre of attention for its economic situation, as the physical border of Europe, is the first country that has to deal with this situation. This complicates the conflicting interests among nations and emerges as a serious matter of interest.

Finally, another discourse, floating around this text is Angelina Jolie's activism. She has been criticized by scholars (Mostafanezhad, 2015) for not providing clear political implications with her stance, and not evoking commitment to a certain cause (Chouliaraki, 2012).

It is very interesting that Angelina Jolie did not have "her own video" like the other celebrities in this study. All those that wish to communicate about her, mediate her rhetorical appeal. It might be a coincidence, or a matter of heavy schedule but it also may be a calculated move, which proves that she is there in order to act and not to show off. From a rhetorical perspective, there are differences in terms of disposition, style and delivery (Leach, 2000). There is not much that can be said about Jolie as performer since we follow her performance through the "lens" of a journalist. The journalist by just stating facts presents himself detached from a personal opinion (Chouliaraki, 2013) delivering the image of the humanitarian celebrity without (naturally) mentioning any of the above. This way, by transmitting "objective" news, the image of the saint celebrity is created. Writing down a detailed critical discourse analysis in the way to unveil this.

## **Case 2: Mandy Patinkin**

To begin with, Mandy Patinkin was the most productive celebrity that visited Lesbos. He produced so much visual material that I would need too many pages just to write down a detailed analysis about him. In order to cover as much of his actions as possible, I chose one article about him from the Huffington Post which included one YouTube video along with 17 photos in total and one extra YouTube video-interview. I use both CDA and rhetoric analysis. Since from a linguistic perspective there might be an overlap, in order not to be redundant I focus more on the rhetoric aspect.

The article is a 370-word text under the title “Mandy Patinkin Helps Refugees Land On Lesbos In Emotional International Rescue Committee Video”, written for the British version of Huffington Post. Since the text is –to a great extent- quoting the actor I analyze the video in the most part, since it is richer in elements worth commenting. Apart from the text, it includes one video of Mandy Patinkin, 2 photos of him, and a photograph album of refugees. The text is relatively short; the focus of the article is the visual material that come along. Most of the text are Patinkin emotional quotations about the refugees, followed by some tragedy-related facts. The embedded video is created by IRC (International Rescue Committee). It has over 130 thousand views on YouTube and about 5 million views in the newspaper’s page. It is a 2-minute and 37-second video. In the first scene, refugees arrive and get off the boat that carried them to the island, Patinkin helps by carrying a little girl out of the boat while he tries to understand whether she is alive (in a very dramatic scene). Eventually he passes her to her father. In between there are emotional Patinkin monologues crying out for help and some other scenes of local Greeks or refugees that managed to survive their journey. On the background, there is slow melancholic music. In the end of the video, there is a promotion of IRC and a request for help.

The other video is part of Patinkin’s interview to the journalist Charlie Rose. The video is titled, as ““This is hate speech”. Mandy Patinkin on US reactions to refugees (Dec. 21, 2015) | Charlie Rose”. It has about 50 thousand views and was posted in Charlie Rose’s YouTube account. The video’s length is exactly 3 minutes. In the video, even though being interviewed, the question (the opening question) is not included. Hence, there is a monologue where only a few additional/directive questions are available. In this part of the interview, Patinkin speaks more abstract themes such as being kind to humanity, or making comparisons between Hitler and contemporary politicians.

## **Analysis**

This article is written for the British version of Huffington Post. As a discursive practice, it was produced by a United Kingdom newspaper aiming to reach audiences from the UK. Due to how popular this publication is though, it can be claimed that it aims the whole English-speaking global north. In terms of just describing facts and not using transitivity and modality (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002), it is in many ways similar to Angelina Jolie's case. From a social practice perspective the discourses existing over the text are also similar to great extent due to the similar point in time that both visits took place. One

difference is that Patinkin speaks his mind on his own. As a result, he says himself what he thinks that needs to be said. In the article, there are Patinkin's quotes that are extracted from two videos that are embedded in the article as well as from an article of his in the Washington Post about his experience in Greece.

In the Charlie Rose interview, from a textual as well as rhetoric perspective, what stands out is the World War Two/Holocaust metaphor.

*"It came from the holocaust, if you don't (... ) take care of these people now, if you don't stop care about yourself and take care of your fellow men now when the time comes that you need someone to help you, no one will be there (...) I am listening to the things that (...) Donald Trump, Ted Cruz, say this is hate speech, people laughed at Adolf Hitler (...) was called a fool, he was called a goof, a silly person and then got to be Hitler."*

To make his argument more compelling, Patinkin uses an analogy about the current situation and World War Two. *"A metaphor asserts a substantial or fundamental resemblance between two terms that one does not expect to see associated and does so in a way that opens up new implication."* (McQuarrie and Mick, 1996, p.433). By paralleling the situation in Lesbos, to what in many people's minds is the worst event in recent history, Patinkin has a better chance of touching emotionally more people. There is a resemblance between what happens to Syrian refugees and what happened to Jews around 75 years ago. Furthermore, he spots similarities in the rhetoric of hate between American political leaders and Adolf Hitler. Within the metaphor he repeats the point that he wants to emphasize, like caring about those in need. In the same video, he repeats how we must *"exercise our humanity"* and *"exercise our intellect"* -even though he admits that he gets *"nuts"*- while he states what is the *"moral right thing to do"*. Here, he is describing what should be done as an objective observer, who by judging himself and the audience simultaneously, brings the audience closer to his message. This is a since performers usually *idealize* themselves. Normally during idealization, performers try to put distance between the audience and their own idealized image (Goffman, 1959). Here Patinkin does the exact opposite. This strategy is described by Chouliaraki (2013) as humanization. In contrast to Jolie, Patinkin uses this in reference to his audience and not in reference to those suffering.

The second video of Patinkin is a promotional video for the International Rescue Committee. The oral rhetoric is similar with a lot of epanalepsis and anadiplosis (McQuarrie and Mick, 1996), meaning that he repeated several times the points that he wanted to

emphasize. This video though, is visually interesting. There is melancholic music in the background and the font, what Goffman (1959) refers to as setting when not part of the performer, is a "hill" of life vests, letting the audience to know that some of those people did not make it alive.



Mandy Patinkin in front of life vests

In addition to those mentioned above, there is a very touching scene where Patinkin is trying to understand whether a little girl is alive. The child is in her father's hands which makes the scene even more dramatic. Chouliaraki (2013) highlights how children, being a vulnerable group, trigger more emotional responses from the audience. Patinkin's performance has a plethora of aspects that refer to the global north audience, in a attempt to engage them into action. Regardless of the careful directing and all the connotations that are put there on purpose though, the most important aspect of Patinkin's performance is none of the above. Most of the pictures that are included in the photo album

Patinkin is a remarkably good rhetor. He naturally has a great appeal to emotion. In classical rhetoric, this is called "*Pathos*" (Leach, 2000, p.214). Being an actor, he is professionally trained in accepting roles and perform in front of a camera. His arguments are realistic (at least to extent that he backs them up) and he has a very special "*style*" which is one of the five canons in classical rhetoric. From his deep voice to the way that he moves his hands his style is very personal. Furthermore the phrases that he closes each of his short speeches: "*This is a graveyard of life-preservers*" and "*Give them a good shot. Help them,*

*God O'Mighty, help them*" both constitute great punch lines. He changes the tone of his voice accordingly and he leaves the scene in a dramatic way at the end of the video.

In the end of the video, following those punch lines, there is a reference to the International Rescue Committee with a plea for donations. To his credit, as somebody who cares and not as a performer, Patinkin does not lose expressive control during his performances. This makes his performances seem more authentic. Even though it can be claimed that being an actor he acts as if he loses control, the whole performance seems very authentic.

### **Case 3: Game of Thrones actors**

In the case of the Game of Thrones (GOT) series, the texts that I choose to analyze are two videos created for the International Rescue Committee. The first one focuses mostly on the visits of the actors to refugee camps, while the second one is a plea for help to the global north. Given that the videos were created for an international NGO which focuses on refugees the audience is anyone who is willing to help. Since I only analyze videos where the actors are immediately involved, in this case I only use rhetoric analysis.

The first video is about three Game of Thrones actors (Lena Headey, Maissie Williams and Liam Cunningham) who visit refugees in their camps. The video is titled as "Game of Thrones engage with Refugees in Greece" and counts over 30 thousand views. The total length of the video is 5 minutes and 48 seconds. The video starts with some graphs describing the crisis and shows which camp each actor visited. Maissie Williams visited Cherso camp, Lena Headey visited Kara Tepe camp and Liam Cunningham visited Diavata camp. In the first scene Lena Headey is interacting with a Syrian woman whose husband is ill. In the next scene Liam Cunningham is talking to a man who got separated from his children (who are currently in Sweden). In the last scene Maissie Williams interacts with a young girl whose dream is to be an actor. In the last scene all three actors watch a play in which this girl has a lead role. Between those scenes there are shorter scenes where the actors interact with the refugees and especially with children.

In the second video there are 12 actors involved. It is named as "Join Game of Thrones cast and the IRC to Help Refugees". It reached over 330 thousand views. The main character of the video is Lena Headey who also participated in the previous video. The video is relatively short, being just 1 minute and 44 seconds. The video is black and white and includes slow melancholic music. Its main characteristic is the constant change of actors

repeating the point of emphasis. In total, it is a plea for help. In the end of the video the image of a little boy in front of a destructed scenery (probably bombarded) appears along with the Realm to the Rescue hashtag and a donate button.

## Analysis

In the first videos, three actors (Lena Headey, Maissie Williams and Liam Cunningham) of the series visit refugee camps in Greece and engage with the refugees. Each actor engages with one refugee while in the end of the video they all watch together a theatrical play by young children. The first two refugees are troubled parents, the third one is a little girl. In all three cases, there is much focus on children. Talking to the victims with the help of a translator, offers as direct involvement within the zone of suffering as possible, engaging the emotions of the audience (Chouliaraki, 2013). Following the same line with Patinkin's case, also here vulnerable groups such as children and people that suffer from serious illnesses play a central role (Chouliaraki, 2013). Putting Maissie Williams's engagement which includes children last in video, might not be coincidental as well. Also the fact that the one interacting with the children is Maissie Williams who is close to their age might be related. In the end of the video she also takes a "selfie" with them, which brings in mind what Chouliaraki (2013) refers to as the spectacle of suffering. Of course the children look rather happy to have a picture with a celebrity, but the real question is whether this promotes audience engagement or it is perceived as part of a show.

The second video is more interesting from a rhetoric perspective. The video is black and white which gives a more sad tone to the whole situation. Adding to that, music is in the background, also slow and melancholic. There are no settings, the only font is the personal font of each of the actors (Goffman, 1959). In this video there are 12 in total GOT actors involved, including those three that visited the camps from the other video. Lena Headey is the main narrator.



Nikolaj Coster-Waldau and Lena Headey screenshots

The black and white font makes the audience being concentrated in the faces of the actors - since the camera is shooting from a very close distance -who look darker in comparison to the white background. They are all dressed in a very simplistic way, usually single color clothes which leads to the same result. The only exception is Nikolaj Coster-Waldau who is wearing a black t-shirt with the word "RESCUE" in capitals written on it. It is hard to miss the message, the use of capitals also seems to play a role on this.

Lena Headey is the main narrator while the rest of the actors say small sentences or repeat what needs to be highlighted: "*you can help*", "*rise up*", "*and stand with us*", "*rescue has no boundaries*", "*please*". When describing the situation and why help is so vital, there are no repetitions, a fundamental scheme in advertisement rhetoric (McQuarrie and Mick, 1996) as well as part of style in classical rhetoric (Leach, 2000). Lena Headey uses rather interesting linguistic expressions. She mentions that "*half of the population fled their homes*" which is "*over 11 million people*" which is "*nearly the population of London and Paris combined*". In order to appeal to emotion, she uses *substitution* using questionable numbers to make questionable statements (McQuarrie and Mick, 1996, p.432). The number is abstract since any number over 11 million would be true and there are official numbers by the UN as well as many NGOs. Nobody can be really sure about the numbers of the refugees but the population of London and Paris should be over 11 million by any moderate consideration. In any case this escalates from a mere *ellipsis*, where there are just some missing facts, to a *hyperbole* where what is stated is inaccurate. The numbers might eventually be true, especially since they were increasing by the moment at that point, but the escalation leads to a metaphor of the fleeing population corresponding to the population of two of the biggest European cities (McQuarrie and Mick, 1996, p.432). In order to bring the audience closer and give them perspective of how big a crisis this is, such a rhetoric might be useful, but it also worth mentioning that it might have side effects like losing trust about how the information are being distributed and lose credibility as celebrity humanitarians. Same applies to Liam Cunningham's "*each month hundreds of thousands leave their homes*". As a statement this is as true as it is abstract. While it is not possible for him to provide exact numbers in such a video, he could definitely be more precise. I need to clarify that I am not in any case saying that any of the phrases mentioned above are lies, I totally understand why things were phrased that way, and I am not criticizing this strategy, but there is definitely a level of modality in the speech of the actors (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002, p.83).

From a communication perspective though, the most interesting part is how everyone sees those people as a group of actors and not as individuals. All of them are recognizable worldwide, but individually they could not possibly match (for the time being at least) the fame and the recognition of Jolie or Sarandon. For this very reason, they are the Game of Thrones cast. They are a group of individuals that do not use their names in the titles. GOT is one of the most popular TV shows worldwide, as a result, they would get more attention if they act as a group, as they are more well known acting to the public. If Liam Cunningham paid a visit himself for example, still it would be an important event, but not as nearly as it is when the name of the series gets on the title of an article or a video. In the end of the video there is a "*RealmToTheRescue*" hashtag, following the exact same strategy of exploiting the worldwide known name of the series as much as possible.

#### **Case 4: Susan Sarandon**

In Sarandon's case, I also chose to use two different pieces of material. One article and one video. For this reason I also use both CDA and rhetoric analysis. The analysis is similar to the way that Patinkin cases are analyzed.

The article is 1,300 words long, titled as "Susan Sarandon's Christmas with refugees: 'I want to humanise the issue'". It was written for the Guardian the 29<sup>th</sup> of December in 2015, right after Christmas (since Sarandon did spend her Christmas there). It is a visually rich



Susan Sarandon holding a baby

article since it contains various images where either Sarandon is posing (holding binoculars, holding a baby, and greeting refugees, holding socks saying how much are needed) or images of refugees getting their boats. Sarandon is mostly smiling in the pictures which creates quite a contradiction. The article is not much different to the other ones. It contains several quotations from Sarandon about how needed help is, about the situation in the greater area, about the dangers that refugees meet in the journey, and about how Greece needs global support. She also adds that she does this to honor her Italian grandfather who also was an immigrant. In the end of the article there is also a reference to her meeting with a Greek minister in Athens.

The video that I analyze is a Huffington Post piece of journalism titled as: “Susan Sarandon With Refugees in Lesbos, Greece | The Crossing”. It has around 50 thousand views and its length is 2 minutes and 4 seconds. As the title implies the video is about the refugees’ crossing from Turkey to Lesbos. The video –being as short as it is- has two major scenes. The first one is Sarandon interacting with refugees during daytime close to the shore. The other one is Sarandon interacting with refugees during nighttime in their camp. Those two scenes demonstrate how Sarandon stayed with the refugees for a whole day experiencing their everyday life. There are two shorter scenes, one in front of a mountain (as she says) of life jackets like Patinkin visited and a closing scene with Sarandon in a rescue boat.

## **Analysis**

The two journalistic pieces that I analyze are, an article written for the Guardian along with one of her videos on YouTube created for Huffington Post. Both are huge publications whose audiences are many people in the global north. From a textual perspective, the journalist is not as careful on how he/she uses the language. The way that events are described, is different to Jolie's case. Phrases like this: "*The call to action was born out of frustration from the dialogue in the US*", include partial interpretation of what the actor says. Even though Sarandon's following statement justifies this remark to an extent, the phrasing includes somewhat of an omnipresent witness (Chouliaraki, 2013). Sarandon also unveils a social practice that was mentioned above, "*Greece economically and physically cannot handle this constant influx of 4,000 people a day, it's insane,*" said Sarandon. "*They don't have enough people*". *Physically* refers to the huge numbers of incoming refugees and *economically* refers to the economic situation of Greece. This might be a different major

story for most media, but those two issues are interwoven and cannot be really examined separately, especially in a political level.

Like in all other cases, also in this one children are central point of attention. In most of the pictures, as well as in the video there are images of children being vulnerable and in desperate need for help. For Sarandon, using such images to promote her cause is not accidental. She stated herself that *“I wanted to learn from the refugees, take their stories and somehow put them on the internet”*. Even though this might seem obvious, such a level of honesty is more rare to meet than we actually think. All celebrities state that they are there to help but almost none of them is completely straightforward about his/her intentions. By using images from the zone of suffering they let the audience with an abstract feeling that they did whatever was necessary while being there. Sarandon states honestly the level to which she can help, which is communicating. Taking her role seriously, while being a professional, well known actress, she mentions that she is doing this in order to honour her grandfather who was also an Italian immigrant, she interacts with those that are vulnerable even when they are getting out of the boats and she also stands next to the same hill of life jackets that Patinkin stood. The font implies a theatrical delivery but Sarandon is not hiding this by any means.

Furthermore, she seems in position to set the political agenda by meeting politicians like the alternate minister of migration policy Ioannis Mouzalas. This is not very impressive given that Jolie met the prime minister. It is common for celebrities to shape the political agenda within the zones of suffering (Mostafanezhad, 2015; de Waal, 2008; Ann Richey & Ponte, 2008; Street, 2004; Street, 2012). What is interesting is the classification of celebrity power. Jolie who is one of the most (if not the most) recognizable humanitarian celebrity was able to meet the prime minister. The prime minister also realized that this would possibly bring help along with the attention. Sarandon is a veteran actress and UNICEF goodwill ambassador but at this point of her career she is neither as recognizable nor as involved to humanitarian issues as Jolie. Hence, there seems to be a level of access to political power based on what Driessens (2013) describes as celebrity capital. The alternate minister of migration policy is member of the government, but his political power level is not nearly to the same as the prime minister's.

Based on Bourdieu's (1986) classical capitals theory, this can be explained as high volume symbolical and cultural capital interactions. Since there is correlation, to a certain extent, between capitals and given that the most dominant capital form is the economic capital, the politicians have high institutionalized cultural capital volume, while Hollywood actors have high symbolic capital volume. For politicians their institutionalized cultural

capital volume sources from their state title and recognition as the political leaders of the country, for Hollywood celebrities their symbolic capital volume derives from the public recognition that they are important. Titles such as the "UNICEF goodwill ambassador" provide a sense of institutionalized cultural capital too, but it is insignificant in comparison to the celebrity recognition. Due to this correlation of all four types of capital which is a result of capital conversion (economic, social, cultural and symbolic), both of them have high volumes of social capitals which means that the higher their volume of capital, the more possible it is to interact with someone who has a high social capital volume too. Social capital can be described as which people somebody knows and what he/she can gain out of these contacts. As a result, it is way more possible for Jolie who has more connections to meet someone of higher status (like the prime minister) than for Sarandon or Patinkin. Jolie having higher volume of symbolic capital and investing more time in converting it has more access to political power than any other celebrity in this study. In this case the video does not offer much to be analyzed, the main reason that I comment a few of its aspects is to highlight some common practices with other celebrities as well as a difference. Sarandon in contrast to Jolie participated in videos herself.

In a sense, Jolie's and Sarandon's cases are similar. Their media texts are different, but their access to political power, their collaboration with NGO's and their symbolic capital volume are indisputable. They have differences in their rhetoric strategy as well as in their access and political influence.

## **Comparative analysis and Discussion**

There seem to be some repetitive patters in the rhetoric of all celebrities. They all choose to interact with the most vulnerable of the groups involved which are usually children or with fonts like this "hill" of lifejackets within the zone of suffering at Lesvos that evoke emotions for the spectators of the global north. In all cases there is a certain volume of acting involved, undertaking a persona, which for all being professional actors is not very hard. All those mentioned by Chouliaraki (2013) are empirically further confirmed. Also there is pattern of low melancholic music and emotional appealing speeches.

What is most intriguing though, are the differences emerging in the personal rhetoric of each case. Jolie being the most recognizable, does not create any material for a medium that she is willingly involved. This is a rhetoric of not involvement which in addition to her high political influence is a highly personalized way of performing. The media do all the "talking" for her, she is there to act in a high level while she is humanized (Chouliaraki, 2013) by interacting with mere individuals. Sarandon shares, to a lesser extent, the same political power but in contrast to Jolie she says what she thinks is needed herself. The same applies for both Patinkin and the GOT actors who created videos for International Rescue Committee. In rhetoric terms, Patinkin relies heavily on his rhetoric appeal and the GOT actors rely on the momentum and the popularity of their series that they are currently on.

As explained in Susan Sarandon's case, there is a symbolic and social capital distinction between Sarandon and Jolie. One of the reasons (certainly not the only one) that seems to shape the rhetoric strategy of each celebrity is their social capital volume. Jolie and Sarandon are in the advantageous position of meeting high level politicians. Patinkin in order to have political impact has to use his rhetoric appeal and GOT actors even work as a group. The social status of each one determines to a certain extent the way that they have to act in order to be effective. This varies from having to work as a group in order to draw more attention, up to meeting the highest in command politician of a country.

From a methodological perspective, there is an attempt to combine Critical Discourse Analysis and rhetoric. This is no simple task and in certain occasions complicates things. In order to have a holistic understanding of a text all three levels text, discursive practice and social practice are needed (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002). Each level of analysis provides with deeper understanding of different matters while rhetoric mostly focuses on the means that celebrities use in order to be more persuasive and appealing towards their audience. From a textual and discursive practice perspective there is an overlap (up to a certain extent)

but CDA provides an extra level of analysis while rhetoric focus on a communications perspective. The biggest contribution of CDA, is that in all texts there are certain similar discourses that "flow around" the texts. The texts, even though do not refer extensively to politics and focus more on celebrity image, they have a clear political direction. By promoting the interests of the refugees at the same the international political interests of Greece are being promoted. Greece needs to send refugees to other European countries (they already have thousands and even more are in Turkey waiting to sail to Greece) as well, instead of keeping them 'imprisoned' in Greece. I use the word 'imprisoned' because that is exactly what the refugees want as well. It is mentioned in the text, that they tried to pass the borders and FYROM border guards sent them back to Greece. Asking from the international community to help those in crisis, is equivalent of asking to help Greece which cannot cope up with the increasing numbers of refugees that keep coming every day. Adding to that Greece was in the middle of an economic crisis which resulted to the need for even more immediate attention. This affects the rhetoric of the celebrities from the perspective that they need to call for more impactful help, sooner than they would need to otherwise.

All the publicity that follows humanitarian celebrities, undoubtedly brings a much needed attention to the problem. Along with the publicity though a fundamental problem appears. Most of the publicity may very well disappear as soon as celebrities flee Greece. The same happened with Madonna's visit in Malawi (Rasmussen, 2015). Those visits should be used as a starting point in order to improve conditions. There are not any advanced metrics to show how much those visited help. Furthermore, we cannot know what would have happened had they not visited Lesvos. All I can use as evidence is how the situation is two years later. I will not really go through that (since that is not connected to my research question), all that I want to mention is related to how effective the rhetoric of humanitarian celebrities are in this case. Unfortunately, what Chouliaraki (2013) mentions about lack of long-term commitment to the cause seems to be confirmed. Now there is not much publicity about the issue while the situation has not really improved. This leads the discussion to the innate contradiction between the nature of this problem and the nature of a celebrity (Brockington, 2015) who actually represent a neoliberal point of view being part of the system that creates the problem, as well as to the antidemocratic point of view (Littler, 2008; Daley, 2013) where the problem is centralized around the celebrities who monopolize the discourse. As a result the attention drawn, is not really about the issue, but about the individual instead.

Finally, the intertextuality that appears regarding performances leads towards a postmodern perspective. The way that texts exist within other texts give individuals a

multiplicity of roles that leads towards a fragmented self. More specifically, celebrities in this case embrace the role of simple people who want to help those in need (Chouliaraki, 2013, p.80). Nevertheless, "*the persona, who he or she is off stage, cannot be separated from who that celebrity is onstage, as a theatrical performer*" (Chouliaraki, 2013, p.89). No matter how much the celebrities humanize themselves; they cannot escape the image that is already perceived about them. Even though they try highlight certain aspects of themselves by dramatic realization and hide other elements by mystification (Goffman, 1959) a separation between the performer and the persona does not seem possible. This multiplicity of roles leads to something more than drawing from earlier communicative events. Intertextuality refers to how the readers receive celebrities' multiplicity of roles. When the discourse comes, for example, to Jolie though there is a fragmentation of the self. The different roles she embraces, the glamorous actor that is detached from reality and the helping everyday woman in jeans and t-shirt, are two different selves that different forms and styles are used under different circumstances in order to enable success in terms of communicated images (Firat, 1991).

It is also important to understand that each celebrity's identity is being reconstructed dynamically. It is not only their consistency that provides them with expertise, but also their consistency is being built from those actions. Jolie's greater political connections are also related to her long-term commitment to those causes. Actions on humanitarian issues shape the discourse but at the same time the discourse is shaped from those actions. Discourses as Foucault says shape our actions (Hall 1997) but those actions shape the discourse as well as the humanitarian celebrities identity (as even more consistent).

## Conclusion

To sum up, the aim of this study was to analyze how celebrities communicate from the zones of suffering in order to engage the audiences from the global north to humanitarian action. To achieve this I applied a combination of critical discourse analysis and rhetoric. Rhetoric focus more on the communication perspective while critical discourse analysis focuses on the medium.

All celebrities perform from the zone of suffering with effort to evoke emotions to their audience. Interacting with vulnerable groups and especially children plays a crucial role. The media that cover those performances are world recognized and since that press coverage is in English the potential audience is all of the global north. Angelina Jolie relies heavily in her access to political power due to her high social capital volume and chooses not to create any promotional material, she lets the media do the talking for her. Susan Sarandon has also access to political elites to a lesser extent but she interacts with media and creates her own material. Mandy Patinkin focuses in his rhetoric ability to evoke emotion to his audience. The game of thrones actors form a group and use the name of the series where they act in order to maximize their recognition. Their volume of social capital seem to play an important role regarding their access to political power, hence it shapes to a certain degree their rhetoric strategy.

Unfortunately, two years later we can say that none of these strategies seems to have affected the situation to a satisfying extent since the problem persists. Regardless of the rhetoric strategy adopted in each case, the centralized monopolization of the discourse, and the neoliberal politics that celebrities represent, contradict the cause that they claim to fight for, since they are actually part of the system that gives birth to those kind of issues. This failure may also be part of their unsuccessful attempt to humanize themselves and close the gap with their audience. The separation between the persona and the humanitarian celebrity seems unsuccessful.

Finally, the level of access to power seems to be affected from the volume of consistency and effectiveness in communicating a certain message. Drawing from earlier events information about ones identity leads to intertextuality as well as a fragmented postmodern identity, which both are being shaped dynamically along with the broader humanitarian discourse.

## **Limitations**

There are two kinds of limitations that I would like to mention. Both of them have a methodological nature. The first one is about critical discourse analysis and rhetoric combine to lead to proper analysis. They examine different aspects of a text while they have an overlap (they both examine the text linguistically, focus on metaphors etc.). This overlap is a limitation since combining other methods, this could have been avoided. However it provides the advantage of examining both the medium and the communication strategy which was my objective.

My second remark is that since different methodologies produce different results, critical discourse analysis and rhetoric are no exceptions. Even though the three dimensional model in addition to a rhetorical analysis provide a solid method, it produces results that other methods would not. Since this is a limitations segment I am not comparing methodologies. All I claim is that the limitations of the results lie on the application of each method. Alternative methodologies would lead to different results and highlight other intriguing aspects. Many methodologies offer inspiration and their combination may lead to even better results.

## **Future Research**

Regarding further research that may be conducted, I believe would be very interesting to see results in the same case using different analysis or different methods of collecting data, such as for example field notes and interviews with celebrities as well as people that have been around them with possibly a combination of hermeneutic and rhetorical analysis. Also analysis of more cases would be very useful in order to examine how access to political power or rhetoric patterns remain the same in other cases of celebrity humanitarianism. As I mentioned above, analyzing other types of celebrities (besides Hollywood stars) such as the Pope –being the leader of a religious group- or the Queen of Jordan –holding political power and being from the Middle East- would also be very interesting.

Besides that, there is a general need for more cases of humanitarian celebrities to be examined under rhetorical lenses in order to unveil not only their strategy and objectives but more importantly what lies behind those strategies and what makes them act on the way that they do.

## References

- ARNOULD, E. J. & WALLENDORF, M. 1994. Market-oriented ethnography: interpretation building and marketing strategy formulation. *Journal of marketing research*, 484-504.
- BOURDIEU, P. 2011. The forms of capital.(1986). *Cultural theory: An anthology*, 1, 81-93.
- BROCKINGTON, D. 2015. The politics of celebrity humanitarianism. *Celebrity Humanitarianism and North-South Relations: Politics, Place and Power*, 210.
- BUDABIN, C. A. 2015. Ben Affleck goes to Washington: celebrity advocacy, access and influence. In: RICHEY, L. A. (ed.) *Celebrity Humanitarianism and North-South Relations: Politics, Place and Power*. Routledge.
- BULMER, S. & BUCHANAN-OLIVER, M. 2006. Visual rhetoric and global advertising imagery. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 12, 49-61.
- CHOULIARAKI, L. 2012. The theatricality of humanitarianism: a critique of celebrity advocacy. *Communication and critical/cultural studies*, 9, 1-21.
- CHOULIARAKI, L. 2013. The ironic spectator. *Cambridge: Polity*.
- COOPER, A. F. 2007. Beyond Hollywood and the Boardroom-Celebrity Diplomacy. *Geo. J. Int'l Aff.*, 8, 125.
- CUNXIN'S, A. 2015. CELEBRITY PHILANTHROPY IN CHINA. *Celebrity Humanitarianism and North-South Relations: Politics, Place and Power*, 106.
- DALEY, P. 2013. Rescuing African bodies: celebrities, consumerism and neoliberal humanitarianism. *Review of African Political Economy*, 40, 375-393.
- DE WAAL, A. 2008. The humanitarian carnival: A celebrity vogue. *World Affairs*, 171, 43-55.
- DRIESSENS, O. 2013. Celebrity capital: redefining celebrity using field theory. *Theory and society*, 42, 543-560.
- DWIGHT, E. 2016. Celebrity Humanitarianism: Bridging the Gap. *Harvard International Review*, 37, 18.
- FIRAT, A. F. 1991. The Consumer in Postmodernity. *Advances in consumer research*, 18.
- GOFFMAN, E. 1959. *The presentation of self in everyday life*, London, Penguin.

- HACKLEY, C. 2003. *Doing research projects in marketing, management and consumer research*, Routledge
- HALL, S. 1997. *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*, Sage.
- HAMMERSLEY, M. & ATKINSON, P. 2007. *Ethnography: Principles in practice*, Routledge.
- JEONG, S. H. 2008. Visual metaphor in advertising: Is the persuasive effect attributable to visual argumentation or metaphorical rhetoric? *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 14, 59-73.
- JØRGENSEN, M. W. & PHILLIPS, L. J. 2002. *Discourse analysis as theory and method*, Sage.
- LEACH, J. 2000. Rhetorical analysis. *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound*, 207-226.
- LITTLER, J. 2008. "I feel your pain": Cosmopolitan charity and the public fashioning of the celebrity soul. *Social semiotics*, 18, 237-251.
- MCCRACKEN, G. 1989. Who is the celebrity endorser? Cultural foundations of the endorsement process. *Journal of consumer research*, 310-321.
- MCQUARRIE, E. F. & MICK, D. G. 1996. Figures of rhetoric in advertising language. *Journal of consumer research*, 22, 424-438.
- MCQUARRIE, E. F. & MICK, D. G. 1999. Visual rhetoric in advertising: Text-interpretive, experimental, and reader-response analyses. *Journal of consumer research*, 26, 37-54.
- MOISANDER, J. & VALTONEN, A. 2006. *Qualitative marketing research: A cultural approach*, Sage.
- MOSTAFANEZHAD, M. 2015. Angelina Jolie and the everyday geopolitics of celebrity humanitarianism in a Thailand-Burmo border town. In: RICHEY, L. A. (ed.) *Celebrity Humanitarianism and North-South Relations: Politics, Place and Power*. Routledge.
- MUPOTSA, D. 2015. SOPHIE'S SPECIAL SECRET. *Celebrity Humanitarianism and North-South Relations: Politics, Place and Power*, 88.

- OLWIG, M. F. & CHRISTIANSEN, L. B. 2015. IRONY AND POLITICALLY INCORRECT HUMANITARIANISM. *Celebrity Humanitarianism and North-South Relations: Politics, Place and Power*, 170.
- PHILLIPS, B. J. & MCQUARRIE, E. F. 2004. Beyond visual metaphor: A new typology of visual rhetoric in advertising. *Marketing theory*, 4, 113-136.
- PHILLIPS, N. & HARDY, C. 2002. *Discourse analysis: Investigating processes of social construction*, Sage Publications.
- PIGRUM, D. 2008. Rhetoric. *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*, 792-793.
- RASMUSSEN, M. L. 2015. Madonna in Malawi: Celebrized interventions and local politics of development in the South. In: RICHEY, L. A. (ed.) *Celebrity Humanitarianism and North-South Relations: Politics, Place and Power*. Routledge.
- RICHEY, L. A. 2015. *Celebrity humanitarianism and North-South relations: politics, place and power*, Routledge.
- RICHEY, L. A. & PONTE, S. 2008. Better (Red)<sup>TM</sup> than Dead? Celebrities, consumption and international aid. *Third world quarterly*, 29, 711-729.
- ROSAMOND BERGMAN, A. 2015. Humanitarian relief worker Sean Penn: a contextual story. In: RICHEY, L. A. (ed.) *Celebrity Humanitarianism and North-South Relations: Politics, Place and Power*. Routledge.
- SCHWITTAY, A. 2015. MUHAMMAD YUNUS. *Celebrity Humanitarianism and North-South Relations: Politics, Place and Power*, 70.
- SCOTT, L. M. 1994. Images in advertising: The need for a theory of visual rhetoric. *Journal of consumer research*, 21, 252-273.
- STREET, J. 2004. Celebrity politicians: popular culture and political representation. *The British journal of politics & international relations*, 6, 435-452.
- STREET, J. 2012. Do celebrity politics and celebrity politicians matter? *The British journal of politics & international relations*, 14, 346-356.
- UNHCR1. Available: <http://www.unhcr.org/protection/operations/5645ddbc6/greece-factsheet-lesvos-island.html> [Accessed 20/10/2017 2017].

UNHCR2. Available: <http://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2016/9/57e12c564/300000-refugees-migrants-cross-med-far-2016.html> [Accessed 20/10/2017 2017].

UNHCR3. Available: <http://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/mediterranean> [Accessed 20/10/2017 2017].

## **Appendix 1**

Links to all information used, UNHCR websites:

<http://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/mediterranean>

<http://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2016/9/57e12c564/300000-refugees-migrants-cross-med-far-2016.html>

<http://www.unhcr.org/protection/operations/5645ddbc6/greece-factsheet-lesvos-island.html>

## **Appendix 2**

### **Table of analysis:**

#### **Rhetorical analysis:**

Invention 1)Ethos

2)Logos

3)Pathos

Disposition

Style

Memory

Delivery

Scheme:

Repetition: rhyme, chime, alliteration

anaphora, epistrophe, epanalepsis, anadiplosis

parison

Reversal: antimetabole

antithesis

Trope:

Substitution: hyperbole

ellipsis

epanorthosis

rhetorical question

Destabilization: metaphor

pun

irony  
paradox

Rhetorical remarks:

**CDA analysis:**

Text:

Discursive practice:

Social practice:

**Links to all cases and short analysis tables per case:**

**1) Angelina Jolie: "ekathimerini" article**

Link: <http://www.ekathimerini.com/207050/article/ekathimerini/community/refugee-conditions-in-greece-deteriorating-says-angelina-jolie>

**CDA analysis:**

Text: No transitivity, no modality, metaphor analysis, generalization in the name of "Bichal" which leads to an ellipsis.

Discursive practice: Language-source-target audience-country of origin remark, spectacle of suffering, performativity and persona.

Social practice: Greek economic circumstance, Angelina Jolie's celebrity humanitarian past, access to political power.

**2) Mandy Patinkin: Charlie Rose Video:**

Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3wdkAC9US0Q>

Huffington post article and video:

Link: [http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2015/12/08/mandy-patinkin-helps-refugees-land-on-lesbos\\_n\\_8746922.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2015/12/08/mandy-patinkin-helps-refugees-land-on-lesbos_n_8746922.html) Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tOwL89Tndk4>

**Rhetorical analysis:**

Invention 1)Ethos: as part of the global north no particular distinction

2)Logos: more focus on emotion than in reason (not meaning that it lacks), making various arguments and analogies

3)Pathos: Great appeal to emotion

Disposition: connection between setting and rhetor

Style: very personal style

Memory: improvising

Delivery: -

Scheme:

Repetition: epanalepsis of various points

Trope:

Substitution: possible holocaust hyperbol

Destabilization: Holocaust metaphor

paradox of not helping fellow men

Rhetoric remarks: very personal style appealing to emotion, great punch lines

### **CDA analysis:**

Text: no transitivity or modality by the media

Discursive practice: focusing on the global north

Social practice: -

### **3) Game of Thrones actors: Black and white video:**

Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dCe0Nz7Ie90>

Visit video:

Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AksnFjhfKkA>

### **Rhetorical analysis:**

Invention 1) Ethos: ethical advantage of having visited the area (like in all cases, here a few of the group)

2)Logos: Nice speech, well directed

3)Pathos: in both videos, sentimental speech in the first one emotional interaction in the second

Disposition: connection between visit and the final promotion video (the black and white one)

Style: black and white video, melancholic music

Memory: directed

Delivery: well delivered

Scheme:

Repetition: Multiple epanalipsis. Repetition of the main points. The more repetitions lead to more emphasis on a certain point meaning that this certain point is more important. Also anaphora of RESCUE in the t-shirt.

Trope: Substitution: ellipsis leading to a hyperbole in numbers

Rhetorical remarks: acting as a group and being judged as a group. No matter if there is a narrator nobody is standing out.

**Susan Sarandon:** The Guardian article

Link: <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2015/dec/29/susan-sarandon-refugees-lesbos-christmas>

YouTube video:

Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dEI9ZgLFxe8>

**Rhetorical analysis:**

Invention 1)Ethos: ethical advantage of having visited the area, global star drawback.

2)Logos: contradicting arguments and speech with smiling pictures.

3)Pathos: honoring her grandfather,

Disposition: put refugee stories on the internet

Style: emotional but nothing special

Memory: -

Delivery: -

Scheme:

Repetition: epanalepsis: “They want their kids to be safe, clean and have an education, that’s all they want”.

Reversal: antimetabole: loudest voices are xenophobic and un-American.

Trope:

Substitution: hyperbole

ellipsis

epanorthosis

rhetorical question: “How can you create a structure that can deal with that efficiently and thoroughly? It’s really hard.”

Destabilization: paradox of Greek situation

Rhetorical remarks: figurative speech: for example: “It’s still the tip of the iceberg” or ““The only thing I can provide is to be a little flashlight on information people aren’t getting”.

**CDA analysis:**

Text: No transitivity, no modality, mostly quoting

Discursive practice: spectacle of suffering, performativity and persona.

Social practice: Greek economic and social circumstance, access to political power.