

# EVENT POWER



[ HOW GLOBAL EVENTS MANAGE AND MANIPULATE ]

CHRIS ROJEK



# EVENT POWER

HOW GLOBAL EVENTS MANAGE  
AND MANIPULATE

CHRIS ROJEK



Los Angeles | London | New Delhi  
Singapore | Washington DC



Los Angeles | London | New Delhi  
Singapore | Washington DC

SAGE Publications Ltd  
1 Oliver's Yard  
55 City Road  
London EC1Y 1SP

SAGE Publications Inc.  
2455 Teller Road  
Thousand Oaks, California 91320

SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd  
B 1/I 1 Mohan Cooperative Industrial Area  
Mathura Road  
New Delhi 110 044

SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte Ltd  
3 Church Street  
#10-04 Samsung Hub  
Singapore 049483

---

Editor: Mila Steele  
Editorial assistant: James Piper  
Production editor: Imogen Roome  
Copyeditor: Jane Fricker  
Proofreader: Katie Forsythe  
Marketing manager: Michael Ainsley  
Cover design: Jen Crisp  
Typeset by: C&M Digital (P) Ltd, Chennai, India  
Printed in India at Replika Press Pvt Ltd

© Chris Rojek, 2013

First published 2013

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, this publication may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form, or by any means, only with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction, in accordance with the terms of licences issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers.

**Library of Congress Control Number: 2012955760**

**British Library Cataloguing in Publication data**

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-0-85702-517-3  
ISBN 978-0-85702-518-0 (pbk)

A revolutionary age is an age of action; ours is the age  
of advertisement and publicity.

Soren Kierkegaard

One can trust anyone who babbles the jargon; people wear it in their  
buttonholes. ... Simply to be there becomes the merit of the thing.

Theodor Adorno

Narcissism and the direct satisfaction of impulses are major obstacles  
to the emergence of any collectivity worthy of the name.

Serge Moscovici

It is not clear to me how advanced large-scale societies can  
fulfil the requirements of expressivism, other than by holding  
Nuremberg rallies.

Ernest Gellner



# CONTENTS

Preface: The goodwill newsletter	vi
1 What is event management?	1
2 What are the main types of event?	13
3 Why is 'moral regulation' relevant?	31
4 How is event cognition formulated?	50
5 How are global events organised?	70
6 What do cyclical events do?	80
7 Why are we drawn to events?	100
8 What is event consciousness?	112
9 What do single-issue events do?	122
10 Why are events so emotional?	139
11 What is event appropriation?	152
12 Does event management have a future?	178
References	187
Author index	198
Subject index	201

# PREFACE: THE GOODWILL NEWSLETTER

Global events are the most heart-warming goodwill newsletter of modern times. Periodically, they burst into social consciousness as part of an established cycle of global festivity (the Olympics, the FIFA World Cup, the Rio Carnival, the Sydney Mardi Gras) or in response to an international emergency or incident (Live Aid, Tsunami Relief, the Benefit Concert for Hurricane Katrina). For the duration we are conscious of being part of an international community in which pre-ordained divisions of race, class, religion, sexual orientation, politics and the vulture logic of capitalism appear to magically vanish. Instead, the urge to do good, which is an entirely human and proper sentiment, is hot wired into disinterestedly celebrating the athletic prowess of Olympians or world class professionals in sport; feeding the hungry in Africa; ending torture in Darfur; providing relief from the misery and want that follows an earthquake or *tsunami*; saving the planet from pollution and corporate greed; or more prosaically, conveniently reminding ourselves at the company meeting that we are truly serving the customer and doing good, rather than merely maximising profit. The point about disinterest is revealing, because event logic is built on highly personal displays of emotional energy. Participation in events has become a mark of responsible citizenship, with all of the subsidiary implications for judgements of self-worth, validity and ethically acceptable behaviour that this implies.

Events are designer-built packages to boost publicity, symbolise fraternity and heighten awareness. Increasingly, global events employ celebrities to transfer glamour from the entertainment sector onto charitable and business undertakings.

The organisers and front men and women that present them see themselves as providing positive pedagogy (teaching us about third world inequality and injustice), enhancing social networking and contributing to cultural literacy.

Success in entertainment is redefined as honing a strong humanitarian, global perspective. For example, in Sydney (2011), the Global Leadership Forum brought George Clooney and Martha Stewart together with Muhammad Yunus, Russell Simmons, Michael Fertik and Jeff Taylor and put them on the stage of the Sydney Convention Centre to 'unwrap the concepts, vision and motivation' behind 'authentic leadership' and provide 'challenging new ways of thinking, working

and living'.<sup>1</sup> Ordinary men and women are urged to learn how admired members of the powerful and influential draw on strong, cleansing emotions and apply them to higher business and humanitarian causes. In a world in which people are often triply estranged from government, the state and big business, global events are cheerful testaments to people power. The Forum celebrated the best practice of celebrity trend setters in humanitarian and business enterprise and conjured a spirit of presumed intimacy between strangers. For a moment we are *team-world*, and there is no obstacle of nature, faith, church, economy or polity that we cannot overcome.

The desire to do good is magically combined with the satisfaction of feeling good. Events contribute to a positive self-image. They possess therapeutic value. Their scale and importance has ascended in direct proportion to the expansion of social and cultural injunctions to get more in touch with our feelings and to emote frankly and without shame. Ernest Gellner (1994) once speculated that as human societies develop more efficient and dependable infrastructures of security, the struggle for survival is replaced with a struggle for approval and acceptance. If he is right, global events are the biggest human-made objects of approval and acceptance ever devised. The Olympics, the FIFA World Cup, Live Aid, Live Earth, Live 8 and their cognates are catalysts for deep emotional arousal and exchange. They issue licence to break out of our daily bubble of existence and allow us to express our no-holds barred common humanity. It is as if global events supply ordinary men and women with the intimation that the 7 billion people on the planet constitute the fundamental human entity, beyond the walls of nation, race, class and religion.

Yet events are neither spontaneous nor free expressions of people power. They are closely organised, schooled in the methods of exercising persuasion over human cognition by market research, rigorously planned and monitored in detail. Events are publicised as expressions of 'people power', but event ownership and management do not rest with the people. To be sure the entire category of the event audience is problematic. The mixtures of stadium crowds and network publics constitute an *illusory community*, in which unity and commitment are largely apparitions.

Many commentators increasingly point to the control functions of events. Events are portrayed as radiant, symbolic representations of civil society coming together. In reality, they apply principles of hierarchical authority and keep citizens at arm's length from 'mega-project decision making' (Flyvbjerg et al., 2003: 5).<sup>2</sup> Citizens are not directly involved in planning, commercialisation and securitisation. In cyclical events like the Olympics and FIFA World Cup, the use of CCTV (closed circuit



television) and UAVs (unmanned aerial vehicles) is a standard part of the security package. Global events are actually among the most controlled, regimented settings devised.

As Stephen Graham (2010, 2012) observes, the securitisation of the London Olympics (2012) involved the deployment of more troops than the war in Afghanistan. Anti-terrorism and crowd control measures involved the use of unmanned drones, surface-to-air missile systems, and a thousand armed US diplomatic and FBI agents policing an Olympic zone divided from the rest of the city by an 11-mile, £80 million 5000-volt electric fence. Investment in electronic surveillance included a new range of scanners, biometric ID cards, number plate and facial recognition CCTV systems, disease tracking surveillance and checkpoints.

Intensive risk assessment and adequate security and surveillance provision are now part of the global event planning process. It is subject to well-oiled lobbying interventions from the security and surveillance industry. Pressure from this quarter led to the investment of a \$300 million 'super panopticon' CCTV and information system for the Athens Olympics (2004) (Samatas, 2007). Graham (2012) estimates that the cost of providing security for each athlete in the Athens Games was £90,000. For the London Olympics he puts the cost at £59,000 per competitor.

Investment on this scale puts a huge strain on metropolitan and national finances. The Athens Games are widely regarded to have created a culture of easy borrowing which was a major factor in the collapse of the Greek economy after the 2008 financial crash. In the bidding process, the estimated cost of the London Games was £2.37 billion. By the opening ceremony, this was held to have climbed to £24 billion (Graham, 2012).

All of this is done in the name of protecting 'the people'. Yet citizens are not a genuine party to the decision-making processes. Post-event, the security and surveillance provision is transferred to providing 'more effective' community and city-wide policing. A version of Naomi Klein's (2007) famous 'shock doctrine' is at play here. Namely risk assessment of event anti-terrorist and crowd control security requirements underwrites colossal investment in security and surveillance systems which contribute to the more intensive policing of domestic populations in the post-event scenario.

Event concepts frame the event for the media and the public. The formation and application of the event concept is pivotal. Generally, it is simple, eye-catching and designed to appeal to the emotions, not the mind. 'Feed The World' was the event concept that defined Live Aid. Simultaneously, it demarcated solidarity and defied criticism. It is still rolled out today to combat academic and media accusations that post-event fund distribution squandered the Live Aid money earmarked for relief.<sup>3</sup>

As the event planning stage unfolds and moves into event proper and post-event relations, the event concept is a convenient short cut to

override jarring sentiments and conflicting meanings that individuals and groups bring to, and take from, the event process. The concept is the brand. In an age where self-advertising and impression management are automatically accepted as the key to gaining personal impact, branding is everything. Selling the cause to the public effectively means developing the right concept, in the right place and at the right time. Event concepts work best when individuals accept, without reflection, that universal issues and problems are on team-world radar and that they *must* act upon them *as one*.

Outwardly, events are ecumenical. Unconsciously, they exhibit many elements of religious evangelism and old style salvationism. For example, the event concept is presented as bringing the ordinary man and woman *into confidence*. The issue or problem is a *message* about which ‘good’ people should know. The Make Poverty History campaign, which the Live 8 (2005) event showcased, aimed to turn people of all nations into *disciples* in the march against hunger, disease and inequality.

Global events focus on problems of misery, want and collective improvement. But their internal hard drive, which gradually becomes more palpable as the event process unfolds, is to bring the message of *good news* to people. Needless to say, good news does not lie in the human wreckage that follows a natural or geopolitical disaster. Rather it is the image of the true and noble response of the people to get stuck in, sort things out and affirm a fellowship that is admirable and appealing. Although we habitually feel powerless and impotent in the face of the world’s problems, events permit us to feel that we are *making a difference*. Our *conviction* and *energy* provides an infusion of hope to the wretched. When we see a gay rights float at the Sydney Mardi Gras or a costume parade featuring the *peessoas humilde* (humble people) at the Rio Carnival or the image of starving African infants broadcast on the video screen of a concert to relieve hunger, we become part of an irresistible wave of global unity.

## All for One and One for All

The popularity of global events reveals important changes in the culture of charity and problem solving. It is not for nothing that Chris Hedges (2010: 200) observes:

The belief that we can make things happen through positive thoughts, by visualizing, by wanting them, by tapping into our inner strength, or by understanding that we are truly exceptional, is peddled to us by all aspects of culture.

The most seductive mouthpieces that entreat us to make these acts of virtue are celebrities. To name but a few, George Clooney, Angelina Jolie, Cameron Diaz, Bono, Bob Geldof, Mia Farrow, Michael Stipe, Jay Z and Madonna are celebrity advocates and diplomats who preach on global issues and problems. In doing so, they impart a reviving, *can do* attitude to the public. Events are out of the ordinary experience, so it is no surprise that they use people who are culturally defined as *extraordinary* to inspire ordinary people to act. Celebrities have become an adjunct of the event brand. They humanise event goals and provide event management with sparkle. By assuming a noble, imploring attitude to help, they place themselves on the same footing with those whom they address.

Events are portrayed as virtuous responses to international emergencies or commemoration of long-standing injustice (such as gay repression or racial exclusion) and business and government are cast in the part of clumsy, inefficient operators. Audiences receive not only the gratification of being invited to help, they also have the self-confirmation of being 'in the know', i.e. being conversant with real world issues that ordinary people are unaware of, in which George, Angelina, Cameron and Bono confide with us. Additionally, there is the rhetoric of direct action which contrasts sharply with the image of muddling through that is associated with so much of what business and government do. Thus, events are presented as belonging to people with 'modern' attitudes. By implication, those who do not attend to, or participate in, events are 'pre-modern' or 'traditional'.

But what do events really accomplish? To begin with, we should allow that it would be foolish to dismiss the reality and force of goodwill. Corporate events, for example, provide the workforce with an opportunity to revive and reinforce *esprit de corps*. Business and humanitarian events are no different in this respect. Businesses have long recognised the value of corporate events to improve camaraderie among the workforce and build the brand. Events switch resources to displays of corporate pride and unity. The strong emphasis upon 'speaking frankly' during the business event awayday provides a showcase for management to exhibit a caring, listening attitude. The professional event literature is vocal in claiming social integration and organisational image enhancement as standard event outcomes (Bowdin et al., 2011; Getz and Wicks, 1994).

Turning to humanitarian global events, there is no doubt that they bring people together and are fully capable of generating resources for the relief of misery and want. Events aspire to the condition of a people party. They provide the strong and winning image of people power. Nonetheless, questions are raised about both the longevity and concrete results of event people power. A number of studies suggest that event consciousness is finite (Collins, 2001; Elavsky, 2009). That is, popular

interest in event causes fades away after the stage is dismantled and the perimeter fence and portable toilets are packed away.

Moreover, event consciousness is largely communicated through votive behaviour. It lies in the *pledge* to donate money to relieve suffering and the *promissory* grace-note to convert ludic energy into a moral crusade to change the very system that blights the world with hunger, injustice, carbon fuel emissions, nuclear power and so on. The question is, how far is votive behaviour removed from meaningful action? Do we change the world by attending a pop concert for famine relief or are we subconsciously participating in a gaudy enterprise whose consequences are incapable of rising above leaving the scaffold of power that protects the engines of inequality, injustice and irresponsible enterprise intact? Some research into event participation claims to expose the shallowness in the crowd and network public of the promissory grace-note to change the world. Instead it presents event participation more prosaically as a break from the routine of work, the monotony of unemployment and the activation of undiluted escapism (Tickle, 2011).

Might it not be that global events are more accurately viewed as part of the latest consumerist move towards what some observers in the USA have called 'self-gifting' (Carroll, 2011)? That is, the therapeutic practice of periodically and ostentatiously giving presents to yourself in order to provide self-gratification and serve notice to others of personal worth.<sup>4</sup> Dean MacCannell (2011: 24) speaks of the rise of a new world of consumer experience that is already among us, in which behaviour takes the form of 'staged authenticity', in which appearance is all. In these conditions, concludes MacCannell, 'raw ego' has replaced personality.

Certainly, given the scale of human resources required, the money and manpower raised by global single-issue events like Live Aid and Live Earth, or cyclical events like the FIFA World Cup and the Olympics, offer little more than pinpricks of relief. Further, while global events are estimable outpourings of personal compassion, they are in reality a distraction from the severe economic, political and social issues on the world agenda. What is required is a fundamental thorough-going revision of fiscal responsibilities to remove toxic debt burdens in the developing world and create secure fair trade frameworks (Easterly, 2007; Moyo, 2010; Sachs, 2010, 2011). Instead of fixating on incidents, emergencies and episodes, events should contribute to a popular understanding of the underlying structures of power and causal sequences that reproduce inequality, injustice and exclusion.

These criticisms suggest that it is dangerous to take events at face value. A more searching attitude to *who* defines events, *how* they are managed and *what* they achieve is required. These are substantive questions having to do with how power is generally distributed and operates. However, overwhelmingly, the professional event literature provides a

*technocratic* view of events. It focuses on the nuts and bolts in the machine and when and where to oil the parts. The crucial issues of who owns the machine, who controls it and what is its purpose are confined to the backwaters.

Event capitalisation is not merely a matter of economics. It encompasses the cultural capital and psychological energy that events generate. For too long a blind eye has been turned to the questions of how this capital relates to social ordering and the politics of self-gratification. What needs to happen is greater transparency about event aims and outcomes to ensure that events are understood clearly and the resources that they generate used appropriately.

In order to do this the relationship between events and emotional governance must be addressed. Events are important links in the chain of communication power that influential social networks deploy to regulate global populations. While the roots of causes generally lie in the work of activists, the media and associated power networks take them over and use their message for their own ends (Castells, 2009: 331–2). In gratifying individuals that they make a difference to world affairs and boosting social consciousness about global incidents and emergencies, events provide succour to all who suffer from pangs of guilt about colonialism and world inequality. They replace the logic of political economy with the romance of charity. They offer a sense of transcendence and the comforting feeling of personally providing something that is missing in the world. There is a child-like purity in putting your shoulder behind the wheel that feeds the world, ends poverty, halts pollution or celebrates brotherhood. However, the publicity radiance that precedes and accompanies a global event has the effect of making us brain-blind.

The scale of economic, humanitarian and environmental problems facing the world is bigger than the competence of any single event or amalgamation of events to solve. When we come together at a company meeting as one entity, the conflicts of interest that divide us, and the differences in authority and power that separate us from one another, melt away on stage, but stubbornly persist after the wine and canapes at the post-event party are consumed. In any case, a pragmatic focus on the ends of the event concept is the wrong place to concentrate energies. This is hard to articulate candidly, because events are so securely positioned on the moral high ground in our culture; but to the extent that events deflect efforts from strategic issues of power and inequality which are not merely divisive, but antagonistic, they are a red herring.

This book is written in the conviction that events *do* provide something that is missing: pinning the tail to the donkey. They stir up a global media *mazurka* that unintentionally obscures the structural transformations that are necessary to make the world (or the corporation) a better place. They perpetuate a homespun philosophy that ordinary men and

women have hearts of gold, who think of their neighbours first. They make us feel like heroes, just for one day. But who is driving the donkey and to what end?

## Notes

- 1 Clooney was advertised as ‘an actor, activist and co-founder’ of the charity Not On Our Watch; Martha Stewart as one of ‘the world’s greatest entrepreneurs’; Muhammad Yunus as CEO of Grameen Bank and Nobel Peace Prize Winner; Russell Simmons – founder of Def Jam Records and Phat Farm clothing and author of *Do You! Twelve Laws to Access the Power in You to Achieve Happiness and Success* – as one of the ‘most influential people in the past 25 years’; Michael Fertik as ‘founder of reputation.com’; and Jeff Taylor, as ‘founder of Monster.com and Eons.com’. Planned and managed by the Growth Faculty, an Australian education and public relations organisation, the event billed itself as being about ‘unwrapping genius’. Reserved tickets were advertised at \$A595; Premium Reserve at \$A880; VIP Reserve at \$A1100; and the VIP Cocktail Pack, providing seating at the VIP front section, access to VIP catering and networking and a ticket of entry to the VIP Cocktail Party in which all speakers, except George Clooney, ‘will attend’.
- 2 Events are typically presented in terms of a partnership – between event organisers, audiences and network publics, between chief executives and the workforce. In reality, the professionalisation and commercialisation of global events has created a monopoly over security and cost control in the event management team.
- 3 The strong self-image of global events as providing worthwhile pedagogy, contributing to cultural literacy and fundraising goes hand in hand with an exceptionally defensive attitude to criticism. When BBC reports alleged that Live Aid money had been appropriated to buy munitions and arms for the war in Ethiopia, Bob Geldof responded with the furious indignation that we associate with an Old Testament prophet. As we shall see later, there is a good deal of evidence to show that Live Aid funds *were* used to purchase munitions and arms that prolonged the war in Ethiopia (pp. 127–35). But because this evidence conflicts with Live Aid rectitude it is denigrated and pulverised by event planners and managers.
- 4 Even votive behaviour (to make a financial pledge) carries strong positive associations in event participation.



# 1

## WHAT IS EVENT MANAGEMENT?

Event management refers to the targeting and managing of designed public events geared to invest emotional energies and economic resources to selected goals. Events are a branch of the hospitality, leisure and tourism industries. The field they address concerns aggregate issues known in the trade as Meetings, Incentives, Conventions and Exhibitions (MICE). The foremost examples of global events are single-issue international charity-building and consciousness-raising events such as Live Aid (1985), Sport Aid (1986), the Nelson Mandela 70th Birthday Concert, aka 'Freedomfest' (1988), the Indian Ocean Tsunami Relief Concert (2005), Live 8 (2005), Live Earth (2007), the Haiti Relief Concert (2010); and global cyclical events like the FIFA World Cup, the Olympics, Oktoberfests, Burning Man City, annual international literature, film and drama festivals, trade expositions, Carnival, Mardi Gras and heritage festivals.

At the local and national levels, events are also commonplace in the form of neighbourhood festivals, corporate meetings involving the whole workforce, management awaydays, horticultural shows, literary, comedy and film festivals, livestock shows and flower festivals. Event management therefore covers a large territory encompassing the general production, design, publicity and management of events (Getz, 2012).

However, as will become apparent in the course of this study, the scale and variety of events render blanket propositions pointless. In this book the foremost emphasis is upon the analysis of global events. While some of the points made in relation to event planning, strategy and consciousness apply to non-global events, it would be wrong to infer that differences of scale, organisation and level of impact can be ignored. There is all the difference imaginable between organising a jumble sale to save the parish youth club and launching an international programme of attractions, with multinational sponsors, telecast live in support of emergency relief or global consciousness raising.

The focus upon global events in this book reflects the extraordinary profile that they have attained in tackling questions of want, promoting



narratives of belonging and imprinting subjective psychology with a sense of shared purpose. They are a highly visible branch of what Ulrich Beck (1992) calls 'sub-politics', meaning the social interests and movements that are located outside the field of organised party politics and pressure group lobbying. For large numbers of the population the subsidiary importance implied in the term 'sub-politics' is redundant. Personal responses to humanitarian events, international sporting competitions and counter-cultural festivals, like the annual Burning Man event in Nevada, have emerged as one of the most revealing life-scales measuring personal character and integrity. They allow us to weigh both the validity of a cause and the worth of a person.

Indeed, there is a case that it is most useful to think of them as components of lifestyle architecture through which we now build competent, relevant, credible images of ourselves. Lifestyle architecture is critical in the question of holding a tenable self-image, and pivotal in portraying ourselves as competent, credible actors in social networks.<sup>1</sup> Not least, because to show support for a cause or identify unimpeachably with corporate or national values affords a short cut to recognition, acceptance and impact. Demonstrating support for an event 'says it all' about who you are and what you aspire to be.

At the social rather than psychological level, events are part of the urge to interrogate and utilise space and time to define occasions as special and worthy of commemoration. As such, they are frequently taken to be a sign of the health of the community and the vitality of ethics of responsibility. However, the expansion and size of some global events raise separate concerns about issues of social ordering, performative labour, task-centred regulation, manipulation and communication power. Events are powerful, short-hand mechanisms of social theming. They confer a readily comprehensible brand and glamour upon event management, organisation and participation.

Politicisation has emerged as a keynote theme in the contemporary analysis of events. In other words, event consolidation and the responses to events have become important proof of personal worth and social membership. Global events, which are also known as mega-events (Roche, 2000, 2002), involve the building of sports stadiums, hotels, blasting highways and constructing slip roads that often require the eviction of inner-city populations and the destruction of areas of outstanding natural beauty. The FIFA World Cup in South Africa (2010), the Beijing Olympics (2008) and, as we shall see in more detail in Chapter 5, the Vancouver Winter Olympics (2010), produced widespread evictions and protest.

Some events celebrate lifestyles and beliefs that have been traditionally marginalised or stereotyped in negative ways. For example, the annual Gay and Lesbian Sydney Mardi Gras originated as a political protest in 1978. It was designed as the legitimate, transitory occupation

of inner-city space to celebrate both the validity of nonconformist sexual values and to air the values of the counter-culture against the prejudice and narrowness of the heterosexual establishment (Forsyth, 2001). The event is telecast globally and draws a network public of 300,000. Less well reported is the continuing undercurrent of heterosexual resentment at the temporary annexation of urban space for the celebration of nonconformist sexual values. On closer inspection, events which are portrayed by the mainstream media as enhancing social integration often carry an undertow of social tension and spatial resistance (Mason and Lo, 2009: 97). There is circumstantial evidence to suggest that this undertow was a significant factor in the decision to drop the 'Gay and Lesbian' prefix and redefine the event as the Sydney Mardi Gras dedicated to the new event slogan of 'the freedom to be' (Munro, 2011).

As we shall see in more detail in Chapter 9 when we consider the question of event appropriation, the Carnival in Rio de Janeiro, which has grown into one of the world's foremost hallmark events, has generated controversy from activists who claim that it has been cut adrift from its roots. The Brazilian tourist industry and government present the Carnival as the distillation of national identity and a positive image of Brazilian miscegenation. However, the lower income levels of the black population, whose traditions are associated with inventing the samba form of dance and exhibition upon which the Rio Carnival is based, now find themselves priced out of full participation (Sheriff, 1999).

Because drama, theatre and melodrama are integral to the event form, events illustrate in unusually graphic ways how the display of fellowship inadvertently produces conflict and how messages of global unity are exposed as media gloss. In modern cultural settings where a person's connection with others is often fragile and provisional, events exhibit unity and solidarity. By validating the self, the ideology of emotionalism that is central in event planning and management conjures up a form of emulsified spirituality that makes us feel personally affirmed and relevant. By being recognised as a small but necessary cog in a wheel at the company general meeting or donating \$50 to feed Africa during a concert relief telethon, we publicly exhibit social credibility and self-worth.

The therapeutic aspect of event participation is a fundamental reason for the vast expansion in event visibility over the last three decades. Events provide a forum for public recognition and personal confirmation. People nail their colours to the mast, not merely by supporting a good cause, but being *seen* to do so. Increasingly, this visual dimension requires a record in the form of an image captured on a mobile phone, SLR camera, iPad, lap-top or video recorder. Psychologically speaking, global events allow the individual to briefly enter into the romance of charity while submitting, in the rest of life, to the dominant, implacable logic required by acquisitive, divisive political economy.

In these opening pages another aspect of event culture must be remarked upon, not least because it appears to have gone unnoticed in the professional event management literature.<sup>2</sup> Events provide a compelling material analogue for the peer-to-peer, open-sourcing and advance of creative commons that has become such an exciting and prominent feature of the digital economy. The event is the material embodiment of new forms of cooperative labour, social recognition and social networking that are now commonplace on the internet (Baym and Burnett, 2009; Turner, 2009: 82–3). Like the net, events seem to represent *people power*. This carries unmistakable anti-corporatist, anti-government and anti-consumerist overtones. Cooperative labour, volunteering, social recognition and social networking through the digital economy are popularly represented as a ‘break’ from traditional modes of production and associated systems of politics. Similarly, events are often portrayed as part of the new politics, unlocking the power of the people in the digital age.

## The Importance of Performative Labour

The concept of performative labour is especially important in understanding event management and event consciousness. It is widely used in studies of the workplace, especially those relating to the hospitality and tourist industries (Crang, 1994; Edensor, 2001; Hochschild, 1983). Nonetheless, while these studies go a long way to clarifying the concept, they omit to do justice to its importance by confining it to the shallow orbit of the work setting. For example, Alan Bryman (2004: 103) defines performative labour as ‘the rendering of work by managements and employees alike as akin to a theatrical performance in which the workplace is construed as similar to a stage’. In a book of many insights, he applies the concept specifically to the Disney theme park industry where Disney personnel use surprisingly tightly formulated and well-honed ‘people skills’ (rather than old-fashioned empathy, hospitality and spontaneity) to regulate crowd behaviour. As Bryman (2004) and other commentators make abundantly clear, the concept of performative labour has become pivotal in the sociology of Western employment market economies because of the growth of the service sector. Blyton and Jenkins (2007) calculate that seven out of ten workers in the advanced economies of the West are now employed in service work. This work is intimately connected with performative labour since it is based on communication, knowledge, information and broader ‘people skills’.

However, central to the meaning of performative labour is the idea that communication, knowledge and information are integral to all forms

of human interaction. In the digital economy, where data relating to personal life enhancement and modes of people skills are ubiquitous through television, the internet and the media, access to performative labour resources is continuously available. These resources are vital, not only in landing and keeping a job, but in developing effective relations with your partner, your parents, your children, your next door neighbour and so on. The internet, the iPad and mobile phone are now foundries of performative labour training which are of equivalent importance to schooling and the workplace.

In this study I want to expand the concept of performative labour from the workplace setting to apply it to *a central means of status differentiation and social impact in popular culture*.<sup>3</sup> In doing so, I draw to some extent on the work of Judith Butler (1990, 1993), who deploys the concept of performativity in explaining how social identities and practices are moulded and disciplined. Butler's work chiefly addresses the relationship between performativity and gendered power differences. Concretely, it focuses upon how female embodiment and character are coerced to assume specific values privileged by patriarchy. While Butler's work is a useful resource, the emphasis she places upon the relationship between performance and gender is too restrictive. I submit that performative labour is now so generalised in society that it is essential for understanding *all* forms of social interaction. For a multiplicity of reasons, personal life has become increasingly preoccupied with standing out from the crowd and making social impact.<sup>4</sup> We not only desire to believe that we are different, we need to register social impact as a mark of personal validation. Important questions of the meaning of personal authenticity and trust follow from this, but, for reasons of space, for the most part, they will be treated as separate from the core considerations in this book (but see Bauman, 2000; Sennett, 2003).

This way of thinking about the growing importance of social impact has been found useful in a number of fields that have nothing to do with event management. To take a dramatic example, the sociologist Mark Juergensmeyer (2003) has argued that the foundational element in terrorism is what he calls 'performance violence'. A conscious part of planning and executing a terrorist incident is the use of extreme violence to register maximum impact upon social consciousness. Personal validation does not lie first and foremost in the violent act, rather it resides in the incident being recognised as 'mind numbing', 'mesmerising' political theatre *for an audience*. The network public in question is of course connected to each other and to the incident through the global communication network. The camera has become fundamental in weighing up the social worth of an action. Just as extensive TV coverage 'validates' a suicide bomber, a kiss at a concert for emergency relief has more personal meaning *if it is filmed*.

In part, my interest in expanding the concept of performative labour goes back to the work on 'performative utterances' by the late J.L. Austin. For Austin (1962) when words are articulated in appropriate contexts they have the power of enforcement. For example, when an employer makes an offer of employment in the workplace it has an effect. It changes your identity. You cease to become an applicant for the post. You become an employee and generally, you perform the role that you have obtained through the job selection process. In this sense talk is action.<sup>5</sup>

In the present study the term performative labour will be applied to forms of behaviour designed to exhibit integrity, compassion, solidarity, competence, credibility, relevance and other types of status differentiation and social impact. As such, I depart from Austin in as much as I do not restrict the concept of performative utterances to speech acts. A much broader notion of *social linguistics* informs what I understand by performative labour. To be sure, this includes speech, but it also encompasses dress, grooming, manners, attitudes, values, politics, brinkmanship, flirting and other techniques of impression management.

Further, I maintain that performative utterances are primarily motivated by the object of building and managing confidence and achieving social impact in interpersonal relationships. No relationship between brokering confidence and being honest is assumed. Performative utterances are designed to be noticed and build trust. They are not necessarily related to virtue or sincerity. The purpose of these various techniques is to acquire recognition as a person of 'the right sort', 'good character', 'appealing', 'sexy' or 'sound'.

Because social impact depends so much upon being in the know and looking right, according to the mores of the peer groups to which one is attached, performative labour is now a perpetual, seven days a week undertaking. The articulation of choices about matters like diet, transportation, clothing, posture, car ownership, attitudes to sexism, racism, gainful employment, terrorism, animal rights, climate change, etc., are designed and exchanged as *utterances* that express wants of personal impact. Performative labour is the visual and linguistic means through which people convey what they take to be, or wish to be seen as, the mark of their inner personalities.

That theatre is inherent in performative labour has long been recognised by sociologists. Although the concept predated the work of Erving Goffman, his (1961, 1963) extensive writings on dramaturgy and the presentation of the self make transparent use of the concepts of performance, gaining advantage and making social impact. From Goffman we acquire the idea that the self is not bounded by subjectivity. Rather it is enmeshed with complex and multi-layered codes and symbolic networks of affirmation, solidarity and differentiation. These codes are much extended and additionally nuanced in the digital age where personal scripts, forms of

grooming and impact strategies owe as much to *para-social* relations developed through television and web as primary relations (Horton and Wohl, 1956).<sup>6</sup> Even participation abounds in rich ethnographic material that exhibits scripts for emoting in public, acknowledging solidarity and engineering performance to achieve personal impact.

Essential to my use of the concept of performative labour then is the notion of theatre. That is, I do not hold that it is necessary for people to believe in the values and attitudes that they articulate. Rather I see the articulation of these matters as what might be called cultural chips exchanged in the roulette wheel of social encounters with the end in mind of making a notable and, usually, positive impression. Social impact is the name of the game (Rojek, 2010, 2012).

The same rule of thumb applies to event culture. On one level, the disinterest, social inclusiveness and concern for suffering and corporate solidarity expressed in events are genuine responses to issues and emergencies. I don't wish to be understood as proposing that events do not enhance social consciousness or raise funds. Nor are they simply exercises in unrealistic pedagogy and wishful forms of cultural literacy, i.e. by hiding the real roots of power in society and distracting us from the necessary structural transformations required to produce meaningful contributions to problems of, for example, global inequality, injustice and environmental pollution. All the same, in addition, if we do not see them as performative utterances designed to display qualities of personal worth which have telegenic impacts we do not get the full picture of their effect in modern culture.

As popular culture has become more sceptical about the prospect of fundamentally transforming dominant political economy through collective resistance, the biomedical idiom has become more significant (Furedi, 2004: 173). We now use the body to resist. This involves tattooing, piercing and other forms of body styling, but it also encompasses using other speech acts to *display* resistance.

Global humanitarian events are group speech acts designed to dramatically highlight issues and problems. They have not, however, produced a form of transformative politics that is a genuine threat to capitalist hegemony. The old idea that the personal is political has been replaced by the more general, but vastly more superficial notion, that *representation is resistance*.

In network society it is impossible to underestimate the centrality of the media in agenda setting and conditioning the content and vernacular of performative labour. The pivotal importance of communication networks in the formation of identity and life politics means that, as consumers, we use para-social prototypes of display and representation drawn from television studios, film sets, concert halls and radio mikes at all levels of interpersonal communication.