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We cannot fight for our rights and our history as well as the future until we are armed with weapons of criticisms and dedicated consciousness.

Edward W. Said.

Use truth as your anvil, nonviolence as your hammer and anything that does not stand the test when it is brought to the anvil of truth and hammered with nonviolence, reject it.

Mahatma Gandhi

We know too well that our freedom is incomplete without the freedom of the Palestinians

Nelson Mandela

The global BDS movement for Palestinian rights presents a progressive, anti-racist, sophisticated, sustainable, moral and effective reform of civil, non-violent resistance. It has indeed become one of the key political catalysts and moral anchors for a strengthened, reinvigorated international social movement capable of ending the law of the jungle and upholding in its stead the rule of law, reaffirming the rights of all humans to freedom, equality and dignified living. Our South Africa moment has finally arrived!

Omar Barghouti
ABSTRACT

I rely upon the ideas of symbolic interaction generally and the social constructionist approach to social movements in particular to explore the ways in which blog activists strategically use celebrity to generate attention on behalf the BDS campaign against SodaStream and to communicate claims and grievances on behalf of the wider Palestinian movement. Using grounded theory and mix-methods, I employed a process-oriented approach to collect and analyze three types of data: 1. text, 2. images, and 3. data I created quantitatively from the qualitative data extracted from Mondoweiss blog articles published from January to March 2014. The study addressed 1. in what way blog activists strategically use celebrity to draw attention to the wider Palestinian movement’s claims and grievances; and 2. how blog activists maintained enduring interest in campaign activities for mobilizing social action and social change over time. The study examined how the SodaStream announcement of the Hollywood actress Scarlett Johansson as their Global Brand Ambassador, which blog activities immediately labeled her as *The Face of Apartheid*, was used as an opportunity to provoke a response from the celebrity and to contest the authenticity of her reputation as a humanitarian fighting to end poverty. I identify how blog activities strategically utilize Johansson in multiple ways to problematize her as a spectacle to communicate claims and to generate attention. Blog activists utilized her responses as a further opportunity to strategically use her celebrity to sustain interest by politicizing her humanitarian reputation. This was intended to motivate action as they attached their contestation over her humanitarian reputation to key external issues surrounding the BDS campaign against SodaStream; ultimately legitimizing *The Face of Apartheid* label, a celebrity who chose to be on the wrong side of history.
**Key words:** Palestine; BDS campaign against SodaStream; Scarlett Johansson; blog activists and social movement creative tactics and strategies; perceived threat opportunity; turning points; qualitative methods
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The history of social movement activity and protest has had a tenuous relationship with mainstream media particularly with newspapers and television, which are perceived as dominated or influenced by elite actors and/or the state who are also often the primary targets of social movement campaigns. Boycotts have played a central role in social movement protest activity and it is considered a successful campaign tactic. Such tactics have since found their counterparts online as alternative media have afforded social movements with the tools and platforms to change the playing field of contentious politics. Social movements now have the potential for harnessing greater control on how their images and messages are presented and this can lead to effective mobilization for social action and social change.

The BDS (Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions) movement has structured their boycott campaigns around anti-apartheid claims-making and protest activities. Peteet (2005) advocates the practice of labeling people, actions, and events; particularly the “strategic” use of the label “apartheid” in the Israeli-Palestinian context by making parallels between apartheid South Africa and modern-day Israeli occupation of Palestine (Lowstedt 2014). Such anti-apartheid movements employ rhetorical and persuasive strategies and tactics stemming from human rights discourses that evoke shame and blame in their cultural and consumer campaigns to apply pressure to the apartheid state and their supporters. They also direct their activities towards entertainers (such as musicians or celebrities) to take advantage of their carefully crafted reputations and draw them into the political debate by making them respond to the debate, but ultimately to generate attention to wider movement’s claims and grievances.

Subsequently, alternative media is changing how the world ‘sees’ and ‘talks’ about the Israel-Palestinian conflict. Although both Israel and Palestinian movements engaged in ‘politics
of representations’ over what is to be taken as ‘truthful’ or the most accurate representation of the conflict, such counter claims-makings and confrontations are increasingly being taken online in what is referred to as ‘social media wars.’ This reflects a novel form of creative activism using journalistic editorial and lampooned images (which incorporates aspects of anti-marketing/advertising strategies) in social movement campaign claims making and protest activities. Therefore, it engages one to examine further how such creative endeavors play a role in strategically using celebrity to communicate claims, generate attention, and to sustain interest and thus shape mobilization in social movement campaigns.

The study

Drawing primarily from social movement literature, this study is focusing on the online claims making and protest activities by blog activists during a specific protest event. SodaStream, an Israeli company that produces home carbonated products (along with Ahava, Hewlett Packard, Caterpillar, and Eden Springs), became one of the central targets of the BDS movement’s (a Palestinian grassroots and global solidarity movement) consumer boycott list since the launching of the “Palestinian Call for Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions against Israel” in 2005. On January 10th 2014, SodaStream announced a new multi-year endorsement agreement with the American Hollywood actress Scarlett Johansson. Johansson’s SodaStream advertisement was scheduled to broadcast as one of the exclusive commercial spots to be aired during the American Super Bowl half-time event on February 2nd, 2014. SodaStream’s main operation and production site is illegally (according to International laws found in the appendix section of this dissertation) located in the West Bank Settlement, Ma’aleh Adumim, and industrial zone of Mishor Adumim. This production site is strategically located to prevent
individual freedom of movement and infrastructural development and is viewed as another violation of international law (Global Exchange, online). In addition to supporting the Israeli state’s practice of apartheid and illegal occupation, reports have been published regarding human right violations and discrimination towards SodaStream’s Palestinian workers. The company is also reported to misleading its consumers by labeling its products “Made in Israel” which is another source of contention for Palestinian supporters and their advocates.

During the month of January 2014, blog activists from the Mondoweiss blog (a citizen journalist based blog and has become a critical resource among a diverse network making up the Palestinian movement) responded to the announcement as an opportunity (i.e. the SodaStream/Johansson controversy). According to Mondoweiss, it is an independent website (started as a personal blog of journalist Philip Weiss) founded in 2006 and it emerged from the progressive Jewish community:

We recognize that Jewish voices are often prioritized in discussions of Israel and seek to challenge that dynamic by bringing a universalist focus to an issue that is commonly dominated by narrow points of view. We publish original on-the-ground reporting, analysis by scholars and personal stories. As the site has grown, we have developed a large group of regular contributors who are committed to high journalistic standards of documentable evidence and reliable sourcing (http://mondoweiss.net/about-mondoweiss/).

Although the controversy was constructed as part of the BDS campaign against SodaStream, Johansson quickly emerged as a central target in Mondoweiss blog editorials and images. Initially labeling Johansson ‘The Face of Apartheid,’ Mondoweiss blog activists’ strategically used the celebrity in multiple ways to problematize the announcement for generating attention to the movement’s claims and grievances and BDS campaign against SodaStream. Johansson served as Oxfam’s International ‘Global Ambassador’ since 2007.
As an Oxfam ambassador Johansson utilized her celebrity as a platform to address the food crises, famine, drought issues, appealed for aid, and participated in a variety of global celebrity charity galas and events in order to assist Oxfam in creating awareness and to generate funds. As the celebrity responded to the controversy, this created dramatic shifts on how blog activists strategically used her celebrity through their editorials and images to politicize her role and relationship with the boycotted factory and the opposing movement, and contested her reputation as a humanitarian to sustain interest in the campaign for protest. BDS supporters and their allies are often marginalized and attacked in dominant Israel-Palestine conflict discourses, so condemning and satirizing a celebrity who is popular and well liked could further alienate their supporters and or shift the controversy to focusing on the celebrity herself and not about the occupation in Palestine. An analysis of the unfolding protest event reveals how Mondoweiss blog activists validate their initial suspicions about the celebrity as a threat to the movement, thus solidifying their label of her as ‘The Face of Apartheid,’ an example of a celebrity who ‘chose to be on the wrong side of history.’

**Purpose and research questions**

The purpose of this study was to address the study’s questions on 1. how blog activists strategically used celebrity to draw attention to wider Palestinian movement’s claims and grievances, and 2. how blog activists maintained enduring interest in campaign activities for mobilizing social action and social change over time. I examined how the SodaStream announcement of Scarlett Johansson as their Global Brand Ambassador was utilized as an opportunity to contest the authenticity of the celebrity’s reputation as a humanitarian fighting to end world poverty, which blog activities immediately labeled Johansson as *The Face of*
Apartheid. I identified how blog activities strategically used Johansson in multiple ways to problematize her as a spectacle to communicate claims and to generate attention. I also examined how creative tactics through the use of editorial rhetoric and images about the celebrity reflected dramatic shifts or ‘turning points’ to how she responded to the controversy.

I then examined how blog activists used that as a further opportunity to strategically use her celebrity to sustain interest by politicizing her reputation as a humanitarian. This was intended to motivate action as they connected their contestation over her humanitarian reputation with external issues surrounding the BDS campaign against SodaStream, thus legitimizing their initial suspicious of her relationship with the boycotted company and politics surrounding the occupation in Palestine. Examining the activists claims making and protest activities through a process-oriented approach is important because we can learn how messages are being contested and celebrity as an antagonist character are constructed in proactive and dynamic ways, and that they not just being determined or shaped at the structural level. This ultimately provided insights to how movements and their actors strategically target and utilize celebrity to maintain interest and mobilization in protest campaigns and activities.

Methodology and theoretical frameworks

Drawing from various social movement theories, I relied upon the ideas of symbolic interaction generally and the social constructionist approach to social movements in particular to explore the ways in which blog activists strategically used celebrity to generate attention about the BDS campaign against SodaStream and to communicate claims and grievances on behalf of the wider Palestinian movement. Using grounded theory and mix-methods, I employed a process-oriented approach to collecting and analyzing three types of data: 1. text, 2. images, and
3. data I created quantitatively from the qualitative data extracted from the editorials and images collected from the Mondoweiss blog articles published in January to March 2014. I examined the use of the SodaStream announcement of Scarlett Johansson as their Global Brand Ambassador as a perceived threat opportunity which blog activities immediately labeled Scarlett Johansson as *The Face of Apartheid*. The study is situated as a case study to present a novel empirical case based on rich data in order to produce a substantial theory about celebrity politics and creative blogging activist practices in claims making and protest activities online.

**Results**

The study examined how blog activists constructed a critical event by problematizing the SodaStream announcement and subsequently Scarlett Johansson’s reputation as a humanitarian by responding to it as an opportunity to protest. Blog activists deployed ‘*The Face of Apartheid*’ label to make her a media spectacle to strategically communicate claims and grievances on behalf of the wider Palestinian movement and to draw attention to the BDS campaign against SodaStream. Johansson was initially used to take advantage of her celebrity by pressuring her to become involved into the debate about SodaStream and to expose the conflict in occupied Palestinian territories, human rights and labor violations, and illegal corporate consumer practices at the SodaStream factory. The study revealed how claims making activities involved the creative employment of Palestinian movement’s ethos of nonviolence (which resonates with anti-apartheid movement practices) and movement frames (injustice, human rights, and unethical consumerism) via the use of editorial text and images.

Subsequently, the study then examined how Johansson responded to the controversy which created a dramatic shift to how activists intensified their utilization of editorials and
images to provoke the celebrity to respond in some way. The turning points revealed how blog activists continued to take advantage of multiple opportunities in their strategic use of Johansson to politicize her role with the opposition to sustain supporter interest in protest mobilization based activities. These turning points illustrate how blog activists politicized Johansson further by making connections to her relationship with the boycotted company and other external issues. Blog activists’ initial labeling of her as *The Face of Apartheid* and suspicions about her relationship with the boycotted company are perceived to be validated by the last turning point.

From the perspective of the blog activists, the controversy elevated the public profile of the BDS movement and the wider Palestinian movement, thus making it a long-term success given the potential use of a celebrity antagonist to be made an example for future celebrity cases: *The Face of Apartheid*, the celebrity who ‘chose to be on the wrong side of history.’ These findings represent a novel empirical research on how celebrity is strategically used to generate attention and communication movement claims.

**Reflexive statement: the researcher’s background and position in the study and with the Israeli-Palestinian discourse**

I follow the Weberian (1968) tradition for utilizing *verstehen*, or the ability of the scientist to understand the significance of social phenomena, by developing an understanding of the meanings that individuals attach to various courses of action. Reproaching the idea of detachment with scientific objectivity, Rosaldo (1989: 19) contends that the researcher is a ‘positioned subject’ and whose “life experiences both enable and inhibit particular kinds of insights” acknowledging the role of the scientist through the process of “systematic and rigorous research” (Ritzer 1992: 116). As such, it is important for the researcher to maintain the ethics and ethos of this study as both scientific and sociological by clarifying my position in this study as a
scientist with advocacy concerns. I am a BDS advocate and supporter of the Palestinian movement. As a critical sociologist involved in advocacy work, it is important to represent marginalized voices such as the Palestinians and to share their ‘voices’ from an academic position so that others may relatively understand their position, ideologies, and practices within Israel-Palestinian discourses.

Due to the increasing anti-Arabism and Islamophobia and near absence of normalized discourses regarding the Israel-Palestinian conflict in mainstream academic and political circles (Bakan and Abu-Laban 2009), BDS and Palestinian supporters increasingly face backlash and great misunderstanding. Subsequently, they are often labeled as ‘anti-Semitic’ as an instrument of censorship or a way of discrediting legitimate Palestinian concerns and voices regarding their subjugated realities (cf. Butler 2006). And with the growing politicization of celebrities (celebrities getting involved in political issues and events regarding their public support for Palestine) celebrity supporters of Palestine during Israel’s 2014 military action within Gaza faced a vicious backlash and were labeled anti-Semitic (cf. Guzman 2014). This is further addressed in the history chapter. The Israel-Palestinian conflict is essentially centered on two polar narratives (a third does exist—one that seeks a middle ground, but the for sake of brevity this study focuses on how, unfortunately, the two extreme positions are posited in mainstream media presentations and discussions) and as such is an extremely controversial and emotionally sensitive topic.

‘Truth’ is relative and is often dependent on one’s ‘position’ or ‘side’ of the issue. However, for many Palestinian supporters, this is an issue about human rights violations and illegal occupation practices. It is about apartheid and therefore being critical of Israel and their practices are not anti-Semitic but vital to creating awareness to an unfortunate reality. Following the BDS ethos of apartheid, Palestinian activists and advocates primary grievance is that Israel is
not following international laws over the disputed occupied Palestinian territories. The perception is that they are instead committing blatant human right in Palestinian Occupied Territories. It is not about ending the State of Israel or even Zionism. It is about embodying a democratic right to be critical and any defenses to such criticisms are automatically ‘anti-Semitic’ places a barrier from any serious discussions on how to address this complex conflict any move further.

Nonetheless, it is important to make clear that this study presents a culturally relative picture of a marginalized position and their perspectives in this conflict that is grounded in objective data. Therefore an understanding of these perspectives requires a background overview on the movement’s narratives and frames for the reader to recognize how this movement was created and for what purposes. It is not the intention of this researcher to change minds but to present a valid and thought-provoking case based on critical sociological inquiry.

I contend that this study is a form of critical sociology because it endeavors to address sociological questions and aims to debunk ‘taken for granted common sense’ when it comes to Israel-Palestinian discourses, and to acknowledge both history and novelty when it comes to social movement, celebrity, and media studies. Critical sociology is explicitly ‘critical’ of how the domination of states, corporations, the media, and other powerful institutions play in influencing our beliefs and worldview. Therefore, anti-colonialism and critical sociology provides the framework which aims to examine how relations of power and domination are ‘encoded’ in cultural texts, such as those of alternative media. Additionally, it helps to illustrate how people can resist hegemonic meanings and produce their own critical and alternative narratives. Thus, a Palestinian sociology and critical sociology can illustrate how mainstream media culture manipulates and propagandizes us, and yet at the time, marginalized people can
use the very same media to resist dominant meanings in mediated cultural products and produce their own meanings. Utilizing such a framework facilitates an understanding to how moments of resistance and criticism within media culture can promote the development of a more critical sociological consciousness to a ‘real world problem.’ This study uses evidence that is grounded in the analysis of a social conflict and how actors, using agentic and creative forms of activism rooted in anti-apartheid and human rights, can strategically use celebrity to contest hegemonic mediated power.

Why this issue is important and relevant to me and important to share to the reader

I take the opportunity in this introduction to introduce to you, my audience, the background, values, and cares that I bring to this research which seeks to present the context of my values and points of view on the Palestinian position. I am not Palestinian. I grew up in Chicago proper in a working class family with 7 other brothers and sisters. We are first generation Afro-Cuban Mexican and fifth generation Irish. Although I cannot claim to understand the everyday realities of Palestinian under apartheid and occupation, I have experienced various class, racial, and gender discrimination and inequalities throughout my life. As such, I grew up empathetic to the suffering of others and I believed this directed me to a career in anthropology and sociology.

My masters anthropological fieldwork was situated in Morocco. However, for a few weeks I ventured to Egypt, Palestine, and Jordan. This was during the fall and winter of 2004/2005 when the ‘Apartheid Wall’ was in its second stage of construction (the wall was completed in 2006). Witnessing various forms of racism and discrimination directed at Palestinian Arabs, non-Israeli citizens, Christians, and personally experiencing (not as harshly as some of my travel
companions) acts of aggression for being mistaken as Palestinian and a Palestinian sympathizer, the experience inserted me to a deeper realization surrounding the complex and varied realities of Palestine and of Israel. I was moved by the level of friendship and kindness in everyday interactions, and the use of hope and humor in their accounts in the face of their nightmarish realities.¹ What we see and what we are told in American mainstream media, has not and does not portray a fair or authentic representation of Palestinian everyday experiences and situations. I became enlightened.

When I returned to the United States, I continued to develop my relationships with those I made in Palestine. I joined related groups in the Ames community (and eventually I joined other groups online) whose goals were to address the misinformation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, while making connections across varied groups—whether ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religious, secular, or national. This complex engagement of a ‘local’ issue with a diverse global participation inspired me. Despite the varied perspectives about Palestine and Israel respectfully, place and what happens with that “place” (i.e., illegal settlement and occupation) and more importantly what is happening inside this contest place (i.e., human rights violations and apartheid) is at the center of the debate.

Although I received my masters in anthropology it was my doctoral experience that launched me into anti-colonialism and critical sociology. My study is not intended to contribute to the bipolar noise of opinions as it pertains to the Israel-Palestinian conflict. As a critical sociologist and cultural anthropologist I am receptive to marginalized voices and if there is such a group that is marginalized and oppressed it is arguably the Palestinian people. Therefore, I use my study as a platform to communicate their voices in a world that is, unfortunately, extremely anti-Palestinian and whose voices and positions are severely muted in mainstream media. I am
not declaring that Israel and their position do not necessarily have a point of view. My objective is not to vilify Israel or their supporters, but I feel, as many others, that they already have an advantage as being the dominant narrative in academia and the media.

This study is being used a sociological empirical study as well as an academic platform for communicating marginalized voices. Academically I personally feel safer to finally engage in such a sensitive but vital endeavor. Ever since the call made in 2005 from a majority of Palestinian civil society and organizations to the rest of world to protest against Israel’s violations of Palestinian human rights, supportive groups (academic, arts, and science) were met with resistance and harassment from the hegemonic Israel lobby. Empathetic academics to the Palestinian cause traditionally have been vilified and forcefully quieted. As what happened with apartheid in South Africa, one may disagree on what is happening or how the direction should occur in Palestine, but not to communicate marginalized voices—no matter how disputed—is not a reflection of academic freedom. As such, anthropology and sociology would therefore have no meaning or place in this world if such positions are to be restricted.

In 2013, several academic associations such as the American Studies Association (ASA) stepped up in spite of opposing hegemonic forces and finally answered the call: “The goal of the academic boycott is to contribute to the larger movement for social justice in Israel/ Palestine that seems to expand, not further restrict the rights to education and free inquiry” (ASA 2016: online). Such a boycott is not limiting Israeli voices, but it is placing restrictions for institutions and people to wake up and realize to the everyday realities unjustly placed on a people. Nation state issue aside, human rights violations and illegal occupation is wrong. We have a right to conduct academic inquiry into the matter and to communicate marginalized voices and present their position.
More recently, the resolution to boycott Israeli academic institutions was endorsed by a vote of 1040-136 at the American Anthropological Association business meeting on November 20, 2015, one which I attended and participated. The resolution failed to pass by the narrowest of margins (39 votes, or less than 1% of ballots cast). However, this movement towards supporting academic freedom on behalf of marginalized voices empowered me that researching marginalized voices can, should, and will be presented and made public. That is the core of critical sociology. Therefore, I contend this study is a worthwhile sociological endeavor as situated within an interdisciplinary approach. It is important to stress that any assumptions to be extrapolated on the position of this highly sensitive and controversial issue is not a reflection of my committee or the institutions I represent. This is an academic endeavor—and one solely made on my behalf—it is objectively a study on the claims making and protest activities involving blog activists working towards justice for Palestinians.

One can disagree with history and feelings as reflected by quotes from Palestinians and their supporters, but those are a reflection of marginalized voices, nowhere is this study endorsing whether or not Israel should exist. My personal feelings and background were presented as part of the sociological endeavor on being scientifically reflective and honest as to whom I am and my personal history that led to this study. It is also intended to highlight my personal objective regarding engaging in critical sociological endeavors that add to Palestinian sociology (cf. Tawil-Souri 2012) and to contribute to academic platforms for marginalized voices in order to contribute alternative perspectives on the wider conflict, thereby making such discussions regarding conflict more balanced.
A clarification of Palestinian/Israeli terminology:

While both sides do have their forms of ‘anti-Semitism’ and ‘anti-Arabism’ or anti-Islamism, this study is about creating an understanding as to why such imagery or ideologies are created from a particular position. Any forms of sentiments or statements that are ‘anti-Semitism’ or ‘anti-Arabism’ will be discounted as it undermines the objective of the study. Separate from a quoted statement, this study will avoid positioning the two extreme positions as ‘pro’ or ‘anti’ since they carry a negative imagery about their positions within Israel-Palestinian discourses and about the conflict itself. As such, Palestinian movement indicates movements, groups, and or individuals whom are supporters, activists, and or advocates to the Palestinian position/perspective within Israel-Palestinian debates and discourse; and likewise with the wording referring to Israel movement/actors. Since this study is examining the blogging practices of BDS and Palestinian advocates and activists, opposing movement logically refer to the oppositional messages and practices of the Israeli movement (and their allies).

Zionism\(^2\) reflects a political movement and a political ideology which complicates the makeup of people, religion and politics in Israel. Subsequent criticisms regarding the internationally declared illegal practices of the State of Israel are not anti-Semitic or racist. Instead, it refers to those that oppose such practices, specifically Zionist practices because they are often intertwined in Israeli occupation practices and politics. It is to be made clear that any discussion regarding Zionism and or Israel illustrate Palestinian movement activists criticisms and grievances about the state (and its related actors such as SodaStream) and related practices are based by those who perceive (and internationally recognized as) such activities that reflect apartheid and illegal occupation against an indigenous population who have a right for self-determination and self-preservation. Furthermore, while hasbara (‘explanation’ in Hebrew)
specifically refers to the public relations efforts by the Israeli movement to promote positive images and information about Israel, in the context on the Palestinian movement ‘hasbara’ has been adopted to indicate ‘Zionist propaganda’. Hasbara is perceived as part of the hegemonic media practices and thus viewed as oppositional to Palestinian cause, messages, and perspectives.

**A summary outline of the dissertation**

The dissertation is structured in six basic parts: 1. Introduction; 2. Literature review; 3. Methodology; 4. Analysis; 5. Historical background on the Israel-Palestine conflict and Palestinian and BDS movements; and 6. Conclusion.

(1) The introduction presents the study objective and research questions. The chapter also includes a clarification of some controversial rhetoric used throughout the dissertation, in addition to presenting a background of the researcher’s interest and position in the study.

(2) The literature review presents the concepts and theories that this study draws from: social movement scholarship, alternative media, and celebrity studies. The chapter also presents some empirical cases and ends by situating this study within the social movement research and scholarship.

(3) The method section explains the grounded theory methodology and method, in addition to the case study approach. An explanation of why those methods and approaches were fruitful for this study is provided. Although I may be sensitive and empathetic to the Palestinian and BDS cause and perspectives, nonetheless as a sociologist I endeavor to maintain objectivity and accountability throughout the research process. This is why the grounded theory methodology in part was chosen as a means to facilitate that objective because it aided in the
constant reflection and cross checking of the data during the data collection and analysis processes.

(4) The historical overview of the Israel-Palestine conflict and Palestinian and BDS movements is intended to contextualize the issues behind the campaign against SodaStream, and to provide the reader with a background overview of the Palestinian movement. In particular, the frames and narratives which define the BDS movement and their advocates’ activities within their network are presented. A summary explanation of the BDS movement is provided including a brief background on SodaStream, Oxfam, and Scarlett Johansson. The history chapter reflects a Palestinian perspective supported by empirical resources and documentation. It is reflective of a critical sociology where even Marx and Engels prophesized and warned about the establishment of a Jewish state which sought to harness imperialism and capitalism at the expense of indigenous Palestinians:

The socialistic bourgeois want all the advantageous of modern social conditions without the struggle and dangers necessarily resulting therefrom. They desire the existing state of society minus its revolutionary and disintegrating elements. They wish for a bourgeoisie without a proletariat. The bourgeoisie naturally conceives the world in which it is supreme to be the best; and bourgeoisie socialism develops this comfortable conception into various more or less complete systems. In requiring the proletariat to carry out such as a system, and thereby to march straightway into the social New Jerusalem, it but requires in reality, but the proletariat should remain within the bounds of existing society, but should cast away all its hateful ideas concerning the bourgeois (Marx and Engels 1848/1908: 42).

(5) The analysis chapter presents the data that was quantitatively made from the qualitative data collected, and presents in-depth data to support what was discovered.

(6) The conclusion chapter summarizes the findings generated by this empirical study. It also presents a discussion on the limitations and future work to be conducted as a result from this study.
This dissertation is a sociological examination of social action and social change. More specifically, it is a study of a particular group of activists and an in-depth examination of their claims making and protest activities. As a critical sociologist and a human rights advocate, it is important to support movements such as the Palestinian struggle by supporting campaigns that fight against racism, for civil rights, human rights and for workers’ rights on behalf of marginalized peoples. My objective is to add to sociological inquiry about creative forms of online activism and the use of celebrity, in addition to utilizing this dissertation as a platform for making aware of the Palestinian struggle, to build solidarity with the people of Palestine, and to ultimately fight against occupation everywhere.
CHAPTER 2. THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: A LITERATURE AND EMPIRICAL REVIEW

This chapter develops the conceptual framework which guided my empirical study of the SodaStream/ Johansson controversy as an examination into the social construction of online claims-making and protest activities. The chapter is structured into five sections and it provides a comprehensive literature review of the following scholarships: 1. social movements, 2. alternative media and cybercultural studies, 3. celebrity studies, 4. empirical case studies pertaining to online activism, and 5. the social construction of claims-making and protest activities. The objective of the chapter is to present a general background of the main scholarships and empirical works which directs towards a specific focus on my study and elaborate on keys ideas and concepts drawn and utilized.

The first section is a review of social movement scholarship and highlights key ideas from prominent paradigms in the field. The second section presents a background to alternative media and cybercultural studies and provides a background to understanding alternative media as a movement tool and platform for activism, and conceptualizing blog activists and their virtual communities among movement networks. The third section provides a scholarly and empirical review on celebrity. It provides a background understanding to how celebrity has been conceptualized as a commodity and pathology (i.e. as part critique of modern society discourse), especially in the context of politics and humanitarianism. I do this to highlight how celebrity as a commercial commodity or product, is actively (re)produced and consume particularly in social and political realms which is part of the critique of celebrity in contemporary society. I also highlight the role of celebrity as it pertains to the society of the spectacle and the problems as observed by the attention economy in the blurring of entertainment and politics. The fourth section addresses the previous conceptualization of alternative media and media practice in
social movements by presenting some empirical examples of social movement online activity against the background of social movement theory.

On the basis of these scholarship reviews and empirical examples, the chapter closes by presenting how my study contributes to social movement scholarship on the construction of online claims-making and protest activities. I rely upon the ideas of symbolic interactionism generally and social constructionism in particular. Although the contemporary BDS and Palestinian movements are characteristic of new social movements, I am not examining movements at an organizational or macro level or the outcome of movement activities. Instead, I am examining the online protest and claims-making activities as constructed and practiced by a specific virtual community. Scarlett Johansson emerged as a central target because of her brand ambassadorship with SodaStream is perceived to morally contradict her role as the celebrity humanitarian ambassador for Oxfam. Targeting a celebrity is strategically risky so I examined how Mondoweiss blog activists strategically used celebrity in multiple ways through the use of blog editorials and images in order to construct her as inauthentic and harmful to the wider movement’s cause. As such, I take a constructionist approach to the study of social movement campaigns and more specifically social movement activists’ online claims making and protest activities.  

I draw from social movement theories important concepts and ideas from perceived opportunity and framing processes to help understand the creative construction of a social problem and how it was transformed into protest. Taking a process-oriented approach, I examined the perception and construction of a social problem (claims) through the creative use of problematizing and politicizing the celebrity in order to generation attention and communicate messages and claims on behalf of the wider movement. Social movement activists affixed an
antagonist identity of the celebrity to facilitate the perceived ‘social problem’ and to communicate claims and inspire social action.

Section 1: Literature review of social movement scholarship

A historical overview of social movement scholarship

Social movements are different than any other form of collective action (i.e. a riot or electoral politics). They are “conscious, concerted, and relatively sustained efforts by organized groups of ordinary people to change some aspect of their society by using extra-institutional means” (Jasper 1997: 5). According to Buechler (2011: 1) “the origins of the social movement are thus intertwined with the rise of modernity itself. The confluence of capitalism, state building, urbanization, proletarianization, and warfare provided the networks, resources, identities, and grievances for social movements.” However, contemporary social movement scholarship came into fruition after various social and political events from the 1960s onwards. The social movement field has since expanded since (Beuchler 2011). 8

Pre 1960s studies on protest were dominated by theories of psychological causes, such as focusing on crowd behavior, deviance, and looking at crowds as uncontrollable groups comprised of irrational actors. Post 1960 scholarship was influenced by Olson’s (1965) economic rational theory which was rooted in classical collective action theory. Theories centering on organization, structure, and rationality became the dominant social movement framework in the United States. In the 1980s, social movement research was influenced by the cultural turn and the emergent New Social Movement theory in Europe. An increased focus on the role of culture (e.g. aesthetics, dramaturgy and protest performances) and identity in social movements have since been further emphasized in more recent social movement research.
Klandermans (1997) presents a parsimonious overview of the social movement scholarship by breaking it down to four basic elements: “grievances, resources, political opportunities, and processes of meaning construction” (1997: 2000). Since the 1960s, (along with the emergence of various countercultures, the Civil Rights movements, environmental movement, peace movement, student movements and women’s movements) the growth of social movement activity modified classical views of collective behavior to conceptualizing social movements as acts of resistance guided by strategic behavior and strong normative systems. Resource mobilization and political process emerged as the dominant social movement scholarship among American scholars (cf. McCarthy and Zald 1977; Tilly 1978; McAdam 1982) and social-constructivist paradigms (i.e. New Social Movement theory) was generally practiced by European scholars (cf. Touraine 1981; Melucci 1988; Klandermans 1991).

Despite their differences, both structural and cultural paradigms focus on social movement actors (individuals and groups) as rational and conceptualize contentious politics and protest as normal features of society. The concept of ‘contentious politics’ is a useful starting point for understanding the BDS’s movement’s use of their campaigns against Israel and its supporters. The campaign against SodaStream qualifies as contentious politics because the BDS movement and their activist supporters use the campaigns to make claims and protest against SodaStream’s illegal economic and labor practices in occupied territory in Palestine.

**Classical perspectives**

Social movement scholarship has long sought to explain why individuals aggregate to communicate their grievances. Social movement scholarship has its roots in “collective behavior” which stems from Le Bon’s description of crowd behavior. According to Le Bon’s
(1895/1960) analysis, movements were largely conceptualized as a form of collective behavior that is largely pathological and spontaneous; or rather, as a form of irrationality where groups would get out of control, and react impulsively to political issues. In essence, this perspective reduced collective phenomena to a sum of individual behaviors (della Porta and Diani 1999). This perspective shaped ‘classical’ social movement theories (such as relative deprivation, cf. Gurr 1970 and mass society, cf. Kornhauser 1959) which conceptualized actors (individuals and or groups) grievances and participation as irrational, or more specifically, anomic syndromes by people responding to some structural ‘strain’ on the social system (cf. Smelser 1962). Such perspectives focused on why movements and riots erupted, rather than addressing the how or understanding the mechanisms that brought on protest. The classical model was later replaced by the idea that crowd behavior can be viewed as rational of logical persons.

**Resource mobilization theory**

Resource mobilization theory employs a ‘purposive model of social action’ and explains social movements in reference to a strategic-instrumental level of action (Tilly 1978: 228-31). A main distinction from classical perspectives is that resource mobilization theorists contend that social movements emerge when participants are able to mobilize sufficient resources and organizational strategies to effectively mobilize support, compete with other movements and opponents, and present their claims and grievances to the state (McCarthy and Zald 1977). Resources are acquired by movements in terms of their cultural, moral, social-organizational, human or material dimensions (Edwards and McCarthy 2004: 132-133). This paradigm views social movements as flexible and fluid but organized within hierarchal structures. Social movements are any broad social alliances of people who are connected through their shared
interest in preventing or creating social change. Social movements do not have to be formally organized, and multiple alliances may work separately for common causes and still be considered part of a wider social movement. Therefore, a distinction is drawn between social movements and social movement organizations (SMOs) (Zald and Ash 1966).

A SMO is a formally organized component that is part of a particular social movement. Additionally, movement participation is facilitated by movement entrepreneurs who offer certain incentives (i.e. solidarity, purpose) to attract members and or supporters. Since movement organization encounters both administrative and logistical challenges, SMOs become essential because they can provide continuity and extend the reach of social movements. SMOs as well as individual movement actors take on the role to find innovative ways to facilitate protest.

**Political opportunity structures/ Political process theory**

The political opportunity perspective also focuses on resources, strategy, and organization but further examines the characteristics of political contexts that facilitate or impede the ability for movements to protest. Working within the same framework as resource mobilization theory, the political process theory (replacing political opportunity structures developed by Eisinger 1973) was initially developed by Tilly (1978) and the model similarly emphasized the structural aspects of social movements. The success or failure of social movements depended on three components: 1. insurgent consciousness (this was replaced later by ‘framing’), 2. organizational strength (similar to arguments made by resource mobilization), and 3. political opportunities.

Instead of focusing on the organizational structures by which movements convert ideology into action, political process theorists link movements to a broader political struggle of excluding interest groups whereby ‘openings’ for action and mobilization need to occur in order to gain
access to the established polity (Diani 1992). Tilly (1978) placed social events in the context of a broader historical perspective and observed connections between contemporary shifts in contentious politics and the corresponding changes in the dynamics of collective action and mobilization. For example, the access to political space and decision-making for protest may vary over time on the basis of the political system’s current prevailing conditions.

Due to criticisms that the political opportunity structure perspective carries a structural bias and static view of ‘political opportunity structures’ (cf. Goodwin and Jasper 2004 for an example on some of these critiques) McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly (2001) expanded on earlier views and proposed the dynamics of contention which breaks events (i.e. revolutions) into smaller episodes and focused on identifying mechanisms for a more ‘dynamic’ or relational focus. These mechanisms are shaped by factors specific to the context of a social movement rather than on the structure. Giugni (2009) presents an alternative response to these criticisms and expanded on the rational view by breaking it down by four particular dimensions: 1. discursive opportunities, 2. specific opportunities, 3. perceived opportunities, and 4. from conditions to mechanisms. Another contribution to social movement theory is the concept of ‘repertoires of contention’ or ‘protest repertoires’ which refers to a set of protest-related tools and actions available to a movement in a given historical period (Tilly 1986). Tilly observed a shift on how people protest (or make claims) and he explained that these shifts in repertoire use changed as a consequence of collective learning within strong structural limits.

**Repertoires of contention or ‘protest tools’: strategies and tactics**

“Repertoires of contentions” refer to the tactical forms from which social movement actors can choose at any given moment to protest their claims (Tilly 1986). A protest repertoire is a set
of means, tactics, and strategies that movements utilize in their campaigns and protest activities. A protest repertoire is historically embedded and dependent on social custom and political circumstance, and this includes alternative media. Traditional activist strategies and tactics have been adapted to the online environment although uniquely digital ones have also emerged. Employing a human rights discourse further enhances an awareness of human rights (cf. Grabe and Dutt 2015). Likewise, humor and sarcasm are useful tactics in heightening awareness (for action and support) and delegitimizing opposing narratives by providing an alternative way of thinking and acting in a non-violent way (McAdam 1986).

The ‘repertoire’ concept provides a framework for examining the utilization of particular tactics within social movement activities. Historical variations in strategies or tactics used by relatively powerless groups seeking to challenge the status quo highlight the dynamic nature of political contention (cf. McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 2001). Strategy refers to a combination of choices about allies, claims or demands (linked to movement frames and goals), identity, issues, presentation of self, resources to generate, avenue for protest, and tactical use (Meyer 2007: 82). Tactics on the other hand refer to the specific means of implementing a movement’s strategy (e.g. boycotts, protest, sit-ins, among others and their online counterparts).

Tilly (1995) recognized two distinct repertoires throughout history: the tradition repertoire which is characteristically non-state based. These are tactics which are employed to address issues below the state level (e.g. food riots, disruption of ceremonies, group trespassing, and invasion of land). ‘Modern’ or contemporary repertoires tend to be directed at elite or state-based targets which emerged during the late eighteenth to early nineteenth centuries (e.g. boycotts, demonstrations, petitions, public meetings, and strikes). A wide range of cultural strategies (e.g. music and theatre) illuminates the role of culture in mobilizing protest as well as the role
activists to effectively influence allies, articulate grievance and evoke emotions into collective action and mobilization.\(^\text{16}\)

In their review on repertoire change within a range of movements McAdam and his colleagues contends that in almost all cases innovative forms of protest tools are not entirely different. Instead, they suggest that changes were “creative modifications or extensions of familiar routines” (McAdam et al., 2001: 49). Likewise, in a review on online repertoires, Meikle suggest that “the whole repertoire of tactics developed throughout the twentieth century, from the Suffragettes to Civil Rights, from Greenpeace to ACT UP, from Gandhi to Greenham Common, have found their digital analogues, as social activism moves into cyberspace” (2002: 24-25).

While offline repertoires have found their online counterparts (e.g. e-petitions, e-letter writing campaigns, e-mail campaigns, e-boycotts, etc.), others contend that innovative forms such as cyber-hacking and culture jamming have emerged specific in the internet context (cf. Rolfe 2005). Alternative media technologies offering distance and or virtual participation are redefining of the boundaries of performance art such as ‘media conmedia performance works’ (i.e. creative activism)\(^\text{17}\) which involve the “melding [of] comedic performance traditions with new media traditions” (LaFarge and Allen 2005: 213). As such, alternative media based repertoires are intensifying in use and more research is reflecting such changes (cf. Earl and Kimport 2011).

However repertories are not just instruments.\(^\text{18}\) They represent a movement’s culture and are linked to a movement’s aims and values. Repertoires also carry considerable meaning and symbolic value (Jasper 1997). The dissemination of a movement culture or worldview provides a critical condition for the collective perception of a social problem. Without the language or rhetoric\(^\text{19}\) to define and evaluate problems and the emotional inspiration of protest events,
potential grievances and opportunities could potentially be ignored by their advocates and allies. As such, social movements and their actors are confronted with a choice of tactics. Tactical decisions may not always directly lead to the success of a campaign. On the other hand, a tactic may indirectly affect success by influencing a mediating factor of success such as harnessing public support/sympathy, media attention, or expanding coalition networks.

Tarrow (1992) differentiated between ‘conventional’ versus ‘confrontational’ forms of protest. Conventional tactics work to make change through existing institutional channels of political participation such as the use of petitions, writing letter to governmental officials, etc. (Tarrow 1992). However, for many social movement organizations, the prevailing structure may not provide proper channels for which they can demand change through. McAdam concluded that “ordinary, insurgents must bypass routine decision-making channels and seek, through use of non-institutionalized tactics, to force their opponents to deal with them outside the established arenas within which the matter derive so much of their power” (1983: 340). Likewise, in a study of movements against nuclear energy, Kitschelt found that “when political systems are closed and have considerable capacities to ward off threats to the implementation of policies, movements are likely to adopt confrontational, disruptive strategies orchestrated outside established policy channels” (1986: 66).

Tactics of a movement have to exemplify the movement’s demands and “need to appear actionable enough to avoid being dismissed, yet challenging enough to inspire attention” (Meyer 2007: 83). They also need to be credible enough to make people identify with the movement and believe that they can make a difference. Because there is a competition for attention, the most effective way of developing a strategy in order to maximize their influence is to “match of tactics to resources is critical” (Meyer 2007: 86). Lipsky (1968) contends that movements have to
simultaneously appeal to four different audiences in order to achieve the mobilization of resources or collective action: 1) their own membership and organizational base; 2) the news media; 3) the public; and 4) target groups or antagonists.

At the same time, while tactics might appeal to one group they may also alienate another (Miller 1968). So movements “need to win external support [in addition to] the ideology leanings of their membership base” (Barkan 1979: 20). Therefore master frames\(^{21}\) can influence a movement’s selection of particular collective action frames and it can shape how strategies and tactics are selected, based on what is believed as most effective, and most familiar to them (Tilly 1978). This involves a strategic decision making process which has to balance sometimes conflicting interests and pressures. Brand (1990) argues that these framing strategies vary with shifts in the “cultural climate,” such that differences in political cultures result in varying movement strategies.\(^{22}\) On the other hand, Gamson (1990) found groups using disruption and nonviolence as strategic tactics such as boycotts have historically experienced more consistent public support.\(^{23}\)

Movements that appeal to widely held norms through the use of non-violent strategies are becoming fundamental for building and sustaining broad mobilization in Western democracies (Kitschelt 1986: 61). Therefore, it is important for groups to show how it presents its arguments that relates to the social culture when deploying a strategy of nonviolence (Meyer 2007: 84). Gurr (2000: 156) supports these positions and noted how non-violence movements of the late twentieth century differed in at least three ways: 1. nonviolence resistance gives protestors a moral advantage because 2. tactics utilized often provided to be creatively disruptive of public order and economic activity and therefore, authorities are compelled to respond in ways that put them at a moral and political disadvantage to the protestors, and 3. nonviolent protests have used
the mass media to send their images and messages well beyond the immediate sites of conflict to “a distant but potentially sympathetic public comprised of people who might be enlisted as allies and agents of reform” (Gurr 2000: 156).

Nonviolent forms of protest is by definition a human right as stated in sections 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It states that all people the right to “freedom of opinion and expression” and “freedom of peaceful assembly and association” (United Nations, 1948).24 Boycotts are an exemplary form of a nonviolent form of protest. Boycotts are an expression of protest and are often the central means to communicate grievances and mobilize in a social movement’s campaign.

There are many successful examples of boycotts such as the Montgomery bus boycott in reaction to racial segregation in Alabama and the boycott of apartheid South Africa. King (2011: 493) noted an increased shift of boycotts was related to a shift in corporate strategies that employed brand and identity to generate consumer loyalty. King contends that because of this “boycotts are [the] perfect tactical weapon for movements seeking to disrupt the tangible and intangible benefits deriving from brand and reputation. Attacking companies’ images through boycotts [is] an intermediate step to instigating broader political and institutional changes in the corporate sphere” (King 2011: 493). Boycott is a common tactic used in the BDS campaigns against corporations or companies. Such companies are perceived to engage in illegal corporate practices and human rights violations by taking advantage (and or because are perceived to be in alliance with the Israeli government) of the illegal occupation and apartheid by Israel in occupied Palestine.

King’s empirical study on boycotts occurring from 1990 to 2005 illuminates how influential boycotts disrupted their corporate targets in two particular ways: 1. tactics that lead to market
disruption as an attempt to destabilize the organization’s use of market resources,\textsuperscript{25} and 2. movement tactics that created mediated disruption by reducing revenue and imposing marketing costs and triggering a negative reaction among a target’s audience by fashioning a reputation target.\textsuperscript{26} According to King (2011), mediated disruption is perhaps the most significant as corporations have invested heavily in their image and reputation and are likewise vulnerable to attacks on their images. King (2011) suggests that alternative media makes it easier for activists to broadcast their messages by employing a variety of novel tactics through creative protest performances. In this way, alternative media is an important link between a movement, the target, and their audiences. The BDS campaign against SodaStream is presented as a site of contestation where Mondoweiss blog activists use the campaign as a framework to shape their strategies and tactics to protest that are “in line with human rights practices of ‘naming and shaming’"\textsuperscript{27} (Lebovic and Voeten 2006).

**Framing theory**

Framing is considered part of the larger cultural turn in the study of social movements. The framing perspective emerged in the 1980s as a response to complement structural variables by drawing attention to the neglected relationships between ideas and meaning involved in mobilizing actors especially in the absence of a favorable political opportunity structure (Gamson et al., 1982; Snow et al. 1986; Snow and Benford 1988). Frames are “schemata of interpretation”\textsuperscript{28} (Goffman 1974) and represent interpretative ‘blueprints’ that offer a language and cognitive tools for making sense of experiences and events in the “world out there” (Wiktorowicz 2003: 202). In this way, frames serve as mental filters influencing the interpretations of events and the world as a whole. A framing approach is often employed to
describe the appeals and justification movements use to mobilize support (Goffman 1974).

Gamson (1992) distinguishes three components of framing: 1) injustice, 2) agency, and 3) identity. Ultimately, effective frames must be capable in convincing non-movement actors that their cause is just, important, and achievable (Cress and Snow 2000). Such a framework is based on shared cultural understanding that can motivate activists to act, mobilize, and facilitate campaign protest activities.

A central element of framing is a movement’s claims and grievances. Gamson and his colleagues (1982) demonstrated that an important condition for participation in protest action is the collective adoption of a master frame. “Master frames are linked to cycles of protest, and work at the most general level of analysis, functioning to “turn the heads” of movement participants and (especially) movement entrepreneurs to see issues in a certain way. Movement participants draw upon master frames to portray their perceived injustice in ways that fit the tenor of the times and thus parallels other movements” (Oliver and Johnston 2000: 4). An injustice and or a human rights frame generally make it possible for diverse groups to form as a coalition. This produces ideological continuity even when their specific group goals may not align (cf. Mooney and Hunt 1996). Movement actors strategically transform the master frames within a cycle of protest by aligning it with the movement’s claims and specific cultural and historical context (cf. Swart 1995).

According to Benford and Snow (2000), only a handful of collective action frames have been identified as being sufficiently broad in interpretative scope, inclusivity, flexibility, and cultural resonance to function as a master frame. These are: choice, culturally pluralist, environmental (in)justice, hegemonic, human rights, (in)justice, oppositional, sexual terrorism, and a ‘return to Democracy’ (Benford and Snow 2000: 619). These frames are considered successful because
there are “culturally resonant to their historical milieu” (quoting Swart 1995: 446 in Benford and Snow 2000: 619).

While master frames are comprehensive in scope, collective action frames are action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire “to mobilize potential adherents and constituents, to garner bystander support, and to demobilize antagonists” (Snow and Benford 1988: 198). Collective action frames emerged through an interactive and negotiated process as a group consciously fashions its grievances, strategies, and reasons for action and mobilization by drawing on and modifying existing cultural codes such as symbols (i.e. celebrity) and narratives. As a result, collective action frames are the products of framing activity which entails three cores tasks (Benford and Snow 2000): 1. diagnostic framing, 2. prognostic framing, and 3. motivational framing. This sets the stage for social movements to further their goals. With so many possible frames, some groups join other groups into order to maximize the impact reflecting a frame alignment process (Snow et al., 1986). This process involves four elements: 1. bridging, 2. amplification, 3. extension, and 4. transformation.

Identity construction is linked to the framing of issues and serves as a motivation for collective action. Hunt, Benford, and Snow (1994) found that movements construct three sets of identities: antagonists (oppositional actors), audiences (bystanders, neutral or uncommitted observers), and protagonists (advocates, beneficiaries, sympathizers). While every social movement has an injustice frame, an adversarial component (or rather the antagonist identity) is vital because it is a crucial demarcation for collective identity (distinguishing ‘us’ from ‘them’), solidarity, and mobilization. The antagonist identity includes “claims about countermovements, countermovement organizations, hostile institutions, inimical publics, and social control agents” (Hunt, Benford, and Snow 1994: 197). It articulates the target and helps to
direct the emotional and moral component of the master frame, and subsequently motivates one to action.

Framing is a significant component in social movement activity because it shapes discourse and presents a social movement’s claims in a way that aligns with an audience’s commonly held beliefs or values. There are some significant overlapping with framing and new social movement theory as they both focus on cultural norms, identity, ideology, and symbols.

**New social movement theory**

New social movement theory holds a post-materialist view and minimizes structural causality. Particularly, this perspective provides an alternative way to understand solidarity and mobilization by shifting the attention away from formal governing structures of organization to the role of culture, identity and ‘new values.’ New social movement perspectives lean towards a social constructionist approach as opposed to resource mobilization or political opportunity theories. Melucci (1989) and Touraine (1981) observed that a structure centered approach focuses more on addressing the ‘how’ rather than the ‘why’ of social movements. Additionally, new social movement theory focuses more on the traditionally overlooked non-cognitive aspects of movement activity and collective action such as: culture (Habermas 1981; Klandermans 1992; Oliver et al., 2003); emotions (Jasper 1998); framing (Snow and Benford 1988); identity (Melucci 1988); and performances (Eyerman 2006). This paradigm seeks to understand mechanisms and processes underlying “large-scale structural and cultural changes” (Diani 1992: 5). New social movement theory is utilized to analyze how new social movements form and achieve their objectives for change, in addition to how movements’ constructs identity, solicits
and builds support, influences and deploys information, and works to change structural elements in society to achieve its goals.

New Social movement theory contributed to the social movement scholarship by providing an alternative perspective in conceptualizing: 1. movement organization in that they are now more loosely organized and international in scope (i.e. networks), 2. social movements evolving role in history, and 3. how the negotiation of identity is both a goal and a means. The new social movement paradigm is often known by claims to observe historical differences between traditional and contemporary movements (cf. Cohen 1985; Melucci 1989; Tournaire 1981). According to the new social movement paradigm, the type of goals, membership, and strategies differentiate between traditional social movements and contemporary social movements.

Contemporary movements diverge from materialistic goals and single issues and emphasize creating change on a global scale by focusing on culture, identity, and life style concerns (e.g. human rights and injustice). Movement participants are regarded not as members but as advocates participating in loosely organized networks. Subsequently, networks become the most important location through which contemporary movements are created and sustained over time and movement protest activities are engaged and practiced. Melucci (1988) contends that the construction of collective identity is a central cognitive framework for collective action and mobilization, because it is “a process in which actors produce the common cognitive frameworks that enable them to assess the environment and to calculate the costs and benefits of the action” (1988: 343). Often acting as influential ‘brands,’ movements draw from successful frames, narratives and identities in order to facilitate the new movement’s adaptation to a new situation when an opportunity to protest emerges. Likewise, movement identities can still hold considerable capital even after the termination of the movement (Melucci 1988).
Creative activism and the cultural turn in new social movement theory

From the Zapatista movement and the Battle of Seattle, to the Arab Springs to the Occupy Wall Street and Tea Party Movements, and to the recent Ferguson and Black Lives Movements all have demonstrated new forms of action and grassroots organizing, specifically with a preoccupation of creative activism. Creative activism is a type of culture that embraces play, the use of dramatic performances and humor as it traverses the boundary between consumption and creation. It is a form of resistance and collaborative process that employs available resources to creatively produce something to share with others (i.e. ideas, information, images or reconfigured resources).

Indicative of the ‘subjective turn’ in social movement scholarship, creative activism is fundamentally connected to the spaces, discourses and alternative media channels in which new types of social movement discourses sought to explain how and why large groups of seemingly disparate people would come together to collectively act and mobilize. Flynn (2016: 65) asserts that “subjectivity emerges as a key site of conflict and creativity as activists independently” and quoting Razsa (2015: 12) “to seize the means of producing themselves as subject.” Creative activism “is not the revival of any movement, nor is it the comeback of any style” or representing a generation of artists engaging in “fashionable theoretical gadgets” or an “additive of a traditional artistic practice,” but rather “the main informers of their activity” (Bourriaud 2002: 44, 45). Creative activism emerged as a medium of social experience and reflects how subjectivity is elaborated and meaning is created.

Contemporary forms of creative activism were inspired by the Situationists and urban artists of the 1950s and 1970s, punk ‘DIY’ (‘do it yourself’) culture in the 1980s and the early hacking ethos and billboard artists in the 1990s to the current culture jamming techniques. Such
techniques are utilized to intervene into the mainstream public sphere (Cammaerts 2012). “The primary aim is to build unique idealized networked in which anyone can participate…members of the DIY underground aren’t ‘fixated with the promise of money, they are people who want to do something just to see it happen”’ (Michael Cupid as quoted in Spencer 2005: 11).

Recently, a growth of ‘creative activist’ organizations and workshops intend to inspire and provide activists with the resources and organizational strength to engage online activism in creative ways (cf. the School for Creative Activism at artisticactivism.org; Boyd 2012). Creative activists, which characterizes many blog activists, are those activists who “work outside the mainstream of consumer society, in grass-roots efforts, to create social change that positions individuals and groups of people as reflective contributors who occupy a participatory democracy” (Garber 2013: 53). In this way creative activists are people whose art and actions occupy spaces in a participatory democracy and provoke social change. Along with a growing scholarly interest on the mediation of online activism and political campaigning, alternative media offers resources, organizational strength and opportunities for citizens and activists all over the world to come together, share ideas and potentially provide long-term tools that can strengthen civil society and the public sphere (Shirky 2011). “Our social tools are dramatically improving our ability to share, cooperate, and act together” (Shirky 2008: 304) which is intended to essentially contest opposing narratives and generate attention in a media-saturated and spectacle savvy world.

Section 2: A background on alternative media and cybercultural studies

Since the 1980s there has been growing discourse around alternative media, the Internet, and the impact they have on contemporary society (Levy 2001). According to Levy, cyberculture
encapsulates not only the infrastructure but also the “practices, attitudes, modes of thought, and values that are thereby enabled and developed” (Levy 2001: xvi). To provide a background context to my examination of bloggers’ claims-making and protest activities during a specific campaign protest event I draw from cybercultural theory the cultural implications of online technologies to make sense of: online cultural manifestations (specifically virtual communities such as blogs and blogger activists), creative forms of online resistance or performances (performance that comprises a hybrid of comedic traditions and digital technology, cf. LaFarge and Allen 2005) and how alternative media play a key role as providing tools and a platform for aesthetics, content, delivery form, or techniques advantageous for online activism.

Taking a constructionist approach requires an elucidation of culture. I follow a Geertzian (1973) view of culture (i.e. that systems of meaning are what produce culture) and take into consideration the creative and agentic aspects of claims-making and protest activities during a protest event. Johnston (2009) identified three basic categories of culture: artifacts, ideations, and performances. The blog itself is a cultural artifact produced as a collectively material object which is publically accessible and available. As it pertains to this study, blog editorials and images can be seen as representing cognitive reformulations of beliefs, values, and norms of behavior. Blog editorials and images can also be viewed as a performance, as action, and locations where culture is accomplished. Blogs are where activists “strategically craft their messages so that they have the wide impact or present events in the best light possible” (Johnston 2009:3).

Such an approach to alternative media requires a rethinking of politics and social life (Kellner 2002). Taking an either or position would only perpetuate a reductionist assumption about technology and human behavior (Kling 1996). It is important to note that alternative media
encompasses both positive and negative effects (Aday, et al. 2010). Although this dissertation highlights more of the advantages and potential of alternative media, I avoid a technological deterministic direction which tends to conceptualize technology as an effective and causal vehicle for organizing and mobilizing change.\(^{40}\) I follow the position which focuses on what people actually do with alternative media (Couldry 2002; Silverstone 2005) and how technologies are integrated in people’s everyday lives and their political engagement in networks of human activity (Dahlgren 2009, McCaughey and Ayers 2003). As Dahlbohm and Mathiassen (1996: 904) affirm, “technology is what its users perceive it to be.” Therefore, it is important to examine what “people are doing in relation to media [and] how people’s media-related practices [are] related in turn, to their wider agency” (Couldry 2012: 37).

As such, LaFarge and Allen (2005: 215) contends that alternative media forms and the Internet are “one of the liveliest arenas of political discourse where citizens are drawn to participate meaningfully in the central debates of our time [and where online activists actively] create politically charged performance work that does not immediately reduce to simple satire, cynical lampooning or lightly disguised propaganda.” This political impetus reflects a growing trend of online activism that seeks to address and problematize contemporary issues on a global scale. Alternative media provides a contested terrain for groups to promote their interest, circulate local and global struggles and resistance. The idea of a global dynamics of flows and ideas, and a space where these flows occurs is in accordance with the perspective of ‘glocalization’ (Robertson 1992), or the global production of the local such as the globalized contestation surrounding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

For many, globalization involves the economic and social restructuring of advanced capitalist societies which was predicated upon the advances of alternative media technologies (cf. Castells
I follow what Kellner (2002: 286) advises that we “avoid both technological and economic determinants, and all one-sided optics of globalization in favor of a view that theorizes globalization as a highly complex, contradictory, and thus ambiguous set of institutions and social relations, as well as one involving flows of goods, services, ideas, technologies, cultural forms, and people.” This echoes Appadurai’s argument that “the critical point is that both sides of the coin of global cultural process today are products of the infinitely varied mutual contest of sameness and difference on a stage characterized by radical disjunctures between different sorts of global flows and the uncertain landscapes created in and through these disjunctures” (Appadurai 1990: 308). As such, global flows and new technologies provide room for the expression and practice of new forms of political contention and resistance.

As such, the online sphere is “no longer a realm separate from the offline “real” world but fully integrated into offline life” (Miller 2011: 1). Moreover, “activists have not only incorporated the Internet into their repertoire but also…substantially what counts as activism, what counts as community, collective identity, democratic space, and political strategy. And online activists challenge us to think about how cyberspace is meant to be used” (McCaughey and Ayers 2003: 1-2). Therefore an understanding of online protest and claims making activities requires a rethinking of some of the assumptions underpinning older conceptualizations of protest and mobilization in light of web 2.0 technologies.

Web 2.0 Background on the emergence of alternative media

Web 2.0 has produced many different forms of social media platforms. The most widely used Social Networking Site (or Service) [SNSs] are Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and blogging. While SNSs present their own structural characteristics for communication and
interaction, all of these distinct spaces are easily interconnected to one another via hyperlinks. Hyperlinks create a dynamic and shared interactive and discursive space that affords movement networks’ access to one another and increased visibility with the public (Caiani and Wageman 2009). Several characteristics have been identified as advantageous such as communication that is not restricted to text but is available through video and audio streaming. Users can access multiple networks and information almost instantaneously regardless of location and wireless technology to enhance mobilization. This is a compelling basis for the emergence of a public discourse online as well as maintaining and shaping connections offline.

In these ways, the infrastructure of alternative media is the seemingly unlimited potential to generate, store, and share information (Bermejo 2007: 35). Web 2.0 applications emphasize the importance of openness, network effects, and user participation—specifically ‘netizens’ such as bloggers. Boler (2008) contends that Web 2.0 challenges dominant forms of conventional media by its democratization of knowledge and multiplication of sources and voices. This has the potential to influence the political and market landscapes. Hegemonic control over media coverage of conflicts, ideas, and products are increasingly challenged as non-institutionalized actors or ‘netizens’ bring additional resources or ideas to help society develop a better understanding of a situation or product.

**The networked society**

Although social movements depended on ‘old’ media (such as printing press, radio and television), alternative media has certain emergent qualities which are rapidly transforming how movement’s organize and mobilize. Information can now flow across communication networks to allow broad exchanges between large numbers of actors, creating rich possibilities for
democratic interaction (Rheingold 1993). The networked society\textsuperscript{44} propels societal change by presenting individuals with platforms and resources to challenge the present social order (Couldry and Curran 2003; Castells 2009).

Exhibiting characteristics of a ‘spectacular society,’ which is a pervasive and dominant media-consumer way of life, many aspects of contemporary social life is increasingly commodified through images and products.\textsuperscript{45} It is this battle over images and ideas that are the sources of the battle for minds and souls in the networked society (Castells 2009: 302).\textsuperscript{46} The role of rhetoric and the construction of meaning are essential to shaping actors’ minds during the process of claims-making in alternative media (Castells 2009: 193). Therefore, alternative media “provides an essential platform for debate, a means on acting on people’s minds, and ultimately serving as their most potent political weapon” (Castells 2007: 13) especially through the innovative and creative forms of online contentious politics. Empirical research have demonstrated the critical role alternative media have played in these protest events (note however this is not as a causal factor)—by facilitating movement activity and encouraging protest action and mobilization both online and offline.\textsuperscript{47}

**A convergence culture and the attention economy in the networked society**

In today’s digitally connected and mediated world, flows of all kinds of information circulate around the world at speeds unthinkable even a few decades ago, creating platforms for political engagement and expression. With the emergence of alternative media and its ubiquitous use in the networked society, cyberspace affords platforms and tools where extra-institutional or marginalized actors can be part of the political scene in a way that is much easier and more
available to them than in traditional institutional channels (Sassen 2002: 382). And these global flows of information and activities traverse the emergent new media landscape.

Although social movements depend on media, social movement activity is caught amongst the contradictions by an attention economy (Tufekci 2013). According to Tufekci (2013), we are living in an age where the expansion of alternative media is a double-edge sword in terms of the excess of information it affords us, but the rapid growth and ever-expanding of information results in a scarcity of attention. On the other hand, as long as the media and social context fosters participation and action (Roberts 2009), alternative media can afford individuals to participate in what Jenkins (2006) calls a ‘convergence culture.’ A convergence culture is where traditional and alternative media intersect, where grassroots and corporate media collide, and where producers and consumers of media interact in unpredictable ways.

Jenkins (2006) observes how convergence is not simply a process of bringing various media function together, but that is also represents a cultural shift among consumers who strive to uncover new information with media content. More importantly, media audiences are no longer passive spectators but empowered participants in this process. Increasingly, actors such as netizen journalists are knowledgeable, tech savvy and skilled in the utilization of alternative media. However, the flows of images, ideas, and narratives across multiple media channels demand more creative and dynamic forms of spectatorship. For online activism to be successful, claims-making strategies have to incorporate a message which can be understood for a diverse and global public (Niven 2004). Recall that alternative media permits the everyday consumer to be potential collaborators (Shirky 2008).

This new environment is complex and producers and consumers are not necessarily equal given that some consumers have greater abilities than others. Therefore the competition in the
production and circulation of media content depends on a consumer’s active participation and creativity (Jenkins 2006). Additionally, the production, distribution, and consumption of information has become fundamentally affected by the escalating competition for (an increasingly important resource) attention (Tufekci 2013). Consequently, the utilization of the power of the network to form communities of like-minded individuals can help sustain the organization and mobilization activities for social movements, activists, and their supporters (Benkler 2006). The networked society and convergence culture stems as a starting point to understanding the emergence of virtual communities such as blog communities like Mondoweiss. Such concepts and ideas helped me to understand how creative activism techniques and practices are utilized by such netizens journalists, and how they ingeniously harness attention, protest, and get messages across the density, noise, and competitive flow of spaces.

**Virtual communities, blogs and bloggers**

In this study, the term virtual community is used to conceptualize and characterize blogs as an online community which includes a set of rules, a joint home page, and widgets for participating blogs or online forms of journalistic editorials. Virtual communities facilitate online interactions between a specific set of people characterized by a strong sense of community which encompasses four elements: 1. fulfillment, 2. influence, 3. integration, and 4. membership (McMillian and Chavis 1986). Virtual activists’ communities such as the Mondoweiss blog are held together by their reputation and visibility. They maintain networked relations and solidarity with those among the wider Palestinian and BDS movement network. Such communities have taken root independently of the state and state allies because the Internet allows them to become part of the political communication system outside of the opposition’s total control. Such
communities “display unusually strong norms of trust and reciprocity in times of crises. They are likely to share images, help each other stay in touch…and help outsiders by supplying information on the ground…and learn about each other’s strategies for getting ideas out to the public” (Howard 2010, online).

Blogs function primarily as a communication medium through which activist bloggers can publicize aspects about the movement to mobilize public activity and opinion. Bloggers play an important role in shaping public discourse just as media portrayals of the movement affect public opinion about the movement and their claims (Passy and Giugni 2001). Blog activists are well situated and skilled at securing media coverage by dramatizing issues through a spectacle in their blog editorials, and at times, can shape a course of action and mobilize people to action. As ‘moral entrepreneurs’ (Becker 1963) blog activists call attention to injustices and seek to transform social debates. In doing so, they employ rhetoric and techniques that names, interprets and dramatizes such social problems (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998: 897). Blog activists not only raise awareness, but they strategically structure how claims or an issue should be interpreted to advocate certain policy responses and or activities. In addition to traditional journalist writing styles “the peer-reviewed process involved in blogging increased credibility of blogs. Readers trust in the fact that corrections can be made to anything posted on a blog” almost instantly (Banning and Sweetser 2007: 452).

The concept ‘microcelebrity’ (Senft 2008) defines the condition of being famous within a niche group and using status-seeking/self-presentation techniques and strategies to develop and sustain an audience. Microcelebrity is a ‘celebrity-like’ persona and status often involving an ‘ordinary’ person but increasingly includes ‘conventional’ celebrities as well. This is an online status that is carefully constructed. It is an ‘edited self’ that is “maintained through ongoing
audience or fan management; and self-presentation is carefully constructed to be consumed by others in SNS contexts (Marwick and boyd 2011: 140). The empirical research on celebrity microblogging practices (Marwick and boyd 2011), Silicon Valley technology workers (Marwick 2013) and political activists (Tufekci 2013) demonstrates how microcelebrities play an increasing important role in harnessing attention and visibility through their agency for some social or political concern. Similarly, Platon and Deuze’s (2003) empirical research on Indymedia blogger activists found that while their ‘news model’ of covering and reporting information are qualitatively similar to conventional journalists where Indymedia activists provided points of view different from mainstream media. As such, microcelebrity bloggers utilize their journalistic skills in a variety of ways. They ultimately challenge the top-down nature of conventional media which allowed for a more shared communications between ordinary citizens (Kidd 2003). The strength in blogs rests in their ability to mobilize public awareness and political organizing around social issues in the long term (Gamson 1992; Graber 2009).

**Relationship between social movements and the media: the need for harnessing attention**

But how can social movements harness the attention of media and sustain their interest and or coverage and persuade people to protest? Media are “frequently the central conduit through which social movements “seek to influence public opinion and policy in their efforts to promote or resist change in society” (McAdam and Snow 2010: 365-366). Social movements have historically relied on media outlets for purposes of mobilization, validation, and scope enlargement to generate public sympathy and support for their claims (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993). As Gamson and Wolfsfeld affirm “demonstration with no media coverage at all is a
nonevent, unlikely to have any positive influence either on mobilizing followers or influencing
the target” (1993: 116). Media is important for several reasons: for expanding a movement’s
reach, as an opportunity to “improve its relative power compared to that of its antagonist” and to
validate and legitimates the movement as an important player in the eyes of the “targets of
influence” (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993: 116).

Due to the non-institutional position of social movements, the relationship between
movements and conventional media tends to be unequal as they often have to compete for
attention (Gamson 1992; Gamson and Modigliani 1989). But unlike as a means to an end or as a
by-product of mass media (Gitlin 1980) attention is an intangible resource attained through
pathways of mass media; it is a means to get at political ends (Tufekci 2013). Alternative media
platforms such as blogs are crucial for a social movement’s actions because they attract a broad
and diverse audience to their agendas (Walgrave and Verhulset 2009). Posting reports,
photographs or video images online can create feelings to move users to action and solidify their
allegiance, identity and sympathies with the group. Marwel and Oliver (1993) add that for others,
group size could also be an indication of a group’s efficacy. Users can actually ‘see’ the number
of supporters on a group’s page or comments posted, the amount of ‘shares’ of an article or
image, and or ‘likes’ on a post in various social networking site platforms.

As Gamson and Wolfsfeld (1993) and Herman and Chomsky (2002) have concluded social
movements rely on media but marginalized or powerless groups often face constraints in
conventional media. Likewise, Fuchs (2008: 8) observes how there is “an antagonism between
cooperation and competition” in the economy of alternative media “that can threaten the
potential for cooperation.” Although much empirical work has demonstrated the importance for
social movements to harness media attention, this has led to a “high competition among groups
who aim to get their message across in the public discourse” (Koopman 2004: 372). Social movements compete against one another for media as attention and “news is a vehicle for procuring an audience” (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993: 125). They compete amongst themselves with “higher flames and more action on their news” (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993: 125). Subsequently, social movement organizations adopt strategies and tactics that possess this ‘high flame’ and action-centered entertainment characteristics in a media saturated field (Meyer and Minkoff 2004).

Dalton (1996: 71) notes “as protests become less conventional, it also becomes less noticeable and newsworthy.” Therefore, activists need “to cosmetically attack symbolic properties and provide spectacle at the fringes of demonstration” (Cammaerts 2012: 123). In this way, creative activism affords activists with resources, organizational strength and opportunities to harness that attention and presents alternative ways of ‘reporting’ as demonstrated with some bloggers’ activities. Empirical work has demonstrated that the more disruptive and visual tactics generates more attention especially when it involves some form of conflict, drama, and entertainment (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993: 125). “It is not surprising that politics of the spectacle has long been an attention acquisition strategy” (Tufekci 2013: 852) for social movements. Castell (2001) states that dramatic events or crises tend to trigger social action and social change. Jasper points out that ‘moral shocks’ are fundamental for mobilization in that they can “raise such a sense of outrage in a person that she becomes included toward political action” (1997: 106). Similarly, a ‘suddenly imposed grievance” or a “critical event” can motivate ordinary citizens to mobilize (Opp 2009: 96).

Movements and activists have always utilized the latest communication device (i.e. printing press, telegraph, radio, television, Internet, etc.) to distribute information, recruit, and
mobile support for protest “as the processes challenging institutionalized power relations are increasingly shaped and decided in the communication field” (Castells 2007: 239). However, given a more free-lanced and individualistic format that encourages self-expression (i.e. the democratizing ability of alternative media) alternative media platforms are arguably changing the social movement terrain even more radically than ever with previous technologies (McLuhan 1967). Alternative media allows users to become not merely receivers of the message but also the creators and the distributors of messages.

As a ‘weapon of the weak” (Scott 1985) alternative media can provide a means for activists and netizens journalists to circumvent the gatekeepers of conventional media and control their own messages (Cleaver 1998). They are altering the political landscape by avoiding mainstream corporate media gatekeepers. Such netizen journalists (especially those who have achieved microcelebrity status and recognition) are perceived as transmitting authentic and transparent messages. They also have broad connections to the press, and their editorials and or editorial images can be posted instantaneously onto a myriad of SNSs capturing mainstream media and global attention. In these ways, alternative media has transformed how collective action and mobilization takes place, but also the very nature of conventional journalism and what is considered news. This reflects what Castells (2001) refers to as a new type of ‘informational politics.’ Here, claims-making activities and shared grievances are expressed through networks contributing to the ‘electronic grassrooting of civil society’ thus making alternative media a politicized space (Castells 2001).

Alternative media tools allow people to communicate, collaborate, and share information thereby enhancing the power and agency of non-institutional actors to make political contributions in innovative and novel ways. Treem and Leonardi (2012) contend that
characteristics of alternative media (visibility, editability, etc.) are important in shaping movement organizational communication, claims-making and mobilization processes because they afford particular behaviors (e.g. socialization and knowledge sharing) that were often difficult to achieve in the past. ‘Weak ties’ and a shared online identity along with on the ground action build ‘strong’ ties among mobilized participants which creates the resiliency to resist repression. Those are some of the reasons contemporary social movements are increasingly utilizing alternative media for effective participation in protest activities. As such, alternative media provide inherently discursive spaces where individuals or groups can put forth arguments and engage in more dynamic public deliberations.\(^{54}\)

The Internet flourished outside of the scientific and military communities by the mid-1990s when it was embraced by political activists as a tool to promote causes, to ensure internal communication, sustain solidarity, and to employ forms of alternative media as a type of tactical media practice. This was exemplified by the Zapatista movement in 1994 when political activists used alternative media to mobilize international support in their rebellion against the Mexican state (Cleaver 1998). During the ‘Battle of Seattle’ in 1999 vast demonstrations against the World Trade Organization’s Ministerial Conference took place when anti-corporate protestors “began employing the Internet to foster affiliations and stage events” for protest and mobilization (Kahn and Kellner 2004: 87). The popularity and ubiquitous nature of social networking has given rise to the potential for social activism through alternative media as demonstrated from the Arab Spring and Occupy Movements of 2011, and more recently with Ferguson and the Black Lives Matter movements (Ehrlich 2013, online). These events underlined the potential of alternative media for political activism: 1. the production and dissemination of media information to a wider audience is cheap, fast, and virtually instantaneously and global, 2.
external supporters became easier to reach and mobilize, 3. solidarity amongst internal members of the activist community can be boosted more easily; and 4. actual activities can be coordinated rather effortlessly; and 5. direct individual participation and interaction among geographically dispersed activities is ensured (Knudsen and Stage 2012; Leenders and Heydemann 2012).

Due to the potential of alternative media as discussed above, alternative media’s role with social movements are that: 1. it can facilitate a movement’s existing offline repertoire as a communication and mobilizing tool for activism (e.g. by adding e-mail campaigns and online petitions) (Kahn and Kellner 2004; Juris 2005), and 2. it can create new forms of activism and resistance or ‘repertoire of digital contention,’ such as culture jamming, hacktivism, hashtag activism (Costanza-Chock 2003; McCaughey and Ayers 2003; Wettergren 2005; Rolfe 2005; Van Laer and Van Aelst 2009; Lievrouw 2011). In this convergence culture access to and familiarity with technology have become an important resource for a movement’s claims-making activities, collective action, mobilization, and protest repertoires (Rolfe 2005). In addition to functioning as a tool or movement repertoire, SNSs affords platforms for information and political updates (crucial for mobilization and protest) about various movement activities to advocates and potential supporters—not just due to the cost-saving, reach and speed, but claims and messages can be fashioned in creative and entertaining ways.

Culture jamming is a type of creative activism in that it is “the act of resisting and recreating commercial culture in an effort to transform society” (Sandlin and Milam (2010: 25). Culture jamming is a tactical form of ‘reverse advertising’ or subversive re-branding (e.g. via billboard, magazine advertisement alterations to their counterparts online as in the form of memes) that assigns new meanings to the images. Such meaning often carries a political message or social commentary on the brand, product, or corporation doing the advertising in a parodied manner.
Activists strategically use culture jamming to “interrogate and expose ideological forces embedded within our everyday” (Darts 2004: 323) and “they reflectively engage in cultural production that challenge the status quo of consumer culture” (Garber 2013: 60).56

According to Lasn (1999),57 the basic unit of communication in culture jamming is the meme. Using memes, either in their Internet form or other cultural forms such as songs, jingles, and popular symbols is a popular way to get a message to a target audience. “Humor reduces and diffuses hostile reactions to broken taboos, and nothing spreads faster by ‘word of mouth’ or Twitter tweets and memes, than tales of audacious humor” (New Tactics in Human Rights, online). Memes facilitate social change in that they provide:

the big paradigm-busting idea that suddenly captures the public imagination and becomes a superspectacle in itself…the meme-warfare equivalent of a nuclear bomb. It causes cognitive dissonance of the highest order. It jolts people out of their habitual patterns and nudges society in brave new directions (Lasn 1999: 124-125).

Exemplifying ‘passionate politics,’ culture jamming is the fusion of culture and politics (Hirsch 1997). Culture jamming tactics reveal the emotional processes involved in claims-making activities. By playing on the emotions of their audiences (Wettergren 2005) emotions such as anger, fear, and shame are considered to be the catalysts for social change (Summers-Effler 2002). Such emotions are most often evoked and provoked through the creative and persuasive use of culture jammed images and of rhetoric. Creative activism is important in social movement campaigning because it can draw attention, get the message across and engage existing and new people into carrying out an intended action. Although this study is not specifically examining emotions, it does take into consideration how feelings, moral shocks and humor are utilized in blog activists’ use of rhetoric in online protest and claims-making activities during a specific protest event.
Section 3: A background on celebrity studies

Celebrity are products of capitalism, specifically of a ‘culture industry’ (Horkheimer and Adorno 2002) and the commodification of mass communications (Milner 2005). As a ‘human pseudo event’ (Boorstin 2012) celebrity involves the commodification of representation (Hurst 2005) and the construction of audiences (Marshall 1997). I draw from Turner et al. (2000: 7, 8, 9) to emphasize how celebrity can be used as a reputational tactic: Celebrity is:

[not] a property of specific individuals. Rather, it is constituted discursively, by the way in which the individual is represented… Modern celebrity, then, is a product of media representations: understanding it demands close attention to the representational repertoires and patterns employed in this discursive regime … [however] celebrity is not only a discursive effect [but it is] also a commodity: produced, traded and marketed by the media and publicity industries. In this context, the celebrity’s primary function is commercial and promotional … [therefore] celebrity is a genre of representation and a discursive effect; it is a commodity traded by the promotions, publicity, and media industries that produce these representations and their effects; and it is a cultural formation that has a social function. Turner et al., 2000: 7, 8, 9.

Celebrity is a complicated commercial and cultural product and scholars have analyzed and approached ‘celebrity’ in many ways. The sociology of celebrity literature primarily has centered on celebrity as a biographical or as a social critique on the value or harm celebrity is to our society. Meyer and Gamson (1995: 183, 184) contend that celebrity participation in social movements have not been significantly researched, particularly “the unusual roles that celebrity play in the processes of mobilization political and social resources, and in constructing collective identities.” As such, ‘celebrity’ is an adequate research subject to analyze aspects of culture and social change:

Like it or loathe it, celebrity culture is with us, it surrounds us and even invades us. It shapes our thoughts, conduct, style, and manner. It affects and is affected by not just hardcore fans but by entire populations (Cashmore 2006: 6.)
The intensification of celebrity as a societal phenomenon reflects a complex process that involves the media, market, power struggles, and internal dynamics. Celebrity is thus profoundly woven into our social fabric. In addition to being a manufactured commercial product celebrity has a social function that participates directly in the negotiations of self, group, and identity (Turner 2014). Being part of the social fabric, celebrity actively plays in the construction of identity from self to groups.

From these varied scholarly approaches to celebrity, Turner (2014) outlined three primarily components of celebrity: 1. as a way that people are represented and talked about discourse, 2. as a process, by which a person is turned into a commodity [commodity and as part of a culture manufacturing industry] and 3. an aspect of culture which is constantly being crafted.

Moreover, Ferris (2007) specifies that there are two dominant themes that can be found in the sociology of celebrity: 1. celebrity as a commodity, a product of a flawed system, and 2. celebrity as pathology, a commercial product open to public critique. This segment briefly presents a background review on how celebrity status, hierarchy, their capital, and persona play a central role in the implicit core concept identified in the data collection of this study: reputation.

**Commodity**

Although celebrity have existed throughout human history (Braudy 1986), celebrity has acquired new significance in the era of new media where the development of motion pictures marked a solidification of contemporary culture and visual images making “fame instant and ubiquitous in ways that the printed word could not match” (Rojek 2001: 128). A central feature of celebrity, whether traditional or contemporary, is the attention it wields and the ability to
convert that into some form of influence. Celebrity is more than their charismatic and appeal (Ferris 2007). There is a historical difference from those that are distinguished for their fame, heroics, or achievements to those that have achieved fame and reputation (i.e. notoriety whether positive or otherwise) due to contemporary media visibility.

According to Meyer and Gamson (1995: 184), two distinctive attributes of the contemporary celebrity are: 1. their notoriety (manufactured through a rationalized celebrity industry) and 2. the celebrity production system (which has become increasingly visible in media casting doubt on the claim that celebrity status is derived from natural, individual, personal qualities). Such characteristics were intensified in the era of alternative media by marketing and publicity industries such as the Hollywood star system (Boorstin 2012). In this vein, celebrity is the sum of these societal macro-processes which centered on the commodification of the celebrity through advertising, promotion, and publicity. Celebrities are not only products and producers of alienated labor but they also embody and personify the ideology of capitalism (Dyer 1979; Marshall 1997; Rojek 2001):

The celebrity as a public individual who participates openly as a marketable commodity serves as a powerful type of legitimation of the political economic model of exchange and value—the basis of capitalism—and extends the model to include the individual (Marshall 1997: x).

Celebrity status in the Weberian (1921/1978) sense is characterized as a status group that has prestige based on a positive reputation or high esteem (based on one’s fame, honor, notoriety, and visibility). However, unlike status groups as theorized by Weber, celebrity does not appropriate honor on their own but through the ‘celebrity industrial complex’ (Orth 2004) or also referred to as the ‘culture industry’ and or ‘public relations industry’ (Tye 1998; Gamson 1994). While celebrity status is certainly part of a celebrity’s persona, celebrity persona is a
kind of ‘human brand,’ (Thomson 2006) that is part of a branding process which is a form of
text. Becoming a media spectacle involves a
branding process that comprises intangible assets characterizing aspects of reputation (such as
credibility, image, trustworthy, etc.) which are manufactured throughout the commodification
process cultivated by fame, notoriety, and visibility.

Celebrity status in itself can be seen as a product or commodity and it serves as valuable
currency, which is subsequently being appropriated for different political causes.
However, to keep this currency valuable as is...[it also] require...to
maintaining...celebrity status on all fronts (e.g. Hollywood movies, television talk shows,
fashion, and gossip magazines) as they all reinforce each other...[through] carefully
constructed media persona that keep commanding attention (Huijser and Tay 2011: 109).

Nonetheless, a celebrity’s success and fame is not fixed and it can rapidly change (Lines
2001). Furthermore, the user-generated social networks have transformed ‘normal people’ into
online celebrity (or microcelebrities) and it has launched the careers of reality TV stars—‘being
famous for being famous’ (Marwick 2015). At the same time, alternative media has removed the
celebrity’s untouchable and mysterious status and enabled them the opportunity to directly
communicate with their fan-bases. The celebrity can also choose how they reveal themselves to
their fans (O’Brien 2014: 13).

In the escalating competition for attention in contemporary society, marketers (whether
commercial, political, and or social in the form of humanitarian aid) compete for the consumers’
ever-decreasing attention span by employing well-known spokespersons to get a brand, cause,
and or issue noticed across alternative media platforms. This intensified along with the changes
in the media industry along with new political and marketing strategies. Cooper (2008) observed
how the use celebrity as a powerful message medium by non-commercial entities increased in
the twentieth century where a celebrity’s capital served a variety of media and political propaganda agendas (Barlow 2014).

While celebrities have enjoyed a degree of autonomy they are employees in the sense that they could be bought and sold, traded, produced, managed and maintained (Marshall 1997). And as such they place great investment into impression management and performative strategies which are fundamental to their careers. Therefore celebrity can be deconstructed to contest the perceived artificialness on the authenticity of their reputation. The intent of this is to reveal the orchestrated nature of such marketed or publicity campaigns as part of a wider social or political propaganda. Corporations and celebrities alike are aware of this so they invest in the production and in the management of celebrity (who are also competing among themselves). However their status is not firmly secured in that they can overshadow a product or lose credibility (Cooper 1984) and or any negative information about a celebrity endorser can influence a consumer’s perception of a product (Till and Shimp 1995). They can lose their hierarchal position through some damage to their carefully crafted reputation. In this way, celebrity traverses a “precarious balance between celebrity as both opportunity and disappointment” illustrating “very real social tensions and power struggles in the society in which they operate” (Johansson 2006: 352).

Celebrity constitutes a status that is hierarchical and as part of the power elite as they are viewed to afford a great deal of power, wealth, and visibility (Mills 1956). Hierarchy is depended on the celebrity’s ability to amass celebrity capital and to be considered ‘special’ (Couldry 2007). Bourdieu discusses capital as “accumulated labor…it is what makes the games of society” (1986: 241). Such factors give celebrity a “perceived authority” (Bell 2011). As elites with high visibility in a mediatized society (McCracken 1986) celebrity are part of a hierarchy through their ability for recognition, to wield attention, capital, networks, and resources. Such high status
affords celebrity with agency and power, or rather influence. Gamson (1994: 62) explains how
celebrities and their publicists attempt to control the impression that a celebrity’s public persona
as an authentic self: “celebrities can be both performers and salespeople, professional impression
manager” as a means to present a manufactured social reality to their audience.

The intensification of celebrity value via the celebrity brand and the expansion of
innumerable media audiences has resulted (in accordance with television ratings such as the
Neilson ratings) ‘celebrity impact measurement systems’ (cf. Hearn and Schoenhoff 2016). Celebrity are given a ‘use value’ based on their persona, abilities, and the activities that in turn
increases their capital, status (i.e. ranked worth) and ability to generate resources and access
networks. A celebrity’s status or the value of their brands as defined by fame and notoriety are
characteristics not necessarily associated with artistry. Celebrities that engage in various public
displays of social or humanitarian support add a personality dimension comprising of perceived
compassion and caring to their persona and reputation. Such characteristics subsequently
enhance their profiles and ‘use-value.’ “As elite figures, celebrity developed the power to shape
public perception and understanding. Moreover, the magnitude of their authority has led them to
come become driving forces in major social movements.69 Their prominent role in these movements is
directly correlated to the amount of power they are given in society” (Mozes 2015, online). A
celebrity’s rank in the entertainment industry corresponds with their prestige and socio-political
status. Their worth, or exchange value, comes down to how much attention they can bring to it, a
value that is socially and symbolically constructed.

The buzz and charisma that a revered celebrity brings to production has unmistakable
economic and political implications. When a celebrity is endowed with a ‘prophet like status’
“they are ideally placed to lead campaigns and moral crusades” (Furedi 2010: 496). At the same
time, it also makes them open to criticism. Forbes (2015, online) positioned Scarlett Johansson as #65 out of the top 100 Celebrity 100 Earnings (down from #76 in 2014):

Scarlett Johansson’s reputation—and reimbursement—is on the rise. By combing popcorn fare such as “Avengers: Age of Ultron” and “Captain America” with her first major action hero role in “Lucy,” which grossed $459 million, Johansson has proven she is a box office draw. As a leading woman, she commands over $10 million a movie, while reports place her fee for forthcoming thriller “Ghost in the Shell” at $17.5 million. Johansson this year made more than any other, supplementing her money with Dolce and Gabbana and SodaStream endorsements.

Furedi (2010: 493) contends that modern society “have turned celebrity into objects of mass consumption” and their capital can be subsequently converted into other capital. Celebrity capital can be converted into economic or political capital through corporate, humanity, or other lucrative investment projects. Celebrities are products of a number of cultural and economic processes such as consumerism and mass-marketing that are all part of a celebrity-industrial complex dedicated to the fabrication of interchangeable stars (Furedi 2010: 493). However, it is important not to simply regard celebrity as an aspect of popular commercial or that its primary function is commercial and promotional (Marshall 2010; Turner 2010). Celebrity also fosters a critical consciousness. “Celebrity commodity intersects and leak, they are ideologically porous, and counter values emerges in their sign systems” (Redmond 2006: 40).

The ‘celebrity-industry’ does not completely control the construction of celebrity. Instead, the true power of ‘celeb-making’ lies with the audience (Gamson 1994: 5). As Dyer further explains “audiences cannot make media images mean anything they want to, but they can select from the complexity of the images and meanings and feelings, the variations, inflections and contradictions, that work for them” (Dyer 2004: 4). Dyer (2004) suggests that the very pursuit encourages audiences to think in terms of the truth. Subsequently, the power of celebrity resides in how much fans and audiences ascertain that these roles are authentic. Likewise, by uncovering
what is ‘real’ about the celebrity, media actors such as the Mondoweiss blog activists purport to give audiences what is “unquestionably and virtually, by definition, the truth” (Dyer 1991: 136).

Celebrity are no longer just famous for their efforts, but for their personas and how authentic they present themselves to be. Therefore, in order for celebrity endorsements to be successful representatives of a particular brand (whether commercial, humanitarian, or political) the celebrity must be knowledgeable, experienced, and qualified in order to be ‘seen’ as an ‘expert’ (Ang 1991; Turner 2014). Driessens (2013) elaborates that celebrity capital is not a special category of social or symbolic capital. Celebrity is a form of capital in its own right which has the power of convertibility into other resources such “as a specific kind of reputational capital that can be used by new ventures as a strategic asset to increase their perceived trustworthiness, credibility, reliability, responsibility, and accountability. Celebrities can be employed as endorsers for the venture or brand and also as entrepreneurs, by being involved as (part) owner, initiator or manager” (Driessens 2013: 249).

Nevertheless celebrities cannot escape extreme interest as well as criticism and scrutiny as a result of the rise of sensationalism and gossip in media (Slattery, Doremus and Marcus 2001; Wittebols 2003; Marshall 2010; Kapoor 2013). Celebrities are evaluated for authenticity which is conceptualized as characterizing trustworthiness and sincerity. These are characteristics that shape how reputation becomes an important implicit element in the celebritization process in the attention economy. As a consequence of the ‘attention economy’ (Van Krieken 2012; Tufekci 2013) attention is a scarce resource and has resulted in the blurring of entertainment and politics (Bimber 2003).

We worship celebrities because they’re simple focal points in a world in which we have too much information…the most valuable commodity in ending misery is not money or even will, but attention. And attention is the celebritgod’s lightning bolt…But at least
someone will see it. And someone will film it. And a few of us may, little by little, be moved to change it (Time Magazine quoted in Bunting 2010, online).

The media acts as a transformative agent in converting celebrity into ‘viewable spectacles’\textsuperscript{74} which is a fundamental aspect in rendering celebritiness and as a pathway to seize audiences and increase influence and profit. Celebrity participation or the visibility of their participation in a group or movement becomes a significant asset (Meyer and Gamson 1995). Likewise, politicians and corporations use celebrity appeal to leverage attention to an issue or product by shifting their tone to a more personalized and dramatized style (Gitlin 1980). Drake and Higgin’s (2006) empirical work demonstrates how movements utilized celebrity and media spectacle in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee from the 1960s and Citizen Change from 2004 and their respective slogans of \textit{black power} and \textit{Vote or Die!} in order to market voting. Kellner (2009) observed that media spectacle\textsuperscript{75} produced by the Obama presidential campaigns illustrates the increasing role of celebrity as an important mediating feature in contemporary global culture and politics (cf. Tsaliki, Frangonikolopoulos, and Huliaras 2011).

A celebrity’s brand and reputation is likewise built through a process of celebritization\textsuperscript{76} Celebrity grows larger than life qualities (i.e. high status, authority) derived from their structural roles (i.e. from movies, political and or humanitarian advocacy, etc.) but not from internal personal characteristics.\textsuperscript{77} The commodification of human brands by our consumer and mediated culture is the process by which people become things and where these “things are idolized, dreamed, adored, and followed, but manly produced and consumed” (Cashmere and Parker 2003).

Brand management is principally concerned with the consumer and uses marketing techniques for distinguishing one product from another. Although two different things, brand
image and reputation measures are strongly correlated and are often oriented in the same
direction especially in times of crises such as reputational damage\textsuperscript{78} (Bruno 2015, online).

Brand attributes include things such as quality, value, variety, and the shopping
experience. From the potential buyer’s perspective, brand is all about ‘What’s in it for
me?’… Whereas reputation on the other hand, is the entirety of the public’s perception
about a company’s corporate action. Reputation attributes include community building,
corporate culture, policy, job creation, and citizenship. The public asks and answers the
question ‘Is this company the good guys or the bad guys’ (Bruno 2015, online).

The commodification process as part of a celebrity’s persona is underscored in much of the
literature (cf. Gamson 1994; Rojek 2001; Turner 2014). As part of a “strategy of performance”
(King 1991) celebrities work to create and sustain a persona that is “committed in their on and
off screen life in the hope that by stabilizing the relationships between persona and image on the
screen they may seem to be the proprietors of a marketable person” (King 1991: 144). By the
same token, audiences are attracted more to the sensationalism of celebrity such as scandals
(based on some story, human interest, morality, or moral panics) which usually “creates a culture
of dialogue and discussion in the public sphere” (Nayar 2014: 115).

According to Nayar, this created a tabloid culture industry which is useful to understand how
celebrity, as a commodity and consumer product, is at the center of public consumption and
production that is utilized and transformed in a variety of ways for a myriad of purposes.
Whether represented as humanitarians or debated on a celebrity tabloid site “the production of a
celebrity… [is] to classify her or him as a spectacle that focuses as individual or collective
desire… [and it involves] the production of something on screen and is consumed by the
audience” (Nayar 2014: 68, 69). Of course there are limits to what audiences will accept in terms
of celebrity’s social and political activity or celebrity scandal. Celebrity traditionally has been
involved conservative or safe\textsuperscript{79} platforms in the political sphere (Prindle 1993; Meyer and
Gamson 1995; McLagan 2002). The implications of this argument are important for understanding why celebrity involvement in previously tabooed subject such as with the Israel-Palestine conflict are heavily debated and yet increasingly play a central role for persuasion in claims making and protest activities.

Given that celebrity is a ‘human brand’ they engage in impression management in their quest for appeal and the making of their ‘authentic self’ for their consumers. Because celebrity persona encompasses characteristics of authenticity and sincerity, it is important to note that the “celebrity persona is intersubjectively negotiated, in that authenticity is what an audience accepts as sincere or true (something credible or genuine), but it resides in a precarious context because given that performance, if a behavior is perceived by others as a performance then it will be judges as insincere or untrustworthy” (Jerslev 2014: 176). Additionally, “authenticity or ‘do-gooding’ is “one way of producing and reproducing celebrity, an instrument of distinction, a means of developing…capital, a means of solidifying the fan base a means of the continuous reproduction or a sellable, likeable person” (Jerslev 2014: 175). According to Rudinow (1994: 129): “authenticity is a value—a species of the genus credibility. It’s the kind of credibility that comes from having the appropriate relationship to an original source.” Jerslev (2014: 177) employs Brockington’s (2011) four criteria that are used for evaluating the authenticity of celebrity humanitarian: 1. expert authority (knowledge and experience), 2. affinity or similarity with others (being represented as ‘ordinary like everyone else’), 3. empathy (shared emotions with others as a result of personal experiences), and 4. sympathy (emotion provoked by the other’s fate). Jerslev (2014) contends that the strongest authentification criterion is expert authority or witnessing.
Rojek (2001:11) describes celebrity performance as a “presentation of self [that] is always a staged activity.” Goffman’s (1959) ideas can be applied to celebrity’s presentation of self. A celebrity’s ‘front stage’ performance is manufactured to appear as a personal and unplanned ‘back stage’ encounter, or rather a ‘staged authenticity.’ So as some celebrities attempt to present their public persona as their true selves (Gamson 1994), the back stage is no longer behind the scenes, but just another part of their performance. According to Gamson (1994: 191), “critics have warned that these practices pose dangers to informed participation in decisions that matter, that democratic choice requires authentic voices.” At the same time, most audiences and celebrity fans are skeptical concerning the genuineness of celebrity representations and are quick to expose the constructed pretense where they find it (Gamson 1994; Žižek 2012). Therefore the enterprise to discredit a celebrity by unmasking the celebrity’s ‘staged authenticity’ and expose to audiences/consumers how they were duped and that celebrity was being used to obscure some true aspect of reality.

Pathology

Scholarly analyses from Boorstin (2012/1961) to Richey and Ponte (2011) have sought to undermine the authority of the celebrity spectacle by exposing new aspects of its production and the underlying realities that it attempts to obfuscate. A celebrity pathology approach conceptualizes celebrity as a human brand in the form of endorsements or media spectacles, which are the object and vehicle for consumption and as such represent a larger media and market strategy. Elaborating on this critical view of celebrity, Cashmore constructs celebrity as a replacement of a god, as an opiate to the masses. The ‘celebrity as pathology’ paradigm posits that the culture and power of celebrity serves as a metaphor for everything that is bad about
contemporary society (Ferris 2007; Ferris and Harris 2011). By highlighting the insidious aspects of individualism and capitalism, celebrity is approached as pathology or ‘disease’ representing a ‘distasteful’ product of capitalism, consumerism, and individualism. In all of their manifestations the celebrity is a symbol of evil, corruption, and an otherwise contemptible figure. It is like a disease that should be shunned (Ferris 2007).

I am not arguing on behalf of the position that celebrity ‘is’ something bad and or harmful to our society, but the pathological view of celebrity is considered to present a context on how celebrity is perceived, evaluated, and thus contested. Such a view provides explanatory power to understanding how criticism about celebrity politics and humanitarianisms is applied to Johansson by Mondoweiss blog activists’ editorial critique of her contradictory ambassadorships. Celebrity is after all based on ‘Fama’ the Roman goddess of fame and rumor. The ensuing declining economic state of contemporary society has given way to a societal narrative on the anxiety and fears about downward mobility and increasing demands for democratic, social and political solutions (Furedi 2010). At the same time, this has coincided with suspicions on all authority forms creating the ‘disenchantment of the so call authority figure.’ Celebrity is often recycled as moral and social leaders who possess the authority to ‘influence’ people about how to conduct their life. As such “the outsourcing of conventional authority to celebrity represents one of the most disturbing developments in public life” (Furedi 2010: 496).

**Celebrity as a site of discourse and critique**

Cashmore (2006: 4) asserts that celebrity “take the role of the prisoners inside the ‘panopticon’ prison, [where they] are constantly subject to inspection.” When celebrities are expected to uphold cultural/ societal morals, norms, and values, they are manufactured as part of
a greater morality tale. But this makes them easily accessible and visible targets open to criticism as they are always being watched and evaluated. According to Meyer and Gamson (1995: 184) “celebrities’ standing as authentic, and their motives for public action (are they expressing themselves genuinely or performing themselves manipulatively?) are always in question.” Consequently, unmasking authority has become a fashionable enterprise that resonates with popular culture (Furedi 2010: 494). The authority a celebrity represents is constantly being contested for their sincerity and authenticity (Trilling 1972).

As a site of discourse celebrity works like ‘signs’ as part of semiotic systems embedded with cultural meanings to be actively read and interpreted by their audiences (Dyer 1979). Celebrity is not “a property of specific individuals. Rather it is constituted discursively, by the way in which the individual is represented” (Turner et al., 2000: 11). Dyer argues that we read celebrity as text and these texts are both ideologically saturated and discursively constructed. Marshall extends According to Marshall (1997: 65), Dyer’s analysis of celebrity as “an embodiment of a discursive battleground on the norms of individuality and personality within culture. The celebrity’s strength or power as a discourse on the individual is operationalized only in terms of the power and position of the audience that has allowed it to circulate.”

Therefore, crossing the boundary between the public and private worlds (Rojek 2001) the function of ‘gossip about celebrity’ (i.e. deconstruction: evaluation, criticism, contestation) becomes “an arena for testing and working through various social norms” (van Krieken 2012: 109). ‘Celebrity gossip’ is an important social practice and process where relationships, identity, and cultural and social norms are debated, evaluated, modified, and shared (Turner et al., 2000). As such, celebrity is not only a pathway for media attention and personal aspiration (Turner
but it is also a site for discussion where cultural meanings are contested, negotiated, and organized (Marshall 1997).

**Celebrity industry: celebrity at the intersection of idolatry and criticism**

The defining characteristic of celebrity is that it is essentially a media production and its usage is largely confined to the twentieth century (Giles 2000: 3). It is imperative for culture industries to manufacture their celebrity as a protagonist because it affords them with the characteristics that can be evaluated for authority and authenticity. Because celebrities are well known and have many followers and fans, celebrity can be an easy pathway to introduce or disseminate information or products to a larger audience. This has led some celebrities to seek alternative means of publicity. As a result, the celebrity industry is one in which marketing and public relations dominate in the pursuit of public attention for profit.

The spectacular rise of private philanthropy efforts is paralleled with the use of celebrity for visibility and reputation legitimization on part of wealthy individuals, businesses, etc. (cf. Kapoor 2013). Such enterprises structure itself based on the model of the market in the interest of enhanced ‘efficiently’ (Holmes 2012). There is a whole industry based on celebrity activism such as the *Global Philanthropy Group* (which also adds to celebrity worth or capital, and in turn their hierarchical celebrity status. The result of which is to sustain “the paradoxical idea that capitalist markets are the answer” to these complex issues or social problems (Büscher 2012: 12). In service to this production of fantasy celebrity promotion helps to mobilize support for causes by centering on splashy, sensational-filled spectacle supporting the win-win narrative (Brockington 2009). This is intended to invoke the cause “as exciting, exotic, and glamorous—as ‘sexy’” (Sullivan 2011: 335).
Social activism, particularly humanitarianism, is considered a modern form of currency in Hollywood and it serves a major role in forming the public persona of the celebrity. Politics is increasingly observed as a partaking in a type of entertainment business which is based on a celebrity’s currency through their fame and performances\(^87\) (Marshall 1997; Street 2003; Kapoor 2013; Turner 2014). Tolson (2001) linked celebrity performance to certain kinds of moral credibility and one way to do this is through a joint venture with corporations\(^88\) who simultaneously are looking to expand their reputations and product brands and benefit from celebrity in gaining validation and legitimacy (O’Brien 2014). However, celebrity also resides at the intersection of idolatry and criticism. While there are many positive achievements made by celebrity, many criticize this phenomenon and are skeptical of celebrities who utilize activism to further their careers.

When celebrities enter humanitarian, political and or social movement activities, they bring with them the peculiar dynamics and concerns of the notoriety industry (Meyer and Gamson 1995: 184). This means that celebrity authenticity and their performative motives for public action, attention and consumption are always in question. Civil discourses can become diluted with the blurring of entertainment and politics as audiences become subdued to the short sound bites delivered by celebrities intending to convey complex information and issues. Assessing celebrity advocacy and their role and engagement with politics is important because the blurring of entertainment and politics as Brockington and Hensen (2014: 2) affirms, “it is a way of doing politics… [therefore] it is important to consider how publics are responding to the opportunities for political participation which celebrity advocates present to them.”
Celebrity politics and humanitarianism

Alternative media has blurred the lines between entertainment and politics where the celebrity has become orchestrated into viral terms and the meanings and values attributed to their authority has changed (Street 2004). Furthermore, the contemporary celebrity is most likely identified with causes which are then carried over into political arenas (Meyer and Gamson 1995). As demonstrated in recent political campaigns in both the United States and England (cf. Furedi 2010) “celebrity and politics are like Siamese twins, for the simple reason that both are about visibility, recognition and esteem; where popular politics and any approximation of democracy, there shall celebrity be” (van Krieken 2012: 109). Gaining power and authority is increasingly dependent on the ability to construct and maintain a well-crafted and appropriate persona in an ‘image management’ process in order to affect emotional resonance, which through audience recognition and legitimacy directs attention. As part of their ‘celebrity performance’ politicized celebrities work to provide credible endorsements for partisan and issue-driven campaigns (Street 2004).

Celebrities who work for partisan and issue-driven campaigns must create a persona that invokes their own credibility and authority which then gets conferred onto the cause to which they are associated (Pleios 2011; Street 2004). In turn, celebrity is viewed as something authentic and effective the closer they are associated with politics (Cooper 2016). They then use resources and their networks to demonstrate authenticity in order to get the attention and sympathy of the audiences they seek, and to protect themselves from retribution should they alienate their audiences (Collins 2007: 186). Because of their celebrity capital and the attention it can attract (Rabidoux 2009), celebrities are moving beyond simply appearing at public event or campaign, or lending their image in a commercial to support a political candidate. Historically
celebrities’ had only given their name and fame to organizations. However, throughout the 20th
century celebrities are increasingly taking a more active role in the dissemination the values of
the campaign itself in order to provide credibility to external politics and validation to internal
audiences (Brownstein 2011).

**Humanitarian endorsers**

Cooper (2007) characterizes celebrity humanitarians as enthusiastic amateurs but also as
master manipulators. “Compared to other endorsers, famous people achieve a higher level of
attention and recall. They increase awareness of a company’s advertising and create positive
feelings towards brands and are perceived by consumers as more entertaining…using celebrity in
advertising is therefore likely to positively affect consumer’s brand attitude and purchase
effective communication” are two most important mantras guiding brand success in today’s
competitive marketing environments. Corporations that decide to employ a celebrity to promote
its products or service have a choice of using celebrity as (Khatri 2006: 27): 1. testimonial,89 2.
endorsement,90 3. actor celebrity may be asked to present a product or service as part of a
character enactment,91 and 4. spokesperson-celebrity who represents a brand or company over an
extended period of time.92

On the other hand, there is no guarantee that any celebrity could positively persuade
consumers based on their celebrity only. Celebrities’ influence not only audiences and markets,
but also the commodities and brands attached to them. Research in marketing have found that
there are times when negative attributes of a celebrity can transfer over to the product a celebrity
is endorsing.93 So it is with great care that companies utilize marketing strategies that center on a
set of characteristics that have been identified to effectively communicate persuasive information that creates a high degree of certainty for consumers.

Summarizing a collection of empirical work which found a relationships between celebrity endorsements and brands, Schlecht (2003) outlines four leading endorsement advertising strategies to positively influence consumer brand attitudes and preferences: 1. source credibility and attractiveness (the effectiveness of a message depends on the perceived expertise and trustworthiness of an endorser), 2. the match-up hypothesis (the congruency between celebrity endorsers and brands to explain the effectiveness of using a famous person to promote their brands, 3. the meaning transfer model (the transferability of the meanings associated with the celebrity becomes associated with the brands), and 4. the principles of multiple product and celebrity endorsement (some celebrities are endorsing several brands or a specific brand is endorsed by different spokesperson). According to Schlecht (2003), these strategies could justify the high costs associated with this form of advertising under the right circumstances. It is in these ways that “celebrity can also be thought as an audience-gathering mechanism, critical to the project of commercial popular cultural production” (Collins 2007: 183).

Focusing on celebrity humanitarian as a media construction, Jerslev (2014) examined celebrity Angelina Jolie as an example on how information about her humanitarian work is transformed and translated as a means for critique by users in an online celebrity site. “There is no doubt that celebrities are able to draw the world society’s attention to global injustices. Nonetheless, how much change celebrities’ charity work actually instigates is a contested issue” (Jerslev 2014: 172). Jerslev examines how the construction and public critique of the celebrity persona and reputation relies on strategies of authentication. As one of the few celebrities to
achieve an ‘authentic celebrity humanitarian status,’ the empirical work on Angelina Jolie presents as a useful point of reference.98

Expanding on Brockington’s (2011) claims “that authenticity is the single most contested issue in debates about celebrities as goodwill ambassadors, their relationships with NGOs, their intervention and development causes, etc.” … [Jerslev 2014: 172] maintains that authenticity is a relationship and discursive endeavor and is therefore always negotiated in specific contexts.” And this is why celebrity humanitarians work hard in communicative and performative strategies and to construe “an altruistic self that is compatible with the ethos of humanitarianism” (Chouliaraki 2012: 7). Brand making and maintenance is of particular importance in the realm of humanitarian politics. Perceived as part of a ‘moral economy’ celebrities are subject to strict public evaluation (Aaltola 2009; Douzinas 2007) and they are subsequently expected to uphold their culture’s morals and values at all times (Jones and Schumann 2000). Ellis noted that this is a reflection of a cultural shift in which celebrity have assumed a moral authority among target audiences which were ‘once associated with charismatic leaders’ (Cashmore 2006: 218). According to Jerslev (2014: 184), “as players outside the field of entertainment […] and because of their contribution to a powerful Western media industry, their presence on the international stage of political discussion of inequality can hardly avoid being contested.”

Section 4: Empirical case studies regarding social movements and online activism

The relationship between social movements and alternative media is not a causal one. As observed in the Arab Spring and Occupy Wall Street movements in 2011, it “makes clear that the space of flows was primarily the space of capital and that the logic of common places can be a global and networked logic of resistance” (Fuchs 2014: 124). However, scholars have raised
valid concerns and issues about the ownership of mediated platforms and collective decision making, the exploitation of users, censorship, threats, privacy concerns, and government surveillance (Fuchs 2014). Additionally, the ‘digital divide’ may be furthering inequality and reinforcing traditional social stratification by class, gender, and race (Marwick 2013). It is important to stress that alternative media is not a solid guarantee for citizen engagement, decision-making, and or participation; nor is it a replacement for traditional mobilization and organization.

Even though the Arab Spring and Occupy Wall Street movements were not directly caused by alternative media, it did help to facilitate protest activities by altering the landscape and allowing individuals to create a ‘shared awareness’ (Shirky 2011). It also engaged people into contentious politics with a different set of rules and it changed the way news regarding protest was produced and consumed (Clark 2012; Lim 2012). Therefore as argued by Jenkins, this ‘participatory culture’ is about considering the ways individuals and groups are engaging with the world around them in creative and expressive ways. The rise of digital knowledge based on a greater contribution and construction of information by users seems to contribute to an increased democratic participation in social life and the making of new forms of community (Katerelos and Tskeris 2014). The following are some empirical examples to the ways alternative media has been used for facilitating movement mobilization and online activism.

Alternative media can be used to frame grievances and evoke emotions to generate mobilization and to form a collective identity. Given that alternative media is embedded in society, Downing (2001) explains how alternative media can stimulate political discourse by evoking emotions to mobilize people into protest. As demonstrated by the Tunisian protests, bloggers circumvented national media blackouts by brokering information to the international
mainstream media (notably Al Jazeera) by providing information about the situation inside Tunisia. The activity acted as the catalyst\textsuperscript{100} to evoking emotional and moral grievances among the populace. This illustrates how SNSs platforms can not only inform users about the prospects of certain events, but inducing others to protest and engage in disobedience and civil uprisings.

As such, alternative media affords activists the tools and platform to expose their grievances and produce content that evokes emotions to go ‘viral.’ Berger and Milkman (2010) demonstrate how anger and anxiety induced by and transmitted through alternative media were key forces in driving social action and mobilization during the Tunisian revolution (i.e. emotional mobilization).\textsuperscript{101} In this way, more recent studies have shifted the focus towards emotional motives that relate to beliefs about society (Goodwin, Jasper, and Polletta 2001; Jasper and Poulsen 1995; Jasper 1998; Oliver and Johnston 2000). People can be motivated to engage in protest out of a sense of moral indignation provoked by an emotional response to an aggravating situation.

However, grievances alone do not always lead to the emergence or creation of a social movement. According to Meyer (1995: 173), resource mobilization theory holds that grievances are ‘ubiquitous and constantly’ occurring in society. Therefore, as part of the mobilizing structure, alternative media affords social movements the resources and organizational ability to network and mobilize people into protest (Ghannam 2011; Shirky 2011). The Zapatista rebellion in Chiapas Southern Mexico (1994) is often regarded as one of the first incidences when a powerless group utilized alternative media to communicate grievances and to harness international attention. As demonstrated by Cleaver (1998) the movement illustrates the mobilizing power (for resources, organizational and network strength) of alternative media.
Likewise, through an examination on the participants, activities, and political context of the Battle of Seattle (1999) Smith (2001) illustrates how transnational mobilizing structures (afforded by alternative media) shaped the organizational leadership, strategies, and tactics that organizers adopted in their protest activities. In the same vein, Breuer, Landman, and Farquhar (2010) present evidence from the Tunisian revolution that alternative media was a significant resource for protest mobilization. They concluded that alternative media transcended geographical and socio-economic imbalances to enable a national collective identity unified in protest against the unpopular regime. The internet was the basis upon which popular grievances were articulated, but it also acted as a resource for collective action.

According to Cammaerts, the “ultra-saturated media and communication environment” (2012: 122) also affords movements with unique opportunities for activists. Introducing the ‘mediation opportunity structure’ (Cammaerts 2012) Cammaerts posits that while there are objective constraints with alternative media, activist can better control the means of communication as new opportunities emerge or can be created. Conventional media has gatekeepers and other factors which often made it impossible for marginalized groups to communicate grievances and to use as opportunities to mobilize. In many ways alternative media is unrestrictive and give citizens opportunity to express themselves when ‘forcible repression’ occurs. In this way, as a viable ‘political’ platform, alternative media are used to challenge the status quo in many parts of the world (O’Rourke 2011). This was demonstrated during the 2011 Egyptian Revolution (cf. Chebib and Sohail 2011). Because of its accessibility and speed, alternative media and related mobile technologies acted as a catalyst and as a platform in creating opportunities for collective action to revolt against the status quo.
These empirical studies are just a few examples on how alternative as a tool to frame and mobilize grievances, recruit participants, organize, network and protest claims and grievances, and induces a desire for change and to challenge a status quo. Alternative media also presents groups with opportunities to punctuate the structure and protest when other opportunity structures (conventional media or via the government or state) are closed. Therefore, it is important to link external factors with internal activists’ dynamics in an examination of claims-making protest activities.

This section attempted to provide a background on how contemporary social movements use alternative media as an effective tool and space to create new forms of global activism. Land (2009) observed a maturation of the field that links with the professionalization of human rights advocacy, which is also playing a greater role in competing for the public’s attention. There is power in the space of flows. By finding ways to control information and engage in transformative meaning making practices, these groups are establishing a well-known reputation as legitimate movement actors among the public. The emergence of alternative media has altered conventional media structures and opportunity contexts. Rather than a few channels there are now multiple flows. This enables groups to find ways to compete and share information about their claims and grievances and possibly mobilize supporters into action. It also empowers people to overcome their fears and to create a ‘togetherness’ that cultivates collective action (Hansen, Bramsen, and Nielsen 2012: 63). It is important to stress that this transformative potential of networked activism lies not in the technology but in the actions it fosters. Scholars assert that the power of alternative media lies in its ability to generate small changes via aspects of culture that makes it possible for larger changes to come into fruition (Atkinson 2007).
The scholarship has primarily examined the role of alternative media as a tool and platform for online activism. Additionally, despite the connection made between the arts and wider social movements, there have actually been few attempts to link conceptually and empirically to what Becker (1976) called ‘artistic mavericks’ who go against the conventional art world by creating new ways of working and challenging social norms, especially in online environments. Although this dissertation is not focusing on the actual use or role of alternative media (except that it is the field site where data is extrapolated and analyzed), I do consider how alternative media affords activists, communities, tools and platforms in unique ways as opposed to what occurs in offline protest activities or sites.

Section 5: The social construction of protest and claims making activities

I rely upon the ideas of symbolic interaction generally and the social constructionist approach to social movements in particular. A constructionist approach emphasizes that the social world is comprised of shared meanings rather than objective truths. The study of symbolic interaction is most concerned with understanding the ways in which individuals and groups interact in society to create, sustain, and transform meaning. According to Holstein and Miller, unlike structural based theories constructionists examine “the ways in which social conditions, cultural ideals, and the discrepancies between them are socially constructed.” Holstein and Miller (2003: 3) explain that the social constructionist perspective has been controversial because it “breaks with conventional and commonsensical conceptions of social problems by viewing them as definitional social processes.” They contend that social problems are “not distinctive and inherently immoral conditions; they are definitions of, and orientations to, putative conditions that are argued to be inherently immoral or unjust” (Holstein and Miller 2003: 3).
Likewise, protests are political expressions of a group’s perception of a social problem which Spector and Kitsuse (1977: 76) contends involves “claims-making and responding activities.” Claims-making activities “reflect substantive concerns on the part of participants, but analytically we take those claims to be reflective of the interplay between their moral sensibilities and the dynamics of the process itself, that is, the sociology of social problems” (Ibarra and Kitsuse 2003: 23). Moreover, “the constructionist conception of the claims-making process accepts members’ constructions of putative conditions as “objects in the world” that are amenable to investigation as “products” of communicative processes.” (Ibarra and Kitsuse 2003: 19). A protest fundamentally “seeks to bring about social or political change by influencing knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors or the public or the policies or an organization or institutions. Protests often take the form of overt public displays, demonstrations, and civil disobedience, but may also include covert activities such as petitions, boycotts/buycotts, lobbying, and various online activities” (McLeod 2011, online).

Although the contemporary BDS and Palestinian movements are characteristic of new social movements, I am not examining movements at an organizational or macro level or the outcome of movement activities. Instead, I am examining the claims-making and protest activities as constructed and practiced by a specific virtual community. I draw from social movement theories important concepts and ideas from creative activism, perceived opportunity, and framing processes to help understand the construction of a social problem and how it was transformed into drama and sustained throughout the protest event. According to Ibarra and Kitsuse (2003: 19):

attention to the claims-making process… [starts with] the participants’ descriptions of the putative conditions and their assertions about their problematic character, that is, the members’ definitions. From this methodological stance the research turns to a number of process-oriented questions: how does definitions emerge and shift over time, how they
variously express the members’ conceptions of “the problem,” how they are pressed as claims and to whom, what resources are mobilized, in light of what constraints and considerations, and so forth. The constructionist conception of the claims-making process accepts members’ constructions of putative conditions as “objectives in the world” that are amenable to investigation as “products” of communicative processes.

Claims making activities play a central role in the construction of protest. However, my research involves more than claims-making activities and the following provides background information to: the conceptualization of contemporary social movements as networks; an elaboration of campaigns and critical events; an explanation of perceived threats opportunity; the making of an antagonist identity; and a background explanation of components of creative activism (humor and playful elements in dramatic protest). These areas enriched the study and my conceptualization of key literature ideas which inevitably guided my data analysis.

**Conceptualizing social movements as networks**

The dominant social movement paradigms have been presented but it is important to clarify how social movements and specifically campaigns are conceptualized in this dissertation. Building on the working definition of social movements introduced at the beginning of the chapter, I take into consideration the globalizing and technological changes to describe the phenomena of social movement activities constructing claims and protesting outside of the state structure and mainstream media outlets. Contemporary social movements such as the BDS and Palestinian movements can be better conceptualized as part of “a network of informal interactions between a plurality of individuals, groups, and/ or organizations, engaged in a political or cultural conflict on the basis of a shared collective identity” (Diani 1992: 13).

As communities of meanings, networks shape individual perceptions which form the basis for the ultimate decision to mobilize and act. This resonates with Castell’s concepts of the
networked society and Kahn and Kellner’s (2004) emphasis on the importance of virtual public spheres in initiating and sustaining momentum for social movement activity. Conceptualizing movements as networks helps us to better understand the relationship between movements, groups and individuals, and why spatial locations and online platforms such as blogs are significant locations for empirical examination of contemporary protest activities. As a network movement, the BDS and Palestinian movements maintain connections with a myriad of groups and individuals who utilize alternative media to deploy movement campaigns. The Internet, in particular mediated communication, offers the opportunity for the launching and sustaining of movement campaigns (which are easily accessible from websites and social media forums) and facilitated protest events on a scale and speed previously unheard of (Rheingold 1993, Myers 1994, Boncheck 1995).

The focus on networks shift traditional social movement scholarship beyond the study of movements based on a singular organizational structure to how networks have become the primary form of organization and structure of contemporary social movements (Castells 1996). According to Tilly (2004), one of the main components of social movements are campaigns, which are the long-term, organized public efforts that make collective claims on target authorities. This dissertation is focusing on the claims-making activities as constructed and practiced by a particular virtual community which draws from a movement campaign the framework to protest and shape rhetoric through the use of editorials and images.

**Campaigns and critical events**

In effort to implement the goals of the wider respective social movement, organizations run strategic campaigns. Such campaigns are comprised of a stream of deliberate decision and
actions known as tactics, which are “effective means to attain independent ends” (Jasper 1997: 235). According to Taylor and Van Dyke (2004: 263), the study of social movements is “not as groups or organizations but as clusters of contentious interactive performances or protest events.” In the end, social movements are about people making choices about how to use their skills, time, and resources.

Protests are often initiated by a critical event. A critical event is “a ramified sequence of emotional occurrences that results in the transformation of the dynamics of collective action…[and they] do so by dramatizing the relationships among movement activists, publics, and opponents. Such relationships compel action” (Yang 2005: 80). Critical events therefore serve as a “mechanism that allows for the presentation of information and its transmission from a sender to a receiver” (Price 2008: 87). These types of events are loaded with symbolism that offer “the orientation of national and global political systems and processes, and the ideological assumptions and operation that underpin them” (Hayes and Karamichas 2012: 2).

Lahusen asserts that focusing on the level of campaigns is important in social movement research because it is in the campaign activity and protest performances (or what he calls ‘protest simulacra’) where one can analyze the complex and dynamic interplays between the micro and macro processes of a social movement’s collective action and mobilization. As he demonstrated in his empirical study on celebrities and social movement’s ‘Rock For a Cause,’ campaigns served as a political frame that constituted collective action (through information, persuasion, and socialization) via entertainment channels. Campaigns not only inform and socialize potential supporters into mobilization, but they also provide platforms for generating awareness and discussion.
Movement campaigns targeting corporations intensified with the rise and increased use of alternative media and the celebritization of campaigns since the 1990s (Klein 2000). According to Klein (2000) what gives campaigns their power is the vulnerability of a corporate brand. Such recognized brands become a pathway to expose corporate practice when the carefully cultivated imagery of the brand is undermined. Campaigns that target corporations use their brands and organizational reputation as a rhetorical strategy to bring attention to issues as disagreement is transformed into distaste.

Social movement theory rightly addresses issues of resources, of ideologies, of networks, and of tactics, but social movements also depend upon reputation. Through the ability to establish a reputation movements and their opponents make moral character central to organizational credibility. We feel comfortable judging people, perhaps more so than their ideas. As a result, debates over war and peace become a battleground for reputational politics” (Fine 2009: 102).

This shifts the focus of research from examining social movements at an organizational level or specific political contexts to how meaning-making or specifically, claims-making activities affect possibilities for social change. It requires the unpacking of a single protest event which consists of contentious performances and focusing on the action and interaction inside them (e.g. Tilly 2008). By focusing on a social movement’s campaign as a case study one can understand the praxis of claims-making and responding protest activities, how a movement provides a path or opportunity for participatory appeals, and how the use of ‘rhetoric’ influences public communication and collective action. As “social dramas of symbolic struggles,” campaigns reveal the strategies of a movement’s meaning production—how actors perceive and define the situation in order to communicate and achieve campaign purpose and goals.
Perceived threat opportunities

Perceived opportunities are based on actors’ interpretations of a specific situation and then respond by creating an opportunity to justify political contention for action (Kurzman 1996). It is based on a public’s awareness of opportunities for successful protest activity versus a structural opportunity perspective which considers political opportunities as more limited to the state. Underscoring the central point in their discussion of movement development and activity “movements may largely be born of environmental opportunities, but their fate is shaped by their own actions” (McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1996: 15). Although empirical research has demonstrated how opportunity structures can influence mobilization and the sustainability (i.e. through cycle of protest) of movements, this study is taking the approach that movement actors are actively constructing their own opportunities through the affordance of movement campaigns. Opportunity structures imply that although favorable situations (in terms of some institutional or structural control or limitation to allies, information, and resources) may present themselves in a way that affords movement actors to respond and protest with a reasonable amount of control and with possible gains. They are nonetheless still are faced with certain limitations.

Campaigns provide activists with a framework and potential cultural symbols. The BDS campaign against SodaStream present movement actors within the network the means to find or create opportunities to protest when it comes to do with anything involving SodaStream. Protests are often defined by some spectacular event based on some perceived injustice or egregious issue made by the campaign target, in this case SodaStream. Although protest itself is a tactic, protest events, i.e., critical events, are “spectacular incidences… [b]ut they are only one component of the whole process of emerging collective action. Their effects depend on how these changes
impinge [i.e. turning points] on individual incentives to collective political action” (Opp 2009: 120). Mondoweiss blog activists’ constructed controversy over the announcement and subsequent protest was based on a perceived opening from the BDS campaign target.

In the case when institutional means to protest are closed in the political structure, activists can find ways to create a political opening to protest. Consequently “movements sometimes succeed in forcing public attention on issues by creating or exploiting critical, often unexpected events. Various types of events can focus attention on issues and provide impetus for social movement mobilization” (Meyer and Staggenborg 1996: 1638). As such, “movement activists not only generate some of these critical events, but they also play a large role in creating the climate in which certain events are deemed momentous” (Meyer and Staggenborg 1996: 1638).

Thus, a perceived threat opportunity implies that movement actors can actively construct an opportunity to protest in a political context of a perceived threat; even when the risks to do so may be high or risky. While they may lose more than they gain, they can actually be unbounded from the constraints often faced by institutional political opportunity structures. They can therefore take more risks because they have nothing to lose.

In this way, constructing a critical event surrounding a perceived threat can be used as opportunity to subvert conventional openings in the political structures and they can use it to produce drama for action and mobilization. A political threat opportunity provides conceptual weight to understanding why the celebrity was perceived as a threat and antagonistic to the wider movement’s cause.
The making of a campaign antagonist target

Identity is constructed from how we see ourselves (self-identity) and how others see us (social identity) through our interactions with others. Although identity is shaped at the micro-level, it is claimed and contested against the “histories and cultures of the individuals and societies that they belong to” (Norris 2005: 185). Identity is also constructed or reconfigured within the context of the society to which they belong. Social movements can sustain solidarity and campaign protest activities by “creating oppositional knowledge and engaging in resistance activities. Often there are deeply held oppositional narratives that are called on consistently to create consonance” (Woehrle et al., 2008: 123). Moreover, movement actors play an important role in use and spread of ‘ideological framing’ and ‘meaning construction’ (Diani 1992: 7) during claims-making activities.

As part of their framing activities, movement actors strategically deploy identities to further movement goals (cf. Bernstein 1997; Armstrong and Bernstein 2008). According to Van Dijk (1998: 25), when conflicting group or movement interests are involved such as with the creation of a critical event, identities tend to be fashioned in ‘us and them’ polarizations to help communicate claims, and generate collective action and mobilization. These polarized identities represent the ‘in-group’ members (supporters or allies) and the out-group members (opposing groups and their allies). The in-group utilizes positive representations but deploys negative representations for the out-group. Examining these polar categories can unravel the norms and values being violated (van Dijk 1998) which plays a role in shaping moral panics.

This study examines how the SodaStream announcement was perceived as a threat and how celebrity was immediately constructed as an antagonist character to communicate movement claims and generate attention about the campaign. The antagonist identity plays an
important role because blog activists can attribute ‘blame to shame’ by providing supporting
evidence to their critique of her reputation as a celebrity humanitarian; in addition to validating
their initial suspicions that her rhetoric and motives are similar to SodaStream the company she
supports and represents. The blog activists use this reconfigured antagonist identity to articulate
that this new target is not just a perceived threat but also harmful for the movement and thus
rightfully discredited.

However, these tactics can be polarizing at the same time. Given that claims-making
rhetoric often changes over time if claims makers may discover that their initial arguments aren’t
effective, they may modify their claims in search for language or images that will be credible.
This means that the social problems process is interactive, and as such claims makers must attend
to their audiences’ reactions just as the audiences responds to claims. Framing helps to provide
understanding on how blog activists transform the celebrity humanitarian identity to one that is
antagonistic to the wider movement’s cause. However, it is not enough to simply label Johansson
as the “Face of Apartheid” and to critique her reputation as a celebrity humanitarian. The blog
activists need to produce drama and evidence that not only supports their identifying of the
celebrity from a celebrity humanitarian to someone who is justifiably antagonistic to the wider
movement’s cause, but someone who shares the similar culpabilities as the campaign’s main
target: SodaStream.

Drama needs to resonate with movement frames and therefore incorporate moral shocks in
order to help organize experience, meaning making activities that guide action surrounding the
critique on the celebrity’s reputation as a humanitarian. Drama involves rhetoric and images that
are creatively crafted to arouse feelings and actions (Goodwin and Jasper 2006: 621).
Marginalized people become upset when they perceive situations or outcomes as unfair and
place that blame to a target (Goodwin and Jasper 2006). Additionally, coupled with injustice frames, “moral shock” is often deployed to “get at the anger and outrage that can sometimes trigger political action in response to information or events that disrupt one’s ontological security…[and] mediating factors probably include the attribution of blame; construction of heroism, villainy, and victimhood, sheer hatred, fury, and revenge” (Goodwin and Jasper 2006: 630). There is a ‘moral anger’ that so often leads to collective action and mobilization (Gamson et al., 1982). The central activity of blame is to fuse emotion and cognition. This is a central activity of movement groups (Goodwin and Jasper 2006: 629).

These mechanisms are important for understanding how public presentations of celebrity identity (specifically her reputation as a celebrity humanitarian) were crafted and strategically deployed for critique by blog activists. Using dramas as a means of critique has been “a propaganda construct [that] has certainly been part of public discourse for a very long time” (Jowett and O’Donnell 2006: 280) specifically when it centers on a ‘hero-against-villain-struggle’ for describing some perpetual conflict arising from polar symbolic constructs (Jowett and O’Donnell 2006: 278). In this way, the construction of an antagonist character “is central to social movements because it constructs agency, shapes [us versus them identity constructs], and motivates action” (Ganz 2001: 3). Goffman’s (1959) conceptualizes social action as a cultural performance or rather:

the social process by which actors, individually or in concert, display for others the meaning of their social situation. This ‘meaning’ that they as social actors, consciously or unconsciously wish to have others believe. In order for their display to be effective, actors must offer a plausible performance, one that leads those to whom their actions and gestures are directed to accept their motives and explanation as a reasonable account (Alexander 2006: 32).
At the end of the day, movement actors themselves create systems of meaning that shape individual and collective action. It is important “not [to] view social movements merely as carriers of extant ideas and meanings that stand in isomorphic relationships to structural arrangements and/or unanticipated events. Rather, we see movement organizations and actors as actively engaged in the production and maintenance of meaning for constituents, antagonists, and bystanders or observers” (Benford and Snow 2000: 613).

Social movement scholars had traditionally ignored the interpretive work of activists and focused instead on more structural matters of resources and opportunities. Appreciating the role of creative activism requires attention to protest performances: “who is telling the story, with whom they are interacting, where and when stories are told… [in these ways] social movements are not merely reconfigured networks and redeployed resources” (Ganz 2001: 10). A symbolic interaction insight helps to provide a background context to the understanding of dramatic techniques employed in creative activism. Dramatic techniques produce dramatic effects, which are emotion effects designed to “evoke the appropriate emotion or mood” (Benford and Hunt 1995: 90). Movement activists do this “by creating scenes or situations to embarrass or shame the opponents. They may also target the emotions of participants and audiences by staging emotionally stirring scenes” (Yang 2005: 83).

**Components of creative activism: Humor and playful elements in dramatic protest**

Of course there is a risk when targeting and constructing celebrities as antagonist so they have to be appropriate for the given context. If the tactic violates certain boundaries few potential adherents are gained and many supporters can be alienated. An innovative form of tactic is to present claims and demands in an artful way that can generate a lot of attention. Laughter and
ridicule can weaken authority and elites and reduce their ability to compel obedience or to defend themselves. Humor and satire, either through rhetoric or images, are techniques of nonviolent directed action which involves strategies decision-making processes. By violating cultural taboos in strategic ways, humor and satire can provoke reactions without alienating current or potential supporters. “Acts of audacity proved to be the most effective in gaining attention and support. By breaking the typical social taboos and customs in a nonviolent manner, attention is brought to the issues by shocking the target audience” (New Tactics in Human Rights, online).

Despite being rooted in social movements and various forms of protest throughout history (Tilly 1986) the role of humor in protest is still largely unexplored (Hiller 1983). Weissberg (2005) asserted that focusing on playful or theatrical approaches are frivolous or counterproductive. Others such as Shepard (2009) countered that such practices involve multiple meanings and thus require greater scrutiny. If anything, playful tactics is a kind of strategic dramaturgy in that it plays a significant role in highlighting the visibility of a social problem (Berlant and Freeman 1993). Plant (1992) and Shepard (2009) both point to a long history of playful aspects such as culture, humor, satirizing, and sex which were employed to advance movement gains. “Play is both a creative and combustible ingredient within contentious movement interaction, but its influence has been historically obscured” (Shepard 2009: 20). Shepard makes a strong argument for the effectiveness of play as a political but creative outlook for social movement claims-making and protest activities both in the public and behind the scenes.

Eyerman explains that “as in a theatre performance actors and roles are important. Movement actors perform and convey; they also dramatize, adding powerful emotions to their
actions which represent known narratives through the use of symbols” (Eyerman 2006: 199). Activists use humor in their protest activities as an underdog strategy to expose the contradictions, hypocrisy and injustices of their targets, and to ultimately challenge the dominance of corruption and oppressive institutions and elites. Drawing on satire and humor can frame human rights issues in a more emotional and human context. Therefore, attending to how humor and ‘playful’ techniques are utilized in protest is important for examining how movement actors communicate and construct grievances. However, perceived opportunities in contentious politics can maximize activists’ potential for actively creating social action and change.
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

This study examined the online SodaStream/Johansson controversy facilitated by Mondoweiss blog activists over the announcement that the Hollywood actress Scarlett Johansson was SodaStream’s celebrity Global Brand Ambassador. This chapter presents how data was collected to address the following two questions: 1. how did blog activists strategically use celebrity to draw attention to the wider Palestinian movement’s claims and grievances? and 2. how did blog activists maintain enduring interest in campaign activities for mobilizing social action and social change over time?

Using grounded theory, the study collected and analyzed data (images and text using humor and journalistic editorial reporting) from Mondoweiss blog articles. The study examined how the announcement was used as a perceived threat opportunity to contest the authenticity of the celebrity’s reputation. This was subsequently used to generate attention and communicate the movement’s wider claims and grievances about the occupation in Palestine. The study identified multiple opportunities that were used to provoke a response from the celebrity and to reinforce Mondoweiss blog activists’ initial branding of the celebrity as The Face of Apartheid. Turning points reflected a shift in the data when the celebrity responded to the SodaStream/Johansson controversy and how the blog activists subsequently altered their strategically use of celebrity via satire images and editorial reporting. The SodaStream/Johansson controversy represents a protest event part of the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions [BDS] campaign against SodaStream (which is tied to the wider Palestinian movement's claims and grievances about apartheid and the illegal occupation in Palestine).

This study utilized a mix-method approach derived from grounded theory methodology, case study, and online ethnography to collect and analyzed three types of data: 1. text, 2. images,
and 3. data I created quantitatively from the qualitative data extracted from the editorials and images collected. The data corpus specifically consists of 37 articles from the Mondoweiss blog site which yielded two types of primary qualitative data: 53 images and 488 ‘data chunks’ [a unit of information organized in descriptive ‘chunks’ to help organize the data corpus and aid analysis] of text. These data chunks yielded a total of 26 codes. ‘Reputation’ emerged as the core category along with four categories: three targets (celebrity, SodaStream, and Oxfam) and ‘external issues’ and their sub-categories were identified, collected, and analyzed. Although reputation emerged as a central theme it is important to clarify that reputation is the implicit theme through which blog activists are using as an opportunity to provoke a response from key targets. Celebrity emerged as the central target (particularly to contest her contradictory ambassadorships and specifically her reputation as a celebrity ambassador fighting for poverty and injustices) and the issue of apartheid emerged as the central external issue to which blog activists are attempting to link through the key target.

Applying cultural approaches to social movement theories, the study used qualitative methods to create unique quantitative and qualitative data to reinforce the study’s analysis and findings. The protest event refers to the online controversy over SodaStream’s announcement constructed and facilitated by Mondoweiss blog activists during the months of January to March 2014. The study is based on empirical data collected and analyzed from the Mondoweiss blog during the protest event (i.e. the controversy over SodaStream’s announcement) and is characterized by a critical event and three turning points. The critical event addresses the first question guiding this study [how did blog activists strategically use celebrity to draw attention to the wider Palestinian movement’s claims and grievances?] by demonstrating how blog activists strategically used Johansson through editorial text and images to draw attention to the wider
Palestinian movement’s claims and grievances. The second question [how did blog activists maintain enduring interest in campaign activities for mobilizing social action and social change over time?] pertained to how and why this practice of portraying her reputation as a celebrity Global Ambassador fighting for poverty and world injustices as inauthentic intensified over time. The turning points reveal how blog activists maintain enduring interest during this campaign’s protest event through creative activism by creating drama through their use of editorial text and images of Johansson to apply pressure and challenge SodaStream’s practices, in addition to drawing attention to the wider BDS movement’s grievances.

This chapter is organized into four sections. The first section provides the methodological framework that informs the dissertation and the types of methods used. In this section, I present grounded theory as the theoretical background for the main methodology used for my study, specifically the ‘classical’ or the Glaserian approach. This section explains the underlying framework for my data collection and analysis. Background information on the main methods and the techniques utilized for collecting the data, and the ‘field site’ is explained. The second section presents the main sources of data collected from the field site, the types of data used and sample characteristics.

The second section provides information about the sources, and types of data. This includes an explanation of the source of data and a brief clarification of the researcher’s epistemological and ontological positions. A brief discussion on the initial and re-entry into the field is presented to provide the reader an understanding on when the data were collected. Subsequently, a discussion about small sampling is also reviewed to validate the worth of the data collected and provides a linkage back to the research as part of a case study. These discussions are important because it provides a framework for the reader to understand where the
data were collected from and how that influenced the types of methods chosen to collect and analyze the data.

The third section lays out the data management and data coding processes. This sections centers on the actual data coding process. Following the Glaserian methodology, a detailed explanation on how the data was collected is divided into three steps: open coding, selective coding, and theoretical coding. Each of these steps presents samples of the data, how the data was organized, and how information was extrapolated and or created which shaped the conceptual and theoretical ideas of the study.

The fourth section presents quantitative data I created from the qualitative data collected from the editorial text and images collected from the Mondoweiss blog editorials. This analyzed data is critical in addressing the two questions guiding this study and for providing the supporting data which is further illustrated in the analysis chapter.

Section 1: Methodology and types of methods

Grounded theory methodology

Grounded theory is a “systematic, qualitative procedure used to generate theory that explains, at a broad conceptual level, a process, an action, or an interaction about a substantive topic” (Creswell 2002: 439). The phrase ‘grounded theory’ refers to a theory that is developed inductively from a corpus of data. Grounded theory originates from the work of Glaser and Strauss (1967) and was developed as a reaction against the extreme positivism that had dominated most social research. Grounded theory challenges “the notion that the purpose of social research is to uncover preexisting and universal explanations of social behavior” (Suddaby 2006: 633). Ground theory offers “a compromise between extreme empiricism and complete
relativism by articulating a middle ground in which systemic data collection could be used to develop theories that address the interpretive realities of actors in social settings” (Suddaby 2006: 634). According to Suddaby (2006: 634) grounded theory “is most suited to efforts to understand the process by which actors construct meaning out of intersubjective experience. Grounded theory can also be used in a way that is logically consistent with key assumptions about social reality and how that reality is ‘known’”

Grounded theory methodology was proposed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) but it eventually fractured into three main types: Glaser’s (1992) classical grounded theory or the ‘Glaserian approach,’ Corbin and Strauss’ (1990) approach or the ‘Straussian version,’ and Charmaz’s (1994) constructivist approach. Specifically, the Glaserian and Straussian perspectives differ in their paradigmatic dimensions, formulation of research questions, analysis procedures used, usage of literature, sampling procedures, and the procedures for validating the resultant theory (Devadas, et al., 2011: 348). Although some differences exist, McCann and Clark (2003) identified the fundamental components of grounded theory overall: theoretical sensitivity, theoretical sampling, identifying the core category, and the measure of rigor. The purpose of grounded theory is not to make truth statements about reality, but to elicit fresh understandings about the patterned relationship between social actors and how these relationships and interactions actively construct reality (Glaser and Strauss 1967). As such, Suddaby (2006: 636) contends that “grounded theory should not be used to test hypotheses about reality, but, rather, to make statements about how actors interpret reality.”

For this study the Glaserian approach was employed and it was the difference in coding practices between the Glaserian and Straussian approaches which played a decisive role to which model was utilized. The Straussian approach is criticized for moving away from the original
grounded theory principles for ‘forcing categories’ on the data instead of allowing categories to emerge during the open coding process (see Glaser 1992). Coding is the process of breaking down data into distinct units of meaning for analysis and then systematically re-evaluating them for their inter-relationships, thus enabling the researcher to move the data to a higher level of abstraction (Goulding 2002). By examining words, phrases, sentences, and memos (or field notes), the aim is to identify as many possible categories and their properties as possible. The researcher then compares the codes and or categories with other data which shows similarities or differences (Glaser and Strauss 1967). Glaser (1978) suggests a three stage process: open coding, selective coding, and theoretical coding to identify and generate categories and their properties, which will then be used to generate a parsimonious grounded theory. These three stages specifically informed my data collection process and are further elaborated in the third section of this chapter.

While I follow the classic grounded theory as my main methodology, I ventured a less positivist to a more constructivist epistemology as proposed by Charmaz (2005) to attend to the process of claims-making and protest as emergent outcomes of interactions as revealed in the blog editorials. Data was investigated to identify patterns in how blog activists discussed and then reconfigured celebrity as a major antagonist character in the campaign story. These discussions and meanings related to their views of celebrity reflect Strauss’s notion of turning points.

**Turning Points**

Drawing from Strauss’s concept of turning points—this study explored emergent events or particular situations that influenced blog activists to change their rhetoric and tone about the
celebrity’s reputation as an authentic humanitarian. According to Strauss (1959: 95) turning points are “critical incidents that occur to force a person to recognize that ‘I am not the same as I was, as I used to be.’” The data revealed how certain incidences marked by the celebrity prompted the blog activists’ editorial pursuit to amplify their tone and manner of their use of rhetoric and images in their assessment of the celebrity’s reputation as an authentic humanitarian within the overall Israeli-Palestinian issue. Strauss’s considerations are based mainly on his observations of chronically ill patients which led him towards the analysis of the identity transformation processes. His concept is taken to be applied here to exemplify how the campaign, as an active ongoing protest activity and as a story, can be “conceived as a series of related transformations... [in which] person [in this case celebrity] ‘becomes something other than they once were” (Strauss 1959: 92). Constructionist insights to the campaign reveal how people construct meanings at different stages or turning points. But it also provides insights to how blog activists made use of these incidences as agentic opportunities to make sense of the wider socio-political situation that surrounds them by constructing meaningful opportunistic action to generate attention, communicate grievances and encourage mobilization. As such, turning points reflect the transformative process, the process of change that is provoked by a single incident (i.e. turning point) which is often accompanied by experiences of misalignment, surprise, shock, chagrin, anxiety, tension, bafflement, and self-questioning (Strauss 1959: 95). Each turning point is characterized by some reaction by the celebrity to the controversy made during the protest event. This in turn acts as a catalyst in amplifying blog activists’ editorial text and images to that response to render these new experiences meaningful and to logically overcome the disconnection caused by the perceived threat as identified from the critical event (i.e. the announcement of Johansson as SodaStream’s Global Brand ambassador).
Main methods: Case Study and Online ethnography

Case study

Situated this research as a case study is appropriate because the objective of this study was based on a sociological examination of a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context. This study observed behavior as ‘recorded’ in an online setting. The controversy constructed by Mondoweiss blog activists surrounding the announcement of Johansson’s signing as SodaStream’s celebrity global brand ambassador allowed me to study the practices and behaviors of my participants unobtrusively (Lather 1992). According to Yin (2003), a case study is relevant when the focus of the study is to answer “how” and “why” questions. Additionally, it is relevant when the researcher cannot manipulate the behavior of those involved in the study and when the researcher wants to cover contextual conditions believed relevant to the phenomena under study. As an instrumental method, it allows for a single case to produce a general theory of a complex social phenomenon in a real-life setting. I argue that this study provides fruitful empirical and theoretical contributions to future related work on creative activism by blog activists, specifically those targeting and contesting celebrity especially when the celebrity falls on the opposing side of the activists or movement) as a media spectacle to construct drama for attention, communication of grievances and mobilization.

An important aspect of case study is to construct a conceptual boundary around the case under observation. According to Yin (2003) and Stake (1995) placing boundaries on a case study, such as time and activity (Stake 1995) ensures that the study remains reasonable in scope. Although the BDS campaign against SodaStream is ongoing (the campaign against SodaStream began in 2005 as one of the key corporate targets to boycott when the BDS movement was established) the study centered on a specific protest event that emerged during the month of
January 2014. Data collection and analysis was completed when theoretical saturation was met in March 2014 and is elaborated in the third part of this chapter.

**Online ethnography: online forums**

The online forum is increasingly popular discursive practice in social media. It allows people to communicate interactively so they can express their feelings and opinions. According to Ottaway and Hamzawy (2011: 12) a form of protest that is becoming increasingly widespread is through the use of blogging. Blogging is effective in disseminating information and spreading the word when protest is being planned and or occurring, and circulating audio-visual materials documenting the event (or in this case as a medium to construct a critical event for drama and protest). Even though people are communicating through editorials and accompanying images, the digital format affords them to express their beliefs, emotions, and opinions on sensitive and often controversial issues in creative but serious ways. The information that is conveyed through texts also has the potential to influence the mind sets in the blogger’s audience. As such, blogs can be conceptualized as a domain for contesting hegemonic politics. It is, after all, where social wars (i.e. reputational warfare) occur and then spread to other social networking sites and possibly shape both online and offline mobilization and protest activities.

Given the research question and context, collecting data from online forums reduces time for collecting, processing and analyzing data, as well as visualizing results. This is particularly fruitful when a study is seeking a group or community’s perspective of specific issues (cf. Im and Chee 2008; Abidin et al., 2011). Studies that used electronic data collection methods have supported the feasibility of electronic data collection methods, the richness of electronically
collected data, informative and prompt responses of research participants, and decrease in human errors (Lakeman 1997).

**Blogospheres**

Among the new platforms are weblogs (blogs) or what was formally referred to as ‘online logbooks’. The term ‘weblog’ emerged in 1997 by Jorn Barger and shortly afterwards it was shortened to ‘blog’ by Peter Merholz in 1999 (Blood 2000; Siles 2011; Herring, et al., 2004). Blogs originally served as “websites devoted to classifying and annotating online information” (Siles 2011: 738). As “a medium for a practice of communication” (Dean 2010: 46) blogs are a type of web pages that is typically text-based (but includes graphics, visuals, and hyperlinks to external sites) and contains a list of dated entries that are typically displayed in a reverse chronological order (Hookway 2008; Siles 2011). Many blogs feature sidebars that offer links to other recommended blogs and social media sites, and they typically include an archive function which allows users to search for past posts “allowing users to participate in the public sphere (Siles 2011). Central to this free and user friendly medium is the ‘feedback mechanism,’ the “commentary… that made the blog itself worth reading” (Dean 2010: 42). They are a popular communication tool that allows users to read and write personal remarks on a wide range of issues, generally in a mediated manner but where the blog author or host remains in control (Herring et al., 2004).

The motivations, aims and target groups of blogs can differ and the entries vary from short opinions or references, journalistic approaches, to large reports with citations (Herring, et al., 2004; Miller and Shepherd 2004). This early collecting of data, interwoven with ideas, laid the groundwork for an entirely new global content medium that would grow throughout the next
decade into tens of millions of blogs across the internet. According to Technorati (technoarati.com) in 2010, there are more than 8 million blogs online. A new blog is created every 7.4 seconds, 12,000 new blogs are created every day, 2,75,000 new posts are made every day, and 10,8000 updates are made every hour. Additionally, blog readers consider blogs to be the most credible media especially when compared with printed and online newspapers (Johnson and Kaye 2004: 630). Blogs are praised for their accessibility and ease of use and are widely credited with kick-starting the rise of citizen or participatory journalism (Jenkins 2006), creating new forms of community (Wei 2004), and identity (Bortree 2005).

**Blogs: As a field of study**

The recent expansion of alternative media and Web 2.0 has afforded researchers with new tool, but also as platforms for new forms of interaction to study human interaction and communication. Hookway (2008: 92) contends that “blogs offer substantial benefits for social scientific research providing similar, but far more extensive opportunities than their ‘offline’ parallel of qualitative diary researching”. Blogs provide a publicly available, low-cost, and instantaneous technique for collecting substantial amounts of data. Blogs contain naturalistic data in textual forms and online context offer anonymity for bloggers, access populations potentially geographically and socially removed from the researchers, and the archival nature of blogs make them valuable to examine social processes over time (Hookway 2008: 93). Therefore, “these qualities of practicality and capacity to shed light on social processes across time and space, together with their insight into everyday life, combine to make blogs a valid addition to the qualitative researcher’s toolkit” (Hookway 2008: 93). However, Hookway (2008: 94) notes that despite the research opportunities blogs provide, for the most part they remain unexamined.
**Blogs: As networks and communities**

“Online communities form and manifest culture, the learned beliefs, values and customs that serve to order, guide and direct the behavior of a particular society or group” (Kozinets 2010: 12). As more people increasingly use the Internet, it is supporting the formation of a variety of online communities. The Mondoweiss blogging community has a known group identity which is fundamental to building relationships and to impact society or culture around them (Bowler 2010: 1271), especially within the wider BDS movement network. Kozinets (2010: 89) suggests that online researchers should look for communities that are: 1. relevant (they relate to the research focus and question(s), 2. active (they have recent and regular communications), 3. interactive (they have a flow of communications between participants), 4. substantial (they have a critical mass of communicators and an energetic field), 5. heterogeneous (they have a number of different participants), and 6. data-rich (offering more detailed or descriptive rich data). All these suggested guidelines characterize the blogosphere Mondoweiss (and a further explanation is provided in a section below).

Mondoweiss can also be characterized as a community that is part of an extensive network of the Palestinian and BDS movement. As part of a network, it contributes and redistributes among other weblogs and SNS such as the Electronic Intifada, BDS/ BNS, CodePink, etc. It is a community because the social component driving the links in the network. Mondoweiss comprises a group of activist bloggers who use journalistic editorials and hyperlinks as part of their strategies to connect with others and for sharing/ spreading knowledge within the community and wider movement.

As a community Mondoweiss emphasize their social connections, not just externally, but among themselves as a ‘community of practice’ (Lave and Wenger 1991). Like any ‘in-group’, a
community of practice is a collection of people who engage on an ongoing basis in some common endeavor. Communities of practices emerge in response to common interest or position, and play an important role in the forming of their members’ participation in, and orientation to, the world around them. It provides an accountable link, therefore, between the individual, the group, and place in the broader social order, and it provides a setting in which linguistic practice emerges as a function of this link (Eckert 2006). It is a community with shared blogging norms and practices.

Blogging practices are negotiated within a community, but are performed within the constraints of the blogging tool—the material affordances. Borrowing from Johnston’s (2009:26) concept of ‘protest performances’, I contend that blogs are central for social movements because they provide “encounters to which social actors bring their ideas about how the world is or should be, offering them up to social discussion, scrutiny, and vetting, and, then, act. […] In numerous performances such as these, culture is [then] created and affirmed, changed and fortified, nudged along and tied to past practices.” As platforms for protest performances (to evoke drama and draw attention), blogs “comprise the subject matter…. [and] detailed descriptions of processes and how ‘actors [strategize] to make their claims, confrontations with the opposition, and the actual protest performances in public places, are the best way to untangle cultural processes at work in protest mobilization” (Johnston 2009: 26). The blog articles are ‘left’ as social artifacts of these ‘protest performances; they are public records available to view and observe. These cultural artifacts are not just reflections of the protest presentations and practices that occurred, but are also reflections of the group’s culture and community through time.
Section 2: Field site, sources and types of data and their sample characteristics

Initial entry into the field

Common to grounded theory and qualitative analysis, the researchers must first immerse themselves in the data to become familiar with its content and to note any initial analytical observations. Following the prescribed methods of the Glaserian grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Glaser 1978, 1992, 1998) empirical data were collected from blog articles written by Mondoweiss blog activists at the Mondoweiss blog. I conducted a search for articles in the Mondoweiss blogosphere pertaining to the campaign against SodaStream and Scarlett Johansson since January 2014 during the month of May 2014. The search was conducted by first utilizing the following words (and a combination of) to ensure all articles pertaining to the controversy were obtained: Scarlett Johansson, SodaStream, BDS, and Super Bowl. I also conducted a search in the blog’s archives (organized by month and year) and cross-checked all articles pertaining to the controversy. The articles were each saved in a password protected file by individual article, and then organized by month.

Data Corpus: Types of data

My data collection stemmed directly from Mondoweiss articles collected from January to March 2014. Table 1 presents the data corpus (from which three types of data were collected: 1. images; 2. text; and 3. the data I created quantitatively from the first two types of data). Table 1 is an organization of 37 articles collected from January to March 2014. In this table, the articles are coded by: an article number representing the article’s respective place according to its date of publication; a word count of the article (to provide a sense of ‘size’ of the article); the name of the blog activist author(s), and the title of the blog article.
A separate file containing all image based data collected from the articles was created.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Blog Activist/Author(s)</th>
<th>Article Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson for SodaStream: ‘Set the bubbles free’ but keep the Palestinians bottled in Area A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.15.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson watch: SodaStream stock plunges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.17.14</td>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td>‘New Yorker’ says Scarlett Johansson’s relationship with SodaStream may hurt her image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.22.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>Update: ‘Blood bubbles’-mainstream media turn on SodaStream and Scarlett Johansson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.23.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>Oxfam expresses ‘concerns’ over Scarlett Johansson’s support for settlement product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.24.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>Scarlett and Oxfam chat over Palestinian land loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.25.14</td>
<td>US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation</td>
<td>Call grow for Oxfam to drop Scarlett Johansson following her defense of Israeli occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.25.14</td>
<td>Nguyen</td>
<td>Deconstructing Scarlett Johansson’s statement on SodaStream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.26.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson gets an ally—Mike Huckabee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.27.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Liberal Zionists support Scarlett Johansson—and settlements. Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.27.14</td>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td>Grandson of Oxfam founder calls on org to cut ties with Scarlett Johansson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.27.14</td>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td>Watch the Scarlett Johansson SodaStream ad banned from the Super Bowl (not for the reasons you’d hope)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.28.14</td>
<td>Palestinian BDS National Committee</td>
<td>Palestinian civil society to Oxfam: ‘Match words with action’, break ties with Scarlett Johansson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.28.14</td>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td>In 2012 Oxfam Italy cut ties with celebrity spokesperson over SodaStream connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.28.14</td>
<td>Norr</td>
<td>Vote at the Guardian: Should Oxfam sever ties with Scarlett Johansson?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.29.14</td>
<td>US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation</td>
<td>Human rights advocates meet with Oxfam &amp; Scarlett Johansson reps over concerns with Israeli settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.30.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>Palestinians living near West Bank SodaStream factory urge Scarlett Johansson to end role with occupation profiteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.30.14</td>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td>‘Without doubt, the biggest loser in this well publicized BDS campaign was SodaStream’: Reactions to Johansson leaving Oxfam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.30.14</td>
<td>Robbins &amp; Norr</td>
<td>Lost in Occupation: Scarlett Johansson ends relationship with Oxfam to stick with SodaStream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.30.14</td>
<td>Nguyen</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson not only abandons Oxfam but throws it under the bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.31.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>SodaStream flap educate Americans about the illegal settlement project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.2.14</td>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td>The real SodaStream commercial they don’t want you to see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.2.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson’s new image (grossout alert)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.2.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Do SodaStream workers have the right to vote? Roger Waters asks Scarlett Johansson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.3.14</td>
<td>Horowitz &amp; Weiss</td>
<td>After all that build up—SodaStream ad was flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.3.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson’s new pals: groups that are trying to break Obama’s Iran deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.3.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>SodaStream’s Super bowl ad brings spotlight on Palestine and the Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.6.14</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>The Two-State SodaStream Solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.10.14</td>
<td>Deger</td>
<td>Avigdor Lieberman: ‘Our Oscar goes to Scarlett’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.11.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>France to perform CPR on Scarlett Johansson’s image—award for film career!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.20.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson’s ‘scholarship’ and ‘intelligence’ cited Mike Huckabee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.3.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson is featured at AIPAC. to applause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.7.14</td>
<td>Nussbaum</td>
<td>A modal factory for a colonialism in trouble: the SodaStream saga revisited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.15.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Peace Now board member jokes about owning a SodaStream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.18.14</td>
<td>Deger</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson parrots SodaStream CEO in attack on Oxfam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.18.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Johansson got career boost from ‘comic farrago’ over SodaStream—‘New Yorker’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given its size, Table 2 (collection of images) can be found in the appendix section. However,
Table 3 contains an example of images collected from the first article. Image sizes were adjusted to fit table column contents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Blog Activist</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 4 summarizes characteristics for the text and images. In addition to the information presented in Table 1, Table 4 includes the number of images, and number of videos. ‘N/A’ stands for ‘not available’ indicating that respective video is no longer available to view online from that article site. This yielded a total of 53 images and 8 videos (5 were not available at the time of data collection in May 2014) to be coded and analyzed.

Table 4: Sample characteristics of 2 data types: Text and images
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Blog Activist/ Author(s)</th>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th># of images</th>
<th># of videos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson for SodaStream: ‘Set the bubbles free’ but keep the Palestinians bottled in Area A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.15.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson watch: SodaStream stock plunges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.17.14</td>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td>‘New Yorker’ says Scarlett Johansson’s relationship with SodaStream may hurt her image</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.22.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>Update: ‘Blood bubbles’-mainstream media turn on SodaStream and Scarlett Johansson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TURNING POINT 1: Johansson’s response to criticisms about her SodaStream ambassadorship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.23.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>Oxfam expresses ‘concerns’ over Scarlett Johansson’s support for settlement product</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.24.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>Scarlett and Oxfam chat over Palestinian land loss</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.25.14</td>
<td>US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation</td>
<td>Call grow for Oxfam to drop Scarlett Johansson following her defense of Israeli occupation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.25.14</td>
<td>Nguyen</td>
<td>Deconstructing Scarlett Johansson’s statement on SodaStream</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.26.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson gets an ally—Mike Huckabee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.27.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Liberal Zionists support Scarlett Johansson—and settlements. Why?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.27.14</td>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td>Grandson of Oxfam founder calls on org to cut ties with Scarlett Johansson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.27.14</td>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td>Watch the Scarlett Johansson SodaStream ad banned from the Super Bowl (not for the reasons you’d hope)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.28.14</td>
<td>Palestinian BDS National Committee</td>
<td>Palestinian civil society to Oxfam: ‘Match words with action’, break ties with Scarlett Johansson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.28.14</td>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td>In 2012 Oxfam Italy cut ties with celebrity spokesperson over SodaStream connection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>128.14</td>
<td>Norr</td>
<td>Vote at the Guardian: Should Oxfam sever ties with Scarlett Johansson?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.29.14</td>
<td>US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation</td>
<td>Human rights advocates meet with Oxfam &amp; Scarlett Johansson reps over concerns with Israeli settlements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.30.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>Palestinians living near West Bank SodaStream factory urge Scarlett Johansson to end role with occupation profiteer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Images</th>
<th>Videos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.30.14</td>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td>‘Without doubt, the biggest loser in this well publicized BDS campaign was SodaStream’: Reactions to Johansson leaving Oxfam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.30.14</td>
<td>Robbins &amp; Norr</td>
<td>Lost in Occupation: Scarlett Johansson ends relationship with Oxfam to stick with SodaStream</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.30.14</td>
<td>Nguyen</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson not only abandons Oxfam but throws it under the bus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.31.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>SodaStream flap educate Americans about the illegal settlement project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.2.14</td>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td>The real SodaStream commercial they don’t want you to see</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.2.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson’s new image (glossout alert)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.2.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Do SodaStream workers have the right to vote? Roger Waters asks Scarlett Johansson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TURNING POINT 3: Reactions (and ensuing events) to Johansson/ SodaStream Super Bowl commercial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Images</th>
<th>Videos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.3.14</td>
<td>Horowitz &amp; Weiss</td>
<td>After all that build up—SodaStream ad was flat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.3.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson’s new pals: groups that is trying to break Obama’s Iran deal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.3.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>SodaStream’s Super bowl ad brings spotlight on Palestine and the Occupation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.6.14</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>The Two-State SodaStream Solution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.10.14</td>
<td>Deger</td>
<td>Avigdor Lieberman: ‘Our Oscar goes to Scarlett’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.11.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>France to perform CPR on Scarlett Johansson’s image—award for film career!</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.20.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson’s ‘scholarship’ and ‘intelligence’ cited Mike Huckabee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.3.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson is featured at AIPAC. to applause</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.7.14</td>
<td>Nussbaum</td>
<td>A modal factory for a colonialism in trouble: the SodaStream saga revisited</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.15.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Peace Now board member jokes about owning a SodaStream</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.18.14</td>
<td>Deger</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson parrots SodaStream CEO in attack on Oxfam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.18.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Johansson got career boost from ‘comic farrago’ over SodaStream—‘New Yorker’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total images: 53 videos: 8 (5 not available)
Following the Glaserian method, data collection and analysis was completed when theoretical saturation was met by the last article posted in March 2014. During the initial data collection process, a pattern emerged. A critical event and three turning points were identified from the data. These turning points assisted in the subsequent organization and analysis of the data. A critical event are incidences that are created to challenge some dominant discourse or threat that will ultimately lead towards some change that would be regarded as a success for the movement. According to Espeland and Rogstad (2012) a critical event presents analytical value to studying collective action and social change.

The critical event and three turning points identified:

**Critical event:** Reaction to SodaStream’s Announcement of Scarlett Johansson as their Global Brand Ambassadorship

**Turning point 1:** Johansson’s response to criticism about her SodaStream ambassadorship

**Turning point 2:** Johansson quits her role as Oxfam’s Celebrity Global Ambassador

**Turning point 3:** Reactions (and ensuing events) to Johansson’s SodaStream Super Bowl commercial

These turning points reflect how blog activists’ use of rhetoric (regarding what was being discussed in the editorially text and images contesting Johansson’s authenticity as a humanitarian) responding to Johansson’s reaction to the controversy were strategically used as an opportunity to generate attention, communicate claims, and sustain interest for mobilization and protest. These turning points indicate a juncture in the data when something changed. These turning points also helped to organize the data into a meaningful and coherent manner. Once the critical event and three turning points were identified, I went back to the data corpus and relevant organization of the data, and adjusted the data according to which turning point it represented (as illustrated in the tables presented in this chapter). Patterns in the data now made better sense and contributed immensely to the theoretical conceptualization of the data.
Resolving small sampling issues: A brief discussion

According to Glaser and Strauss, saturation is an outcome of a researcher’s assessment of the quality and rigor of an emerging theoretical model: “The criteria for determining saturation…are a combination of the empirical limits of the data, the integration and density of the theory and the analyst’s theoretical sensitivity” (1967: 62). Suddaby (2006: 639) elaborates on this and maintains that “the signals of saturation, which include repetition of information and confirmation of existing conceptual categories, are inherently pragmatic and depend upon the empirical context and the researcher’s experience and expertise.”

Although my data sample is small (consisting of 37 articles), Patton contends that the “logic and power of purposive sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth [and] information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about ideas of central importance to the purpose of the study” (1990: 169). Likewise, purposive samples rely on saturation (Guest, Bunce, and Johnson 2006) and therefore are quite appropriate for both a grounded theory and case study approaches centering on a critical event. It is not breadth, but depth that matters and a “successful grounded theory research has a clear creative component” (Suddaby 2006: 638). According to Morse (2000:3), sample size depends on the considerations of a number of factors such as: “the quality of data, the scope of the study, the nature of the topic, the amount of useful information obtained from each participant, the number of interviews per participant, the use of shadowed data, and the qualitative method and study design used.” In this case, the researcher starts the study with a sample where the phenomenon occurred: the announcement of the celebrity Scarlett Johansson as SodaStream’s global brand ambassador. This study is focused on a very specific event involving a specific community (the Mondoweiss blog) and the products (the Mondoweiss blog articles) made by a specific group of individuals.
(Mondoweiss blog activists)—all of which are further elaborated in subsequent sections within this chapter. As Glaser and Holton (2004, online) stated:

grounded theory provides an honesty approach to the data and lets the natural organization of substantive life emerge. The grounded theory researcher listens to the participants venting issues rather than encouraging them to talk about a subject of little interests. In this case the participants’ views are found in blog articles online. The mandate is to remain open to what is actually happening and not to start filtering data through pre-conceived hypothesis and biases to listen and observe and thereby listen for the main concern of the participants on the field and how they resolve this concern.

As such, I contend that the Glaserian approach allowed me to work with a small sample yet generate enough authentic and rich data, and subsequent insight to theorize the strategically innovative ways activists are using alternative media to subvert and counter hegemonic messages in a specific protest event. 37 articles yielded 53 images and 488 ‘data chunks’ for me to code and then analyze. Doing this enabled me to identify aspects of change and characteristics of celebrity reputation which, arguably, can be useful for future empirical studies focusing on blog activists targeting celebrity political involvement as an agentic opportunity to construct drama online and utilize creative activism.

Source of data: Mondoweiss blogosphere

Why Mondoweiss

During my initial exploratory research when I investigated the discourses surrounding the SodaStream controversy, it became apparent that Mondoweiss played a fundamental role in this controversy because it was their blog activists who picked up the story from Al Jazeera about the SodaStream’s announcement for signing Scarlett Johansson as their celebrity ‘global brand ambassador’. Furthermore, Mondoweiss is perceived as a legitimate ‘citizen journalist blog’ and are one of the most frequently shared and referenced by other social media forums and main
websites among the wider Palestinian movement transnational advocacy network (such as the BDS movement itself, CODEPINK, Jewish Voice for Peace). As such, Mondoweiss frequently allows their blog to be used as a platform for distributing BDS related campaigns and activities. Likewise, Mondoweiss articles are often quoted and referenced by a variety of online independent and mainstream newspaper forums (such as The New York Times, Jewish Daily Forward, Huffington Post, Aljazeera, Al-Monitor, among many others) as well as other blog sites (such as the Tikkun Daily and the Electronic Intifada).

During the initial data collection stage, the frequency of blog article posts appeared sufficient enough for a purposeful sample to collect and analyze data: 37 blog articles (specifically centering on the SodaStream and Scarlett Johansson controversy) from January to March 2014. As observed, January was the month which had the most articles posted about the campaign and audience comments. The following presents a summary of Mondoweiss to contextualize the community culture and character of the blog for the reader:

According to the blog (see http://mondoweiss.net/about-mondoweiss) “Mondoweiss is a news website devoted to covering American foreign policy in the Middle East, chiefly from a progressive Jewish perspective” and the blog is co-edited by Philip Weiss and Adam Horowitz. Mondoweiss co-editors state that they “maintain [the] blog because of 9/11, Iraq, Gaza, the Nakba, the struggling people of Israel and Palestine, and our Jewish background” (http://mondoweiss.net/about-mondoweiss).

What particularly drew me to the Mondoweiss blog is its statement of its four principal aims (http://mondoweiss.net/about-mondoweiss) outlined below:

1. To publish important developments touching on Israel/Palestine, the American Jewish community and the shifting debate over US foreign policy in a timely fashion.
2. To publish a diversity of voices to promote dialogue on these important issues.
3. To foster the movement for greater fairness and justice for Palestinians in American foreign policy.
4. To offer alternatives to pro-Zionist ideology as a basis for American Jewish identity.

Given this statement I felt Mondoweiss offered an open platform for a variety of participants and perspectives on the Israeli-Palestinian issue. Although Mondoweiss aims to present information and news on behalf of a Palestinian and BDS standpoint, Mondoweiss is inclusive and aims to build a diverse community with articles from a variety of blog activist authors.

**Mondoweiss comments policy**

Although this study is not utilizing audience comments as a source of data, I felt it important to share Mondoweiss’ comments policy to help further characterize the blog’s purpose and objectives. According to Mondoweiss comments policy (which can be accessed at: [http://mondoweiss.net/policy](http://mondoweiss.net/policy)) one of their goals is to promote critical discussion and debate on US foreign policy and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: “We want Mondoweiss to be a place that everyone feels comfortable visiting, to read and comment, regardless of political perspective. People might not always like what we post, but everyone should feel invited and encouraged to join the discussion, share their opinions, and engage in debate” (mondoweiss.net/policy). While people are encouraged to post comments, interested participants must first register to blog—by providing a username (which can be a pseudonym), and they have the options to post any relevant information the commenter wishes to share online. Mondoweiss has the right to remove participant comments that are deemed inappropriate, insensitive or does not meet their ground rules, by blocking the offending participant’s ability to comment from their registered username.
information. They can do this by banning the IP address where the commenter is posting from.

Their ground rules are summarized as follows (monodweiss.net/policy):

1. No racist or sexist comments (including anti-Arab, Islamophobia and anti-Semitic comments);
2. No Nakba or Holocaust denial; 3. No profanity; 4. No personal attacks; 5. No imposture (pseudonym’s are welcomed but participants must not represent themselves as someone else); 6. No trolling (someone who posts inflammatory or off-topic comments in an online community)—Mondoweiss encourages “free-flowing debate” but stress commenters whose aims are to sabotage the discussion are not welcomed; 7. This is not a site to discuss 9/11 theories.

Mondoweiss also clarifies that comments “become the property of Mondoweiss.net to be reproduced in perpetuity” (mondowesis.net/policy). The site further stress that if interested participants do not agree with their comments policy, then they should not accept their license and therefore do not comment at Mondoweiss (Mondoweiss.net/policy).

**Mondoweiss “blog activists”**

The Mondoweiss blog activists can be characterized as movement entrepreneurs and ‘micro-celebrities’ (for their recognition and reputation among the movement network and by other SNSs and blog sites—this is discussed in the literature review chapter) who are part of the Palestinian movement network, and who see it as their duty to facilitate the BDS call to boycott. As citizen journalists, it is their responsibility to present an alternative narrative and to communicate a reality on the situation in Palestine. These individuals are part of a larger network of activists who have the potential to interact with one another about a particular object of interest (or lack of) in the media. When such a group is organized in this mediated site, they have the ability to influence social movements and others who are part of this alternate mediated public (e.g. in offline or traditional forms of media as discussed in the literature review chapter).
Table 5: Blog activist(s)/author characteristic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blog activist/author</th>
<th>Number of times authored article</th>
<th>Information about blog activists publicly available at Mondoweiss and located at the end of each article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deger</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Allison Deger is the Assistant Editor of Mondoweiss.net. Follow her on twitter at @allissoncd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marc H. Ellis is retired Director and Professor of Jewish Studies at Baylor University and author of Burning Children: A Jewish View of the War in Gaza and Exile and the Prophetic: Images in the New Diaspora which can be found at <a href="http://www.newdiasporabooks.com">www.newdiasporabooks.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Adam Horowitz is Co-Editor of Mondoweiss.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Katie Miranda is an illustrator, jewelry designer, and cartoonist living in Portland, OR. She is currently working on a graphic novel called &quot;Tear Gas in the Morning&quot; which is a memoir about the nonviolent resistance movement in Palestine. Visit katiemiranda.com to learn more. Facebook: <a href="https://www.facebook.com/katiemiranda.bazaarkhalil">https://www.facebook.com/katiemiranda.bazaarkhalil</a> Twitter: @KatieMirandaArt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Phan Nguyen lives in New York and has a Twitter account: @Pan_N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Henry Norr’s information has been withheld on the website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nussbaum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Benjamin Katz-Nussbaum is a Jewish-American scholar and activist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian BDS National Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The BDS National Committee (BNC) is the Palestinian coordinating body for the BDS campaign worldwide. For more information, visit <a href="http://www.bdsmovement.net/BNC">www.bdsmovement.net/BNC</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Anne Robbins is Editor at Large for MA, a mother, a human rights activist and a ceramic artist. She lives in the SF bay area. Follow her on Twitter @annieofafani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation is the largest and most diverse coalition working to change U.S. policy toward Palestine/Israel to support human rights, international law, and equality. Learn more at endtheoccupation.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Philip Weiss is Founder and Co-Editor of Mondoweiss.net</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 illustrates a list and description of the blog activists which authored the 37 articles used for this study. Following the ethics outlined by this study and approved by the IRB board, information regarding the respective blog activist author (and or co-author) are publicly available at the Mondoweiss blog and the same information listed follows each article. As illustrated from Table 5, most articles collected were authored by Horowitz (6) and Weiss (11), the creators and co-editors of the Mondoweiss bog; and Annie Robbins (9) whom is a major contributor to the Mondoweiss blog, especially when it pertains to the Palestinian movement and BDS related issues.
Section 3: Data management and the coding process

The data corpus consists of articles that specifically pertain to the controversy surrounding the campaign against SodaStream published online from January to March 2014 (when the research met theoretical saturation). Therefore, data analysis consisted on categorizing and coding the data to reflect the critical event and turning points (and respective external issues surrounding and shaping the campaign process) represented during this time. The Glaserian grounded theory method presents three levels to the coding process: open coding, selective coding, and theoretical coding. Although the stage is presented in a consecutive manner, the method is iterative and each stage guides the following and vice versa. The following sections provide a systematic description on how the data corpus was coded following the Glaserian grounded theory approach.

Step 1: Open coding and constant comparison

Glaser (1978, 1992) suggests that open coding is the first step towards the discovery of categories and their properties. Glaser maintains that attention should be on the data and that the researcher should allow the data to tell their own story by asking, ‘What do we have here?’ (Stern 1994: 220). Open coding utilizes a process of constant comparison (Glaser and Strauss 1967) which involves a simultaneous and concurrent process of coding and analysis. Specifically, Glaser (1978: 57) states that the researcher should compare all codes by asking key questions of the data: 1. “What is this data a study of? 2. What category does the incident indicate? 3. What is actually happening in the data?” As categories start to accumulate and gain depth, constant comparison enabled me to reflect on the data and begin conceptualization process which eventually resulted into a substantive theory.
“The constant comparative method is designed to aid the analyst…in generating a theory that is integrated, consistent, plausible, close to the data” (Glaser and Strauss 1967: 103). A substantial theory is then produced from a set of plausibly induced categories, properties, and hypotheses which regard real social problems (Glaser and Strauss 1967: 104). Validity results from data saturation when no new concepts emerge from the data. Furthermore, it is imperative that the researcher combines the open coding process with memo writing which records the emerging categories (the themes or variables), theories, and potential hypotheses.

I wanted to approach the data from ‘anew’ even though the data were collected from an earlier attempt. I did not use my initial codes so I started afresh by first reading and re-reading the 37 articles. During this process, I organized the 37 articles into meaningful ‘data chunks’ so that the data (and subsequent selection of codes and identification of categories) could be organized, replicated, and verifiable.

The data corpus consists of empirical data that were collected from 37 articles specifically pertaining to what blog activists wrote in the Mondoweiss blog about the celebrity Scarlett Johansson and SodaStream controversy during the months of January to March 2014. After a careful reading and re-reading of the articles, each article was broken up into ‘chunks,’ to make the data more meaningful and systematic. The articles were broken down by sentence or sentences, each reflecting something about one of the three targets or an external issue. Sometimes there was overlapping, but this helped to make the coding process more manageable and organized. This process yielded 488 data chunks.
Step 2: Selective coding

Date type: Text

According to Glaser (1978), there is a conceptual time when open coding will cease and the researcher will begin to selectively code for a core category because of the continued appearance of the same information and incidences without much variation or new information or turning points. The selective coding process produces the “substantive codes [that] conceptualize the empirical substance of the area of research” (Glaser 1978: 59). It is during this process when the substantive codes break down the data representing the empirical pattern. At this stage, identifying the core category begins to restrict coding “to only those variables that relate to the core category in sufficiently significant ways to be used in parsimonious theory” (Glaser 1978: 61). During the initial coding process, I began to consider possible core categories and postulated which codes could go into them. As I highlighted these words and or phrases (initially for potential codes, and later for ‘quotes’ to support my analysis and conclusions statements) I then fashioned related codes into categories (through a process of selection-sorting, weeding out those that were similar, different, or not relevant), and these formed into emerging categories. I then separated those codes which concerned the celebrity and placed those codes into a subcategory that addressed the ‘why this was happening to the celebrity’ question.

After a meticulous organization of the data corpus into 488 data chunks, I conducted another careful reading of these data chunks to begin the selection process. I was beginning to identify key codes and or ideas emerging from the data. I recognized that the blog activists were utilizing the Mondoweiss blog as a platform to participate in creative activism and a social media war by revealing, through the use of images and text, how and why the celebrity’s previous reputation as a human rights and poverty humanitarian is inauthentic and immoral. Essentially,
blog activists implied that the celebrity is part of wider politics which reflected mediated propaganda from Israel (or the opposing movement supported affiliates).

Two fundamental principles of grounded theory are that data are analyzed using the constant comparative method (where data are collected and analyzed simultaneously) and theoretical sampling (decisions about which data should be collected next are determined by the theory that is constructed). A basic tenant of Glaserian Grounded method analysis is the identification of a core category. Glaser (1978: 9) asserts that “the generation of theory occurs around a core category” and represents a main topic of a substantive area of inquiry. The core category is identified through an iterative process of coding, memoing, theoretical sampling and sorting. The objective of the core category is that it captures the main concerns of the participants in the study and accounts for the variation in a pattern of behavior. It explains the “what is going on in the data” (Glaser 1978: 94) and becomes the basis for the emerging substantive theory. It was here when I identified ‘reputation’ as the core category and four main categories that stemmed from this core category.

The open coding process yielded 488 pieces of data to be coded. During this process, 21 codes (sub-categories) were discovered for four main categories (stemming from the core category ‘Reputation’) yielding a total of 26 codes. These four main categories are the three targets for which the blog activists were contesting Johansson’s humanitarian reputation in their use of images and text: ‘Celebrity reputation’ [CR] for Scarlett Johansson; ‘SodaStream reputation’ [SS]; ‘Oxfam reputation’ [Oxfam]; and ‘Other’ (pertaining to external issues surrounding the Johansson and SodaStream controversy). I labeled the fourth category as ‘Other’ to reflect five external issues pertaining to the Israel-Palestinian conflict as identified in the 37 articles. This category consists of five coded sub-categories (out of the total 21 coded sub-
categories; note “Total celebrity ambassadorships” was added to later charts for visual representation which would make 21 coded sub-categories: Apartheid; BDS/ campaign (against SodaStream); Liberal Jews/ Zionism [LJ/Z]; Media Attention [MA]; and the two State Solution [2SS]. These five sub-categories coded under the Other’ category does not directly pertain to ‘Reputation’ but instead to surrounding movement discourses which the blog activities attempt to bridge with their contestations of the reputation of the three targets (and reflect the wider BDS movement’s narratives and grievances). Although reputation emerged as a central concept it is important to clarify that reputation is the underlying theme through which blog activists are using as an opportunity to provoke a response from key targets, specifically from the celebrity. Like the hinge on a pair of pliers, it is through the celebrity that blog activists have strategically targeted to take advantage of her celebrity to take advantage of multiple opportunities stemming from her relationships with Oxfam and SodaStream to ultimately condemn SodaStream and its role in the illegal occupation in Palestine.

Table 6 provides a code key which illustrates the categories, sub-categories, and their respective codes identified. These would later assist in constructing the conceptual maps (which aided in illustrating conceptually and theoretically how the process unfolded as extrapolated from the data collected) and analyzing the data conceptually and theoretically.
Table 6: Code Key of four categories and 21 sub-categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Category: Reputation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR: actress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR: political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR: protest activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR: rhetoric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I then typed and organized my codes/ categories, and notes into a word document, and saved it all in a respective labeled file inside a password protected computer. Glaser contends that the classical grounded theory approach is interpretive, contextual, and emergent while Strauss and Corbin’s approach is more likely to lead to force perceived notions of the data. I found that although it is an exhaustive process Glaser’s method proved to be applicable and fruitful in this case because it enabled me a greater ability and range to transverse through the data without restrictions, and to generate a final set of theoretical categories based on a variety of codes collected.

Codes for each of these categories, and later their respective sub-categories, were eventually created after a continual process of reading, re-reading, and cross-checking of the articles. Once sub categories were identified, I continually searched through the data set to evaluate if further data needed to be collected, or if I needed to reexamine and cross compare
codes and categories as I assessed them during the theoretical sampling process. No other
categories or sub-categories were discovered once data saturation was completed.

Table 7 is an example of a coded article as part of the main data collection consisting of
all coded articles. It illustrates how the article is organized by critical event or turning point,
article characteristics (number, date of publication, author(s), title, and image information) and
how initial codes were extrapolated from the data (both text and images). This main data
collection is saved as a password protected document file labeled ‘primary coded articles’ inside
a folder labeled ‘coded articles.’ Coded articles were noted for their order within the four turning
points that were later identified during the selective coding process. Information from the coded
article contains the article number; article date (including blog activist author) and data chunk
number [this is a unique number pertaining to the specific code(s) that were found in that data
chunk and can be easily found and or referred when appropriate]; article title (including image
and text considered part of the data chunk); and codes that were extrapolated from that respective
data chunk. Here, images and article titles were identified, separated by their own respective data
chunk, but included with the main coding.
Table 7: Example of a coded article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article number</th>
<th>Article date—blog activist author—‘data chunk’, number</th>
<th>Data chunk: Article title, text, and or image</th>
<th>codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1214—Robbins</td>
<td>CRITICAL EVENT: Announcement (and reaction) to Scarlett Johansson’s Global Ambassadorship with SodaStream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1214—Robbins</td>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Scarlett Johansson for SodaStream: ‘Set the bubbles free’ but keep the Palestinians bottled in Area A</td>
<td>CR: amb SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1214—Robbins</td>
<td><strong>Image:</strong> SodaStream <strong>unveils:</strong> Scarlett Johansson as its First-Ever Global Brand Ambassador</td>
<td>CR: amb SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1214—Robbins</td>
<td>Sultry Scarlett Johansson is adding another image to her resume, as the new face of apartheid.</td>
<td>CR: actress, CR: political, Apartheid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1214—Robbins</td>
<td>She’s signed on with SodaStream, for its Super Bowl ad to be aired on February 2, launching off the corporation’s new worldwide advertising campaign with the sales pitch “better bubbles, made by you and Scarlett.”</td>
<td>CR: amb SS, SS: SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1214—Robbins</td>
<td>The SodaStream factory is built in Mishor Adumim Industrial Zone, located in the settlement of Ma’aleh Adumim, one of the largest Israeli thefts of Palestinian land in the occupied West Bank. The chunk of land the settlement is built on separated Ramallah, Jerusalem, Bethlehem and Jericho in violation of human rights and international law.</td>
<td>SS: factory, Apartheid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1214—Robbins</td>
<td>At the announcement yesterday, Johansson appeared before a backdrop that bragged, “Set the bubbles free.”</td>
<td>Celebrity: amb SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1214—Robbins</td>
<td>Her mother is Jewish, and the Times of Israel calls her a “Jewish actress.”</td>
<td>CR: political, CR: actress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1214—Robbins</td>
<td><em>Haaretz</em> reports: Israeli firm SodaStream hires Scarlett Johansson as its new face. “We are thrilled to welcome the remarkably talented Scarlett Johansson into the SodaStream family.” Daniel Birnbaum, the CEO of SodaStream, said in a statement.</td>
<td>CR: amb SS, SS: rhetoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1214—Robbins</td>
<td><strong>Image:</strong> map of the settlement of Ma’aleh Adumim. <strong>Image text:</strong> The settlement of Ma’aleh Adumim is strategically located in a manner which disconnects Ramallah from Bethlehem. <em>Map: Shai Efrati. Background topography. Copyright 2009 ESRI</em> (from&quot;Hat tip Taxi)</td>
<td>SS: factory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the 37 articles were digitally organized, I printed out hard copies of the data and commenced with an opening coding process. I conducted a search which involved investigating the data sentence by sentence. I looked for key words and phrases pertaining specifically to the
blog activists’ assessment and description of Johansson’s (and the organizations she represented) reputation as an actress and as a humanitarian. I conducted this opening coding process first by hand on paper. This allowed me to view and analyze multiple codes simultaneously (i.e. in a time-series order). I then went back to the digital copy and highlighted (in yellow) key sentences (that may prove insightful and or useful for my analysis) and typed in the codes and sub categories identified in the open coding process.

Table 8 is an example of the ‘CR actress’ coded sub-category (from one the 21 sub-categories), but it derives from the category ‘CR’ (Celebrity Reputation) as collected from the constructed critical event. Table 8 illustrates an example on how the coded data were extrapolated from the corpus data and organized into their own respective collection of data. This was done to each category and their respective sub-categories (and each was organized into a corresponding file according to the name of the subcategory, inside the folder labeled under its respective category located in the main Methods-Data Collection folder). This helped me to identified key patterns and possible explanations of what was happening as this critical event unfolded.
Table 8: An example of the sub-category ‘CR actress’ from the category ‘CR’-collected during the Critical Event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data chunk number from initial collection/ new number order for this code collection</th>
<th>CRITICAL EVENT: Announcement (and reaction) to Scarlett Johansson’s Global Ambassadorship with SodaStream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR: actress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>Sultry Scarlett Johansson is adding another image to her resume, as the new face of apartheid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2</td>
<td>Her mother is Jewish, and the Times of Israel calls her a “Jewish Actress.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/3</td>
<td><em>Haaretz</em> reports: Israeli firm SodaStream hires Scarlett Johansson as its first face “We are thrilled to welcome the remarkably talented Scarlett Johansson into the SodaStream family.” Daniel Birnbaum, the CEO of SodaStream, said in a statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/4</td>
<td>SodaStream, is the seltzer maker that produces its fizz-boxes in occupied territory in Palestine, and the other day starlet Scarlett Johansson signed a multi-year contract with the corporation that kicks off during the Superbowl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/5</td>
<td>“Even Star Johansson Can’t Help SodaStream as Stock sinks 26%” was Boommber Business Week’s headline, while InvestorPlace contributor Lawrence Meyers cites SodaStream as “long-term business failure…a momentum, fad stock.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/6</td>
<td>‘New Yorker’ says Scarlett Johansson’s relationship with SodaStream may hurt her image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/7</td>
<td>On Wednesday, some online commenters were less than pleased to see the Hollywood starlet lauding a company that manufactures in the Occupied Territories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/8</td>
<td>And after laying out examples of celebrity misbehavior inuring the brands they were associated with, Greenhouse says the inverse may be true here: “Any excoriation of Johansson will come not from the company but from the public—...who may label her as insensitive or irresponsible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/9</td>
<td>Johansson hasn’t been criticized much for the prison sentence handed down to Domenico Dolce and Stefano Gabbana for considerable tax crimes; should she be—or is it different because she’s only their model, not an “ambassador?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32/10</td>
<td>Even if Johansson stays out of politics, this dust-up could impact her image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33/11</td>
<td>That’s the problem with celebrity ambassadorship: you agree to a quasi-diplomatic role without being trained whatsoever in the art of diplomacy. Ambassadors—the traditional sort—spend years navigating the fields of political relations; Johansson has spent her career in ball gowns and lace, Vermeersque pearls, and cat suits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35/12</td>
<td>Interestingly enough Greenhouse uses the story of Kristen Davis as a cautionary tale for celebrities that end up on the wrong side of a corporate endorsement in Israel/Palestine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38/13</td>
<td>Scarlett Letter A for Apartheid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39/14</td>
<td>Actress Scarlett Johansson’s decision to represent SodaStream has already brought a shockwave of opposition—because SodaStream produces its seltzer-makers in a Jewish colony in the occupied West Bank.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Date type: images**

Images were coded in the same way the text data. Ten image types were identified: (1) aerial photo, (2) graphic art of celebrity, (3) logo, (4) map, (5) movie poster, (6) Oxfam image of celebrity, (7) image of celebrity as actress, (8) image other than celebrity, (9) SodaStream (SS) image of celebrity, and (10) ad stock chart. Table 9 illustrates the coding frequencies of all coded images from the 37 articles (organized within the critical event and three turning points). Elaborations on the frequencies of these images are discussed further in the analysis and discussion chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image type</th>
<th>CRITICAL EVENT</th>
<th>Turning Point 1</th>
<th>Turning Point 2</th>
<th>Turning Point 3</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerial photo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic art of celebrity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie poster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam image of celebrity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of celebrity as actress</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image: other than celebrity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS image of celebrity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock chart</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Image types were also coded with the text type codes, and images were identified whether if the original image was hijacked (subversive satirical or parodied practices, i.e. ‘culture jamming’ as discussed in literature review chapter) with either: lampooned words, a caption, a speech bubble; or if the original image was hijacked (i.e. superimposed) with another image in a satirical way (as represented by Table 10). An elaboration of the importance for these distinctions is discussed further in the analysis and discussion chapter.
### Table 10: Image type coded by text code: Original image hijacked with additional (satirical) text or image

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image Number</th>
<th>Photo/ image: type and description</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Hijacked original images with words/caption/speech bubble</th>
<th>Hijacked original image with another image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Photo of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: amb SS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Map: Mishor Adumim factory location</td>
<td>SS: factory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Photo of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: amb SS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SS Stock chart</td>
<td>SS: stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SS Stock chart</td>
<td>SS: stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Graphic art of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: actress X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SS photo of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: am amb SS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SS photo of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: am am amb SS X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Graphic art of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: am am amb SS X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Photo of celebrity</td>
<td>CR: actress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Oxfam logo</td>
<td>Oxfam: principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Oxfam photo of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: am am amb Oxfam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SS photo of celebrity / map of Palestine</td>
<td>CR: am am amb SS X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SS Stock chart: “worst day ever”</td>
<td>SS: stock X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SS photo of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: am am amb SS X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Photo of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: am am amb Oxfam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Aerial photo: Mishor Adumim</td>
<td>SS: factory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CRITICAL EVENT:** Reaction to SodaStream’s Announcement of Scarlett Johansson as their Global Brand Ambassadorship

1. Photo of celebrity: Image from SodaStream ad
2. Map: Mishor Adumim factory location
3. Photo of celebrity: SodaStream image of Johansson
4. SS Stock chart
5. SS Stock chart
6. Graphic art of celebrity: Scarlett Letter A for Apartheid
7. SS photo of celebrity: Scarlett’s mum on SodaStream complicity
8. SS photo of celebrity: Resting her arm on SS machine in front of apartheid wall. “Set the bubbles free! Palestinians can wait…”
9. Graphic art of celebrity: Drawing of actress over apartheid wall
10. Photo of celebrity
11. Oxfam logo
12. Oxfam photo of celebrity: Johansson visits Dadaab
13. SS photo of celebrity / map of Palestine
14. SS Stock chart: “worst day ever”
15. SS photo of celebrity: Resting her arm on SS machine in front of apartheid wall. “Set the bubbles free! Palestinians can wait…”
16. Photo of celebrity: End poverty
17. Aerial photo: Mishor Adumim

**Turning point 1:** Johansson’s response to criticism about her SodaStream ambassadorship
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10: continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 18 | **Oxfam photo of celebrity:**  
|     | “This would make a great SodaStream factory.”  
|     | CR: amb Oxfam  
|     | CR: rhetoric  
|     | X |
| 19 | **Oxfam photo of celebrity:**  
|     | “Say, so you know that SodaStream is hiring?”  
|     | CR: amb Oxfam  
|     | CR: rhetoric  
|     | X | X |
| 20 | **Photo other:**  
|     | Scott Stringer  
|     | CR: political |
| 21 | **SS photo of celebrity:**  
|     | Celebrity at security checkpoint/ Oxfam statement  
|     | CR: amb SS  
|     | Oxfam: rhetoric  
|     | X | X |
| 22 | **SS photo of celebrity:**  
|     | comparing statements by actress and Oxfam  
|     | CR: amb SS  
|     | CR: rhetoric  
|     | Oxfam: rhetoric  
|     | Oxfam: principles  
|     | X | X |
| 23 | **SS photo of celebrity / map** of Palestine  
|     | CR: amb SS  
|     | CR: rhetoric  
|     | Apartheid  
|     | X | X |
| 24 | **Photo other:**  
|     | (4 activists)  
|     | Oxfam: AP |
| 25 | **Photo other:**  
|     | (5 activists)  
|     | Oxfam: AP |
| 26 | **Photo other:**  
|     | (one activist)  
|     | CR: AP |
| 27 | **Photo other:**  
|     | (2 activists)  
|     | CR: AP |
| 28 | **Bab al Shams Village Council logo**  
|     | PA |
| 29 | **Turning point 2:** Johansson quits her role as Oxfam’s Celebrity Global Ambassador |
| 30 | **Oxfam photo of celebrity:**  
|     | “Keep it together and look concerned. Last photo op and I’m outta here!”  
|     | CR: amb Oxfam  
|     | CR: rhetoric  
|     | X |
| 31 | **SS photo of celebrity:**  
|     | Newsweek: Global Brands 2014 cover  
|     | CR: amb SS  
|     | X | X |
| 32 | **Oxfam photo of celebrity:**  
|     | “You were all great backdrops, but I’m not really that into all this human rights stuff.”  
|     | CR: amb Oxfam  
|     | X |
| 33 | **Oxfam photo of celebrity:**  
|     | “I know, and I’m really proud of my Oxfam work. It’s just…I have this SodaStream gig to get to.”  
|     | CR: amb Oxfam  
|     | X |
| 34 | **Movie poster** of celebrity:  
|     | Lost in Occupation  
|     | CR: actress  
|     | Apartheid  
<p>|     | X | X |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Oxfam photo of celebrity: Oxfam trip to Sri Lanka</td>
<td>CR: amb Oxfam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Oxfam photo of celebrity: Oxfam tour in India</td>
<td>CR: amb Oxfam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>SS photo of celebrity and other: Johansson celebrating with SS CEO</td>
<td>CR: amb SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Cartoon panel/ graphic art of celebrity and SodaStream factory workers</td>
<td>CR: amb SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS: factory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Photo of celebrity and other:</td>
<td>CR: actress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johansson in between two politicians: Johansson and The Israel Project ad</td>
<td>CR: political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Photo other:</td>
<td>CR: actress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roger Waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>SS photo of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: amb SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Screenshot from SodaStream’s Super Bowl commercial in which Scarlett</td>
<td>SS: SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johansson wonders how it all went so wrong:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Photo of celebrity with tattoo from The Israel Project:</td>
<td>CR: actress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Israel’s Project is milking Johansson’s support for settlement project”</td>
<td>CR: political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>SS photo of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: amb SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celebrity at security checkpoint/ Oxfam statement</td>
<td>SS: Apartheid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Photo other:</td>
<td>CR: political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avigdor Lieberman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Photo of celebrity</td>
<td>CR: actress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>SS photo of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: amb SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Johansson for SodaStream”</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Photo of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: actress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The intelligent and scholarly actress by right wingers, Scarlett Johansson”</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Oxfam photo of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: actress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Johansson as an ambassador for Oxfam”</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>SS photo of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: amb SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resting her arm on SS machine in front of apartheid wall.</td>
<td>SS: Apartheid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Map:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mishor Adumim factory location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>SS photo of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: amb SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hands on hips in front of ‘SodaStream: Set the bubbles free’ banner</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Photo other:</td>
<td>SS media propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS mailing label</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>SS photo of celebrity:</td>
<td>CR: amb SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hands on hips in front of ‘SodaStream: Set the bubbles free’ banner</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 illustrates the frequencies of all the coded images and text collected. An explanation on the relevance of this is clarified in section four of this chapter.

| Table 11 Data types: Text and Images Coding Frequencies |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| CODE                                           | CRITICAL EVENT: Reaction to SodaStream’s Announcement of Scarlett Johansson as their Global Brand Ambassador | TURING POINT 1: Johansson’s response to criticisms about her SodaStream ambassadorship | TURING POINT 2: Johansson quits her role as Oxfam’s Global Ambassador | TURING POINT 3: Reactions (and ensuing events) to Johansson/SodaStream Super Bowl ad |
| CODE                                           | CR: actress 13 | 11 | 19 | 26 | 69 |
| codes pertaining to celebrity                  | CR: ambassador SS 22 | 16 | 19 | 21 | 78 |
| codes pertaining to SodaStream                | CR: ambassador Oxfam 1 | 14 | 20 | 3 | 38 |
| codes pertaining to Oxfam                     | CR: ambassador conflict 7 | 25 | 32 | 21 | 85 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | Ambassador total 30 | 55 | 71 | 45 | 201 |
| codes pertaining to SodaStream                | CR: political 5 | 39 | 20 | 32 | 96 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | CR: protest activities 10 | 22 | 20 | 1 | 53 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | CR: rhetoric 5 | 57 | 41 | 18 | 121 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | TOTAL (minus ambassador total) 540 |
| codes pertaining to SodaStream                | SS: factory 15 | 53 | 32 | 44 | 144 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | SS: media propaganda 2 | 17 | 5 | 23 | 47 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | SS: rhetoric 5 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 22 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | SS: stock 13 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 21 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | SS: Super Bowl 4 | 5 | 6 | 15 | 30 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | TOTAL 264 |
| codes pertaining to Oxfam                     | Oxfam: political 2 | 19 | 12 | 17 | 50 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | Oxfam: principles 1 | 24 | 11 | 15 | 51 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | Oxfam: protest activities 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | Oxfam: rhetoric 1 | 19 | 9 | 5 | 34 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | TOTAL 156 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | Apartheid 32 | 64 | 59 | 82 | 237 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | BDS/ campaign 9 | 15 | 27 | 10 | 61 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | Media Attention 22 | 27 | 33 | 40 | 122 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | 2SS [Two State Solution] 0 | 10 | 2 | 17 | 29 |
| codes pertaining to external issues           | LJ/Z [Liberal Jews-Zionism] 0 | 13 | 5 | 19 | 27 |
As such, these tables facilitated in the construction of the conceptual maps and for me to accomplish theoretical sensitivity (discussed more in the third section of this chapter), all of which are further discussed and elaborated in the analysis chapter.

**Step 3: Theoretical coding**

Whether implicit or explicit, “theoretical codes conceptualize how the substantive codes may relate to each other as hypotheses to be integrated into the theory” (Glaser 1978: 55). Through a process of sorting, memoing (writing and theorizing), and cross referencing with the literature, the “theoretical codes “weave the fractured story back together again” (Glaser 1978: 72 into “an organized whole theory” (Glaser 1998: 163). Theoretical codes are flexible because “they are not mutually exclusive, they overlap considerably…and one family can spawn another” (Glaser 1978: 73). Although selective and theoretical coding processes occur simultaneously, substantive codes play a fundamental role because then the theoretical coding will be empty abstractions (Glaser 1978: 72). Likewise, theoretical codes capture the relationships between all the crucial categories and the core category (or what provides the best fit for the data). As the research heads toward the final emergence of core categories, theoretical sensitivity, and saturation, and accompanied with memo writing (specifically theoretical memoing), I identified the pattern how categories (and their properties) essentially relate with one another and no further data was required to collect.

Reviewing the organized data and my memos, ‘reputation’ emerged as the core category (and is discussed further in the theoretical coding section), and “Celebrity’s reputation” [CR], SodaStream’s reputation [SS], Oxfam’s reputation [Oxfam] emerged as categories. Table 12 illustrates an organization of my memos which helped me to make sense of the emerging
patterns in the data, and then orient me to identify the targets of concern (which eventually became my categories) and the core category ‘reputation’.

| Table 12: Target Reputations: Intended versus revealed through memoing |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| **TARGETS OF CONCERN** [in blog activists’ text images] | **REPUTATION** [Core Category] | **Intended** | **Revealed** |
| Scarlett Johansson/ Celebrity | Hollywood actress | Talent, beauty | Using sex and celebrity to sell apartheid, whitewashing situation in Palestine. She potentially has political interests with Zionist connections |
| Oxfam ambassador | 8 years of experience, witnessed accounts to highlight the impact of natural disasters and raise funds to save lives and fight poverty worldwide | No real diplomatic experience/ knowledge or understanding of political issues; lack of authenticity and moral integrity: 1. fulfilling incompatible/ contradictory ambassadorship roles (insensitive, irresponsible to real world issues/ people); 2. participating in humanitarian causes as part of elevating celebrity status for material reasons; and 3. lack of accountability: intentionally throws Oxfam under the bus |
| SodaStream brand ambassador | Celebrity endorsement to increase sales and product visibility | Economic rewards; inconsiderate/ ignoring surrounding political issues; associated with supporting apartheid and illegal settlement and consumer practices; potentially damaging celebrity image, persona authenticity and credibility |
| **SodaStream** | Company competing globally with Coca Cola and Pepsi by providing an alternative healthier product | Environmentally friendly and engaging in building bridges with workers and local communities | Illegal settlement/ occupation/ violating international laws; human rights violations with Palestinian employees; apartheid connections |
| | Conscientious consumerism | Lying to consumer/ misuse of labels. |
| | Utilize celebrity as a “brand ambassador” to empower the company’s image/ brand and sales | Falling stocks; unsustainable product; boycotted product; using celebrity as part of media/ image propaganda |
| **Oxfam** | Internationally recognized, respected, and credible NGO and charity | Upholding principles of anti-poverty and fighting injustices around the world | Potentially tarnishing organization’s principles |
| | Utilize celebrities as ambassadors to campaign on behalf of the organization | Delayed action to pressure Johansson to maintain organization’s economic/ fundraising interests |
Conceptual Maps

According to Novak and Gowin (1984) concept maps provide a graphic representation of a person’s knowledge or understanding of a particular topic. Concept mapping is used to elucidate and evaluate understanding of complex topics and fits well with constructivist approach—it is a tool to support reflection, helping to transform implicit associations to make explicit linkages between various concepts (Wheeldon and Faubert 2009) to understand change and processes involved and offer a means to ground theory within data (Glaser and Strauss 1967). For this study, concept maps were used as a tool to visualize and measure turning points as reflection by data collection, and that these concepts have meanings and are logically related within the concept map; in addition to understanding the temporal relationships between these concepts to events unfolding around this protest event.

Taken into consideration the data collected and my memos (as illustrated in Table 12), I constructed a conceptual map of the data: core category (reputation), categories (celebrity, SodaStream, and Oxfam), and respective sub-categories. The conceptual map, Figure 1, illustrates the raw emergence of my theoretical understanding of the data and patterns identified.
Ultimately, it is from the theoretical coding stage when I observed that unlike any other sociological studies on celebrity and movements (specifically on the limits on celebrity involvement in a controversial social movement due to the possibility for developing an antagonistic identity). In this case Mondoweiss blog activists as movement actors contest the reputation of the celebrity (rhetorically and visually) as a humanitarian fighting poverty and injustice. Although the main target is SodaStream, blog activists strategically use Johansson’s celebrity as an opportunity to generate attention and communicate grievances about the occupation in Palestine. Additionally, through her responses to the controversy, the blog activists further contest the authenticity of her humanitarianism to sustain interest throughout the protest.
event to generate mobilization and protest in the campaign against SodaStream. In the end, Scarlett Johansson is perceived as a humanitarian hypocrite for choosing economic and political motives over altruistic reasons.

For the purposes of generating attention, communicate movement grievances and mobilization, blog activists constructed the celebrity as a media spectacle during the critical event and labeled her as ‘The Face of Apartheid,’ a celebrity antagonist in the BDS campaign against SodaStream. ‘The Face of Apartheid’ is a constructed parodied form of an ‘involuntary celebrity spokesperson’ for the Palestinian movement—and Johansson is made as an example of a celebrity who deliberately chose to be on the wrong side of global humanitarian politics, specifically apartheid concerns. As such, movement actors within the group can use her image and ‘disreputable’ humanitarian celebrity story throughout the campaign and future protest performances to bolster the wider movement’s claims and to further generate attention, communicate grievances and mobilization.

As I began to fine-tune my understanding of what was going on throughout the coding process, I constructed a more precise conceptual map, representing the process unfolding as identified from the data. Figure 2 illustrates this conceptual process with the critical event and three major turning points identified.
Relatively constant categories throughout protest event:

CE: The announcement
Announcement of Johansson’s SodaStream ambassadorship is taken as a perceived threat. Activists label actress The Face of Apartheid and employ multiple opportunities to problematize her and dramatize the situation or attention.

TP 1: Celebrity’s response to activist pressures to quit SS
As more mainstream media attention increases, movement and advocates call for protest activities; focus on celebrity rhetoric to reveal contradictions; external political issues are introduced and celebrity is politicized.

TP 2: Celebrity quits Oxfam
Celebrity’s rhetoric is assessed and shamed after quitting Oxfam for perceived economic/potential reasons; celebrity’s authenticity as an actress and authentic humanitarian is contested and further lampooned.

TP 3: Response to SB commercial and ensuing events
Because celebrity is associated with SodaStream Johansson’s reputation is contested because of her connection with and support of the company; likewise, the celebrity is associated as part of an image making and media propaganda with wider politics choosing economic/potential reasons instead of humanitarian ones. The Face of Apartheid is legitimized.

Overall summary

[CE] Celebrity’s ambassadorship and relationship with SodaStream is called into question

[TP1/TP2] Celebrity’s images and rhetoric are assessed and contradictions revealed regarding celebrity’s conflicting ambassadorships ← celebrity is associated with wider political issues/connections

[TP3] [Because of celebrity’s association/support with company] Celebrity’s reputation as a Hollywood actress and authentic humanitarian are opposed/contested; therefore, celebrity is a worthy to have been labeled as ‘The Face of Apartheid’ and she is made as a prominent media spectacle to assist in the boycott [particularly future BDS campaigns against SodaStream.]

**Figure 2 Theoretical Conceptual Map:** Summarizing key categories within the critical event and three major turning points [T.P.]

Creating quantitative data from qualitatively collected data

To systematically investigate the research question, I initially performed qualitative methods of online materials as left behind ‘cultural artifacts,’ specifically, case study and going online. I approached this research qualitatively, meaning:

…an emphasis on process and meanings that is not rigorously examined, or measured, in terms of quantity, amount, intensity, or frequency. Qualitative researchers stress the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry. They seek answers to questions that stress how social experience is created and given meaning. In contrast, quantitative studies emphasize the measurement and analysis of causal relationships between variables, not processes. Inquiry is purported to be within a value-free framework (Denzin and Lincoln 1994: 4).

Qualitative research methods allow researchers to view behavior in natural settings without the artificiality that sometimes surrounds quantitative methods. These techniques allowed me to increase the depth of my understanding the social phenomena under investigation, specifically a topic that has not been previously investigated. However, while qualitative approaches assisted me to identify a core category and sub-categories of ‘representation’ (as illustrated in the conceptual maps presented above) I subsequently created quantitative data to make my data more empirically organized, replicable, and validated. Thus, the data collected and organized from the conceptual maps and tables were then systematically fashioned into quantitative data as represented in charts in order to assist my findings in the analysis chapter.

Section 4: Coding category frequencies

I created quantitative data from the editorial text and images collected from the Mondoweiss blog editorials to validate that blog activists were strategically using celebrity to draw attention to the Palestinian movement’s claims and grievances. Three targets were
identified: celebrity (Scarlett Johansson), SodaStream, and Oxfam, in addition to external issues surrounding issues which played a role in impinging how editorial perceptions and or arguments were made to contest the reputation of these three targets. Although the protest event was an extension of the BDS campaign against SodaStream, celebrity emerged as a central editorial focus and target leverage against the other two. Subsequent reactions by the celebrity to the critical event were punctuated in turning events which reflected a shift on how blog activists amplified editorial text and images to maintain enduring interests throughout the protest event. Coding analysis revealed that reputation emerged as a core theme and editorial tactics were employed to apply public mediated pressure towards a soft target (i.e. Johansson and or Oxfam) to generate some type of action and reaction that can be used against SodaStream.

Five codes were identified concerning the celebrity: 1. actress, 2. political, 3. ambassador total (this was further reduced to whether discussion was addressing her ambassadorship with either Oxfam, SodaStream or in some conflicted way), 4. rhetoric (how she responded or did not respond), and 5. protest that was enacted towards her in a creative way, either by Mondoweiss activists or those connected in the movement network—but as it pertained to the controversy).

Five codes were identified concerning SodaStream: 1. stock, 2. media propaganda (as perceived by Mondoweiss activists; this is a central focus in many of their editorials regarding the lack of media attention on apartheid in Palestine and perceived questionable democratic journalistic practices by mainstream media outlets and or journalists), 3. Super Bowl (referencing the SodaStream commercial starring Scarlet Johansson to be televised during the Super Bowl in February), 4. rhetoric (how the company or its representatives responded, or not, in statements or otherwise), and 5. factory (any discussion related to the main factory’s location in an illegal
settlement in occupied Palestine, corporate and or worker human rights violations the company was claimed to be engaging in).

Four codes were identified concerning Oxfam: 1. principles (principles that the NGO espoused and whether it was referenced and or perceived to be in contradiction to their actions), 2. political (when the NGO’s role in the controversy was perceived to be in connection to some external political context), 3. applying pressure for protest (when various forms of protest was encouraged by Mondoweiss blog activists to pressure Oxfam to make a choice regarding their relationship with the celebrity), and 4. rhetoric (whether the NGO responded, or not, in some way to the controversy), data revealed that the primary focus was on the celebrity, second on SodaStream, and then Oxfam.

Six codes were identified concerning external issues surrounding the controversy. These external issues reflected some of the key issues that Mondoweiss editors frequently discussed in their blog editorials regarding the Palestinian movement, BDS movement, the Israel/Palestinian conflict, and the illegal occupation in Palestine. Analyzed data revealed how blog activists attempted to make (perceived) authentic connections these particular six issues in some way to politicize the three targets, and in turn to contest their reputation depending on the context: 1. apartheid (occupation); 2. the BDS campaign against SodaStream (or the BDS boycott in general); 3. media attention (whether the controversy received mainstream media interest and discussion); 4. protest activities (whether encouraging supporters to participate in protest related activities pertaining to the controversy or if some activity has been engaged); 5. the two state solution/issue often discussed in Israel-Palestinian discourse; and 6. the lack of support from liberal Jews (primarily in the United States).
Drawing from the categorized codes as presented in Table 11, I re-organized the codes from the highest to the lowest. From this I identified what targets and or issues were centered on more or less during the protest event (i.e. critical event and three turning points):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 13</th>
<th>The frequencies of categorized editorial text codes based on Table 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRITICAL EVENT: announcement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SodaStream</strong></td>
<td>15: factory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oxfam</strong></td>
<td>2: political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Issues</strong></td>
<td>32: apartheid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **TURNING POINT 1: Johansson’s response to criticism** | |
| **SodaStream** | 53: factory | 17: media propaganda | 7: rhetoric | 5: Super Bowl | 2: stock |
| **Oxfam** | 24: principles | 21: protest activities | 20: rhetoric | 19: political |

| **TURNING POINT 2: Johansson quits role with Oxfam** | |
| **Celebrity** | 71: total ambassador (32: amb conflict; 20: amb Oxfam; 19 amb SS) | 41: rhetoric | 20: protest activities | 20: political | 19: actress |
| **SodaStream** | 32: factory | 6: Super Bowl | 5: media propaganda | 5: rhetoric | 5: stock |
| **Oxfam** | 12: political | 11: principles | 9: rhetoric |

| **TURNING POINT 3: Reactions to Super Bowl ad** | |
| **SodaStream** | 44: factory | 23: media propaganda | 15: Super Bowl | 5: rhetoric | 1: stock |
| **Oxfam** | 17: political | 15: principles | 5: rhetoric |
Likewise, I did the same with data collected from the frequency of coded image type as presented in Table 9:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Event: announcement</th>
<th>Turning point 1: Johansson’s response to criticism</th>
<th>Turning point 2: Johansson quits role with Oxfam</th>
<th>Turning point 3: Reactions to Super Bowl ad</th>
<th>TOTAL of top image types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3: image of celebrity as actress</td>
<td>5: image: other than celebrity</td>
<td>5: Oxfam image of celebrity</td>
<td>6: SS image of celebrity</td>
<td>15: SS image of celebrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: SS image of celebrity</td>
<td>4: SS image of celebrity</td>
<td>3: image: other than celebrity</td>
<td>3: image of celebrity as actress</td>
<td>10: image, ‘other than celebrity’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: stock chart</td>
<td>2: logo</td>
<td>2: SS image of celebrity</td>
<td>2: image, other than celebrity</td>
<td>9: Oxfam image of celebrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: graphic art of celebrity</td>
<td>2: Oxfam image of celebrity</td>
<td>1: graphic art of celebrity</td>
<td>1: map</td>
<td>8: image of celebrity as actress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: map</td>
<td>1: aerial photo</td>
<td>1: movie poster</td>
<td>1: Oxfam image of celebrity</td>
<td>Note: The most image types focused on the celebrity 32 (out of 58);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: logo</td>
<td>1: map</td>
<td>1: image of celebrity as actress</td>
<td>1: stock chart</td>
<td>and the second most image types focused on ‘other than celebrity’ (10).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Oxfam image of celebrity</td>
<td>1: image of celebrity as actress</td>
<td>1: image of celebrity as actress</td>
<td>1: stock chart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Although 53 images were collected, some images overlapped with regards to the coding of ‘image type.’ Hence the resulting total sum of 58.

These analyzed data confirmed that celebrity and the external issue of apartheid played a central editorial focus in the Mondoweiss blog activists’ blogs. From this Table I created a chart which illustrates all code frequencies for all three targets and external issues during the protest event:
CHART 1 Baseline of total frequency of all targets and external issues during the protest event

TABLE 15 Key chart representing frequencies codes used in charts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHART FREQUENCIES CODE KEY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td>SodaStream</td>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>External Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C: actress</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S: factory</td>
<td>O1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C: amb SS</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S: media propaganda</td>
<td>O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>C: amb Oxfam</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>S: rhetoric</td>
<td>O3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>C: amb conflict</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>S: stock</td>
<td>O4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>C: amb total</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>S: Super Bowl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>C: political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>C: protest activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>C: rhetoric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analyzed data reveals that two editorial focuses emerge from the data: the celebrity and the issue of apartheid. This reflects how Mondoweiss blog activists’ claims to present the Johansson as an antagonist The Face of Apartheid by strategically making a connection between the celebrity and the movement’s wider claims about apartheid or the illegal occupation in Palestine. As a brand of SodaStream, she is initially strategically used to apply pressure to the boycotted company to draw attention to the movement’s claims and grievances.
From Table 2 and Chart 1, the leading discussions pertaining the celebrity was with regards her ambassadorship (specifically the conflict surrounding her ambassadorship with both SodaStream and Oxfam), how she responded (or lack of) to the controversy, the political connections perceived by blog activists surrounding her relationships with SodaStream, her role as an actress a Hollywood celebrity, and the creative protests created as a result of the controversy facilitated by Mondoweiss blog activists.

From Table 2 and Chart 1, the leading discussions pertaining to SodaStream was with regards to its main factory in an illegal settlement in occupied Palestine, the media propaganda the company engages in as perceived by Mondoweiss blog activists, the SodaStream Super Bowl commercial Johansson was to (or had) starred in, how the company responded to the controversy, and the declining stock since the announcement of Johansson as their global brand ambassador.

From Table 2 and Chart 1, the leading discussions pertaining to Oxfam was the connection with political insinuations as perceived and connected by the Mondoweiss blog activists for failing to respond to the controversy they introduced, their principles which the blog activists used as a form of leverage to indicate the NGO was acting in a hypocritical way with how they were dealing with the controversy surrounding Johansson, how the NGO responded (or failed to) to the controversy, and, and the various forms of protests to influence Oxfam to either make Johansson respond to the controversy or to fire her as their celebrity global ambassador.

From Table 2 and Chart 1, the leading discussions pertaining to external issues are apartheid or the illegal occupation in Palestine, the amount of media attention to the controversy created by Mondoweiss blog activists as reported (and with evidence provided) by Mondoweiss blog activists, the lack of response or support by liberal Jews (a consistent topical theme in many
Mondoweiss editorials regarding apartheid in occupied Palestine), protest activists that were enacted as a result of the controversy, and the two state solution (this overlapped with the political connections blog activists made with the celebrity and Oxfam, it is also one of the consistent topic themes in many Mondoweiss editorials regarding the Israel-Palestine issue).

Table 2 and Chart 1 illustrate how there is a consistently robust focus on the celebrity (specifically with regards to her ambassadorships) and the issue of apartheid during the protest event. However, it is noted that SodaStream and Oxfam play central roles in the editorials as targets impinging editorial discussion and presentation of the celebrity.

An analysis of major themes concerning the three targets revealed that contesting reputation of the three targets was the center of editorial focus during this protest event. Specifically, Johansson’s reputation as a celebrity humanitarian fighting world poverty and injustices was called into question. Movement narratives about the illegal occupation and apartheid in Palestine, in addition to collection action frames surrounding the SodaStream factory: injustice, human rights (violations) and environmental injustice were used to problematize and politicize the celebrity’s association and relationship with the company. External issues regarding political motives and associations with United States politicians and Jews (liberal Jews/ Zionists) associated with Israel were also made. How the celebrity responded to the controversy was used by the blog activists to support their claims (in their attempts to attribute blame and shame) that she responded irresponsibly and insensitively to the issues made by choosing economic matters over social concerns.

As a target, Oxfam was initially used as a leverage to stimulate response from the celebrity. However, the Oxfam’s reputation in upholding their principles as compared to previous controversies made by their celebrity humanitarians with similar BDS campaigns (i.e.
Kristin Davis) was heavily contested since it was perceived that the NGO responded different (i.e. slowly and or for financial motives) when controversy over the celebrity Johansson was produced. Soon after the celebrity responded, a focus on Oxfam’s principles increased as the perceived delayed response of the charity organization was called into question. As reflected in the data, calls to petition Oxfam emerged and intensified during the first turning point (but ended after that point). Although Oxfam was somewhat redeemed after Johansson quit her ambassadorship with the NGO, and Oxfam was periodically criticized during the second and third turning points due to the NGO’s slow response. As with the celebrity, external issues corresponded with how economic and political motives were constructed during those turning points was drawn and associated to Oxfam.

A focus on the location of the SodaStream factory, worker human rights violations, illegal labeling practices, and playing into wider Israeli media propaganda were the main criticisms made against SodaStream. Editorial rhetoric surrounding the company was similarly made with discussions referencing external issues regarding the issue of apartheid. However, blog activists incorporated external evidence and examined perceived grievances against the company mostly in association with the celebrity’s decision to stay with the company to support their claims; and in this way, to illustrate some economic and or political motive on behalf of the celebrity. This corresponds with the contestation of the celebrity as a former humanitarian specifically on her claims to reduce worldwide injustice and poverty. Frame and narratives are used to support blog activists claims that rhetoric made by the company was part of a wider corporate media propaganda tactic, and likewise were using the celebrity to support their claims for ‘building bridges for peace’ and were ‘environmentally friendly.’ The blog activists used this rhetoric to politicize the celebrity by presenting connections between her association with the
company and wider settler colonial state political propaganda. Discussions about the boycott (specifically the *BDS campaign against SodaStream*) and stock were intended to illustrate how boycotting the company (whether then, now or in the future) was effective in negatively affecting the company’s stocks. This bolstered their claims that protest to their celebrity brand, Johansson, would be effective.

I constructed charts pertaining to the three targets and external issues so I can visually explore a more nuanced illustration on the total frequency of codes. As illustrated in the analysis chapter, quotes are supported by the data chunk number in parentheses and the blog activist author of a referenced editorial would be mentioned (refer to Table 1). Following a process-oriented approach, data is presented corresponding the editorial publication date to highlight how changes were shaped by external issues and thus protest and claims are socially constructed. Some dates represent multiple editorials published on the same date. Images presented in this chapter are to accentuate points. Images have been resized for appropriate fit. Each image includes a date number and brief description. The complete collection of images with complete information can be found in the appendix listed as Table 2.

**Chapter summary and conclusion**

This chapter provided the background, framework, and in-depth explanation of the methodology and methods on how data was collected, coded, and constructed. It presents the systematic collection and organization of data for a novel study examining the strategic use of celebrity to generate attention and communicate movement claims. The first section provided the methodological frameworks that inform the dissertation and the specific types of methods used. The second section provided information about the sources, and types of data, in addition to the
researcher’s epistemological and ontological positions. The third section laid out the data management and data coding processes following the Glaserian methodology with a constructivist orientation. A detailed explanation was provided on how the data was collected, organized, and how information was created which shaped the conceptual and theoretical ideas of the study. The fourth sections explained how qualitative data was created from the qualitative data to address the study’s questions guiding the research: 1. how do blog activists strategically use celebrity to draw attention to the wider Palestinian movement’s cause? and 2. how blog activists maintain enduring interest in campaign activities for mobilizing social action and social change over time.

From the data, the study observed how blog activists constructed a critical event around SodaStream’s announcement for making Scarlett Johansson their celebrity Global Brand Ambassador, and used this as an opportunity to create drama and as a media spectacle to draw attention to the wider Palestinian movement’s cause. As events around the celebrity unfolded during this critical event, the study identified three turning points which were instrumental in changing the blog activists tone and rhetoric (through images and editorials) about the celebrity’s reputation as being inauthentic and ultimately harmful for the movement. A more detailed presentation on the analysis of the data and findings is presented in the following chapter on data analysis.
CHAPTER 4. HISTORY

This chapter presents a historical overview and context to understanding the Palestinian movement’s narratives and frames (stemming from al-Nakba\textsuperscript{111} and subsequent events) which has shaped their claims-making and protest strategies. The chapter will start with a description of the State of Palestine’s location and a brief historical summary of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the illegal occupation. Additionally, it will provide an overview of the Palestinian and BDS movements and demonstrate how it sought to build global solidarity movement and to create sustainable alliances with others that recognize the oppression of Palestinians. The chapter will include a literature review of the controversies over media representations of the conflict, demonstrating to the reader the importance on how and why Palestinian movement activists and their allies are strategically using celebrity to counter these hegemonic accounts of the past and present issues. The chapter ends with a summary overview of: SodaStream, Oxfam, Scarlett Johansson, Mondoweiss, and Kristin Davis.

Location

The state of Palestine is located to the east of the Mediterranean Sea and is situated between Lebanon and Syria (to the North), Egypt (to its South), and Jordan (to the East). The most southern part of the state touches the Eastern tip of the Red Sea. Ramallah, East Jerusalem is the capital of Palestine. Palestine has been occupied by Israel since 1948 although European Jews and Zionists have immigrated to Palestine since the late 1800s. Over time the construction of Israel as a settler colonial state has resulted with the increasing fragmentation and annexation of Palestinian Occupied Territories (i.e. expropriation of Palestinian land for building illegal settlements and by-pass roads) which are located within the Gaza Strip (to the West and the edge
of the Mediterranean Sea) and Jerusalem and the West Bank (to the east and bordering Jordan). The Palestinian National Council declared its independence from Israel as of November 15th 1988 and Palestine became a non-member observer state of the United Nations on November 2nd 2012.

**The Israeli-Palestinian conflict**

**Al-Nakba, 1948**

As a result of chronic anti-Semitism and the persecution of Jews in Western Christian societies, Zionism emerged as an expression of Jewish nationalism with the goal of establishing a Jewish state in Palestine. The contemporary Israeli-Palestinian conflict represents a geopolitical environmental war zone which can be traced back to the late nineteenth century when the Zionist movement became the de facto ruler of Palestine after the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire during World War I. The new government was created as a result of the 1917 Balfour Declaration\(^{112}\) which sought to “facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people.” Indigenous Palestinian Arabs viewed the imported European Jewish government as colonial usurpers. Subsequent Jewish and Palestinian militias fought and British efforts could not resolve the conflict. The determination for the creation of a Jewish State and increase immigration movements of European Jews only amplified during World War II when European states and the United States were not willing to open their doors to persecuted Jews and other ethnic minorities under Hitler’s government.

In 1947, the *United Nations Special Commission on Palestine* (UNSCOP) recommended that Palestine to be divided into two states: one Arab and one Jewish. This resulted with almost half of the Palestine population—the indigenous majority on its own ancestral soil to be converted overnight into a minority under alien rule (Morris, 2001: 186) or a ‘trapped minority’
(Rabinowitz 2001). Unfortunately on November 29, 1947, the United Nations proposal (UN General Assembly Resolution 181) was accepted 33 to 13, with 10 abstentions. The U.S. and U.S.S.R. supported the resolution, while Britain abstained. The partition assigned 52% of the land to the new Jewish state, and 45% to the Arab state (Segev 2000). Jerusalem and Bethlehem (3%) was intended to be under international control (Segev 2000). Palestinians and their Arab allies opposed the recommendation and the Jewish government accepted it for strategic and tactical reasons.

On May 15, 1948, a date Palestinian Muslim and Christian Arabs refer as al-Nakba ('the Catastrophe) Zionist leaders proclaimed the state of Israel signifying the end of the British Mandate (1922-1948). 750,000 Palestinians were actively dispossessed from their homes, lands and livelihoods as a result of Israeli ethnic cleansing campaigns during the Arab-Israeli War (November 1947 and July 1949). Israel gained control over large tracts of land including 500 Palestinian villages.113 Jordan established control over the West Bank with Tacit agreement that Israel and Egypt established control of the Gaza Strip. Control of Jerusalem was split between Israeli in the West and Jordan in the East. On December 11 1948 near the end of the Arab-Israeli War, the United Nations General Assembly passed Resolution 194 stating that Palestinian refugees who wish to return their homes should be permitted to do so, and that those who do not wish to return should be compensated by the state of Israel.114 Ever since the Nakba, two extremely different narratives emerged: Palestinians commemorating the years of loss and dispossession (one of suffering and victimhood), and the Israeli state celebrating years of independence and existence (one of self-preservation and a right to uphold that, through any means possible if necessary).
Between 1947 and 1949, the Zionist leadership rapaciously practiced systematic ethnic cleansing campaigns throughout Palestine forcing indigenous Palestinians from their homes and villages outside the borders of the state (Pappe 2006). Those that remained suffered not only from diverse forms of state discrimination but also from their everyday marginalized and precarious status in both Israeli and Palestinian domains (Al-Haj 1993, Rouhana and Ghanem 1998). At the end of the Arab-Israeli war, Israel controlled 78% of Palestine (which is 25% more than the UN partition plan); and no Palestinian state was established on the remaining 22%. Despite ensuing international laws and blatant acts of dispossessions and theft of villages, lands and the destruction of indigenous Palestinian homes and lands dispossessed and refugee Palestinians (even those who were Israeli citizens) have yet been allowed to return to their homes and villages. Although the Arab League and Palestinians did not initially agree to the British partition plan, the ensuing events and international laws that were formed afterwards became a site of legal rhetoric in maintaining their narrative to be heard, respected, and legally recognized—as established by the International community.

1967

As a result of the Six Day War in 1967, Israel came to occupy large portions of land neighboring Egypt, Syria, and Jordan (remaining parts of the Mandate as defined by Britain in 1947), in addition to the Golan Heights (which was under Israeli administration). The Israeli state also illegally seized East Jerusalem, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, asserting that these were ‘disputed territories.’ As a result, Arab residents of the former Mandate were displaced and classified by the UN as refugees.
The Green Line of 1967 (which is internationally considered the limit to Israel’s contemporary legitimacy), the Oslo Accords (1993) and the Road Map (2003) have failed to reach a land agreement between the two states, or to bring Israel to withdraw and uphold the agreed 1967 boundaries. In 2002, Israel built a ‘security wall’ or ‘apartheid wall’ which meanders deep into Palestinian territory. By doing so, Israel retains control over vital Palestinian economic areas, agricultural grounds and natural resources like water. This violated more than 77 UN resolutions including UN resolution 242 (which orders its immediate withdrawal from occupied Palestinian territory after the 1967 War). Despite this and although deemed illegal, Israel continues to build Jewish settlements under a political objective of expansionism.

Unfortunately, as a result of misinformation, Israeli media propaganda, and a general lack of historical context (cf. Muravchik 2003) many observers do not trust the Palestinian word and image. And because of it Palestinians must subvert the long history of prejudice in the West that has turned them into, as Edward Said stated, “a synonym for trouble—rootless, mindless, gratuitous trouble” (1992: 7) … [Palestinians have yet to find] “a socially acceptable narrative to absorb, sustain, and circulate” the facts of their situation” (Said 1992: 254).

**Occupation, environmental appropriation and economic issues**

Early in the occupation Israel profited from occupation by imposing taxes on the Palestinians without providing them with services and instead enforced ‘security costs’ for controlling their movements. International companies like Caterpillar, Volvo and Daewoo have profited from the occupation, all three supplying equipment to the Israel state and military.117 This established a monopoly over their imports and exports into the territories, expropriating and confiscating money and land (cf. Swirski 2005). Israeli citizens quickly moved up the socio-
economic ladder and enjoyed a much higher standard of living, while Palestinians were restricted to agriculture, construction and food service (Adiv 1995). From 1967 to the mid-1980s, military production became the central focus of the economy. In mid-1980s and with financial support from the United States, Israel began to move towards revitalizing its industries, resulting in global capital beginning to invest in Israel.

Given that the Palestinian economy is tied to the Israeli economy Israel enjoys economic gains from international and humanitarian assistance to Palestine. Whenever Palestinians import goods using foreign aid money they must buy either from Israeli companies or from international companies that pay custom duties to the Israeli government (Hever 2010). Israel also gains financially from its control of all essential services in occupied territories, including communication services, electricity, telecommunications, and water. Israeli industrial zones are built in the ‘seam area’ which is between the 1967 Green Line and the Apartheid Wall.

Palestinian workers have no alternative income opportunities and are subsequently caught in a trap of working for an occupation that is pushing them out. The growth of the industrial zones and illegal settlements has had a negative effect on Palestinian businesses and the economy. While Israel is expanding its illegal settlements, constructing new housing and providing grants to settlers and to develop agricultural business, they are denying Palestinians the right to a contiguous state and preventing any possible Palestinian state from having a common border with any Arab state. Water in the region is diverted from Palestinian villages in order to serve the illegal settlements and ensuring that Palestinian any agricultural crops or livelihoods perish. In the end, because the two entities are so intertwined and despite Israel’s illegal economic and environmental gains and desire for an independent state, according to Swirski
(2005, online) “Israel’s arrogance stemming from the 1967 victory carries with it a long-term price tag … if it does not help Palestinians to create a viable economy.”

**Intifadas**

*Intifada*\(^{121}\) is Arabic meaning ‘to shake off’ and is used to describe uprisings against the Israel military occupation in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The first intifada emerged in December 1987 when an Israeli truck rammed into a line of Palestinian workers waiting to return to Gaza. The incident killed four individuals and subsequent demonstrations erupted throughout the Palestinian territories. The second intifada (September 2000) was triggered when former Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and the Israeli police visited al-Aqsa mosque. Additionally, media coverage surrounding the incidents tended to focus on extreme polar narratives and images, and as such resulted in ‘David and Goliath’ media portrayals, centering on a story of resistance and another of self-preservation.

Although the resistance networks (whether civil or guerilla based) were carefully organized, it gradually disbanded as the Palestinian people prepared for the anticipated promise of the Oslo meetings. But the national struggle was further eroded by Israel’s unbridled expansionism and the failed promises of peace process initiatives (cf. Finkelstein 1996). It was at this point when many in Palestinian civil society realized that their strategies and tactics needed to change, especially to counter the oppositional movement’s images and narratives of what was going on, by garnering support and solidarity from the international community.
Palestinian movement

The Palestinian movement is directly related to forces that shaped Palestinian national identity as a reaction to Western intervention, Arab nationalism as a reaction or Ottoman oppression and European colonialism, and Zionism. Although Palestinian nationalism initially incorporated the ideals of pan-Arabism (i.e. Arab unity and independence), the mobilizing force was primarily shaped by the Palestinian revolt against the British Mandate (1922-1948, part of the British practice of ‘divide and rule’) and Zionism. Separate from the historical making of the Palestinian political groups, the Palestinian movement was largely influenced by the 1948 war where many Palestinians were forcibly expelled off their lands. Much movement activity was shaped by the Palestinian diaspora. National interests reemerged during the 1980s when Palestinians in the occupied territories started to build an infrastructure that challenged the Israeli occupation. The movement was further solidified by the 1987 Intifada and synchronized efforts by the diaspora, establishing a local sense of unified national identity embodied in their collective struggle for self-determination.

The Palestinian movement can be characterized as a democratic based movement working for cultural, political and social rights. It can described as ‘rhizomatic’ (Deleuze and Guattari 1987) in that its horizontal model and networking logic provides the movement with a strong support structure for sustaining effective protest and mobilization operations on a global level. The movement uses alternative media as a tool and platform as a means and opportunity to engage in contentious politics within a global network in their effort to hold Israel accountable for its violation of international law through its pressure of key international governments, corporations, and institutions. Within this network they are linked by shared master frames: environmental injustice, human rights, and injustice. Benford and Snow (2000: 622)
note that one factor which appears to have a significant impact on frame resonance\textsuperscript{126} is narrative fidelity.\textsuperscript{127} These are typically narratives that unite marginalized groups against opposing power holders (Armstrong and Bernstein 2008). Therefore, effective master frames are those which echo a movement’s narrative which is the stock of knowledge which define the movement and explains their ‘history’ and source of grievances.\textsuperscript{128} The BDS movement (as a SMO) and support advocacy groups\textsuperscript{129} as part of the wider Palestinian movement are linked together though the paramount Palestinian social movement objective and narrative.

\textbf{Narratives}

These summarized historical events illustrate the shaping of Palestinian narrative which desires for a state of their own and one that will protect their rights as Palestinians. Unfortunately Palestinians have yet to see Israel support Palestinian self-determination and to acknowledge Israel’s part in facilitating their traumatic history. Furthermore, ongoing Israeli military operations in the West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem demonstrate how the State of Israel continues to ignore international laws and the immense loss suffered by Palestinians since 1948. The link between Palestinians and Israelis are deeply entrenched in this history and it continues to manifest itself in the present. The Palestinian narrative stems from the \textit{Nakba} (May 15\textsuperscript{th} 1948) the day after Israeli Independence. The Palestinian narrative centers on ‘victimhood’, borrowing language from both the Holocaust (that Israel is committing ethnic cleaning and committing genocide) and apartheid in South Africa (people ruled by imperialism and colonialism, creating a separate territory of two groups of people).

The Palestinian narrative has been marginalized and actively silenced; to the point that Edward Said (1984) solemnly describes that much of Palestinian history has been “occluded,”
making them “invisible people.” Therefore, countering this hegemonic attempt at silencing and erasing the Palestinian narrative reflects an act at ‘creating culture.’ It is a form of political resistance, and “Palestinian culture is the attempt to re-voice the silences of the witnesses, victims, and historical ‘losers’ (i.e. Palestinians) to ‘re-write’ the historical truth of events in Israel/ Palestine, before and after 1948.” (Tawil-Souri 2003:142).

Historically, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is structured by deeply embedded political relations of domination, subordination and resistance (Chomsky 2003). The conflict has been defined as an ongoing historical contest over ancestral land which is itself embedded within competing ethnic, religious, and national identities (Oliver and Steinberg 1993). Since the Nakba, successive failures of various ‘peace processes’ and increased military repressions by the Israeli state and government have led to the Palestinian discourses opposing these actions as “illegal” forms of territorial annexation and ‘apartheid’ (Shlaim 2003).

“Power is not only exercised over the land and its people, it also controls the story, its point of view, and the meta-narrative of truth and memory” (Bresheeth 2007: 165). According to Foucault, much of reality is maintained though ‘regimes of truth.’ These regimes are made though discourse to produce ‘truth effects.’ Truth effects define and shape what we see, experience, and think, what we say and do; in effect, our knowledge of the world and what we understand as ‘truth’ and ‘reality’ both enable and constrain our actions in the world. Therefore, in order to counter the truth effect of Zionist and Western discourses regarding Palestine, the BDS movement invested in apartheid and human rights discourses in order to subvert and create an alternative reality involving Palestinian experiences and realities.

This human rights and anti-apartheid narrative (which is global in scope) is central to the moral framing discourse by which Palestinians seek to legitimize their struggle for national
independence. It is a key focus whereby suffering and victimization are elaborated and integrated into Palestinian politics (Allen 2009: 163). Campaigns encourage actors to participate in direct actions such as lobbying, adopting ethical consumer practices (by boycotting or participating in creative internet protest tactics such as the redistribution of culture jammed memes) in order to demonstrate the limits of institutional politics and ultimately to expose oppositional claims misrepresenting the situation of apartheid and military occupation in Palestine. Therefore, the BDS movement emerged as an agency of the citizens of Palestine, ready to address the issues they felt were ignored by state and international structures. As such, the framing and re-framing of events stemming from the Palestinian narrative provides moral and rationalized justifications for their protest activities. The narrative matters because it shapes the movement’s culture, identity, norms, and values which all become fundamental reconstructions of the group’s social reality (Kacowicz 2005: 356-357).

Frames

Palestinian injustice/ defiance frames are typical ‘challenger’ frames adopted by weaker protagonists engaged in popular rebellions against established state powers (Wolfsfeld, 1997: 146). These frames argue the case for ending the Israeli occupation based on Palestinian ‘injustice’ and ‘liberation’ claims, and they are prominently featured within Palestinian discourses. Often, the success of a particular form of protest is measured by the amount of media coverage achieved (Gitlin 1980). The BDS movement uses effective mass media strategies, as agents of provocateurs to subvert their opponents by: 1. using frames that aligns with broader themes with their supporters and counter themes to neutralize their competitors; 2. boycotts, tapping into marketing power as a pressure on their adversaries (and to gain human and symbolic
resources); and 3. using publicity (as part of their persuasive tactics following a nonviolent ethos) to embarrass their adversaries in order to hold them accountable for their actions.

In the case of Palestinians, mobilizing fuels processes of social change. This involves the intentional recollection of an event or experience, related to a past grievance, abuse, or violation of rights, and serves as a catalyst for new processes of activism. In other words, historical memory contributes to the development of an injustice frame,¹³⁰ which is necessary for mobilization (Gamson 1995). The history of the Nakba, and the first and second intifadas, represented an attempt to mobilize memory of Palestinian displacement to not just document the past, but to also influence current framings of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (Norman 2013). “In the case of Palestine, past memories of mobilization alone may not be enough to inspire a widespread, collective nonviolent movement, but such memories, still unfolding, can be instructive in inspiring tactics and strategies as the struggle adapt to new challenges” (Norman 2013). In order to avoid the ‘nostalgia effect’, Palestine look to the past as a source of inspiration, but not to create false idealistic expectations, but as a resource for framing real strategies and tactics and applying them to contemporary realities.

This fusion of frames reflects how collective action is part of a coalition process (Diani 2005). However, Diani elaborates that “organizations involved in a movement’s dynamic will share both material and symbolic resources in order to promote more effective campaigns, and will be fairly closely linked to each other. But most importantly, they will also identify each other as part of a broader collectivity” (Diani 2005: 51). This ‘rooted cosmopolitanism’ (multiple belongings and flexible identities, while the actor may be located in one physicality) shape the new activism stratum. Alternative media is providing new forms of protest and framing of
campaigns as a result of transnational exposure and activism. Subsequently, the movement gains influence and legitimacy as more people learn about the BDS movement and their campaigns.

The Palestinian social movement encompasses a broad-based solidarity network of various political actors, and while it is a national struggle, it is anchored in global solidarity based activism. Additionally, the movement represents a form of civil society and political participation though non-violent actions toward political and economic representations at the national and international levels facilitated by the use and platform afforded by alternative media. The functions of these transnational networks depend less on shared territorial space and more on sharing common worldviews. Keck and Sikkink expand on this view by stating that transnational networks “include those relevant actors working internationally on an issue, who are bound together by a common discourse, dense exchanges of information and service and shared values” (Keck and Sikkink 1998: 2).

The BDS movement

South African apartheid, solidarity and ties

Apartheid has its roots in the racist system of domination practices by the South Africa government pre and post-independence 1994. For many Palestinian movement activists and their allies, this claim is being applied to describe the Israeli occupation and colonization Palestine. Their arguments is that there are many similarities (according to the Convention on Apartheid) six major categories of violations that amount to apartheid: 1. legalized discrimination, 2. widespread violation of human and civil rights, 3. the creation and enforcement of inhuman conditions for living, 4. isolation in ghettos (or Bantustans), 5. exploitation of labor, and 6. the repression of opposition against apartheid (Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of
the Crime of Apartheid, online). The South African global anti-apartheid solidarity movement of the 1980s was successful only because it was the result of long-term patient and international work against the mainstream to accumulate core activists and to develop a movement around the idea that apartheid was wrong, thus people around the world had a responsibility to act in solidarity through a common humanity. It is this connection that the Palestinian movement network endeavors to make in their efforts on the international arena.

Subsequent events resulting from the intifadas and with the emergence of a younger more technological savvy generation, Palestinian grassroots and local community groups changed their strategies, tactics, and activism to one that is based on non-violence and focused on establishing an international platform of solidarity and mobilization. The BDS movement is inspired by Martin Luther King Jr., Gandhi, Nelson Mandela, and utilizes the language of a nonviolent global campaign of boycott, divestment, and sanctions (BDS). Modeled after the South African anti-apartheid movement the BDS movement was initiated by Palestinian civil society in 2005. It is a global movement working to pressure Israel until it complies with international law and Palestinian rights. The BDS movement is coordinated by the Palestinian BDS National committee (BNC) and the BNC strives to enhance local and global solidarity on behalf of Palestinians. According to Omar Barghouti and Falastine Dwikat (Aoude, Cooper, and Franklin 2014: 710):

the BNC adopts the operational principle of context-sensitivity, and so it defers to activists in any particular setting to choose their own BDS targets, develop their own strategies, and build their alliances. This puts the onus on individual activists and their collectivists to analyze, critique, plan, and evaluate. In such processes, the individual do not surrender to a hierarchical leadership. The individual contributes to the group’s decision making and is empowered by the group to act as creatively and responsibly as possible. Individuals have ownership over their work and use their creativity to shape the agenda.
Likewise, BDS is a “strategy that allows people of conscience to play an effective role in the Palestinians struggle for justice.” Calling for a global response to hold Israel accountable for denying Palestinians their fundamental rights and self-determination through ethnic cleansing, colonization, racial discrimination, and military occupation, the BDS campaign for boycotts, divestment and sanctions is shaped by a rights-based approach and urges various forms of boycotts against Israel until it meets its obligations under international law by (BDS Movement Call, July 9 2005 in Lim 2012):

Ending its occupation and colonization of all Arab lands occupied in June 1967 and dismantling the Wall; Recognizing the fundamental rights of the Arab-Palestinian citizen of Israel to full equality; and Respecting, protecting and promoting the rights of Palestinian refugees to return to their homes and properties as stipulated in UN Resolution 194. In addition to promoting boycott, divestment and sanction, the movement seeks to establish a critical image of Israel in contrast to the one it presents to the world.

Another influential factor to Palestinian movement persuasive tactics stems from the South African Special Committee Against Apartheid (1963-1994). In October 1983 this committee created a ‘blacklist’ (or more accurately, a list of persuasion, which included the names of entertainers who have performed in South Africa since 1981 as a means to promote the cultural boycott of South Africa particularly in Britain and the United States of America. Enuga Sreenivasulu Reddy (the director of the United Nations Center Against Apartheid) issued a statement in 1984 explaining that the list is not a list:

for persecution, but essentially lists for persuasion. […] Through bribery and propaganda, South Africa was able to attract several entertainers from abroad—especially because of the problems of employment of entertainers. [As a result, the committee collected] a list of people who have performed in South Africa because of ignorance of the situation or the lure of money or unconcern over racism. [With the hope to persuade them and] to stop entertaining apartheid, to stop profiting from apartheid money and to stop serving the propaganda purpose of the apartheid regime. [Noting the irony, Reddy remarks how] It is rather strange, to say the least, that the South African regime which denies all freedoms…to the African majority…should become a defender of the freedom of artists and sportsman of the world. (Reddy 1984, online).
Extending Reddy’s statement to the Palestinian context, Barghouti (2008 online) notes how the real disparaging politics is reflected by the state and its supporters who call for artists to “transcend political division, unifying people in their common humanity.” Barghouti (2008 online) concludes that those who make such arguments about artists’ as if they have some special position that exist outside of their circumstance “forget, it seems, that masters and slaves do not quite share anything in common, least of all any notion of humanity.” Such arguments evade the fact that many states and their regimes that demand freedom of expression are not shamed themselves for treading on others’ freedom of expression.

**BDS campaign and strategies of nonviolence and solidarity**

Omar Barghouti acts as the leading symbolic voice for the BDS movement and describes how the movement was created paralleled to the South Africa movement; specifically one that aims to make BDS organizing into a successful and genuine mass movement as the anti-apartheid in South Africa campaign during the 1980s (Barghouti 2011). For BDS activists and their supporters, they believe Israel is an apartheid state that resembles South African Apartheid because Palestinians live under separate and discriminatory military law in the occupied West Bank and Gaza. According to Barghouti, South Africa’s condemnation of Israel as an apartheid regime and accordingly called for boycotts and divestment against it at the 2001 United Nations anti-racism conference in Durban was a “main trigger” for the launch of the BDS movement (Slovo 2014: 36).

The BDS movement was launched in 2005, starting with a call from over 175 Palestinian civil society organizations for a global campaign of boycott, divestment and sanctions against Israeli institutions and to support fundamental Palestinian rights under international laws.
Specifically, the BDS campaign is clear on its objectives: 1. an end to the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza; 2. full equality for Palestinian citizens of Israel; and 3. the right of return for Palestinian refugees uprooted from their homes and communities (Barghouti 2011). Furthermore, the BDS movement work to expose the denial of the right to return of Palestinian refugees, militarized violence directed against Palestinian men, women and children, the confiscation of land from Palestinians, the demolition of Palestinian homes and the daily racism invoked by a series of policies directed at Palestinians which encumber their freedom of mobility, access to education and ability to earn a living (Bakan and Abu-Laban 2009: 31).

The BDS movement has made considerable headway since this launch, and its efforts have built an international base of activists, all connected within a network. This network plays a critical role in bringing awareness and attention to Palestinian perspectives countering Israel advocacy group’s attempts to silence the truth about Israel’s oppression in Palestinian Occupied territories. It is important to note that the call for BDS originated with Palestinian organizations and local groups, and the movement sought to build solidarity on a firm foundation of challenging oppression and injustice. It is on this basis that the BD movement endeavors to build sustainable alliances which recognized the oppression of Palestinians as a link in the chain of a global system of inequality and oppression.

Among other goals the BDS movement advocates for the cultural and political rights of Palestinian peoples. But BDS is not the only group to advocate for Palestinian causes. There are many other groups actively engaged towards achieving various objectives on behalf of Palestine. However, the BDS movement is recognized as playing a central role in the Palestinian movement network. It is also seen as enabling the ‘movement culture’ by facilitating the Palestinian movement narratives and cultural and political objectives via their campaigns which
are cast out throughout the network. Thus, while the social movement may push Palestinian issues, BDS is a SMO working within the broader social movement and it presents campaign initiatives for those (other SMOs, activist communities, and or individual activists within the network) with the basic means and tools to participate in and incorporate into their own agendas—where the actual organizing and mobilizing takes place. BDS can be conceptualized as a vehicle for articulating and pressing a collectivity’s’ interests and claims. According to Barghouti and Dwikat:

We believe that the strength of the BDS movement is that it allows for anything from small boycott initiatives to large divestment campaigns—that it gives a way for individuals to act within their own capacity and context ... We believe, in fact, that maintaining a golden balance between individual responsibly and creativity on the one hand and collective decision making and action on the other is one of the most important factors contributing to the success of the fast-spaying BDS movement. Developing the international boycott guidelines of the BDS movement is a case in point. ... Having collectively formulated and approved guidelines is crucial for the unity and consistency of the movement. Without them, the implementation of eth boycott becomes inconsistent and subject to manipulation or misinterpretation based on personal interests. These guidelines provide a clear frame of reference and points of unity even as individuals can implement them in ways that are creative and specific to their own locations. (Aoude, Cooper, and Franklin 2014: 711-712).

The moral objective of the BDS movement and its campaigns is to demonstrate solidarity with the Palestinian people who are victims of the Israeli apartheid and occupation. Subsequently, the movement aims to raise awareness of the Palestinian issue from local grassroots initiatives to global levels. The deaths of international Palestinian advocacy activists added an additional element of international connection with those outside of the Palestinian diaspora. The murder of such international advocates such as Rachel Corrie (killed in 2003, run over by a bulldozer in Gaza) and Tom Hunter (killed in 2003, shot in the face by an Israeli tank), Brian Avery (survived after months of facial reconstructions in hospital), Tom Hurndall (shot by Israeli snipers) and countless other international activists during non-violent demonstrations by
Israelis, drew global awareness of the situation in Palestine and presented an alternative reality of the plight of the Palestinian people in the international media.

The BDS movement has been established to expose the denial of the right to return of Palestinian refugees, militarized violence directed against Palestinian men, women and children, the confiscation of land from Palestinians, the demolition of Palestinian homes and the daily racism invoked by a series of policies directed at Palestinians which encumber their freedom of mobility, access to education and ability to earn a living (Bakan and Abu-Laban 2009: 31). However, the BDS movement and their supporters insist that they “do not accept an essentialist, identity-based analytical framework as a general point of departure, we position ourselves so that prior politically or morally constructed stereotypes or discourses do not distract from the focus of our arguments…” (Bakan and Abu-Laban 2009: 31). Instead, the BDS movement’s:

framework calls for a comprehensive campaign of BDS against Israel from the perspective of international solidarity and posits the campaign as a positive and progressive step in coalition building and the advance of social movement. Further, we argue that support for this campaign can serve as a challenge to a particular element of western elite hegemony in the form of the ideology of Zionism (Bakan and Abu-Laban 2009: 32).

Finally, BDS contends that the effectiveness of a “civil society initiative, as a strategy of resistance and cross-border solidarity… [is] framed as an anti-racist movement that contests a post-second world war hegemonic constriction of state ideology, in which Zionism plays a central role and serves to enforce a racial contract that hides the apartheid like character of the state of Israel” (Bakan and Abu-Laban 2009: 32). In essence, the BDS movement is one which endeavors to revitalize peace building initiatives in the Middle East by deploying a strategy of moral resistance and building cross-border solidarity against colonization, oppression, and racism. And in framing Israel as a ‘pariah state’ by comparing it to apartheid South Africa
(Barghouti 2015, online) the BDS call has contributed to an anti-racist challenge to Orientalist and Islamophobic messages (Said 1992). It has brought back the question of Palestine in a way that resonates across ethnic, religious, and cultural divisions fueled by state actors internationally in the post 9/11 era (Said 1992).

As such, Palestinian civil society leader Barghouti (2004) affirms that there is a profound moral and ‘ethical dimension’ to the boycott against Israel:

Faced with overwhelming Israel oppression, Palestinians under occupation, in refugee camps and in the heart of Israel’s distinct form of apartheid have increasingly reached out to the world for understanding, for compassion, and, more importantly, for solidarity. Palestinians do to beg for sympathy. We deeply resent patronization, for we are no longer a nation of hapless victims. We are resisting racial and colonial oppression, aspiring to attain justice and genuine peace. Above all, we are struggling for the universal principle of equal humanity. But we cannot do it alone…Given its uncontested military superiority, the unquestioning and all-embracing support it enjoys from the world’s only empire and the lack of political will by Arab and European states to hold it in check, Israel has been gravely violating international law, with audacious impunity, showing little if any consideration for the UN or world public opinion. Only consistent, systematic and broader international pressures can help end Israel’s oppression and injustice, though ascertaining its status as a pariah state.

**BDS Campaigns**

The BDS movement engages in three types of boycotts: 1. academic, 2. consumer, and 3. cultural. Additionally, an increase in mainstream and alternative media coverage of Palestinian perspectives is emerging, despite that the majority of the reports are heavily influenced by Zionist and Israeli perspectives. Nonetheless, alternative media forums are providing opportunities to overcome these traditional media barriers and invite people on a global scale for discussion and participation. Bakan and Abu-Laban (2009) contend that the Israeli opposition rejects the legitimacy of BDS claims and responds by carefully crafting (and heavily state financed invested endeavor) a counter-response—one which is tied to anti-Semitism (i.e. hasbara). This has been a concerted and long established strategic attempt to create a barrier to
stifle or marginalized serious discussion from Palestinian voices on their everyday experiences (Mearsheimer and Walt 2007).

The economic objective of the BDS campaigns is intended to put pressure on the Israeli state through the rejection of goods generating from Israel and corporations conducting their business in occupied territory. The movement and their network advocates publicize a list of those ‘blameworthy’ companies (and increasingly this is including celebrities) on websites and request consumers to question the ethics in their purchasing and consumption decisions. There is no grand illusion that the consumer will solely collapse the Israeli economy. However, it serves as a compelling symbolic token of solidarity with Palestinians. It is a strategy based on nonviolence and persuasion tactics by raising global awareness to the Palestinian situation, and it puts pressure on the state as a means of ultimately ending apartheid and the occupation in Palestine.

Implementation of the boycott is not an end in itself. Organizations spearheading the boycott campaign need to demonstrate that the campaign is effective and worthy. Thus, the movement endeavors to find strategies and implement tactics to sustain the boycotting approach and their non-violent ethos. One way the Palestinian movement has achieved this is through its alliances with other organizations, communities, movements and individual actors that are also struggling to achieve various social justices. At the same time, asserting the Palestinian narrative (of suffering and victimhood as a result of apartheid and occupation) through primarily the injustice and human rights frames. According to Sears (2011 online):

the confidence to believe victory is possible comes from the conviction that the Palestinian case for justice is powerful and from identifying our victories to date, that remind us that BDS is winnable. The complicity of governments, corporations, and academic organizations in the Israeli oppression of Palestinians creates a responsibility to act so injustice is not done in our name. The challenge for the movement is to find effective and creative ways to make our case as we build alliances with other fighting
injustice and to persuade mass-based organizations to actively join the BDS campaign to exert ever greater pressure on the Israeli state.

**Palestinian movement activists and social media**

**Media, alternative media and the Palestinian Diaspora**

Due to the de-territorialization of Palestine, the Palestinian struggle\(^{136}\) is a diaspora and a transnational one. This makes alternative media an ideal platform and tool for facilitating a common identity, organization, mobilization, and for greatly reducing the physical space between faraway places and peoples. Using the internet creates opportunities for small, safe tasks that make it easy for movement actors and their supporters to contribute to a cause. It also allows for many others to contribute in those transformative experiences while laying the groundwork for greater forms of movement participation later on (McAdam 1986).

Additionally, Western and mainstream media\(^{137}\) tend to dominate a bias and narrative over the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. According to Humaid, a social media activist:

Most of the Western corporations and outlets are biased in favor of Israel, so they totally misled people by fabricating news, showing Palestinians’ destroyed homes as Israeli ones. This attitude sparked uproar and disgust towards those news channels—namely Fox News. Alternatively, Palestinian activists firmly focus in revealing the reality through social media tools (quoting Humaid by al-Helou 2014, online).

Using alternative media creates opportunities for small, safe tasks that make it easy for movements and their supporters to contribute to the larger cause as well as providing a window to the everyday realities and human rights violations in occupied Palestine.\(^{138}\) It also allows for many others to contribute in those transformative experiences while laying the groundwork for greater forms of movement participation later on (McAdam 1986).

As illustrated by the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the Israeli state and their allies have combined conventional operations with misinformation and propaganda disseminated through
blogs and YouTube while non-state actors (movement activists and their allies) retaliate with online narratives of their own (Knutsman and Stein 2010, online). Due to their reach and speed, alternative media have expanded and their user base has broadened, fundamentally changing the terrain of politics. The internet provides opportunities for ‘digital democracy’ and the ways online activism might assist in weakening authoritarian institutions and their allies. At the same time, Knutsman and Stein warn that states and their allies have equally strategically appropriated alternative media to accomplish their purposes. Nonetheless, as demonstrated by the “Israeli-Palestine conflict and the Israeli occupation of Palestinian lands, while the Israeli state may have found ways to control Palestinian populations on and off the battlefield, at the same time, Palestinians (and their allies) are finding innovative ways to counter act and agitate against Israeli messages, policies, and practices. What is clear is the necessarily polyvocal nature of the conflict’s digital field... [contouring] though the production of a single, visually verifiably truth” (Knutsman and Stein 2010, online).

During the first intifada, Palestinian and non-Palestinian established new activist organizations in an effort to explain the Palestinian position to the public by using primarily media relations and public outreach programs. During the second intifada, Palestinian organizations took to the internet. Palestinian activists, especially those in the diaspora who were trying to increase awareness and understanding of Palestinian concerns among Western publics and media, have become more sensitive to the way messages were constructed and propagated in the mainstream Western media. Capitalizing social media platforms, Palestinian movement activists created action alerts to mobilize the community via this transnational network of supporters and advocates, urging them to contact media outlets or political representatives. This interaction between Palestinian activists in and outside of Palestinian territories has helped
increased the overall level of Palestinian public relations to the political realm (Zaharna, et al., 2008: 232).

Aouragh (2008; 2011) demonstrates how the availability of the Internet presented new alternatives to mobility, communication, and empowerment in her research on social media use in Palestine. Alternative media also affords a mediated culture convergence with opportunities for participation, mobilization and protest by a diverse public with transnational ties—specifically in a networked context. The Internet is a mediating platform where Palestinians from different places in the world can meet each other and facilitate the cultivation of the ‘imagined Palestinian nation’ (Aouragh 2008; 2011) while also strengthen the relationships between Palestinian and global actors. Through her detailed ethnographic work, Aouragh illustrates a complex and nuanced picture of the interplay between the local and global activities, and Palestinian constructions, nationalism, and political activism online.

Aouragh (2008) contends that a politicized national identity, restricted movement, biased media framings, and political resistance facilitated alternative media use in their local and global mobilization since the second intifada. The ‘Internet is a political tool and art of everyday practice. The Palestinian activities and experiences confirm that the Internet is a passive objective and an active subject, a non-elite tactic as well as a hegemonic strategy’ (Aouragh 2008). Alternative media is a medium of communication and an alternative ‘space’, but it is not, Aouragh asserts, separate or a replacement of place. “In the case of Palestine, this virtual space is political and socially shaped by continual reference to a particular place…[the] Internet helps to make public what was previously personal, or create new links between communities” (Aouragh 2008: 29).
The Internet provides Palestinians in the diaspora and Palestinians in Palestine to negotiate their disrupted lives leading to a reconstruction of an “imagined” Palestinian nation (Aouragh 2008). It also helped to gain supporters among the international community.

The internet is ‘superior’ to other media forums [because alternative media] provides a medium in which direct participation is allowed and functions as a key communication tool. […] Interwoven in all the texts and images produced and disseminated in cyber space were the re-articulated narratives about Palestinian culture, history, and national identity. Internet offered the political and commercial modes a space to practice these communicative exchanges. Rather than viewing this development as a top-down and static phenomenon, [Aouragh highlights its] bottom-up dynamic. (Aouragh 2008: 122).

De Vries, Simry, and Maoz (2015) examined how emotional and symbolic content also presents a community with opportunities to mobilize solidarity, maintain engagement, and to organize protest among Palestinians during the 2014 war in Gaza. Through an examination of the text and images used in SNS contexts, Abu-Ayyash (2015) found that the Palestine Solidarity Movement (another SMO within the Palestinian movement network) used a human rights frame during a time of crises as an effective online strategy to facilitate SNS tools in informing, organizing and mobilizing activities. According to Abu-Ayyash (2015:16) “motivated by the need to protest against the Israeli offensive in particular and the occupation in general, solidarity movement activists were provided with the political opportunity during the attack on Gaza to organize activities in coordination with their allies and increased the level of collective action on the ground.”

Both Israel and Palestine attempt at resistance are increasingly technologically-mediated and engaging in more online forms of interactions and engagements (i.e. digital battlefields). Organizers used social media extensively during the Freedom Flotilla in late May 2010 when hundreds of international activists aimed to break Israel’s blockage of the Gaza Strip. Bazian (2014: 28) asserts that Israel’s war on Gaza during the summer of 2014 demonstrated the utility
of alternative media by activists “to alter the highly controlled and managed Israeli military and political narrative.” Despite that the Israeli state has increased its investment into digital media and dominated mainstream media outlets since the mid-2000s, the Gaza story had a Palestinian face to it on Twitter, Facebook and other social media avenues (Bazian 2014).

The point, as Bazian (2014: 30) elaborates, “is not whether protest and demonstrations are effective or not, but how to bring about a sustained effort and also engage in complementary strategies that takes the numbers in the streets and converts them into political muscle to change policies and unjust laws.” Likewise, through an analysis of message and videos that were posted in various SNSs during 2009 to 2010, Najjar (2010) found how alternate media created opportunities for users to present their stories to be heard when the mainstream marginalized Palestinian voices from conventional mediated environments. Although not all social media networking sites has been unbiased in the conflict, such as Facebook, but many have given audiences more sensitivity to user-generated content that has circumvented conventional media control of news and information (Livingstone and Asmolov 2010). This has ultimately given rise to alternative reporting (Atton and Hamilton 2008) such as journalist bloggers.

These empirical findings contribute to the background context of this study on how alternative media is increasingly being used as a platform for expressing and promoting its agenda in addition to calling for action, especially among marginalized groups. It is important to investigate the issues and practices by powerless groups as part of critical sociological endeavors. Palestinian voices are marginalized from mainstream media:

The impact of these attacks on Palestinians and the sometimes invisible violence that Israel exerts are rarely discussed. Any violence against Israelis instantly becomes the main story while the suffering of millions of Palestinians under Israel’s military occupation is merely a footnote […] Speaking of ‘two sides’ and laying equal blame on them are prime examples of how the ostensible neutrality of mainstream media turns to be complete and total bias in favor of Israel (Hassan 2015, online).
Reputation warfare and digital battlegrounds: the online battles over images and narratives between Israeli and Palestinian groups

Due to its reach and speed, alternative media and Web 2.0 technologies have also transformed the Internet into a digital battlefield. These characteristics of alternative media expanded the user base, fundamentally changing the terrain of politics. In this way, alternative media provides opportunities for ‘digital democracy’ and ways online activism might assist in weakening authoritarian institutions and their allies. In this digital age, a focus on impression/reputational management in all fields is increasingly becoming more important to protect one’s brand, image, reputation, and or narrative. “Many activist groups leverage the Internet to conduct attacks on their targets. Website blogs, message boards, email newsletters, and social media are all commonly used to urge boycotts, spread information or misinformation, and attack the brand or reputation of their targets” (Mindstar security and profiling 2015: 1). As such, a new type of ‘conflict’ is occurring online: ‘reputational warfare’ or ‘informational warfare’ (Gaines-Ross 2010, online) among cultural-political (e.g. states, social movements, celebrities) and economic/market entities (e.g. corporations).

Since the second intifada (2000-2005), both Israeli and Palestinian movements have waged an ‘identity politics,’ and ‘reputational warfare’ to contest opposing narratives and images on the Internet, participating in what is referred to ‘cyber-warfare’ or ‘weaponized social media’ (Shih 2012). The Israeli state and their allies have combined conventional operations with opposing narratives and propaganda disseminated through blogs and YouTube. At the same time, Palestinian non-state actors such as movement activists and their allies contest and present their own messages and stories online (Knutsman and Stein 2010). As the conflict in Gaza and occupied Palestinian territories intensifies, both sides are battling it out in social media outlets as
part of an intense public relations affair (Knutsman and Stein 2010; Howard 2010) reflecting the intensification of competition for attention in the attention economy (Tufekci 2013). According to Howard (2010, online) this is an example of how alternative media are profoundly shaping political culture today:

Twenty-first century civil society relies upon the Internet and other communication vices for its infrastructure, and for a digital “safe harbor” in which civic conversations can develop. This is especially true in countries where the national print and broadcast media are heavily censored. In short, technology has empowered new and vital means of political communication and acclimate citizens to democratic thought and action.

At the same time, Knutsman and Stein (2010) warn that states and their allies have equally strategically appropriated alternative media to accomplish their purposes. And certainly both Palestinians and Israelis are posting contrasting narrative accounts that are “at best partial and often blatantly distorted” (Sherwood 2014, online). Therefore outcomes are not rested on conventional military factors, but are based on the ability to draw attention, discredit one’s opponent, and to ‘win’ one’s audiences’ opinions and cultural/ ideological/ emotional support (Gaines-Ross 2010, online). It is an online battle of narratives to harness support regarding the interpretation of the recent Gaza conflict and the overall illegal occupation in Palestine (al-Helou 2014). In the context of the Israel-Palestinian conflict, these social media campaign wars are a power struggle over controlling what the global audience consumes.

Although the conflict has become a war of narrative or a war of representation the Israeli state has been found to have more insidious and effective ways of controlling which cultural insights and whose individual voices are represented as illustrated with the recent promotion of Jordana Cutler being named as the head of policy and communications at Facebook’s Israel office. Following Operation Cast Lead Israel increased its financial investment towards whitewashing the occupation. Barghouti (2014: 36) reveals that “what is less known or discussed
in the media is a hidden aspect of the Brand Israel effort—a contract that obliges artists and writers, as ‘service providers’ who receive state funding, to conform with, and indeed promote, state policies. Basically, the contract buys the artists’ and writers’ conscious making a mockery of the ‘freedom of expression’ mantra.”

Despite this heightened competition for attention, the convergence culture illustrates “a new generation of Palestinians has come to prominence in Gaza. Articulating their message in fluent English (the dominant language usage in the Internet) through blogs and Twitter, they conveyed the message to the world as a means to break their isolation, not only from the outside world but also from the rest of the occupied territories in the West Bank and the capital of East Jerusalem” (Abed al-Nasser Abu Oun, a TV correspondent and radio presenter at a local radio station as quoted in al-Helou 2014, online). Although the Israeli state may have found ways to control Palestinian groups on and off the battlefield through counterinsurgency, digital surveillance, and the like (Stein 2012, online), at the same time, Palestinians and their allies are utilizing creative and innovative ways to counteract and agitate against Israeli messages, policies, and practices. Palestinian movement campaigns such as those provided by BDS, capitalize on their supporters creative digital skills and talents within the network to facilitate their campaign objectives via alternative media platforms. In the context of the Israel-Palestinian conflict, these social media wars are a power struggle over controlling what the global audience consumes. As such, movement actors have to engage in creative and opportunistic ways in order to capture attention for political support and action.  

Subsequently a sensationalized form of brand or reputational management to create ‘buzz’ and trigger emotional responses emerged as a means to amplify attention and support regarding Israeli defenses on one hand and Palestinian human casualties on the other (Kerr
2014). This use of ‘weaponized social media’ (Kerr 2014) can be traced back when the IDF (Israel Defense Forces) during the Israeli incursion into the Gaza Strip during 2008-2009 (Stein 2012). The conflict was amplified by a ban on journalists entering Gaza which worked against Israel’s justification of defending itself against the ‘outside threat.’ This inevitably triggered suspicion about the selective truth claims practices as the IDF defended their position in various SNSs platforms, which of course Palestinian groups attempted to capitalize to their advantage.

There is a bias towards Palestinian activist journalists that has intensified since the War on Gaza in 2014 as compared to the use SNSs (e.g. Facebook) actively supporting journalist activists during the Arab Spring in 2011 (cf Dana 2016, online). This has verified a perception on Israel’s role to actively dominate the narrative through media propaganda. According to Sherwood this has resulted in the “rise of live blogs covering events such as the conflict in Gaza (2014) has led to greater reliance by journalists on social media for access to a steady stream of information in real time.” This highlights the importance for research into the roles and practices of bloggers as ‘citizen soldiers’ and netizen journalists in mediated conflicts (Hasian 2016:173). The perception of an unfair coverage of the Palestinian narrative is identified as the motivating actor on the rise of bloggers and netizen journalists and their ability to bypass the hegemonic influence in some SNSs.

According to Hasian (2016: 173) “there is a plethora of evidence that the vast majority of Israelis not only condoned, but supported the fighting in Gaza” which help to add elements of ‘truth’ to Palestinian images and stories. “Israel’s war on Gaza provoked a new way of international solidarity with the people of occupied Palestine and marked a decisive shift in global public opinion regarding the ongoing crises in the Middle East” (Bakan and Abu-Laban
2009: 30). In 2010, activists on a humanitarian convoy heading to Gaza generated sympathy when they tweeted and web casted from their boat after they were boarded by Israeli troops (Knutsman and Stein 2010, online). These social media wars intensified during ensuing conflicts in occupied Palestinian territories such as ‘Operation Pillar of Defense’ (2012) and ‘Operation Protective Edge’ (2014). Notably, Kerr (2014, online) observed that there is a ‘qualitative difference’ in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict compared to other virtual conflicts (e.g. Bahrain, Egypt, Kenya, Libya, Somalia, and Syria) in that these were some of the “first times that actual physical hostilities were mirrored by cyber-social battles for hearts and minds.”

Adding to the empirical research that alternative media is an increasingly important resource for movements and non-institutional actors as a tool and platform. The following segment addresses the growing dynamic on the blurring between entertainment and politics in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The Israel-Palestinian conflict and celebrity involvement: politicized celebrities as strategically used ‘performers’ of truth

While there are benefits related to celebrity involvement concerning political and social causes, there are certainly problems and risks. Celebrities have been criticized for their motivations for using their social networks for self-promotion rather than for altruistic reasons. This conflict of interest between celebrity commercial endorsements and humanitarianism was apparent when Hollywood celebrity Scarlett Johansson, an ambassador for Oxfam, became the celebrity spokesperson for SodaStream in 2014. Despite the controversy surrounding SodaStream,\textsuperscript{153} Johansson decided to follow her economic interests and perceived political motivations rather than her humanitarian principles and terminated her Oxfam representation.
While her contradictory position was certainly taken up by Palestinian movement activists, other non-political actors criticized Johansson.\textsuperscript{154}

Although Scarlett Johansson is not the first celebrity, the Israel-Palestine conflict is traditionally a tabooed\textsuperscript{155} subject in Hollywood because of the risks it could cause to a celebrity’s reputation or career (Meyer and Gamson 1995). Shaheen (2015) has demonstrated how Hollywood has played a political role with its propagandistic images and stories of Arabs, particularly Palestinians since 9/11. However, celebrities around the world became more outspoken about their position as the conflict in Palestinian occupied territories escalated during the summer of 2014. This was evident during many online debates involving celebrities. Celebrities such as Penelope Cruz and her husband Javier Bardem (among 100 other film professionals) signed an open letter calling on the European Union to end Israel’s military operation in Gaza (Weiss 2014, online). At the advent of the letter, “celebrities ranging from professional basketball player Dwight Howard to actress Selena Gomez and singer Rihanna and even boy band sensation Zayn Malik” joined in the ‘digital battlefield’ by tweeting #Free Palestine (Alareer and el-Haddad 2015, online). Other celebrities and well-known persons soon weighed in such as: Annie Lennox, Anthony Bourdain, Dwight Howard, D.L. Hughley, Jon Stewart, Kim Kardashian, Madonna,\textsuperscript{156} Mark Ruffalo, Mia Farrow, Rob Schneider, Roger Waters,\textsuperscript{157}Stephen Hawking, Tori Amos, and Whoopi Goldberg (Kennedy 2014, online). Record producer for artist ranging from David Bowie to U2 and Coldplay, Brian Eno has been a consistent supporter of \textit{Stop the War Coalition} since its founding, published an emotional letter in the midst of the conflict:

\begin{quote}
I sense I’m breaking an unspoken rule with this letter, but I can’t keep quiet any more. Today I saw a picture of a weeping Palestinian man holding a plastic carrier bag of meat. It was his son. He’d been shredded (the hospital’s word) by an Israeli missile attack—apparently using their fab new weapon, flechette bombs […] I suddenly found myself
\end{quote}
thinking that it could have been one of my kids in that bag, and that thought upset me more than anything has in a long time [...] But beyond this, what really troubles me is the bigger picture. Like it or not, in the eyes of most of the world, American represents ‘The West’. So it is The West that is seen as supporting this war, despite all our high-handed talk shows about morality and democracy. I fear that all the civilizational achievements of The Enlightenment and Western Culture are being discredited—to the great glee of the mad Mullahs—by this flagrant hypocrisy. The war has no moral justification that I can see—but it doesn’t even have any pragmatic value either. It doesn’t make Kissingerian ‘Realpolitik’ sense; it just makes us look bad. (Eno 2014, online).

On the other hand celebrities, notably Jewish celebrities such as Howard Stern (Eshman 2014), Jackie Mason (Toto 2014), and Joan Rivers (Alexander 2014) responded that those who supported Gaza were not just uninformed as Israel was in its right to protect its citizens, but that they were also anti-Semitic:

When told by a TMZ reporter that almost 2,000 Palestinians have been killed in the conflict, [Joan Rivers] raised her hands in moral shock: “Good. Good. When you declare war, you declare war. They started it. We now don’t count who’s dead. You’re dead, you deserve to be dead. Don’t you dare make me feel bad about that (Alexander 2014, online).

Celebrities are usually careful to manage their personas, their reputations and impressions. As discussed in the celebrity section of this chapter, celebrity supporting social or political causes are often carefully evaluated and constructed (although not always successful) as they are constantly being assessed and judged by their audiences and other actors in media. Although humanitarian causes can be viewed as a ‘safer’ avenue (versus commercial, market or politics) to improving celebrity status and visibility, the blurring of entertainment and politics is on the rise as more celebrities are engaging in partisan and controversial politics. Despite that celebrity involvement in the Israel-Palestine conflict was more or less a tabooed area in Hollywood, celebrity engagements in the online ‘digital battlefield’ over the conflict in Gaza during the summer of 2014 exemplified a change in celebrity politics.
Subsequently, the blurring of entertainment and politics also renders celebrity to greater criticism and evaluation. As demonstrated throughout this study, celebrity is a pathway to utilize persuasive tactics to generate attention and evoke emotion and debate. Nonetheless, whether celebrity endorsements actually harm the future of their careers or not, this study is examining how blog activists strategically use celebrity in persuasive tactical and creative ways. As exemplified by this study on the controversy surrounding the announcement of Scarlett Johansson as SodaStream’s celebrity brand ambassador, blog activists reveal the celebrity’s ‘true’ self (i.e. economic intentions and political stance) which is perceived as contradictory to her packaged persona and presentation as a humanitarian fighting against traumatic disasters and chronic poverty. This in turns enables them to strategically use celebrity to present their information about the illegal occupation in Palestine. This is the basis which is further elaborated in the analysis chapter. The following presents background information about: SodaStream, Oxfam, Scarlett Johansson, Mondoweiss, and Kristin Davis.

**SodaStream: The BDS Campaign Against SodaStream**

SodaStream was founded by W & A Gilbey Ltd. (London Gin distiller) in 1903, centering on its “soda-maker” (a home carbonation system) produce by George Gilbey. SodaStream has over 20 production facilities worldwide; their biggest factory is located in Mishor Adumim Industrial Park, outside of Jerusalem in the West Bank. The factory is located outside of Israel’s state borders, on a twenty-nine square mile area between Jerusalem and Jericho, expropriated from its original Palestinian owners, and takes advantage of cheap land and water resources are considered illegal according to international law (The Geneva Convention specifically prohibits an occupying power from profiting land it occupies and the European
Court of Justice ruled against SodaStream’s distributor ‘Brita’—located in Germany—that products made in settlements cannot be labeled ‘Made in Israel’ and therefore cannot benefit from trade agreements with the State of Israel. According to their website (http://www.sodastream.com/), the facility at Mishor Adumim employs about 1,3000 people (including 500 Palestinians, 450 Arab Israelis, and 350 Israeli Jews) “who all work side by side with equal wages, equal benefits and equal opportunities). Additionally, the company stress that their “Palestinian workers received wages that are 4-5 times higher than average wages in the Palestinian Authority where unemployment is as high as 30%.” The company further point out that the facility is an attempt to bridge Israelis and Palestinians.

In “About the Plant,” the company contends that:

Many misguided activists attack this facility because of its location. Some political activists even fabricate lies about this facility to undermine its legitimacy and tie it to the so-called "settlement economy" or otherwise to demonize the State of Israel. Some of these activists are even doing so under the guise of international humanitarian organizations but truth be told, many of these are being funded and fund themselves, political or terror-related groups whose true motivation is anything but humanitarian. These groups call on us to close this facility and terminate employment of our 1,300 employees, sending 5,000 Palestinians into unemployment and despair. We resist such accusations and will do everything in our power to protect our Palestinian employees from being sacrificed for a dubious humanitarian cause. We invite true humanitarians to join us in our relentless effort to build a bridge between Israelis and Palestinians. We invite partners who care enough to join us in proving every day, that peace can happen and will happen among our peoples. We invite you to show your support by telling your peers, your neighbors, your friends and family members about the dream that we are turning into a reality.

To further accentuate their position, the company posts a link for consumers to view the actual inner workings of the plant and hear from their workers supporting the company at their YouTube movie “SodaStream, Building Bridges”, which can be accessed at:

http://www.sodastream.com/aboutsodastream/#.VERq2cnp_h4
In a report based on an investigation into the corporate activity in occupied Palestinian territory, it was uncovered that (among other forms of wage and labor discrimination) the employed Palestinian work under severe restrictions of movement and organization, all worker have to obtain special permits and gain clearance from the Israeli General Security Service, products do not serve the local population but are shipped elsewhere, profits of the company benefit the Israeli economy and not of the local Palestinians, and the company practices mislabeling and consumer fraud (Who Profits 2011).

Oxfam

The following information was extracted from Oxfam’s main website, which can be accessed at:

http://www.oxfam.org/en

Oxfam, a global humanitarian organization, was originally formed in England as the Oxford Committee for Famine Relief in 1942 during World War II by Quakers. Oxfam International is an international confederation of anti-poverty and human rights charities that pushes fair trade and watchdogs major corporations (among other things) with an overall objective to find solutions to poverty and fight various social injustices around the world. In 20000, Oxfam adopted the rights-based approach as their framework and recognizes the universality and indivisibility of human rights which they adopted as their principal aims: the right to a sustainable livelihood; the right to basic social services; the right to life and security; the right to be heard; and the right to an identity (see Oxfam International Strategic Plan 2007-2012). Oxfam incorporates the assistance from celebrities in order to raise cash and awareness. According to their website, current ‘Global Ambassadors’ for Oxfam International include: Angelique Kidjo, Annie Lennox, Baaba Maal, Bill Nighy, Coldplay, Colin Firth, Desmond Tutu,
Djimon Hounsou, Gael Garcia Bernal, Helen Mirren, Helena Christensen, Kristin Davis, Leymah Gbowee, Livia Firth, Miguel Bose, Minnie Driver, and Rahul Bose.

**Scarlett Johansson**

Much of the following information was extracted from IMDb (the Internet Movie Database) which can be accessed at: [http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0424060/bio](http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0424060/bio)

Scarlett Johansson was born in New York City on November 22, 1984 to her mother, Melanie Sloan (who is from an Ashkenazi Jewish family) and her father, Karsten Johansson (who is Danish). She began her acting career in the comedy film North (1994). Following the success of the *Horse Whisperer* (1998), she starred in many other films and was later nominated for three Golden Globe Awards (one for drama: *Girl with a Pearl Earring* (2003); one for comedy: *Lost in Translation* (2003), and Woody Allen’s Match Point in 2005). She was engaged and married to Ryan Reynolds (a Canadian actor) in 2008, and later separated and subsequently divorced in 2011. In 2013 she became engaged to French journalist Romain Dauriac in 2013, and later gave birth to their daughter, Rose Dorothy, in September 2014. Johansson has also appeared in advertising campaigns for Calvin Klein, L’Oreal, Louis Vuitton and she is the face of the Spanish brand Mango and the Dolce and Gabbana make-up collection since 2009.

Scarlett Johansson is a well-known celebrity ‘brand’ outside of Hollywood. Johansson is also considered a ‘sex symbol’ and has appeared on the cover on the March 2006 issue of *Vanity Fair* in the nude. This has enhanced the hierarchical ranking of her celebrity status and market interests. She has been ranked in *Maxim’s “Hot Issues”* (a ‘men’s magazine’) (No. 6 in 2006; No. 3 in 2007; No. 34 in 2009,; No.14 in 2011; No. 17 in 2012; No.15 in 2013; and No. 2 in 2014). In November 2006, she was named the “sexiest woman alive” by *Esquire*; and in
February 2007, she was named the “Sexiest Celebrity” of the year by Playboy. *FHM* (a British monthly men’s lifestyle magazine) regularly ranks her as one of their 100 sexiest famous women since 2005. In 2010, *GQ* named her its “Babe” of the Year, and in 2011; and Men’s Heath named her as one of their “100 Hottest Women of All-Time”, ranking her at Number 12.

In 2005, Johansson became Oxfam’s “Global Ambassador” in order to assist in
highlighting the impact of national disasters and raise funds to save lives and fight poverty. For a publicity charity benefit, a fan paid 20 thousand pounds to date Johansson and accompany her to the world premiere of *He’s Just Not That Into You* (BBC News, March 14, 2008). Although she is registered as an independent, according to Goldberg (2014, online):

She told Harper’s Bazaar that she is interested in a political career. She campaigned for Kerry in 2004; Obama in 2008 and 2012; spent time boosting the youth vote in Iowa in 2008; did a short campus speaking tour; co-hosted a fundraiser featuring pro-Obama clothing and accessories; and she appeared in Will.I.Am’s song ‘Yes We Can’ inspired by Obama’s 2008 New Hampshire primary speech. At the 2012 DNC speech she said that she was there to “use whatever attention” she was “fortunate enough to receive to shed the spotlight on what’s at stake for all of us.” But with SodaStream, her considerable attention-getting powers are being used for something less admirable: to advertise for a company located in a place President Obama and Secretary Kerry and Secretary Clinton have called “illegitimate” and “an obstacle to peace” and a “cause for concern.”

**Campaign precedence: Kristin Davis and the BDS Campaign Against Ahava—An example of a redeeming celebrity humanitarian**

The following was extracting from the CODEPINK website, which can be accessed at:


Taking the BDS movement’s call for Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions against Israel for its violation of international law, CODEPINK, a US women’s anti-war movement, a women-initiated grassroots peace and social justice movement, (while this movement work to end U.S. funded wars and occupations and to challenge global militarism, they are also part of the BDS movement and pro-Palestinian advocacy network) launched the ‘*Stolen Beauty campaign*’ in
2009, highlighting the role Ahava Dead Sea Laboratories (an Israeli settlement based cosmetics and spa products company located in the illegal settlement of Mitzpe Shalem). In addition to exploited Palestinian resources and land, the company also misleadingly labels its products as “Made in Israel” when they are actually made in the Occupied West Bank.

The campaign launched a series of social media and social networking protest practices, specifically promoting the campaign on Twitter encouraging supporters to participate in an Ahava Twitter contest (using hashtags #AHAVAreborn and #stolenbeauty), as well as to participate in various culture jamming practices against the corporation in order to create awareness about Ahava’s illegal practices and its occupation and profiteering. The bad publicity caused their celebrity corporate ambassador Sex and the City actor Kristin Davis to ended her contract with the company. The campaign demonstrated how creative forms of activism (cf. Boyd and Mitchell 2013) or to ‘disrupt without disrupting’ are effective forms for mobilization and protest. According to Schurr (2012, online):

The Stolen Beauty Campaign has proven effective because it is multipronged, strategic, global and responsive. It provides space for engagement at all levels of activism, in locations around the world. The campaign employs a range of tactics including street actions, guerilla theater, culture jamming, social media work, traditional media outlets, and consumer education. The campaign acts as an omnipresent mosquito bussing around the head of the company, a target chosen because its practices contravene international law. A core group developed the campaign—the web site, the tools and resources—and coalition activists around the world were able to use them in their locales.
Mondoweiss

Mondoweiss is a citizen-journalistic based blog covering a variety of American foreign policy in the Middle East. Many of their contributing authors are Palestinian movement activists or advocates who implement campaigns objectives and activities of BDS and wider Palestinian movement through their blog editorial contributions. Mondoweiss was created in 2006 with the objective to cover American foreign policy in the Middle East, specifically issues pertaining to 9/11, Iraq, Gaza, the Nakba, and the everyday struggles among those in Israel and Palestine. Mondoweiss is a news-centric blog is co-edited by journalists Philip Weiss and Adam Horowitz.

To clarify, Mondoweiss is a virtual community, and this study is looking at a specific group of blogging activists acting as ‘movement activist auxiliaries’ or movement ‘moral’ entrepreneurs of the BDS and Palestinian movement network. These blog activists are part of a social media network of activities, connected with other SMOs through the social mediated network who are allies to the BDS campaigns and wider Palestinian movement.

According to the Mondoweiss blog, the blog stems from a progressive Jewish perspective while endeavoring to maintain a fair and balance journalistic stance. The co-editors and many of their contributing bloggers are advocates and activists of the BDS and Palestinian movement network. The blog community (although not exclusive) attracts an audience (and sympathizers) part of the Palestinian and BDS movement but also harness a lot of attention from well-known blogs and mainstream media outlets.

Throughout this dissertation, I use the term ‘blog activists’ with meaning drawn from Tufekci’s (2013) conceptualization of ‘networked micro celebrity activists.’ This “refers to the politically motivated non-institutional actors who use affordances of social media to engage in presentation of their political and personal selves to garner public attention to their cause, usually
through a combination of testimony, advocacy, and citizen journalism” (2013: 850). Although the path between a social movement actor’s actions and public attention is increasingly multiplex, Tufekci presents ‘attention’ as a distinct analytical category: it is a key resource and means to other resources and mobilization (Tufekci 2013: 849). As such, blog activists are “non-institutional actors but remain embedded within social and political networks of grassroots activities with alternative structures of accountability and representations” (Tufekci 2013: 859). Because of their visibility and social media based activities, they are well known in their communities and within the movement network. Tufekci (2013: 850) clarifies that the networked micro celebrity activists is not a ‘celebrity “in Hollywood or traditional ‘Weberian’ sense, but because of their attention—commanding abilities based on their status” and their ability to use alternative media to access networked publics.

The networked micro celebrity activist’s status is enhanced though their mass media appearances, their mentioning in other mainstream media channels, and the attention and followers they bring for the movement. However, given that these individuals are not directly chosen spokespersons, they are under intense scrutiny by movement actors and subsequently need to be legitimate, reliable, and adhere to movement values and goals (Tufekci 2013). A brief summary (what was publically shared and accessible from the Mondoweiss bog website) of the blog activists is provided the methodology chapter. This study presents the blog community (editors, editorial and image authors—the ‘blog activists’) as the ‘in-group’ representing the Palestinian position, and the ‘out group’ those actors (and potential threats) reflecting the opposing or Israeli movement’s position.
CHAPTER 5. ANALYSIS

The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate: 1. the ways in which blog activists strategically use celebrity to draw attention to the wider Palestinian movement’s claims and grievances; and 2. how blog activists maintain enduring interest in campaign activities for mobilizing social action and social change over time. This chapter is organized into two sections and presents the sequential nature on how blog activists campaign against Johansson manifested as a protest event, unfolded over a period of three months.

The first section presents how events unfolded during the critical event, specifically how blog activists strategically used Scarlett Johansson in multiple and opportunistic ways to provoke some response from her to draw attention to the BDS campaign against SodaStream and the wider Palestinian movement’s claims. Although reputation emerged as a central theme it is important to clarify that reputation, as the central theme identified from the data is the underlying theme through which blog activists are using as an opportunity to provoke a response from key targets in addition to using their highly recognized lampooned images to draw attention. Celebrity emerged as the central target (particularly to contest her contradictory ambassadorships and specifically her reputation as a celebrity ambassador fighting for poverty and injustices) and the issue of apartheid emerged as the central external issue to which blog activists are attempting to link through the key target. A detailed analysis of data demonstrates how blog activities strategically problematize her reputation specifically through the use of her celebrity as a Hollywood actress, her maternal Jewish ancestry, SodaStream’s factory location in occupied Palestinian territory, SodaStream’s falling stock prices, using apartheid, shame and blame rhetoric, creative lampooned, and hijacked images of the celebrity, Johansson’s humanitarian ambassadorship with Oxfam, and the BDS campaign against SodaStream.
The second section presents how events unfolded based on how the celebrity responded and or reacted to the controversy. A detailed analysis of data demonstrates how blog activists maintained enduring interest in campaign activities for mobilizing social action and social change by politicizing Johansson subsequent responses to the controversy. The ways in which blog activists maintain enduring interest in campaign activities will be gauged through what Strauss’ (1959) referred to as turning points. According to Strauss (1959), turning points are “critical incidents” that signalize new evaluations of self (or in this case, the other, i.e. celebrity). For this study, turning points represent the ways in which certain actions, events, and occupancies lead to sudden shifts to how editorial text and images were used to contest the authenticity of Johansson’s reputation as a celebrity humanitarian fighting for poverty and injustices around the world; thus validating their initial labeling of her as The Face of Apartheid.

Section 1 Critical event: Reaction to SodaStream’s Announcement of Scarlett Johansson as their Global Brand Ambassador

![Chart](chart1.png)

**CHART 1** Total code frequencies of three targets and external issues during the critical event
Chart 1 shows the frequency of the main categories that blog activists focused in their attempts to contest the announcement of Johansson’s SodaStream ambassadorship. The frequency shown in Chart 1 specifically reveals that out of the three targets, celebrity emerged as a central editorial target and opportunity to construct a critical event for protest. The critical event is characterized as an attempt of blog activists to strategically use celebrity in multiple ways to draw attention to the wider Palestinian movement’s claims and grievances. Particularly, blog activists attempt to problematize how a Hollywood actress is a bad marketing choice for a boycotted company and thus a potential target for supporters to capitalize to create drama for media attention and encourage protest to draw attention to the movement’s claims and grievances.

12 January

Mondoweiss blog activists (Robbins) capitalized on SodaStream’s announcement by using it as an opportunity to draw attention to the BDS boycotted company by sensationalizing the announcement around Johansson’s celebrity in the first editorial:

Sultry Scarlett Johansson is adding another image to her resume, as the new face of apartheid. (3)

The editorial is short, but it clearly sets the stage to dramatize the announcement as a threat for the movement and as such they problematize her SodaStream ambassadorship by labeling her The Face of Apartheid to make the boycotted SodaStream connection and to generate attention to the wider movement’s claims and grievances:

The SodaStream factory is built in Mishor Adumim Industrial Zone, one of the largest Israeli thefts of Palestinian land in the occupied West Bank. The chunk of land the settlement is built on separated Ramallah, Jerusalem, Bethlehem and Jericho in violation of human rights and international law. (5)
As a means of problematizing her further, Robbins incorporates how opposing media outlet such as the *Times of Israel* has pointed out that:

*Her mother is Jewish* [and she is a] *Jewish actress*. (7).

The editorial is supported with two images, a SodaStream advertisement of Johansson and a map of the settlement of Ma’aleh Adumim (images 1 and 2 in the data). These images are used as an opportunity to strategically draw attention to the celebrity by making a connection to the issues surrounded the BDS boycotted factory in occupied Palestinian territory.

**Data image #1:** Image: SodaStream

**Data image #2:** Hat tip Taxi

15 January

Three days later, blog activist Robbins use Johansson through SodaStream’s falling stocks as another opportunity to draw attention to their claims. Robbins include quotes from other media (*Bloomberg Business Week*, *Investor Place*, The Wall Street Journal blog *Money Beat*, *Monness Crespi Hardt*) which call Johansson “long-term business failure…. a momentum
fad stock\textsuperscript{161}(14) to illustrate that there is something newsworthy with the initial controversy created over the announcement:

\begin{quote}
Monday was SodaStream’s first day of trading since the announcement that Johansson was SodaStream’s new face, and the stock took a beating, and it hasn’t recovered in the two days of trading since (14)
\end{quote}

Illustrating the strategic use of celebrity for generating attention to their claims, Robbins comments about how SodaStream has been “under assault” by the BDS movement but “as predicted” from the blog’s perspective, there is no acknowledgement from mainstream media crediting the declining stocks to the boycott movement. This is a direct call for mobilization among their supporters to participate in this perceived threat and subsequent protest event regarding the controversy over the celebrity.

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Soda Stream Loses its Fizz}
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\textbf{17 January}

The third Mondoweiss editorial was published two days after the second, and Horowitz capitalizes the attention drawn by an editorial published by the New Yorker (written by Greenhouse\textsuperscript{162}) regarding the controversy over Johansson and how the company has been called
into questioned because of its location in the occupied West Bank and specifically how
SodaStream has been at the center of attention by the BDS movement:

*Online commenters were less than pleased to see the Hollywood starlet lauding the company that manufactures in Occupied Territories* (27)

Horowitz cites how Greenhouse makes the connection Mondoweiss was attempting to create regarding problematizing Johansson’s celebrity ambassadorship:

*Examples of celebrity misbehavior injuring the brands they were associated with… [but in this case] the inverse may be true.* [Horowitz quoting Greenhouse:] *Any excoriation of Johansson will come not from the company but from the public—especially in countries less politically friendly with Israel, who may label her as insensitive or irresponsible.*

*How accountable should a brand ambassador be for the actions of a company she represents? Johansson hasn’t been criticized much for the prison sentence handed down to Domenico Dolce and Stefano Gabbana for considerable tax crimes; should she be—or is it different because she’s only their model, not an “ambassador?”* [The New Yorker piece further elaborates how the controversy should not be easily dismissed as a]: *false controversy…based on a handful of angry tweets […] but that* whether you support or oppose SodaStream’s plant location, *doing business in the Occupied Territories seems, but its very nature political* (29, 30, 31).

Horowitz uses the New Yorker editorial as an opportunity to further problematize the celebrity and her decision to sign up with a company which has a controversial boycotting history regarding its plant location and corporate labeling practices and human rights violations:

*Last fall, Johansson told Harper’s Bazaar that she wouldn’t rule out a political career in the future. If she runs for office, many Americans wouldn’t be fazed by her allegiance with the brand SodaStream; most likely, only a minority would agree with the blogger Annie Robbins, who wrote on the Middle East news site of Philip Weiss, an anti-Zionist Jewish-American journalist, that Johansson’s ties with SodaStream make her “the new face of apartheid.” But surely it would matter to some. Even if Johansson stays out of politics, this dust-up could impact her image.* (32)

Horowitz continues to cite pieces of the New Yorker article to further dramatize the controversy regarding the problem with celebrity ambassadorship, especially in the case with Johansson’s experience or lack of political issues:
You agree to a quasi-diplomatic role without being trained whatsoever in the art of diplomacy. Ambassadors—the traditional sort—spend years navigating the minefields of political relations; Johansson has spent her career in ball gowns and lace Vermeeresque pearls, and cat suits (33).

Horowitz uses the New Yorker to demonstrate how their making of the announcement over Johansson has generated mainstream media attention, specifically as an “endorsement of BDS” (34).

The New Yorker editorial also questions Oxfam’s role in the controversy and that presents another opportunity for blog activists to call attention to the fact that Johansson is also an ambassador for Oxfam and how the controversy over the SodaStream announcement resembles the BDS controversy with celebrity Kristen Davis and Ahava (another BDS boycotted Israeli company). Davis chose to end her relationship with Ahava during that BDS related controversy and the celebrity subsequently continued her relationship with Oxfam instead. BDS activists and their supporters perceived as a wise move and have used it as an example of a BDS successful campaign strategy in their use of celebrity to draw attention to their claims and to capitalize on the celebrity’s ‘celebrity’ for generating attention and applying pressure on key targets:

Interestingly enough Greenhouse uses the story of Kristen Davis as a cautionary tale for celebrities that end up on the wrong side of a corporate endorsement in Israel/Palestine. (25)

Notably Horowitz ends the editorial with a question that foreshadows the ensuing protest event:

How soon before her ties to SodaStream brings this relationship into question? (35)
19 January

In the fourth editorial, Robbins capitalizes on another means to strategically use Johansson for generating attention and applying pressure on the celebrity to respond. Robbins starts the article with the graphic image of Johansson which portrays her as someone branded with the letter ‘A’ for apartheid. The image is the first of many creative, lampooned but dramatic imageries which represent a tactic by the blog activists to emphasize their claims about the celebrity and her questionable relationship with a boycotted company in Occupied Palestine. The image is based on a popular stock image of the celebrity and her décolletage; she is looking straight ahead with what appears to be a smirk on her face. Robbins leads the editorial text by directing the celebrity’s connection with the controversial BDS boycotted company:

*Actress Scarlett Johansson’s decision to represent SodaStream has already brought a shockwave of opposition because SodaStream produces its seltzer-makers in a Jewish colony in the occupied West Bank.* (39).

Promoting the lampooned image presented at the top of the editorials, Robbins subsequently encourage supporters for additional creative reprisals of the celebrity given that Johansson has not yet responded to the controversy, and she makes a point that creative supporters have until the SuperBowl to do so:
We’re expecting to see many creative responses to her decision between now and the Superbowl kickoff on Feb. 2. I contacted Johansson’s publicist to see if she has made any statement about SodaStream’s factory located on a settlement in the occupied West Bank—or, whether she is even aware of that. So far, I have not gotten a response. (40, 41)

The second image presented in the fourth article (image number 7) includes a SodaStream advert which portrays Johansson in a SodaStream white lab coat with a SodaStream machine listening to two potential SodaStream customers. The original image is hijacked with a BDS boycott stamp “Stop SodaStream” in the far right bottom corner, and a lampooned title under the image (“Scarlett’s mum on SodaStream’s complicity”) along with a hijacked speech bubble to the original ad: *Got it! Mum’s the word on SodaStream’s factory in an illegal Israeli settlement*. The image suggests that the celebrity’s lack of response points to a possible collusion with the controversial company; making herself, controversial (a point blog activists are attempting to make):

![Image of SodaStream advert hijacked with BDS boycott stamp and lampooned title](data:image)

A hijacked image of a SodaStream advert of Johansson resting an arm on one of their products is superimposed in front of the Apartheid Wall, making Johansson say in a lampooned speech bubble ‘Set the bubble free! Palestinians can wait…’

Data image #8 “Set the bubbles free! Palestinians can wait…” (graphic: Stephanie Westbrook (@stephinrome)

Robbin’s editorial reflects a perceived Mondoweiss blog success over the controversy given the type of mainstream media attention:

The day after we published Rachele Richards jaw dropping graphic of Scarlett Johansson drenched in red with sparkling bubbles in the background New York Magazine published Kat Stoefel’s brand slaying piece, “SodaStream: Guilt-Free Seltzer or Blood Bubbles?” Did someone say “blood bubbles: at a cocktail party in NYC? Those East Coast lefties are harsh! [Quoting] Stoefel: I was in the kitchen, overseeing eggnog, and I handed my co-host a bottle of seltzer made for the occasion with my SodaStream countertop carbonator. He’s the one who told me what happened next. “Enjoy your Palestinian blood cocktails,” the left-wing reporter said to the vodka drinkers. Since Stoefel’s piece, and the crucial highbrow gossip, the media is beginning to sit up straight over the SodaStream controversy. (47)

To facilitate the type of news being generated by Mondoweiss, Robbins incorporates quotes from prominent business-focused media outlets:
SodaStream Bubbles Are More Controversial Than They Appear.  

Boycotting SodaStream: Righteous protest or empty gesture?  

Boycotting businesses for political reasons is often a complicated affair...The company’s home-carbonation gizmos reduce pollution and enable people to avoid buying bottles and cans of unhealthy soda from giant corporations like Coca-Cola (KO) and PepsiCo (PEP). For those reasons, SodaStream is especially popular among socially conscious types. But now many of those people are learning that the product’s maker isn’t some little hippie-run outfit .... but is in fact an Israeli firm that has a manufacturing plant in the occupied West Bank, and so has been deemed a purveyor of “blood bubbles.” (48, 49)

Fortune’s statement is significant because it portrays that the controversy over SodaStream’s announcement of Johansson is bringing mainstream attention to people who may not be aware of the boycott or related controversial issues surrounding the company. However, not everyone is supportive to the drama generated from the controversy. Robbins exposes those media outlets dismissing the controversy as a “non-issue” and contends that “despite efforts by Haaretz to characterize the SodaStream controversy as no big deal” (53) she counteracts that:

Maybe the average Joe in Kansas has not heard of SodaStream or the boycott against it. But among the hipsters and the activists and the simply well informed, everyone now knows SodaStream is controversial. Everyone. (53)

Despite these media cynics Robbins points to how the controversy over Johansson has nonetheless generated mainstream media discussion, and particularly, that the controversy stems from BDS campaigning and blog activists work:

[Quoting Ynet’s Business and Finance section:] SodaStream’s success has been overshadowed by a political cloud, which is threatening to both the company and their spokesperson, Johansson. [And from the UK’s Daily Mail:] Controversy fizzes up around SodaStream over their use of factories in the West Bank just as Scarlett Johansson signs on to be the company’s first global ambassador. (50, 51)
Redirecting her editorial focus to Johansson and her lack of response to the increasingly mediatized controversy, Robbins points to how the *NY Post*, *Free Beacon* and *Breitbart* as ‘*bastion of integrity*’ they ‘*champion*’ Johansson's (lack of) response to the controversy:

*Instead of answering BDS jeers, she simply said she loves the brand.* (52)

However, Robbins rejects such media deniers and highlights that Johansson has supported the brand before the controversy, and not since. An indication that this critical event and overall protest event hinges on her response:

*Hmm, really? I thought she said that before the jeers started. Seriously, has anyone heard a peep out of Scarlett since this controversy erupted after the announcement of her global ambassadorship of SodaStream? Because last we heard, mum’s still the word from Scarlett.* (52)

Johansson’s lack of response is used as another opportunity for blog activists to frame the situation as an urgent call to arms. Robbins clarifies how the BDS campaign’s need for grassroots creative protests countering wider Israeli/ SodaStream’s media propaganda to withstand their public relations team in any attempt to suppress the controversy:

*And though the “*blood bubbles*” team has the bucks to hire film crews to promote lies about the occupation, boycotters have the web, pro bono graphic artists, and word of mouth. And every dollar spent on promoting SodaStream is now boosting the exposure of this apartheid product, making it an international target for raising awareness. Superbowl anyone? It’s game on.* (54)

This statement is intending to turn SodaStream’s advertisement and products, including their celebrity brand ambassador, on its head. This is indicative on how creative activists take advantage of online tactics as a significant, meaningful, and easily accessible resource (to share with the wider network) and to take advantage of any possible protest related activities. Quoting a BDS Spokesperson via *Al-Arabia*: (58)
It was very surprising that Scarlett Johansson has decided to become the new face of Israeli apartheid, especially given that she is also an Oxfam ambassador... We’re sure she’ll soon realize that there’s nothing green about Israeli apartheid. While the commercial would give the company major exposure... it will be an opportunity for us to shine a spotlight on SodaStream’s active participation in Israeli occupation, colonization and Apartheid. (55).

The editorial and critical event ends with a lampooned graphic image of Johansson over the Apartheid wall, sucking the words ‘SODASTREAM’ through a straw fostering the attempt to associate the celebrity with apartheid:

Data image #9: Italian cartoonist (Graphic: Andrej)

The critical event is multi-dimensional and it is characterized by blog activists attempts to create drama and controversy over the announcement as a means to provoke a response from Scarlett Johansson to draw attention to their claims. They do this by strategically using Johansson in multiple ways to problematize her relationship with a boycotted company: her celebrity as a Hollywood actress, her Jewish maternal ancestry, SodaStream’s factory location in occupied Palestinian territory, SodaStream’s falling stock prices, using creative, lampooned, and hijacked images of the celebrity, Johansson’s humanitarian ambassadorship with Oxfam, and the BDS campaign against SodaStream.
Section 2 Turning point 1: Johansson’s response to criticism about SodaStream ambassadorship

Turning point 1 reflects in shift in blog activists’ editorial tactics based on how the celebrity responded to their initial claims and constructed criticisms over the announcement of her SodaStream ambassadorship. Editorial text and images reveal an amplification of editorial discussion and focus on the celebrity’s contradictory ambassadorship with Oxfam and SodaStream. The purpose of this is to pressure her to respond to activists’ pressures by ending her relationship with either Oxfam or SodaStream. This is a critical turning point in the protest event because depending on how Johansson responds. Blog activists can either shift their rhetoric on her celebrity humanitarian reputation as one that has been redeemed (i.e. choosing humanitarian concerns over economic matters) or she can be shamed and thus validate their initial labeling of her as *The Face of Apartheid* for choosing economic matters. Activists and movement supporters can thus use this *Face of Apartheid* image and accompanied protest event story as an example in future BDS campaigns against SodaStream (as they have done with others
such as celebrity Kristen Davis). Johansson’s response(s) exemplify the character of turning points for this study.

Turning point 1 illustrates an editorial shift to satirizing the celebrity’s perceived ambassadorial contradictions to maintain an enduring interest in activists targeting and politicization of Johansson. This includes an intense focus on past statements the celebrity has made regarding using her celebrity to bring awareness to issues of poverty and world injustices. During this turning point mobilization efforts among supporters to protest emerge and increase editorial tactics to pressure Johansson to decide which ambassadorship (and thus which she values most, humanitarian concerns or economic ones) to support.

23 to 24 January

Blog editorials intensify their tactics to pressure the celebrity to respond to their claims by focusing on Johansson’s humanitarian relationship with Oxfam:

_Things are heating up very fast for Scarlett Johansson. Since the news broke[^186] of her stepping into her new role as global ambassador for the occupation-profit machine corporation SodaStream, activists[^187] have been pressuring Oxfam[^188] to urge Johansson to end her deal with SodaStream—and if she doesn’t, Oxfam should end its relationship with her._ (59)

Robbins provides a quote from an Oxfam executive in their response to this pressure and increasing media attention over the controversy on Johansson’s contradictory ambassadorships:

_We are proud of our relationship with Scarlett Johansson who has worked with Oxfam since 2005 to support Oxfam’s mission to end poverty and injustice. As an Oxfam Global Ambassador, she has travelled to India, Sri Lanka and Kenya to highlight the impact of traumatic disasters and chronic poverty, and she has helped to raise critical funds for life-saving and poverty-fighting work around the world. We deeply value her support. Oxfam respects the independence of our ambassadors. However, Oxfam believes that businesses that operate in settlements further the ongoing poverty and the denial of rights of the Palestinian communities that we work to support. Oxfam is opposed to all trade from Israeli settlements, which are illegal under international law. We have made our_
concerns known to Ms. Johansson and we are now engaged in a dialogue on these important issues. (62)

Following the quote, the editorial is supported with an Oxfam stock image which portrays Johansson on one of her Oxfam ambassadorial trips to Kenya:

![Johansson in Kenya](image12.jpg)

**Data image #12**: Oxfam ambassador Scarlett Johansson visits Dadaab, Kenya, the largest refugee camp in the world (photo: Oxfam)

Robbins uses Oxfam’s statement as an opportunity to problematize Johansson’s relationship with Oxfam, but to also use it as an example that dramatizing a celebrity’s ambassadorship with a boycotted company is nothing new. Robbins discusses how Oxfam was involved in a similar controversy with Kristin Davis and *Ahava* cosmetics (Davis chose to stay with Oxfam) and another case when Oxfam Italy had to cut ties with a well-known radio personality Paola Maugeri over her ambassadorship for SodaStream Italy (Oxfam chose to cut their ties with her). In either case, the celebrity’s reaction on what they did with their ambassadorship with Oxfam brings attentions to the campaign and wider movement’s issues.

However, while outcomes may be deemed ‘successful’ by activists, what happens during each protest event emerges a possible array of protest worthy reactions and opportunities to construct rhetorical tactics. What will occur with Johansson (so far at this point during the first
turning point) is unknown and can go in a variety of directions depending on how the celebrity responds. Robbins reiterates her question posited the previous week’s editorial:

_Last week we asked how soon before Johansson’s ties to SodaStream would bring her relationship with Oxfam into question._ (63). [Subsequently] _What choice will Johansson make?_ (69)

To intensify the pressure surrounding the controversy, Robbins reminds their readers and supporters that regardless of how Johansson responds, time presents them with opportunities to protest (or to create pressure) to generate attention to the movement’s wider claims:

_In 10 days time, on Feb. 2, a much touted SodaStream commercial featuring Johansson will be broadcast at the Superbowl. Between now and then something’s gotta break. The chance she can glide through the next 10 days unscathed and remain an ambassador for both seems low._ [...Referencing the Ahava/ Davis controversy Robbins reminds supporters that this type of protest/ pressure has occurred before.] (66, 67)

Immediately after this statement inquiring how and or whether Johansson will respond, creative protests intensify and mocks the lack of response. Robbins praises how two fellow supporter activist graphics were displayed in the New York Times broadening exposure on the controversy:

_Not one but two of Stephanie Westbrook’s (@stephinrome) fantastic SodaStream/ Scarlett graphics... (73)
Following a tactic during the critical event, Robbins extends the controversy regarding how Johansson will respond to remind readers her relationship with falling SodaStream stocks (indicating that Johansson herself is a ‘cheap stock’ for the company):

*In less exciting news, SodaStream stocks are as cheap as they ever been today.*

Supported with the following image:

![Data image #14: SodaStream stocks, worst day ever (Graphics: YCharts.com)](image)

**25 January**

Soon following Robbins editorial piece Johansson (external from Mondoweiss) releases a press statement on January 24th 2014:

Quoting Johansson’s PR statement throughout the editorial:

> Yet her statement, at 259 words, does not directly address any of the criticisms against her. (105) ...So how does Johansson respond? Let’s break it down: While I never intended on being the face of any social or political movement, distinction, separation or stance as part of my affiliation with SodaStream, given the amount of noise surrounding that decision, I’d like to clear the air. I remain a supporter of economic cooperation and social cooperation between a democratic Israel and Palestine. SodaStream is a company that is not only committed to the environment but to building a bridge to peace between Israel and Palestine supporting neighbors working alongside each other, receiving equal pay, equal benefits and equal rights. That is what is happening in the Ma’ale Adumim factory every working day. [Making a direct reference to Oxfam:] As part of my efforts as an Ambassador for Oxfam, I have witnessed first-hand that progress is made when communities join together and work alongside one another and feel proud of the outcome of that work in the quality of their product and work environment, in the pay they bring home to their families and in the benefits they equally received. I believe in conscious consumerism and transparency and I trust that the consumer will make their own
educated choice that is right for them. I stand behind the SodaStream product and am proud of the work that I have accomplished with Oxfam as Ambassador for over 8 years. Even though it is a side effect of representing SodaStream, I am happy that light is being shed on this issue in hopes that a greater number of voices will contribute to the conversation of a peaceful two state solution in the near future. (107, 109, 111, 114, 121, 126, 132)

Nguyen deconstructs Johansson’s statement to use an opportunity to further contest the celebrity’s relationship with SodaStream. There are key parts to her statement which Mondoweiss blog activists not only critique and contest, but which are consistently referred to and highlight throughout the subsequent protest event. Nguyen uses her statement as an indication that she is:

…supporting Israel’s military occupation and human rights abuses. (78) [In addition to:]
Standing behind the SodaStream product and praising their work environment. (83).

The editorial begins with an image of Johansson holding a serious looking fresh-face (sans makeup, intending to move beyond her crafted celebrity persona as a ‘sexy Hollywood actress’ towards a more crafted serious celebrity humanitarian person), and holding a sign with her signature below the words “end poverty!” The editorial by Nguyen is intended to contest and mock the public relations representation that Johansson is a celebrity humanitarian concerned with issues of poverty.

Date image #16: Image caption: “To be an active member of the community, to be a responsible citizen and to engage politically have always been part of my awareness and part of my life.”
The image is supported with three quotes made by Johansson before she became the SodaStream Global Brand Ambassador, foreshadowing the contradictions she makes in her statement responding to the controversy:

“To be an active member of the community, to be responsible citizen and to engage politically have always been part of my awareness and part of my life.”—Scarlett Johansson, before SodaStream became part of her life

“If you already have the spotlight shining on you, it’s great to direct that toward a cause you believe in and that you can stand behind. It’s nice to be a voice for people who don’t have a voice.”—Scarlett Johansson, before she got paid to be the voice of SodaStream

“I’m not here to be diplomatic...All causes are worth fighting for are going to be controversial.”—Scarlett Johansson, speaking on causes she is not paid for.

Nguyen is immediately critical of these statements as it is presented to contradict her SodaStream statements as a celebrity humanitarian claiming to be interested in using her celebrity to fight for social and humanitarian causes. Nguyen comes across offended that Johansson refers to the controversy and Oxfam’s conversation with her as simply ‘noise’ which Nguyen later retorts “she condescendingly portrays the same criticism as a ‘conversation’ for peace that she is proud to have contributed to with her poor decisions” by the end of her ‘short statement.” (132) Nguyen contests Johansson description that the SodaStream factory represents “economic cooperation and social interaction,” “building bridges,” and her depiction of settlement neighbors “working alongside each other” parrots known SodaStream media propaganda slogans which endeavors to portray itself as “guilt free” and “environmentally sound” (112). Nguyen conveys doubt with Johansson’s “belief in transparency,” [and suspects—and thus foreshadows—that] we will not find the SodaStream “global ambassador” questioning her sponsor’s deceptive use of the “Made of Israel” label for items produced in the occupied West Bank. (131) Nguyen contests that her lack of experience on what is going on at the factory in Occupied Palestine blatantly dismisses numerous World Bank reports which present a
different reality. Nguyen uses her statements as an opportunity to present the issues facing the controversial location where the main SodaStream factory is located:

*The nearly 37,000 Israeli citizens who live outside of Israel’s borders in Ma’ale Adumim are almost entirely Jewish.*\(^{197}\) Meanwhile, the Palestinian employees of the SodaStream factory are shipped in to Ma’ale Adumim’s industrial zone and do not interact with the Israeli residents...Although SodaStream boasts that its factory---located in the Mishor Adumim industrial park in the illegal settlement of Ma’ale Adumim—provides Palestinian employment its very existence as part of the Israeli settlement regime is what prevents Palestinian self-sufficiency and economic development—essentially preventing a viable Palestinian future, while guaranteeing a captive labor force. SodaStream pretends to be the solution to a problem it has helped to create, and from which it profits by exploiting land and labor. [...] From the very start, Mishor Adumim was not intended to benefit Palestinians. [Quoting Benny Kashriel the mayor of Ma’ale Adumim]

“Ma’aleh was established to break Palestinian continuity...[I]f we weren’t here, Palestinians could connect their villages and close off the roads, Ma’aleh Adumim necessarily cuts the West Bank into two.” (115-117, 119, 120)

This is supported with an aerial image of the industrial park\(^{198}\) with a satirized caption:

*Mishor Adumim industrial park in the illegal settlement of Ma’ale Adumim is Scarlett Johansson’s peace plan for the Middle East* (118).

To reinforce claims that Johansson’s rhetoric reiterates carefully crafted SodaStream propaganda rhetoric often used to counter the BDS boycott campaign, Nguyen brings attention to how:
In a PR video\textsuperscript{199} to counter the boycott campaign, SodaStream CEO Daniel Birnbaum claims that he maintains the West Bank factory out of an “obligation” to the workers—as if it were a Goodwill store, existing merely to provide jobs. Birnbaum further claims that “the easiest thing for me to do would be to shut down this facility. “but instead his goal is to “build bridges.” (119)

Turning point 1 reveals greater editorial attention to using Oxfam’s role and rhetoric (i.e. their statement about being in communication with Johansson, and their organization’s principles) to further pressure Johansson to make a decision about her holding contradictory ambassadorships:

\begin{quote}
In other words, SodaStream\textsuperscript{2} is like Oxfam—only publicly traded. And the solution to poverty that Johansson witnessed in her Oxfam-sponsored trips to South Asia and East Africa is the construction of illegal SodaStream factories in those communities—after placing their lands under military occupation, displacing their homes, and preventing them from controlling their own economic development. (122)
\end{quote}

The editorial focus on Oxfam is supported with pictures of Johansson taken by Oxfam on her humanitarian and poverty/ injustice fighting trip with lampooned captions:

\begin{itemize}
\item Data image \#18: Scarlett Johansson in Kenya: “This would make a great SodaStream factory.”
\item Data image \#19: “Say, do you know that SodaStream is hiring?”
\end{itemize}
Unlike previous celebrity protest events whereas Oxfam reacted fairly quickly to pressure the controversial celebrity to make a decision whether to quit or remain with Oxfam, in this case, Nguyen presents the suggestion that there are economic reasons to explain Oxfam’s delayed response to apply real pressure on Johansson:

To be clear, the role of Oxfam “global ambassadors” is not to advise on policy but rather to promote fundraising efforts. They are flown to impoverished countries for photo opportunities and to promote a feel-good vibe that brings in the dollars. Scarlett Johansson happens to have the highest paid of Oxfam’s “ambassadors.” In 2008, a single 20-minute date with Johansson, auctioned off, netted Oxfam £20,000. Oxfam has so far decided that Johansson is too financially valuable to drop, despite her embarrassments to the organization. […] (Quoting a basic response by Oxfam on their site:) We have been engaged in dialogue with Scarlett Johansson and she has now expressed her position in a statement, including stressing her pride in her past work with Oxfam. Oxfam is now considering the implications her new statement and what it means for Ms. Johansson’s role as an Oxfam global ambassador. (124, 125, 133)

In this way, Oxfam is being contested as a means to further pressure and politicize and problematize Johansson. Nguyen points to an earlier talking point concerning the problem of celebrity humanitarians introduced by Robbins during the critical event and how current criticisms against Johansson’s contradictory ambassadorship representations indicate a discernment (from those supportive of the BDS perspective) that she lacks a true understanding of the situation surrounding the controversial company she supports:

That is not why SodaStream is paying her for with its ‘multi-year partnership.’ Paid celebrity endorsements are not designed to empower or educate consumers. Furthermore, the issue is not about consumers “making” their own educated choice that is right for them.” For SodaStream, Palestinians in the West Bank are the labor force, not the target market. What is “right” for the consumers is not what is right for the laborers who manufacture the product. Consumers may have a choice, but the Palestinians do not. And despite Johansson’s belief in “transparency,” we will not find the SodaStream “global ambassador” questioning her sponsor’s deceptive use of “Made in Israel” label for items produced in the occupied West Bank. […] Scarlett Johansson initially described her partnership with SodaStream as a “no-brainer” which in a way is true. Taking money for endorsements many not require much thought, but taking a stand does. The question now is whether Oxfam can stay true to its principles enough to compel


Responing Johansson’s January 24th statement, Mondoweiss publishes another editorial by the *US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation* a coalition group part of the wider Palestinian movement network. This demonstrates how Mondoweiss blog activists are not just comprised of editorial contributions by individual activists but also include editorial contributions from a variety of advocate groups part of the Palestinian and BDS movement network. Because of their visibility, recognition, reputation and advocacy strength, these editorials and comments are used as an opportunity to continue interest to apply pressure on Johansson during this protest event. Such groups often use the blog as a platform to either share information or contribute editorials to support Mondoweiss mediatized protest work (as in this case). Generating attention (i.e. through bad publicity on how others in relationship with her responds to the controversy as well) and pressure to Johansson to make a decision about her relationship with Oxfam, the editorial piece reflects how such movement advocacy calls to action increase pressure towards Oxfam to drop Johansson for her perceived support of the company and ‘defense of [the] Israeli occupation.’ (76)

The editorial is utilized as a mobilization call for people to join more than 6,300 others by signing a petition asking Johansson to end her relationship with SodaStream. Additionally, the petition includes a call on Oxfam America to persuade Johansson to end her relationship with SodaStream and drop her as a Global Ambassador if she does not. (99) The editorial presents contributing statements from a variety of activists and coalition groups all part of the Palestinian network. This demonstrates the reach of the controversy, in addition to how connected these groups are within the movement network in supporting one another with causes they similarly
support (in this case, as it pertains to the illegal occupation in Palestine). The quotes illustrate an echoing of initial claims presented by Mondoweiss blog activists associating the celebrity with apartheid and calling her contradictory ambassadorship with Oxfam into question.

Quoting Ramah Kudaimi\textsuperscript{200}:

\begin{quote}
Scarlett Johansson completely whitewashes Israel’s brutal military occupation and colonization of Palestinian land by asserting SodaStream propaganda that the company is ‘building a bridge to peace’ between Israel and Palestine. How can a company based in an illegal settlement and profiting from the abuse of Palestinian rights contribute in any way to peace? Ms. Johansson has come out for occupation and against principles of freedom, justice, and equality. We demand Oxfam respond immediately and drop her as their Global Ambassador in accordance with their own state position that settlements are a major barrier to peace and contributor to poverty. (85-88)
\end{quote}

The celebrity and apartheid connection is further echoed in the following statement quoting Rebecca Vilkomerson\textsuperscript{201}:

\begin{quote}
Scarlett Johansson just doesn’t get it. SodaStream’s factory is located in an illegal settlement in the West Bank, profiting from the exploitation of Palestinian labor and resources that is endemic to military occupation. These conditions are the furthest thing from equal rights or ‘communities joining together’ for peace. (91)
\end{quote}

Patrick Connors\textsuperscript{202} added:

\begin{quote}
We are shocked to learn that Scarlett Johansson believes that SodaStream’s construction of a factory on stolen Palestinian land and exploitation of a captive labor force held under a brutal Israeli military occupation furthers ‘equal rights.’ We’re disturbed by her assertion that Israel’s colonial domination of Palestinians constitutes ‘communities joining together’ for peace. Given Ms. Johansson’s ringing endorsement of Israel’s military occupation, settlement, and economic exploitation of Palestinians in direct contradiction of international law and fundamental Oxfam positions, Oxfam must immediately drop her as an Oxfam Global Ambassador if it is to maintain its credibility. (89-90)
\end{quote}

Nancy Kricorian\textsuperscript{203} provides a similar perspective:

\begin{quote}
It is entirely inappropriate for Oxfam to continue to use Ms. Johansson as a Global Ambassador, given her statement directly contradicts Oxfam’s strong position against Israeli settlements. Scarlett Johansson touts the SodaStream factory in the Occupied West Bank as an Edenic scene of ‘equal rights’ and ‘social and economic cooperation.’ She needs a reality tour of the Occupied West Bank, starting with the dystopian cattle chute
\end{quote}
that is the Qalandiya Checkpoint. [Reiterating the dissatisfaction and perceived hypocrisy regarding Oxfam’s slowed response to Johansson role and association with the NGO Kricorian continues that] Oxfam must suspend Johansson from publicity work for the duration of her SodaStream contract in the way they suspended Ahava spokesmodel Kristin Davis in 2009. Anything less is pure hypocrisy. (94, 95)

Bolstering the above statement that Johansson should not be supporting a company when international research regarding the illegal activities perpetrated inside the factory are recognized (thus used to contradict her ‘experience’ as a ‘poverty fighting’ humanitarian’), quoting Andrew Kadi:204

In 2013 SodaStream refused to allow Corporate Watch to visit their factory and would not respond to questions about the minimum wage paid, options for unionization, and the exclusion of the local Palestinian Bedouin population from employment in the factory205...A job with poor working conditions, in an Israeli factory on stolen Palestinian land, within a context where Palestinians’ own economic development is stifled by Israel’s military occupation is not anything that Scarlett Johansson should be touting. Palestinians need freedom and human rights, not sweatshop jobs in factories run by Israelis. (98-99)

The above statement not only reverberate wider Palestinian movement’s narrative of apartheid and occupation but subsequently illustrate how injustice and human rights frames are frequently drawn into these discussions and used to problematize and politicize Johansson.

26 to 30 January

What truly defines turning point 1 are the editorial reactions (rhetorically and including online/ offline forms of protest) to Johansson’s 24th statement206 marking an intensification of supporters to the Palestinian and BDS movements publicly criticizing the celebrity in addition to using Oxfam as an opportunity to further problematize and politicize the celebrity by reproaching Oxfam for not responding sooner to earlier calls to pressure the celebrity. Additionally, a political focus in editorial rhetoric emerges and reflects attempts to connect the
controversy, specifically to the celebrity, to external political issues (commonly discussed in Mondoweiss editorials) regarding the perceived apathy Mondoweiss usually encounters with Zionists (primarily secular) and liberal Jews (also referring to the group as progressive Jews) when it comes to Israel-Palestine conflict discussions. An analysis of Mondoweiss editorials reveals a Jewish counter criticism to those Zionist/Jewish groups who are perceived to seek control US discourse about the Israel-Palestine conflict and instead promote a one state and pro-Israel narrative.

Weiss introduces another political connection to the celebrity and the controversial boycotted company she ‘chose to represent.’ Weiss incorporates a video in the editorial which shows United States conservative politician, former Arkansas governor Mike Huckabee (or what Weiss refers to as the ‘Rightwing Fox star’) support for Johansson and condemning Oxfam for criticizing Johansson. Echoing similar perceived propaganda statements made by Johansson (whom is perceived to parrot SodaStream’s media counter propaganda), Weiss quotes Huckabee as stating the following time the video:

What SodaStream is doing in these neighborhoods...hiring Palestinians at wages they’ve never had in their lives before...Palestinians and Jewish Israelis working side by side in a company without their political differences getting in the way. (139)

Huffington Post interviewing the Forward’s Jane Eisner (Weiss subsequently mentions how the ‘Forward was the leader of socialist Jewish life 100 years ago. And now it can’t figure out what it thinks about a military occupation by religious nationalist Jews’ 142), called the controversy “complicated”:

I haven’t quite sorted out all the competing claims. We are a small organization. I write all the editorials...Honestly there’s a lot of confusion out there. There is no question about the competing claims...I’m not really sure where the truth lies right now. It’s a very complicate issue. [...] This [is a] very fraught issue, which is debated a lot in our community. (141)
In addition to noting growing political and liberal Jewish statements publicly supporting Johansson’s response to the controversy, Mondoweiss activists’ takes advantage of these external statements to amplify the perceived political links influencing the celebrity’s response:

[Quoting a Tweet (9:01PM-26 Jan 2014) from Scott Stringer\textsuperscript{208}]: Proud of environmentalist/humanitarian Scarlett Johansson for standing strong against those seeking to undermine a two-state solution. [An update to the article provides extra information on a political connection between Stringer and Johansson:] Update: Phan Nguyen\textsuperscript{209} fills me in: “FYI, Stringer has a special relationship with Johansson. She had stumped for him several times during his recent campaign, and her brother used to work for him. So aside from the usual reasons what NYC politicians would take such a stance, Stringer had a personal quid pro quo reason.” (146, 157)

Weiss notes that Stringer’s statements coincidently reverberate Eisner’s statements the previous week when the Forward (interviewed on Huffington Post) who refused to criticized Johansson contending that:

\textit{Liberal Zionists just don’t want to criticize Johansson. Americans for Peace Now, which supports a boycott of settlement goods,\textsuperscript{210} has been silent on Johansson’s SodaStream connection. […] There’s a reason that the liberal Zionists are silent. They anticipate that within a couple of months Secretary of State John Kerry will announce a “framework” for negotiations towards a final-status agreement. And that framework “deal” is sure to suggest borders for a Palestinian entity that leave major settlement blocs—like Ma’ale Adumim, where SodaStream has its factory—inside the New Israel.} (150, 152)

Implying an external political conspiracy why liberal Jews and United State politicians are slow or refuse to criticize Johansson because it would “undermine the two-state solution” (153). However Weiss, using the Johansson controversy, approaches this as an opportunity to publicize this perceived association between liberal Jews (Jewish organizations) and politicians:

\textit{I remember when J Street started, it was going to oppose the settlements and back Obama. But it scuttled that language in a hurry, when Obama got attacked for even mentioning the ’67 borders, and the American Jewish leadership made it clear that it was backing the Israeli government. Liberal Jewish leaders refused to buck the trend. So that’s why Eisner, Stringer, Bachman, and other liberal Zionists are on Scarlett Johansson’s side. They see this as a test of all-new two state solution.} (154)
Incorporating Palestinian voices as an opportunity to facilitate interest in the campaign, Jamil Barghouti, Bab al Shams village mayor, a village located near the factory states that:

*Israel has been saying it’s serious about peace for over 20 years. Those words have proved empty when you see how settlements have massively expanded over that time. Or when you see how indigenous Palestinians have been displaced as a result of settlement expansions.* (237)

This is a prime example on how blog activists are using the controversy surrounding Johansson to draw attention to claims and issues pertaining to Occupied Palestine, in addition to facilitate interest in their attempts to problematize the celebrity to generate attention for the BDS campaign and Palestinian movement. Weiss subsequently explains that the current controversy is critical because they perceive that the situation in Occupied Palestine ended any possibilities for a two-state solution and what is occurring is a state of apartheid. Reminding that Mayor Kashriel of the illegal settlement did remark that “Ma'aleh Adumim was established to break Palestinian continuity” (156) Weiss includes a quote by Michael Ratner of the Center for Constitutional Rights who visited the settlements a few years back and:

*saw the death of the two-state solution. You’re seeing an area that’s being ethnically cleansed...You’re seeing the architecture of apartheid.... I never had a sense of this until I saw it...an open and notorious taking of land, a pass system, an apartheid system...Once you see this, it [the two state solution] is completely ridiculous. It’s three Bantustans in the West Bank, with Israel controlling everything.* (155)

External reproaches regarding Oxfam’s perceived delayed response is again used as an opportunity to present lampooned images of the celebrity with Oxfam. (The Twitter hyperlink takes readers to the Twitter page devoted to the culture jammed images, and includes tweets from supporters with their own lampooned captions for the image). The following images illustrates Johansson as seductively sipping from a SodaStream drink (taken from one of their stock ads) and is superimposed in front of one of the Apartheid Wall checkpoint’s with a queue
of Palestinians waiting inside a checkpoint cage. To the right of the image, Oxfam International’s logo and a quote about how ‘proud’ they are with their relationship with Johansson are displayed. All three elements are intended to communicate the hypocrisy that Oxfam holds with not responding to Johansson’s statement regarding choosing to remain with SodaStream, and is used an opportunity to problematize the celebrity’s relationship with the charity.

The above image and corresponding editorial is supported by a statement shared by an Oxfam founder’s grandson who intends to elevate the pressure towards Oxfam by Mondoweiss and their supporters.

Horowitz’s editorial is centered on a public statement shared by Hubert Murray:

* I am alarmed that Oxfam America retains as one of its “celebrity ambassadors” Scarlett Johansson despite her becoming the highly paid public face of SodaStream. [...] Maale Adumim, and by its association, SodaStream, are among just such causes of the suffering of the Palestinian people. Scarlett Johansson, by endorsing the kind of SodaStream propaganda that underwrites the Israeli occupation, is acting as an ambassador for oppression. (160, 163)

Reproaching Oxfam for continuing their relationships with a controversial celebrity and for not following through their principles thus tarnishing their public reputation, Murray contends that:

* The ongoing credibility of Oxfam depends on its adhering to its founding principles, which include “the relief of suffering as a result of wars or other causes in any part of the world.” [...] I urge Oxfam America to disassociate itself from Ms. Johansson so long as she chooses to represent SodaStream. I am certain my grandfather and great-uncle would agree with me. (162, 164)
Following Murray’s editorial contribution to the Mondoweiss blog, Horowitz observes that a part of the SodaStream/ Johansson commercial will be censored—but clarifies not for the reasons activists have worked towards. The editorial piece appears to be a call for mobilization with supporters to step up their protest activists given that the commercial is considered offensive only to other corporations rather than the lives of people:

Daniel Birnbaum, CEO of SodaStream, bitterly complained to USA TODAY\textsuperscript{212} late Friday that Fox rejected the Super Bowl commercial “because they’re afraid of Coke and Pepsi.” This year’s rejected ad for the make-your-own soft drink company—which stars red-hot actress Scarlett Johansson sensually sipping her home-made soda—got nixed because it ends with her saying “Sorry, Coke and Pepsi.” That’s the line Fox has demanded that SodaStream kill, says Birnbaum. Don’t get too excited. At this point the ad will still appear, just without the offending line. (168)

Creative hijacked images including a focus on Johansson’s relationship with Oxfam subsequently increases to facilitate interest and to illustrate why such mobilization calls are important. The following image illustrates the perceived hypocrisies between Johansson’s statements and Oxfam’s principles (a central talking point in the disapprovals towards Oxfam in the editorials for failing to act towards the celebrity since her January 24\textsuperscript{th} statement).

\textbf{Date image #23:} (Image via Twitter-- Stolen Beauty @BoycottAhava)
Following the trend to present growing popular hijacked images of the celebrity, another graphic made by Westbrook shows (a frequently used SodaStream stock image of Johansson wearing a tight black dress) sipping on a SodaStream drink, she is superimposed over the ‘Palestinian loss of land 1946-2010’ sequential maps and a hijacked speech bubble stemming from her stating ‘Sure, Oxfam. Let’s keep the dialogue going. What could happen’ to continue the pressure towards Oxfam by mocking their claims that they currently engaging in a dialogue with the controversial celebrity:

![Palestinian Loss of Land 1946-2010](data:image.png)

**Data image #24:** Palestinian Loss of Land 1946-2010 maps: “Sure, Oxfam. Let’s keep the dialogue going. What could happen?” (Graphic: Stephanie Westbrook @stephinrome)

Although editorial focus is primarily on the celebrity, this protest event is part of a wider BDS campaign against SodaStream. Criticisms towards SodaStream remain consistent in the type of rhetoric used in the Mondoweiss editorials. However, Johansson is central in discussion, like the hinge on a pair of pliers, to not only apply pressure on the chief target (SodaStream), but to strategically use her celebrity to generate attention and maintain interest to claims and grievances during this protest event. SodaStream (and related issues surrounding the company such as its factory location, worker, and human rights violations, and mislabeling practices) is thus used as an opportunity to be communicated through the editorial controversy on the celebrity:
SodaStream markets itself as environmentally friendly, but this hides the ugly truth: the company is a colonial enterprise with its main production facility located in the settlement of Maale Adumim in the occupied Palestinian territory (OPT). Settlements are illegal under international law and constitute a war crime. Palestinians are not employed in Israeli settlements as a matter of freewill; they are subjects or a captive economy. Moreover, Palestinian workers employed by SodaStream have explained that they face systematic discrimination and are “treated like slaves.” SodaStream is a key beneficiary of Israel’s occupation of Palestinian land and of the denial of self-determination to Palestinians. The company benefits from government subsidies and tax-breaks established to encourage businesses to operate in Israeli Settlements, allowing them to become viable and flourish. (172, 177, 179, 180)

To further problematize the company, Robbins shares local Palestinian voices about the SodaStream factory:

Providing evidence that ‘the settlement has always been labeled a problem for peace by successive U.S. administrations, the United Nations and peace negotiators’, and according to ‘recent European Union guidelines that no settlements should benefit from European Union taxpayers’ money.’ Instead, notes how ‘all companies operating in settlements directly support Israel’s illegal occupation and colonization by paying taxes to municipal settlement governments’, which in turn supports ‘the economic infrastructures for Israel’s settlement expansion’ (231, 232)

As such, the celebrity is censured for not fully responding to the controversy and taking activists claims seriously. Johansson is perceived to legitimize initial claims made during the critical event (which were initially based on satire and sensationalized to draw attention to the campaign against SodaStream) about the celebrity as her statement resembles the company’s manufactured perceived propaganda rhetoric:

We rebuke Johansson’s remarks that SodaStream is “building a bridge to peace between Israel and Palestine”. This position seems to come directly from the company’s propaganda textbook and has been consistently refuted by Palestinians. It is not for Johansson to lecture Palestinians on what is good for them. (176)

The data reflects that activists are growing more suspicious towards the celebrity and that she is supports the company’s perceived media propaganda:
SodaStream has always chosen not to address its complicity with the Israeli occupation and violations of Palestinian human rights, but rather to pour money into image campaigns, going so far as to use their own Palestinian workers for this purpose.\textsuperscript{215} (196)

As such, mounting pressure and editorial rhetoric towards Oxfam are intensified to pressure the celebrity to make a decision with her relationship with the charity:

\textit{Johansson speaks of purported “economic cooperation” between the Palestinian people living under occupation and the Israeli occupying power, describing them as “neighbors working alongside each other” enjoying “equal rights.” As Oxfam knows well, the reality is quite different…It is precisely due to the Israeli occupation, from which SodaStream profits, that Palestinian workers often have no choice but to work in illegal settlements, as Oxfam itself has documented.} (193, 194)

Maintaining her in his position will only undermine the work of Oxfam and the relationship of trust it has established with the Palestinian people, and not only, damaging the credibility of the organization. [...] with this letter, we join the calls from academics and intellectuals,\textsuperscript{216} human rights organizations in the United States,\textsuperscript{217} Palestinian civil society\textsuperscript{218} as well as the nephew of one of the founders of Oxfam,\textsuperscript{219} urging Oxfam to suspend Johansson from her role as ambassador’…to ensure the organization understand that the current paradoxical situation cannot continue, in order to safeguard the reputation of Oxfam as well as to send a clear message…that promoting illegal activities violating the rights of persons has no place in Oxfam} (199, 200)

Using Oxfam as a means to pressure the celebrity brings a variety of opportunities to maintain interest in the campaign and to encourage mobilization and protest activities to draw attention to campaign claims and grievances. Norr shares that the British national daily newspaper, the \textit{Guardian}:

\textit{has launched an online poll on the ScarJo controversy\textsuperscript{220}[using a Hollywood nickname Johansson is known not to like]. So far it’s a blowout: 87% of voters (number unspecified) says yes, Oxfam should sever its ties with [Johansson…] vote now, and spread the word. [Poll closed 4 February, 2014 and resulted in a majority yes with 53% and no with 47%.]} (203, 204)

However, the controversy has not only generated online discourse and activity but the Mondoweiss editorials during turning point 1 reveal how the online controversy has shaped
activity offline. Activists deliver petitions (according to the editorial the petition contained more than 10,000 signatures\textsuperscript{221}) accompanied with the hijacked and lampooned creative images circulating online to Oxfam offices in Boston, New York, Los Angeles, and Washington, D.C. urging Oxfam representatives to stay true to their principles and cut their ties with Johansson.

The meeting and visits in four U.S. cities came amidst a viral debate in mainstream media\textsuperscript{222} and social media\textsuperscript{223} about Johansson’s role as a Global Ambassador for both Oxfam and SodaStream [...] a Twitter Thunderclap organized by CODEPINK: Women for Peace\textsuperscript{223} with the message “Tell Oxfam to drop SodaStream Ambassador Scarlett Johansson. Occupation isn’t green or ‘guilt free’” had a social reach of nearly 2 million people. Online memes contrasting Johansson’s support for a settlement-based “green” drink company with Israel’s systematic repression of the Palestinian people have also captured media and popular attention.\textsuperscript{224} (210-212)

Data image #25: Activists at Oxfam America’s office in Washington DC. (Photo: US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation)

Activists also attempt to pressure Johansson’s representatives at Creative Artists Agency (receiving no response) to “stand on the rights side of history and end your relationships with SodaStream” (220).

Mondoweiss editorials use these as an indication that their campaigning of the controversy is working and is maintaining interest because it is viewed as important. Therefore, leveraging Oxfam to stand by their principles and to ‘distance itself from Johansson over her support for SodaStream’ (224) helps them to further contest and pressure the celebrity.
Oxfam cannot credibly oppose illegal Israeli settlements in the OPT, describing them as a root cause for poverty among Palestinians, while maintaining as an ambassador somebody who has deemed it appropriate to describe the establishment of an Israeli settlement factory on land from which Palestinians have been ethnically cleansed as a form of “economic cooperation.” Oxfam has said in a statement that it is in “dialogue” with Johansson over her SodaStream promotion deal. However it has become increasingly clear that this “dialogue” has not yielded positive results and Johansson’s position has been made crystal clear. […] According to Oxfam, the Israeli army forcefully expelled 200 Palestinian families from their homes to make space for the construction of Maale Adumim in the early 1990s. […] In recent days this issue attracted an enormous amount of controversy in the international press as well as in social media with Oxfam being a focus of attention. (174, 175, 181, 183)

The BNC²²⁵ [the Palestinian Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions National Committee]:
Calls on Oxfam to immediately sever ties with Hollywood actor Scarlett Johansson over her vocal support for illegal Israeli settlements on occupied Palestinian territory […] As a coalition that includes many of Oxfam’s longstanding partners, we contend that there is a clear choice to be made between celebrity and principle. A refusal to part ways with Johansson will tarnish the charity’s credibility among Palestinians and many people of conscience around the world. Oxfam has consistently opposed illegal Israeli settlements and recently made a call to the European Union to “match words with action”. Oxfam must now heed its own advice and do the same.
(171, 184)

Sharing a letter to Oxfam Italy by Stop SodaStream Italy campaign²²⁶ to Mondoweiss:

Despite the fact that Johansson’s own words reveal an unbridgeable difference between the positions of Oxfam and those of a person representing and promoting the organization, to this day she maintains her role as ambassador for Oxfam. It is unthinkable that Johansson can simultaneously promote human rights and human rights violations. (197, 198)

Other criticisms point to the perceived contradiction on how Oxfam treated previous celebrity ambassadors in related controversies:

As you are fully aware, this company is at the center of an international boycott campaign due to the fact that it profits from the occupation and apartheid regime imposed by Israel. […] In 2012, we wrote to you reading another “ambassador” for SodaStream, Paola Maugeri, due to her involvement in one of your campaigns. At the same time, you demonstrated great consistency with Oxfam policy condemning the Israeli settlements by removing a promotional video made with Maugeri and informing her of the reasons for this decision. (188, 190)
Criticisms towards the celebrity and Oxfam do not just reflect international voices and activities. As an opportunity for Johansson to reclaim her humanitarian reputation, turning point I ends with an editorial written by a network of Palestinians living near the SodaStream factory who ‘urge Scarlett Johansson to end her role with occupation profiteer’ “for the sake of her own integrity” by not dismissing their reality “under the guise of that talk” (227):

While Johansson and company officials claim to be advancing the cause of peace and to support the two-state solution, they are in fact supporting a nearly half-century old Israeli military regime that brutally represses Palestinian rights, illegally exploits Palestinians resources, and denies millions of people the most fundamental freedoms. [...] If Ms. Johansson truly wants to contribute to a more peaceful future for Israeli and Palestinians, she should begin by ending her endorsement of a company that profits from Israeli human rights abuses. [Quoting Jamil Barghouti:] How can you be talking peace when war crimes and colonialism are being committed under the guise of that talk? And how can someone like Scarlett Johansson be part of the deception? She should not withdraw for the sake of her own integrity” (233, 236, 228)

Turning point 2: Johansson quits her role as Oxfam’s Celebrity Global Ambassadorship

Turning point 2 is based on an editorial shift reflecting Johansson’s response to the controversy by ending her Oxfam ambassadorship in favor for SodaStream’s ambassadorship. Although she was
rebuked for not responding sooner during turning point 1, turning point 2 reflects a dramatic turn of events and centers on politicizing the celebrity as her response is perceived to be a validation of their initial suspicions. Satirized images of the celebrity and her humanitarian work with Oxfam and movie roles are intensified. These are accompanied with an attempt to politicize the celebrity with controversial political players and external issues as blog activists amplify their presentation on the controversial relationship between the celebrity and the boycotted SodaStream company, along with claims of factory worker violations in addition to manufacturing goods in the illegal occupation in Palestine. The descriptive data reveals that this tactic shift in the editorials is an attempt to maintain enduring interest to mobilize supporters to continue protesting before the upcoming Super Bowl event in February (when the SodaStream commercial starring Johansson will air during the coveted halftime Super Bowl televised advertisement commercials) to increase protest momentum and to generate attention.

30 to 31st January

Late Thursday, 30th January 2014 Johansson releases a public statement renouncing her Oxfam ambassadorship stating “a fundamental difference of opinion” about the issues raised by her recent decision to serve as “global brand ambassador” for SodaStream (269). Turning point 2 reflects how Mondoweiss activists adjust their editorials on how her January 30th statement solidified their initial suspicions and labeling her the ‘Face of Apartheid.’ Lampooned images are intensified and aspects of her acting career are used as opportunities to satirized the situation (i.e. Lost in Translation). Activists and supporters also use the announcement as an opportunity to amplify protesting opportunities both online and offline before the showing of the SuperBowl/Johansson commercial.
Remarking on Johansson’s January 30th statement, Robbins and Norr (echoing Robbins initial claims shared in the first editorials during the critical event) stated that:

*Ever the optimist, a week ago as I wondered what choice Scarlett would make, knowing “something’s gotta break” between now and the SuperBowl. Somehow I held hope it wouldn’t turn out this way. Scarlett made her choice. She’s throwing in the towel. ending her relationship with Oxfam and Staking her career, reputation, and god knows what else (morals come to mind) with the Israeli occupation and SodaStream. [...] Am I disappointed? Yeah. Heck no. It’s raining men. Scarlett is ‘proud of her efforts’ in behalf of Oxfam she claims they part ways over: a fundamental difference foo pinon in regards to the boycott, divestment and sanctions movement. Oh really” Truth aside, this exposure is a free-for-all PR bonanza for the BDS movement.*

Nguyen presents a deeper criticism to Johansson’s announcement:

*With this statement, Johansson and her public relations team not only extricate her from a vulnerable position, but does so cynically and opportunistically by throwing Oxfam*
under the bus. The statement claims that Johansson left Oxfam over “a fundamental difference of opinion in regards to the boycott, divestment and sanctions movement [BDS]” —an unconvincing assertion since Oxfam has never taken a position on BDS. However, by making this allegation, Johansson frames her departure as a result of Oxfam forcing her to make a different and presumably more difficult decision. That is, instead of being asked not to represent a company that manufactures products from an illegal West Bank settlement, Johansson implies that she was being forced by Oxfam to honor the Palestinian BDS call. There is a difference between boycotting a company and not shilling for a company. At best, Johansson was simply being asked for the latter. The issues was not about BDS, but about the contradiction for one organization that opposes illegal settlements (Oxfam), while being the ambassador for another organization that is based in and profits from an illegal settlement (SodaStream). So Johansson changes the subject, from one in which she occupied both sides of opposing interest—perhaps inadvertently at first, but unwilling to budge—to one in which Oxfam was making unreasonable demands of her. Not only does this place the blame on Oxfam for the ensuing scandal and absolves Johansson of fault, it falsely portrays Oxfam as a supporter of the BDS movement. While there is nothing inherently wrong with BDS—and it would be wonderful if Oxfam did support BDS—the organization has never taken a position on the issue. And while there is no shame in supporting BDS, there is an unavoidable cost. Organizations that publicly support BDS are subject to a fierce pro-Israel backlash that includes relentless harassment, false accusations of anti-Semitism, and loss of donor funding. Thus, while absolving herself of blame for her own debacle, Johansson leaves Oxfam vulnerable to the cost of endorsing BDS without the benefit of having endorsed it. (301-307)

Horowitz, Robbins and Norr incorporate images of Oxfam photos of Johansson with hijacked speech bubbles to lampoon her January 30th announcement, pointing to the perceived hypocrisy and contradiction of her reputation as a humanitarian and previous claims advocating to fight poverty and injustices around the world:
Using this as an opportunity to regard the concerted controversy as a campaign success for BDS for the attention it brought to their claims:

Quoting Omar Barghouti\textsuperscript{230}: Without doubt, the biggest loser in this well publicized BDS campaign was SodaStream, which was exposed to the whole world as an occupation profiteer. Prior to this, most SodaStream customers had no idea that it is involved in grave violations of human rights by producing in an illegal settlement in the occupied Palestinian territory. (242, 243)

Quoting Ali Abunimah\textsuperscript{231}: I credit the Palestinian and global grassroots campaigns that would not allow Oxfam or Johansson to evade their responsibilities for finally bringing this matter to a head. (252)

Quoting Rebecca Vilkomerson: Israeli policies that deny human rights, ignore humanitarian law, and help companies profit from the occupation are no longer being tolerated by people around the world who care about justice. That the BDS movement was able to force this decision in a matter of weeks is proof of the growing power of BDS worldwide.” (255)

Taking advantage of the publicity surrounding the controversy, Weiss states that:
The good news is that the Scarlett Johansson’s Oxfam meltdown has educated Americans, somewhat, about Israel’s illegal settlement project. (316)

Redirecting a focus on the celebrity and using her announcement as an opportunity to admonish and shame her:

Quoting Omar Barghouti: By consciously dumping Oxfam and choosing instead to become the new propaganda face for Israel’s occupation and apartheid, Scarlett Johansson reminds us of the few unprincipled artists who during the struggle against South African apartheid sold their souls and stood on the wrong side of history. Her reputation as a defender of human rights has suffered irreparably.” (244)

Quoting George Bisharat: “Ms. Johansson has defended her association with SodaStream, saying ‘I remain a supporter of economic cooperation and social interaction between democratic Israel and Palestine.’ Yet to ignore the surrounding context—Israel’s illegal expropriation of Palestinian public and private lands, importation of its own civilian settlers, restrictions on freedom of movement of people and goods that choke any possibility of independent Palestinian economic development— is like saying that apartheid was a boon to black South Africans for providing them jobs.” (249)

Quoting Ali Abunimah: “By quitting Oxfam and sticking with her endorsement of SodaStream, Scarlett Johansson has confirmed she values profiting from Israeli occupation and apartheid far above human rights and charitable work. […] Everyone—celebrities, companies, and nongovernmental organizations—must be on notice that complicity with Israeli occupation and apartheid comes with a high reputational cost. Whatever financial gains Johansson reaps will fade. She will be remembered, like those who were complicit with apartheid in South Africa, for standing on the wrong side of history.” (250, 253).

Quoting Rebecca Vilkomerson: “That Oxfam and Scarlett Johansson have parted ways over her association with SodaStream proves that one can no longer claim to be a humanitarian while being associated in any way with the settlement enterprise. (254)

Others view her announcement as an opening for protesting opportunities:

Quoting Kricorian: “We are glad that Oxfam and Scarlett Johansson have parted ways. Oxfam’s clear stance against Israeli settlement trade and Johansson’s association with occupation profiteer SodaStream made their relationships untenable. We look forward to educational leafletting opportunities at Ms. Johansson’s public events.” (258, 259)

Dr. Khader says: “Let’s take it to the Super Bowl.” I’m [Robbins and Norr] geared up, it’s game on. (289)
Subsequently, Robbins and Norr note how Johansson is receiving criticism for her decision to quit Oxfam from a few mainstream news outlets:

*In his must read editorial, Palestinian American English professor Dr. Jamil Khader eviscerates Johansson in his essential decimation of her claims SodaStream is an example of “economic cooperation and social interaction between a democratic Israel and Palestine.”* (281)

Additionally:

*On Al Jazeera picked up by Yahoo News:* Her ludicrous claims are nothing but a recycling of the same tired racist arguments that white slave owners in the American South circulated in order to justify their noxious antebellum regime. Slave owners even concocted perfectly outlandish claims about the rights, privileges and benefits their slaves enjoyed under slavery. […] Furthermore, new life is breathed into these narratives in a post-racial United States, where any struggle for political power in the republic is displaced onto other terrains that entertain and delight, but obfuscate the fundamental antagonism. […] They translate its contentious political realities into a spectacle of (athletic) entrainment or cultural festivities that celebrate our respect for the law and our common humanity. However, these flawed analogies do not only display the actual oppressive structures of slavery and the Israeli occupation of Palestine. They also transmute the troubled relations between oppressors and oppressed, into opposed but equal teams who voluntarily accept to play by the same rules of the game…to speak of cooperation in those terms is obscene. (282)

Turning point 2 reflects a legitimization of initial claims of Johansson’s motives and ties, thus labeling her as *The Face of Apartheid.* The editorials are used to reinforce the purpose of constructing and sensationalizing the controversy because they are bringing attention to the issue of apartheid and the illegal occupation in Palestine, specifically the worker and human rights violations at the SodaStream factory (and many others like it):

*Quoting Patrick Connors: “Contrary to Scarlett Johannsson’s claims that SodaStream furthers equal rights and peace, SodaStream’s Palestinian laborers live under a brutal Israeli military occupation. Israel’s seizure of West Bank land for settlements, like the one where SodaStream factory sits, has destroyed the Palestinian economy, creating a captive force that companies like SodaStream exploit. Away from the ears of his bosses at SodaStream, a Palestinian worker recently told Reuters: ‘There’s a lot of racism here [at SodaStream].’ ‘Most of the managers are Israeli, and West Bank employees feel like they can’t ask for pay raises or more benefits because they can be fired and easily...”*
replaces.’ Palestinians need freedom and human rights, not sweatshop jobs in an Israeli factory built on stolen Palestinian land.” [Robbins and Norr remarks on the Reuters interview]: Amazing how a tenacious Reuters journo can blast a hole through colonialists lies and plummet a million bucks worth of PR efforts from world class professional hasbarists. (And note bloggers were on the story months ago.\(^{236}\) (256-258, 280)

Quoting Rabbi Brian Walt\(^{237}\): “Companies like SodaStream located in exclusive, illegal Jewish settlements built on Palestinian land, do not build ‘bridges to peace’ as Scarlett Johansson claims. If Johansson truly cares about human rights, justice, and peace, she should join those who support the Palestinian call to boycott all companies like SodaStream that profit from the occupation. As a rabbi committed to justice and peace, I believe that standing in solidarity with Palestinians who demand their basic human rights would be a far better way for Johansson to build ‘bridges to peace,’ than promoting a company that is paying her to distract us with ludicrous claims about their commitment to peace. As a person who grew up in Apartheid South Africa, I know that people all over the world who participated against South Africa played a major role in ending Apartheid. By boycotting companies that profit from the occupation, people all over the world could play a similar role in the Palestinian struggle for basic human rights, justice and peace.” (261-263)

Although an editorial focus on using Oxfam as an opportunity to pressure Johansson decreases after the first turning point, Oxfam is nonetheless admonished for not responding or acting sooner to the controversy. In this way, blog activists use Oxfam as an opportunity to be used as an example of those, including the celebrity, who do not respond quicker to their claims and pressures. Responding to Johansson’s January 30\(^{th}\) announcement, Oxfam released a statement:

*Update: Oxfam has accepted Scarlett Johannsson’s resignation\(^{238}\): Oxfam has accepted Scarlett Johannsson’s decision to step down after eight years as a Global Ambassador and we are grateful for her many contributions. While Oxfam respects the independent of our ambassadors, Ms. Johannsson’s role promoting the company SodaStream sui incompatible with her role as an Oxfam Global Ambassador. Oxfam believes that businesses, such as SodaStream, that operate in settlements further the ongoing poverty and denial of rights of the Palestinian communities that we work to support. Oxfam is opposed to all trade from Israeli settlements, which are illegal under international law. Ms. Johannsson has worked with Oxfam since 2005 and in 2007 became a Global Ambassador, helping to highlight the impact of natural disasters and raise funds to save lives and fight poverty. (290-294)*
Thus, Oxfam received quite the backlash for their response and as an opportunity to present how the celebrity betrayed the charity (further validating her questionable reputation as an authentic good person):

Quoting Ali Abunimah: The fact that she quit Oxfam, rather than being fired by the charity weeks ago, reflects very poorly on Oxfam. The charity failed to swiftly and clearly uphold its principles and appears to have been taken by surprise by Johansson’s announcement, adding to its humiliation and disarray. (251)

Nguyen contends that: 

Unfortunately Oxfam made itself open to being exploited by its former global ambassador. Early in the scandal, Oxfam refused to take a strong public stance. Instead, it expressed both its “opposition to all trade from Israeli settlements” and its respect for “the independence of our ambassadors,” adding that it was “engaged in a dialogue on these important issues” with Johannsson. (309)

Nguyen censures Oxfam for their delayed response and reaction to Johansson’s January 24th statement where she defended SodaStream and the charity simply responded stating that they were “considering the implications of her new statements and what it means for Ms Johansson’s role as an Oxfam global ambassador” (310). Oxfam Great Britain tweeted on January 27th that they were still working on resolving the situation (however, Nguyen noted how the tweet was sooner deleted after it was posted). Nguyen shares a report from Ali Abunimah in the Electronic Intifada verifying previous suspicions that Oxfam delayed their response due to financial motives regarding the celebrity’s representation. Blog activists use this as an example to illustrate how the Israel-Palestinian conflict, as reflected by how events unfolded with the SodaStream/Johansson controversy, is wrought with not just politics, but economic concerns over human or humanitarian ones:

There was an “internal revolt” at Oxfam over Johannsson, with its American branch being the holdout to a resolution due to a fundraising fears. Oxfam’s assumed paralysis and its efforts to be diplomatically discreet left a wide gap in the public narrative that Johannsson’s PR team was able to exploit. Johannsson got to announce her departure, and
with that announcement came the privilege of defining the narrative that would cast her in the least culpable light, while deserting Oxfam for the most shameful reason. One door closes, and another one opens. (312)

Data image #37: Scarlett Johansson announcing her deal with SodaStream CEO Daniel Birnbaum at the Gramercy Park Hotel Rooftop Club, 10 January 2014: “I am beyond thrilled to share my enthusiasm for SodaStream with the world!

Quoting Hubert Murray’s interview with Emily Harris International Correspondent at NPR:240

This is a very subtle and complex ethical issue. That’s why it is so important for organizations like Oxfam to have paid very clear adherence to principle, and not shilly-shally and prevaricate. HARRIS: If SodaStream’s Super Bowl ad helps market shares significantly, U.S. consumers may be drawn more in to the political fray over made in settlement products. (325, 326)

However, much of the attention during turning point 2 is centered on the celebrity and admonishing her for what is a perceived choice over financial motives over humanitarian concerns. Mondoweiss activists take advantage to lampoon the celebrity and her decision to reiterate their claims and bring attention to external issues regarding the illegal occupation in Palestine. The celebrity co-starred with Hollywood actor Bill Murray in a movie called Lost in Translation (2003). Mondoweiss blog activists’ incorporates lampooned posters of the movie and incorporate aspects of the film in editorial rhetoric to communicate that the characters
(played by actors Johansson and Murray) represent Johansson and SodaStream. Such tactics are an attempt to maintain enduring interest by creating humor regarding a serious matter. The movie reference is utilized as a satire comparison to SodaStream’s declining stocks since the announcement of Johansson’s ambassadorship:

*SodaStream (NASDAQ: SODA) is apparently the new Bill Murray. [...] It feels very much like SodaStream has wandered off into the night in a land it doesn’t understand, staring at Johansson’s face as the rest of the world moves on to new things...After the update, SodaStream’s stock tanked, and it’s now down 25% on the year. Yesterday, Barclays piled on, cutting the stock’s price target from $100 per share to $55. Ouch. Better options are out there. [...] in Lost in Translation, Murray ends up with the wrong woman, because it seems like the right thing to do. That’s a short-term investment. To get beyond the ups and downs of SodaStream, consider reaching out to companies with stronger brands. SodaStream has said it wants to “normalize” the brand, making it a household name. If that happens, I’ll reevaluate the company’s strength. For now, though, I’m happy to leave Scarlett at the bar with Bill.* (285, 286, 288)
Johansson’s celebrity is used as a segue into discussing how the blog has generated consciousness over the issues as reflected in mainstream media discussion such as the *NPR* interview and how the *New York Times* wrote an editorial “describing the “fuss” as indicative of the growing boycott movement that has frightened Israeli leaders. (327) Weiss also points to how progressive voices in the Jewish community (alluding to Zionists who are perceived to support pro-Israeli agendas) are twisting the controversy to an alternative narrative as part of Netanyahu’s and his propagandist’s hasbara campaigns:

[Referring to Jane Eisner Huffington’s Post editorial supporting SodaStream:] *The headline is “Bursting Bubbles of SodaStream Haters.”* [Weiss responding to the headline] So the critics of the occupation are the problem. “Examining the facts, as opposed to the propaganda, leads us to a more basic conclusion: The only legitimate criticisms of SodaStream is that one of its 13 locations is where it is, in the occupied territory where Palestinians do not share the same rights as Israelis.” [Responding to Eisner’s statement, Weiss counters:] Precisely: that’s the criticisms. It has nothing to do with propaganda. *Is that a flimsy issue? I’ve been ether, and it’s apartheid on steroids.*

But The Forward explains that occupation is not-such-a-bad-thing (unlike countless other issues where liberal Jews have supported boycott. [Adding Ilene Cohen’s response to SodaStream ceo Daniel Birnbaum’s job claims:] With the hubris that comes with unbridled paternalism, Masa Danny boasts about how well he treats his house slaves (he’s doing it for them) and Scarlett thinks it’s all just swell (*a bridge of peace*” and all). But colonial occupation is wrong, just as slavery is wrong. Unfortunately, the majority of twenty-first century Jews in “the only democracy in the Middle East” don’t get it.

[Countering, Weiss responds:] Yes, if it’s so great that they’re working for you, why not give these people the vote over the government that has sovereignty? Can a liberal Jewish newspaper say that? Apparently not. (329-334).

Noting how the controversy relates to a wider debate over the two-state solution:

*The battle anticipates the coming battle over whether the John Kerry framework could produce a viable Palestine state on chunks of land. A British Labour minister [Peter Hain] who long supported the two-state solution has called for consideration of a one-state solution. This kind of discussion is sure to come to the U.S. soon... [Weiss quoting Peter Hain:] But I am increasingly unsure about whether [2SS is] still achievable—mainly because, as time has marched on, and successive negotiating initiatives have come and gone, the land earmarked for a viable Palestinian state has been remorselessly occupied by Israeli settlers. And I am not alone. John Kerry and Willian Hague have both talked of “the window for a two-state solution” closing...*The fundamental problem
is this: sooner rather than later the land available to constitute a future Palestinian state will have all but disappeared. (336)

2 February

Focusing on the upcoming Super Bowl halftime commercial an editorial by Miranda (a frequent creative artist contributor to the Mondoweiss blog) features her cartoon strip lampooning Johansson’s perceived dismissal to Palestinian worker realities at the SodaStream factory. The satirized cartoon strip presents Johansson conversing and acting in a patronizing manner towards an anonymous Palestinian SodaStream factory worker. The cartoon strip refers to an editorial written by Westbrook at The Electronic Intifada “SodaStream “treats us like slaves,” says Palestinian factory worker” (published 9 May 2013) which is centered on an anonymous Palestinian SodaStream factory worker based on research conducted by Who Profits, SodaStream: A Case Study for Corporate Activity in Illegal Israeli Settlements (published January 2011). Westbrook’s editorial countered a carefully crafted-professionally made 8.5 minute YouTube video of the factory posted by SodaStream around the same time. Referencing to Westbrook’s editorial and the Who Profit’s study is important because it is used to oppose what Mondoweiss and BDS supporters perceived as a continued propaganda ploy they face with the company and Israeli state supporters. Israel supporters in turn dismiss BDS claims about the injustices at the factory or the overall topic of apartheid in Palestine. The last panel illustrates a meaningfully constructed dialogue between an unnamed Palestinian SodaStream factory worker and Johansson. The lampooned constructed conversation is an attempt to direct towards criticisms that Johansson ignores the truth of what really happens in the factory and is therefore another perceived paid SodaStream image propaganda piece:

[Dialogue featured in the last panel]: Palestinian SodaStream factory worker (shown grabbing her hand to keep her from keeping him quiet): We Palestinian workers in this
factory always feel like we are enslaved."** [notation refers to: Stephanie Westbrook, “SodaStream “treats us like slaves,” says Palestinian factory worker” Electronic Intifada, http://bit.ly/19T941Q, May 9, 2013] Scarlett Johansson: If you don’t shut up I can’t continue to be a voice for people who don’t have a voice. (342, 342)

Celebrities bring attention to movement causes and Roger Waters is a frequent commenter to the Mondoweiss blog. In an ironic twist, Johansson is used as an example of a celebrity who is perceived to support against a just humanitarian cause. Waters’ editorial is used by Mondoweiss as a public statement written by Wasters to Johansson, pleading her to
reconsider her choice, but also to use his own celebrity to draw attention to the controversy and wider movement’s claims. A central focus on Water’s statement relates to one of the main external issues addressed by Mondoweiss activists during this protest event are the perceived outrageous claims made by SodaStream supporters, including Johansson, that the company is somehow granting Palestinian workers the same kind of equality with their Israeli co-workers.

I met Scarlett a year or so ago, I think it was at a Cream reunion concert at MSG. She was then, as I recall, fiercely anti Neocon, passionately disgusted by Blackwater (Dick Cheney’s private army in Iraq), you could have been forgiven for thinking that here was a young woman of strength and integrity who believed in truth, human rights, and the law and love. I confess I was somewhat smitten. There’s no fool like an old fool. A few years down the line, Scarlett’s choice of SodaStream over Oxfam is such an act of intellectual, political, and civil about ace, that we, all those of us who care about the downtrodden, the oppressed, the occupied, the second class, will find it hard to rationalize. I would like to ask the younger Scarlett a question or two. Scarlett, just for one example, are you aware that the Israeli government has razed to the ground a Bedouin village in the Negev desert in Southern Israel 63 times, the last time being on the 26th of December 2013. This village is the home to Bedouin. The Bedouin are, of course, Israeli citizens with full rights of citizenship. Well, not quite full rights, because in “Democratic” Israel there are fifty laws that discriminate against non Jewish citizens. I am not going to attempt to list, either those laws (they are on the statute book in the Knesset for all to research) or all the other grave human rights abuses of Israeli domestic and foreign policy. I would run out of space. But, to return to my friend Scarlett Johansson. Scarlet, I have read you reposts and excuses, in them you claim that the Palestinian workers in the factory have equal pay, benefits and “Equal rights”. Really? Equal Rights? Do they? Do they have the right to vote? Do they have access to the roads? Can they travel to their work place without waiting for hours to pass through the occupying forces control barriers? Do they have clean drinking water? Do they have sanitation? Do they have citizenship? Do they have the right not to have the standard issue kicking in their door in the middle of the night and taking their children away? Do they have the right to appeal against arbitrary and indefinite imprisonment? Do they have the right to re-occupy the property and homes they owned before 1948? Do they have the right to an ordinary, decent human family life? Do they have the right to continue to develop a cultural life that is ancient and profound? If these questions out you in a quandary I can answer them for you. The answer is, NO, they do not. The workers in the SodaStream Factory do not have any of these rights. So, what are the “equal rights” of which you speak? Scarlett, you are undeniably cute, but if you think SodaStream is building bridges towards peace you re also undeniably not paying attention. Love R. (351- 354)
Returning to politicizing the celebrity and amplifying the suspicion that Johansson has political motives (in addition to financial ones) to maintaining her SodaStream ambassadorship, Weiss center’s his editorial piece [‘Scarlett Johansson’s new image (gross-out alert), 343] on a retweeted poster from the Israel Project which depicts Johansson (fresh face with a smirk on her face and wearing a low cut spaghetti strapped shirt) sitting in-between Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas [Mondoweiss has been critical towards Abbas for not doing more for the Palestinian people]. They are all sipping from a shared SodaStream container. The words ‘Thank you Scarlett tip [The Israel Project]’ are stamped in the lower right hand corner of the poster. The image is captioned ‘Johansson in the Israel Project ad.’

Adam retweeted this arresting poster from the Israel Project, a rightwing Israel lobby group that has now started a campaign to thank Johansson for standing up to the anti-Israel bullies by quitting her work for a global antihunger organization. I don’t think it works. (But then, there are a few things I’m not willing to do for Middle East peace. [Weiss has the word ‘not’ italicized’ in the original form.] 344

Weiss uses the image and political undertones to share his disgust and to be used a creative protesting opportunity:
I’d suggest a caption contest, but most of them would surely be unprintable. I defer to Mairav Zonszein\textsuperscript{245}: This is sick on many levels RT@israelproject Send Scarlett Johansson a personal thank you. http://t.co/nqclUi7Impic.twitter.com/U8WV5wf6ZH – Mairav Zonszein (@MairavZ) February 2, 2014

**Turning point 3: Reactions (and ensuing events) to Johansson’s SodaStream Super Bowl Ad**

![Chart 5: Total code frequencies of three targets and external issues during turning point 3](image)

The third turning point is centered on reactions to the SodaStream/ Johansson SuperBowl commercial. By this point, the association between the celebrity and the central external issue of apartheid has been solidified in editorial rhetoric as illustrated by the descriptive data. Image and editorial rhetoric about this connection are used to politicize Johansson (adding political motives to financial ones, additionally, to her perceived political collusion with SodaStream’s perceived questionable factory practices, violations, and media propaganda). Efforts are made to capitalize on mainstream news attention to further draw attention to key external issues as central editorial talking points surrounding the controversy. Outside the Mondoweiss blog, the opposition appears to intensify their narratives and support for Johansson as a reaction to the controversy drawing
attention to the BDS and Mondoweiss activists’ claims and role in the controversy. Oxfam is
attacked by the opposition’s attempt to shift the controversy’s mediatized narrative. Mondoweiss
activists defend the charity, albeit soberly pointing out how it is a consequence for not
responding to activists’ cautions sooner by ending their relationship with Johansson instead of
giving her the opportunity to betray the charity.

3 February

According to Horowitz and Weiss:

Whatever its political implications, SodaStream’s ad for the Super Bowl didn’t land well
among viewers and mavens. It’s getting panned. (357)

Data image #41: [image caption:] Screenshot from SodaStream’s Super Bowl commercial in which Scarlett
Johansson wonders how it all went so wrong.

Using mainstream media to support their declaration:

Johansson Super Bowl commercial.” The piece focuses on the lame “punchline”, of
Johansson, a purported scientist, sucking on a straw—and says SodaStream needlessly
ran afoul of censors for the second year running, by seeing to take on Coke and Pepsi.
And the Post says the ad was overshadowed by the political controversy. (358)

The USA Today ad meter ranked the commercial the 48th most popular out of 57 das
that aired during the Super Bowl. Our guess is that SodaStream’s CEO Daniel Birnbaum
was expecting a bigger splash when he signed a Hollywood star. CNN suggests that
SodaStream missed the cultural movement. […] And there was the Financial Times.

Peter Aspden and John Reed: Perhaps the biggest disappointment for fans of Ms
Johansson’s acting talents is the sheer banality of the ad. The star’s stiff and clinched
turn is strangely reminiscent of Bill Murray’s performance-within-a-performance in her
breakthrough film of 11 years ago. The cool indie beauty of that time has turned disappointingly corporate. Something appears to have been lost in translation all right. (360, 361, 362).

The following image is an image created by TIP [The Israel Project] and Mondoweiss uses it to support their claims of the opposition’s use of Johansson’s celebrity to imply her political support for their [i.e. pro-SodaStream/ pro-Israel] politics. She is shown looking over exposed shoulders, with black greased strips underneath her eyes (referencing the SodaStream/ Johansson SuperBowl commercial) and a tattoo of the Israeli/ Palestinian flags within a heart where two doves are carrying on each side. The word ‘Peace’ crosses the heart and the statement left of the celebrity: Scarlett, you’re our Super Bowl MVP. tip

Data image #42: [Image caption:] The Israel Project is milking Scarlett Johansson’s support for settlement project

The purpose of this is to draw attention to Johansson’s celebritized political associations to an external issue regarding Obama’s Iran deal.250 Weiss declares:

We live in a celebrity-driven culture, right. And Scarlett Johansson has done more to educate people about the Israel/ Palestine issue than anything since the Gaza war of ’08-’09. She got John Kerry to talk about boycotts251 and the Financial Times to explain252 why the settlements are illegal and wrong...Her image is being milked relentlessly by the rightwing Israel Project. First they did a tasteless lascivious ad with Johansson253 canoodling with two old men. Now they’re given her a peace tattoo, above. So Johansson has gone from being Oxfam’s poster girl to the Israel Project’s!254 (364-366)
Subsequently, Weiss notes how the controversy has drawn mainstream attention to external issues, those additional to the illegal occupation/apartheid focus, Mondoweiss activists have been referencing during the protest event:

Meanwhile, at HuffPo [Huffington Post], Robert Naiman of Just Foreign Policy (who alerted me to my error), says the flap\textsuperscript{255} has highlighted the idea of a principled support for the two-state solution. [Quoting Naiman:] Johansson’s statements on the controversy have tried to obscure a crucial issue; what relationship should people who support the two-state solution have to Israeli settlements in the West Bank? […]. Johansson’s view, apparently, is that it’s ok to claim that you support a two-state solution and then turn around and promote economic ties with Israeli settlements in the West Bank, thereby bolstering and normalizing occupation […] Johansson’s apparent view is marginal among sincere advocates of a two-state solution…By claiming to support a two-state solution while helping to bolster the occupation, Scarlett Johannsson is acting as a Susan Collins\textsuperscript{256} for the occupation, pretending to be moderate, while acting to bolster extremists. (368, 369, 371, 373).

Robbins quoting AOL’s\textsuperscript{257} Daily Finance noting how “people in several countries have created spoof ads highlighting SodaStream’s connection to the occupation”:

The company’s [SodaStream’s] main production facility is located in a West Bank settlement; Israeli settlements in the occupied territories have long been considered illegal under international law, a view recently affirmed\textsuperscript{258} by a panel of judges working under the auspices of the UN Human Rights Council. CEO Daniel Birnbaum told the Times of Israel\textsuperscript{259} that SodaStream doesn’t “strengthen or support the occupation. What we’re doing is taking a facility in the occupied territory and giving Palestinians a career and economic benefits. … Whether or not SodaStream supports the occupation, pro-Palestinians activists contend that the converse is certainly true. According to a report\textsuperscript{260} by Who Profits?, an Israeli peace group, the company’s “success is based, at least in part, on the structural advantages that production in Israeli settlements enjoys”: low rent, special tax incentives, lax enforcement of environmental and labor protection laws, as well as additional government support.” And SodaStream pays property taxes that are used to fund “the growth and development” of the settlement that hosts its factory…With the occupation now more than 45 years old, pro-Palestinian activists aren’t persuaded. “Palestinians are not asking for charity,” said Anna Baltzer, national organizer of the U.S. Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation. “They’re calling for boycott, divestment, and sanction (BDS) against Israel and companies like SodaStream until they end their complicity with Israel’s discriminatory practices. Thousands around the world have joined the campaign to boycott SodaStream, including an exciting new, diverse coalition of Christian, Muslim, and Jewish organizations.” Baltzer also noted that people in several countries have created spoof ads highlighting SodaStream’s connection to the occupation. SodaStream has of course known the risks of being a settlement producer. In
its 2011 filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission, the company described its West Bank factory as a source of “rising political tensions and negative publicity,” which “may negatively impact demand for our products or require us to relocate our manufacturing activities to other locations.” Arguing against relocation: the cost of moving, and the loss of tax benefits. (378, 380-383)

Capitalizing on recent mainstream media recognition because of the controversy, Weiss takes advantages of the attention to mobilize a call for continued online protest support:

*Oxfam did the right thing in taking a principled stand. You can thank Oxfam for their principled stand at MoveOn here and on Thunderclap here. The Thunderclap is set to go off on Sunday evening during the #SuperBowl.* (374)

### 6 February

Linking the Johanssison/ SodaStream controversy to the two-state external issue: Ellis states:

*The value of the Shekel seems to be falling and business leaders in Israel are grumbling. Their collective pin-up, Scarlett Johanssion, isn’t going to save them either. What to do? It seems to be a no-brainer. […] Why Netanyahu doesn’t break his right wing pack and polish his Nobel Prize credentials by saying yes to an offer that really is way too good to refuse is beyond me. If he breaks away from the take-all of Palestine group, he can form a national unity coalition that effectively take-almost-all of Palestine while leaving a cheap and subservient labor pool of millions of Palestinians for Israeli and Palestinian kingpins. Call is the SodaStream solution. [Bold is original] That’s it. SodaStream can be the glossy model of proclaiming peace while ghettoizing a people. It’s already being argued that way, albeit in softer language. Perhaps Samantha Power could come to the newly declared ghetto and bless it. Imagine Power delivering her ever so eloquent denunciation of injustices around the world and declaring the SodaStream plant as a model for solving injustice—at least when Jews who guarantee her career are involved. Scarlett Johanssion could be at her side or, better yet, in a larger than life poster as a backdrop.* […] (386-388)

### 10 February to 3 March

The opposition appears to capitalize the controversy surrounding the celebrity and efforts are made to counter BDS/ Mondoweiss claim to fit their narrative. To sustain interest regarding
the celebrity’s political associations and how the opposition has intensified their response to the attention the controversy has received, Weiss states how the Johansson has become:

the darling of the ring wing and a heroine of the settlers, because of her support for a business that operates out of an illegal Jewish settlement in the West Bank. (398)

Actress Scarlett Johansson is the new heroine of Israel supporters. Ever since she appeared in a Super Bowl ad for a seltzer-maker that operates in the occupied Palestinian territories and quit the human-rights organization Oxfam to do so, she’s been embraced by rightwing supporters of Israel. (410, 411)

Deger remarked how:

[…]

Israeli foreign minister Avigdor Lieberman has praised the starlet on Facebook, stating, “Our Oscar goes to Scarlett,” continuing, she “displayed a courageous stance in the front of hypocrisy and the herd mentality.” Lieberman added: “The attempts pro-Palestinian organizations to bash Johansson for being a presenter of ‘SodaStream’ and its factory in Ma’ale Adumim did not cause the actress to fold or to apologize, but to clearly stand up for her principles in the face of those whom under the guise of false pretext, continue classic anti-Semitism by other means.” Not to be the only Israeli politician courting Scarlett on Facebook, Tzipi Livni also posted: ‘Hat’s off. Talented, beautiful, brave.’ [Deger responding to these comments:] Oh Scarlett, how rewarding our new company must be! (392-395)

Although no captions are included, the following stock images are included with the editorial and suggest ‘inside political’ motives between the celebrity and Israeli politicians:

Data image #44: [No caption provided]

Data image #45: [No caption provided]
Weiss observed that according to the JPost, Mike Huckabee claimed that:

“The BDS movement is embarrassingly stupid because Israel represents the one place [in the Middle East] where freedom exists,” says the former Arkansas governor, who came to the capital with nearly 300 Christian American pilgrims to tour the city and attend a new exhibit at the museum...Much to her credit, [Johansson] showed she has more sense than 99.9 percent of the people sitting in the UN today,” he said. ‘She showed she has far more scholarship and understanding of the issues than most of the people serving in the foreign service and diplomatic corps. Huckabee also called on Oxfam, which he claimed was a proven funder of Palestinian terrorism 30 years ago, to issue an apology to Johansson. “If anything, Oxfam owes Scarlett Johansson a big apology for ever trying to embarrass her,” he said. ‘And the whole world owes her big thanks for having the courage and the intelligence to stand against that nonsense.” (403-405)

Additionally, Weiss noted that “the rightwing Israel’s Project’s Thank You Scarlett campaign, raising money off the star for the organization and railing about the fringe extremists who supposedly support BDS” (406) sent the following message to their supporters:

Dear Supporter, When you stood up for Scarlett Johansson, you stood up for the truth—because peace and coexistence is a better way forward than boycotts and hate. But a fringe group of anti-Israel extremists is increasing their efforts to delegitimize Israel and turn world opinion against the Jewish state *TIP NEEDS YOUR HELP TO FIGHT ANTI-ISRAEL INTIMIDATION CAMPAIGNS.* TIP is dedicated to protecting Israel by getting out the facts about the BDS movement and its motive—the elimination of Israel. Here’s what you can do *RIGHT NOW* to help TIP fight this critical battle...etc. A global campaign of hatred and demonization attempts to silence those who support Israel and her quest for a secure peace. Thank you for joining your voice to ours and please help spread the message. If you would like to help The Israel Project get the truth out about Israel, visit our donate page...We appreciate your support. Josh Block CEO & President The Israel Project. (407, 408)

Exposing how the oppositional defends by falling back on rhetoric meant to delegitimize BDS efforts, the statements reveal how oppositional rhetoric employs language to refer to BDS supporters and their efforts as: ‘anti-Semitism’, ‘anti-Israel extremists’, ‘delegitimize Israel and turn world opinion against the Jewish state’, ‘hatred and demonization attempts’, and ‘the elimination of Israel.’ To accompany the opposition’s tactic the editorial is the following stock image of Johansson, displaying what appears to be a smirk on her face. The image caption is
meant to mock such criticisms (intending as if Johansson herself is aware of these media propaganda ploys) and specifically to reference Huckabee’s statement about the celebrity intelligence and diplomatic abilities on complex political issues such as those regarding the Israel-Palestinian conflict:

Another example is presented on how Johansson’s celebrity is perceived as manipulated by the opposition when an Israel lobby group] policy conference on March 3rd 2014 at an AIPAC [American Israel Public Affairs Committee, Weiss observed how AIPAC:

Used images of Johansson to show off Israeli technology, and the crowd responded with applause. […] AIPAC’s campus outreach leader Winton Steward flashed an image of Scarlett Johansson to register Steward’s recognition of the celebrity. There was brief reference to the Super Bowl ad, and then the ElMindA exec flashed a series of countless images of different human faces before Steward and the audience. The company was one of three or four spotlighted in the high-tech segment. Another imaging company, Camero, displayed radar technology it has developed with the Israeli military to visualize human beings through walls so as to get to “bad guys.” […] Israel is involved in an “intractable conflict,” the panel’s moderator said, and the high-tech story is not getting out to the world. “There’s an Israel beyond the conflict. Israel has helped to heal and help the rest of the world.” [Responding to the moderator’s statement, Weiss retorts:] And Scarlett Johansson is helping. (412-414)
7 March

Katz-Nussbaum criticizes a recent Forward/ Haaretz editorials [SodaStream controversy fueled by lies and distortion\(^2\)(January 30, 2014); Bursting bubbles of SodaStream’s haters\(^2\)(January 31, 2014); and Palestinian workers cheer SodaStream and Scarlet Johansson—Occupation or No\(^2\)(February 1, 2014)] for facilitating perceived inaccuracies about the controversy and situation in Occupied Palestine thus contributing to the pro-Israel media propaganda shaping liberal Jews politics on the issue(s). Noting how

...the Forward and Haaretz are generally important critics of Israel’s occupation, they often seem just seem interested in discrediting a non-violent resistant tool that seems to actually be working. (430)

Referring to the concerted (and perceived as part of the company’s carefully crafted media propaganda) SodaStream factory tour posted on YouTube February 6, 2014\(^2\) showing Palestinian factory workers claiming to give positive revised about working at the factory

...It became clear that the “lies and distortion” the article referred to were none other than critiques of SodaStream, apparently debunked by these magical interviews with no supervisors around! (428)

Using the controversy surrounding Johansson as a segue to introduce Palestinian factory works claims about how they were treated at the factory, Katz-Nussbaum used the Forward/ Haaretz editorials to illustrate how they are incorrectly influencing other journalist/ media outlets:

A Christian Science Monitor article\(^2\) echoing the Forward’s angle “selling its interviews with Palestinian workers as an innocent human interest story, merely out to capture the real lives of Palestinians in print. Of course, merely trying to represent Palestinians ‘as they really are’ might end up coming out on one side or another of this heated political debate, and sure enough, the title of the article was: “Palestinian workers back Scarlett Johansson’s opposition to SodaStream boycott.” This made a handful of interviews sound like some kind of organized Palestinian counter movement against the BDS movement, which (surprised) doesn’t exist. Sure, many of the Palestinian workers interviewed express a more ambiguous position—that they would not work in
Israelis settlements if they had alternative in the Palestinian economy. [...] Only one or two of the many reporters involved mentioned the convenient fact that they had been specially invited to the settlement by SodaStream itself for a factory tour. (431, 432)

As such, Katz-Nussbaum points to the crux of the controversy and explains the importance of BDS/ Mondoweiss activists claims to present an alternative (perceived corrected) journalistic narrative and perceived truth regarding the illegal occupation in Palestine. Referring to Katz-Nussbaum writes about “a model factory for a colonialism in trouble: the SodaStream saga revisited” (415) Katz-Nussbaum further explains the purpose of the SodaStream/ Johansson controversy:

It may have taken up a nauseating amount of our attention by now, but the Scarlett Johansson/SodaStream saga sure have a lot of people talking about how those seltzer machines are made in the Occupied West Bank. Of the recent wave of boycotts against Israeli institutions and companies, this one against SodaStream has crystallized, in a particularly interesting way, the growing momentum and challenges for critics of Israel’s policies, especially the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement. Pressuring Johansson to step down from SodaStream, the movement argued that her promotion of products made in Israeli-occupied territory might contradict her other commitment as ambassador for the global antipoverty organization Oxfam. Oxfam, which provides basic services to Palestinians under Israeli occupation, didn’t find Scarlett’s “saving the world” comment too funny. (416–419)

Illuminating the satirical tactic utilized by blog activists during the controversy:

But a serious kind of joking around, an anticolonial satire, has seemed to work well for the BDS movement. Memes of the actress enjoying soda amid iconic scenes of the occupation circulated on social media under the Twitter hashtags #NoScarJo, and #BDS. This tactic yoked the company’s advertisements for consumer pleasure to the more pleasure of satirizing and mocking the occupation’s commercial propaganda. If the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs spends millions of dollars a year on its “nation-branding”-portraying Israel as a fun tourist haven, with no occupation in sight—the BDS movement has followed its adversary to this awkward territory of fun and fantasy. Awkward because the goals of ending Israel’s occupation and gaining the right of return for Palestinian refugees are quite serious. Yet, like dissidents under occupation in Syria, the movement has understood that in tough times, an aesthetics of laughter may not only provide respite but satirical punch. These memes, or Tamer Nafar’s new rap about ScarJo, might even break the ice at awkward house parties where the host has a SodaStream machine. (420, 422, 423)
As another means to draw attention and maintain interest in the SodaStream/ Johansson controversy, Tamer Nafar’s rap ‘Scarlett Johansson has gas’ is subverted in the editorial as an example to illustrate the types of lampooned tactics have been created during the controversy. Full lyrics to the rap are provided in the endnote section of the chapter but the following are highlighted:

Walla Sababa,
I think we just found the solution for the Middle East
They will have our land
But we have salaries in our bank
And Scarlett Johansson, well she has Gas
[...]
She’s a pretty pretty blond things,
Going her own thing
She is living in the bubbles of a soda Drink
[...]
When I’m with Scarlett I’m gone
With the wind
Gone with the wind (She has gas)
You taught me, What’s the point in
Pointing out my stress
Instead of pointing at them
Checkpoints ama point at my checks
[...]
Ya Scarlett, Roger from Pink Floyd
Wants to spoil our fest
Trying to end slavery and make house
Slaves unemployed I guess
(They took your job? THEY TOOK MY JOB)
[...]
(Scarlett: Like most actors my real
Job is saving the world)
[...]
Even if it’s in a settlement, do we Care?
About Reality, my reality
First they moved me here and now
They wanna move me there
[...]
Famous faces just to make this occupation look like a vacation
Who gave her an explanation about
This situation?
Lets face it it’s not the first time she
Got LOST IN TRANSLATION […] (424)

Returning to a more serious note, Katz-Nussbaum clarifies that the SodaStream/

Johansson controversy is about “the war over facts”:

Still, amidst this funnyly promising moment for the moment, a drier, more dinner table-ish
version of the Palestine-Israel debate was droning on: the war over facts. Certain facts
came to be debated, particularly in Israeli and Jewish-American media, and in ways that
framed the SodaStream factory in the Occupied West Bank as good, not bad for
Palestinians. These were not the structural or historical facts of Israel’s economic effects
on the Occupied Territories the New York Times, at least, mentioned these), but the
slippier, subjective facts embodied in interviews with SodaStream managers and, most
crucially, some of their 900 or so Palestinian workers, 500 of them from the Occupied
West Bank. For some, evidently, the idea was to let the last word on the controversy be
interviews with Palestinian workers—which sounds good at first. (425, 426)
Subsequently, after critique of the Forward and Haaretz perceived bad journalism, Katz-Nussbaum emphasizes how factory testimonials must not only be placed within a wider historical and structural context but that journalists should consider (those even already reported) Palestinian worker perspectives outside the influence of SodaStream (specifically referring to Westbrook’s interview of a Palestinian SodaStream factory worker in May 2013):

_Do We Want This Kind of War of Facts?_ [Bold is kept in original] [...] Despite the Forward’s heavy-handed wielding of such testimonies, there is still the sticky situation that the Palestinian workers made such apolitical statements at all: that they need a job, and they don’t have an alternative to this one. These are the difficult statements to prove for foreign observers. Sure, the CSM article linked to some broader context too. And it would really help to know the long history of politicized Palestinian labor organization being ignored by Zionist labor unions, then brutally put down by Israel. But with history out of the picture, the Palestinian testimonies might just seem to express the cliché that “real life” goes deeper than political ones. And to readers a bit less naïve, these testimonies might be downright confusing: a job some Palestinians can’t but appreciate, yet their legal and civil rights situation is objectively horrendous! How can we make sense of this dissonance? Until recently, the clearest critical response to such pro-SodaStream worker testimonies has simply been to find Palestinian workers who say the opposite. And until this controversy, this strategy unfortunately consisted of only a single interview with a Palestinian worker who told it much closer to the story about labor violations: SodaStream “treats us like slaves,” said the worker. The company told Palestinian workers that participating in PR videos would help the company get enough money that it wouldn’t fire the workers—a subtle threat, backed up by the workers’ lack of recourse. The Israeli NGO, Workers’ Hotline, has elaborated on Palestinian working conditions in Israeli settlements: Palestinian are hired by often exploitive middlemen: they are fired for taking sick days, with no warnings or process through human resources. Shifts are 12 hours, with commutes of up to two hours to get through checkpoints. (433, 434)

As such, Katz-Nussbaum contends that the opposition’s perceived carefully concerted media propaganda with Johansson is due to a war over facts which must be counterbalanced with BDS/ Mondoweiss blog activists’ perceived truth:

_This more critical story has been a crucial counterbalance to the SodaStream propaganda, and some of the recent articles found quotes that corroborate the pictures of a very, very bad labor environment. But the status of the critical testimonies in relation to the pro-SodaStream, ones has been left unresolved. Is it simply up to Western readers to pick which interviews they take as true, and if readers take the critical account as true,
are the pro-SodaStream stories factually false? Before the Scarlett Johansson controversy and the journalistic swarm, the pro-SodaStream account was not in the best shape for such a contest of facts. It consisted of a PR video on YouTube whose source was suspiciously not made clear; and the video was so adamantly playing down the Israeli occupation that it sounded exactly like the Israeli government—the furthest from a neutral arbiter. But now, even as BDS is gaining traction, the pro-SodaStream claims have multiplied too. Taken together, these critical and uncritical interviews shape the debate as an all-to-familiar war of facts, in which the testimony of Palestinian workers is wielded as the transcendent fact—able to speak beyond any kind of structural facts like Israel’s systematic denial of civil rights and its stifling of Palestinian economic growth. And in a war of this kind of facts, the deck is somewhat stacked. The company decides who to invite; influences what workers say; and workers are undoubtedly ariah to come out about abuses, because it is common for Israeli employers in the West Bank to fire Palestinians and revoke their work permits when they complain or try to organize—which the Forward journalist predictably used to discredit the testimony. Lest the recent articles lull us into thinking that maybe commercial life under occupation can be a walk in the park, let’s look further at how these facts are constituted, at the questions the authors assume are worth asking and those they leave out. This cannot be just some abstract academic exercise in historicizing facts; to paraphrase Gramsci, we don’t need detached knowledge but knowledge that helps subalterns win. But this grave task—winning—doesn’t mean we can’t have a laugh (even a wry one). In that spirit, let us plunge further into the assumptions of a strange colonial universe in which Palestinian workers are portrayed as satisfied—even grateful—at being employed in the very Israeli settlements that colonize their land. What better gateway to this fanciful world that—ah, what’s this?—a manual for whitewashing occupation. (435-440)

Referencing the opposition’s perceived media propaganda as a “Manual for Whitewashing Occupation,” Katz-Nussbaum breaks down the opposition’s perceived media propaganda (i.e. Zionist) into three parts (Individualize and tokenize; Ask a Palestinian! and Got a model factory? The first part references to how many journalists play into the opposition’s propaganda tactic by unquestioning the selection of factory workers to interview dismissing the surrounding historical/structural context shaping the factory and its workers:

**Manual for Whitewashing Occupation**

**Individualize and tokenize.** The implicit assumption in these articles is that if one can find a few workers who will call their working conditions OK, then the company is OK and the issue is solved—no sense of connecting the particular to the general here! And the articles do operate on some more general rules of systemic racism: individualize (divide and conquer) and tokenize (let the marginalized individual stand for the people to justify the status quo). […] and the name of this Zionist game, our naïve journalistists forget, is
conquest. But the journalists do get this principle well enough to apply it across the Green Line too. In this strange universe, granting full and equal rights to non-Jews remains out of the question. The result: maintaining a shaky regime of conquest, and try to make that seem legitimate. [...] Most of the interviewees were also very clear that if they had an alternative to working in the settlements, they would. But the subtlety of this point is lost when disconnected from the systemic ways in which Israeli occupation suppresses the Palestinian economy.290 (441-443)

Katz-Nussbaum’s second part criticizes how journalists do not consider pushing to ask further questions or interview Palestinians away from the observation of their supervisors (particularly given the controversy surrounding the company and the surrounding discourse regarding the factory’s location in an illegal occupied territory) and thus delve further in the interviewed statements:

Ask a Palestinian!
The articles are peppered with happy phrases quoted from the Palestinian workers such as, “we are all family” (referring to the Jewish bosses) and “the pay is good.” These statements are supposed to settle the issues. By “even” speaking to Palestinian workers, these reporters claim to have settled the issue. But what makes it so remarkable that they spoke to the Palestinian workers? None other than the blinders of the settler society’s liberal apologists! For these apologists as for some Israeli government agencies, Palestinians as individuals are the subject of great care, interest and intervention—yet the collective fate of Palestinians can only ever be ultimately decided by expert opinion, and according to every last whim of Israel’s needs for recognition and security. Of course, according to the needs of Israel and the Western-backed sham peace process, the expert opinion that gets to decide Palestinian fate is usually not democratically determined by Palestinians. (See the Western-backed takeover of the democratically elected Hamas government in 2006...) So, an interview with a Palestinian in this context is a kind of special occurrence—it enters the equation not out of concern for Palestinian collective fate, but to achieve the effect of telling an audience of liberal Jews or Israelis, “see, I even asked the Palestinians, and they’re ok with the situation!” [...] Activists should take note: The repetition of this circus of maintaining the legitimacy of the settler regime is far more damning than the specific facts they report within this circus. Hence a “centrist” position that argues the facts but does not go after the circus is rather problematic. Let is not be dragged into it. (444, 445)
Katz-Nussbaum’s third point is that the SodaStream (and likewise Johansson), as part of the opposition’s perceived media propaganda, has been manufactured for a perceived concerted display to mask the wider political realities in the occupied Palestinian territories:

Got a model factory?
Let’s recapitulate what is in plain view—what some of the reporters mention, what the Israeli NGO Kav LaOved has reported on, and what workers are very forthright about: SodaStream’s is a model factory, retrofitted for display—and not characteristic of Israel’s West Bank industrial zones. Every modern oppressive apparatus worth its salt has a good model factory (the U.S. had model kitchens, and the analogies get more provocative from ether.) Every social activists and journalist in Israel-Palestine knows: you are not going to get anywhere near this place without an invitation. And as Palestinian workers in the industrial area, and Kav LaOved staff, will tell you: SodaStream has become one of the good places to work—it is the other 200 or so companies in this industrial area where some of the worst abuses occur. But having a factory that can produce fast videos and elicit positive statements from colonized workers is extremely important; without it, those other factories would be subject to even more withering critique. SodaStream plays a hugely important function in what the Israeli government considers an increasingly important “war,” the war for legitimacy. […] The point is that these positives can be taken away at any moment until the occupation ends. Occupation means that Palestinians at this plant are under the authority of Israel’s military, which grants them special permits to work every month; these permits are commonly revoked in retaliation for demanding decent labor conditions. How many violations there are in SodaStream is a sort of red herring, and not only because anyone deemed to be causing trouble is no longer ether! Why would an extremely successful multinational company, well aware of the scrutiny it is under, with a well-oiled PR machine, leave any dirty laundry for journalists to see? In the storm of fascination with Scarlett, a basic sense of skepticism evaporated, even if only momentarily. That is not surprising but it should be alarming. As Israel’s abuses drag on and on, they charge us to be skeptical and thorough, but not necessarily to get dragged into a dry war of facts. (446-450)

Although the opposition is perceived to be using Johansson as a media propaganda to seduce audiences away from the perceived truth, likewise she can be used, as a BDS/Mondoweiss tactic to draw attention to their claims in an entertaining and lampooned manner:

What might be more fun and equally effective at this moment is satire: having a laugh on. Mobilizing a laugh against, the miserable ideological contortions of a colonialism in trouble. (450)
15 March

Given that blog activists made claims and perceived to demonstrate how Johansson has been used as a media propaganda ploy to mask the reality at the factory in Occupied Palestine, Weiss questions if some liberal Jews are not taking the issues presented during the controversy seriously. During the Jewish festival of Purism author Sara Ehrman was quoted in a fundraising email from Peace Now:

_I shpritz my SodaStream (I swear I didn’t buy it—it was a gift). [Weiss retorted:] I just don’t get it. Does APN [Americans for Peace Now] “reject SodaStream” or does it think the occupied territories are just a joke? (453)_

Purim is a Jewish holiday to commemorate being saved from persecution in the ancient Persian empire, and Ehrman’s statement is perceived as not taking discourses raised about the occupation in Palestine seriously, particularly as Weiss noted when APN has previously claimed to take a critical stance against SodaStream and therefore blog activists suggest that liberal Jews are caught by the propaganda media trap made by SodaStream’s use of Johansson:

_During the recent controversy over Scarlett Johannsson’s appearance in a SuperBowl ad for the seltzer-maker SodaStream, which builds its fizzers in the occupied territories, Americans for Peace Now took a strong line against purchasing SodaStream, products. Its ceo Debra DeLee, wrote, “Reject SodaStream” because Peace Now regards the West Bank as so vital to the two-state solution: [quoting DeLee:] because Israel’s occupation of the West Bank is such an anomaly, as much as I may like Scarlett (and seltzer), I will not buy SodaStream, not until it moves its headquarters away from a West Bank settlement. (453)_

18 March

In an interview with Johansson in a Guardian editorial written by journalist Carole Cadwalladr Johansson accuses the charity for supporting the BDS movement. Blog activists use this as an opportunity to further demonstrate how the celebrity is perceived to be conspiring with the boycotted company:
“Actress and SodaStream spokesperson Scarlett Johansson accused the international charity Oxfam of funding” the boycott, divestment and sanctions (BDS) movement. […] and reaffirmed her support for the controversial Israeli factory located over the Green Line.” [Cadwalladr noted that according to Johansson:] “There’s plenty of evidence that Oxfam does support and has funded a BDS [boycott, divest, sanctions] movement in the past. It’s something that can’t really be denied.” [Cadwalladr responding to this:] When I contacted Oxfam, it denied this. (457, 458) [For the reader’s interest, parts of the interview are included in the endnotes of this chapter.]

Deger defends Oxfam noting that the charity had:

already addressed their stance on BDS in a FAQ on their position on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.295 […] Moreover, Oxfam runs programs inside of Israel for the benefit of impoverished Israelis, including dialogue programs that do not meet the guidelines set out by the BDS movement. (461, 467)

Addressing Johansson’s accusations:

Yet the mystery remains, who told Johansson it “can’t really be denied” that Oxfam support BDS? That answer is SodaStream, specifically its CEO Daniel Birnbaum who made the first and same public accusation in Haaretz296 last month. [Quoting Birnbaum:] “Unsurprisingly, Oxfam has joined the BDS movement [to close down the West Bank factory],” said Birnbaum, continuing, “I’m saying unsurprisingly because we found out that some of the Oxfam branches have been donating funds to the BDS, and this money is used to demonize and attack Israel.” Birnbaum then went on to stress that he personally advises Johansson, which would explain to followers of “SodaGate” why the actress’s remarks sound like talking points from the company that employs her. Again from Haaretz:297 Birnbaum said he has been in touch with her regularly since her decision to cut ties with Oxfam. ‘She was very disturbed by having to withdraw from Oxfam,’ he said. “In her words, she loved working for them, and she felt that their cause, to fight poverty around the world, was a very important cause. She did not leave them wanting, and I felt bad for the way it all evolved, but in the end I believe that it will be for the better because by leaving Oxfam—this is my interpretation—she’s actually exposed the hypocrisy of that organization because of political motivations, perhaps because of financial motivations.” 469, 470

Responding to Birnbaum’s statement defending Oxfam’s position and how Birnbaum/Johansson come to continue to ignore their clarifications given a possible “initial misunderstanding” (suggesting a tactic on part of the opposition’s media propaganda) Deger remarks how:
Birnbaum’s accusation were lobbed at Oxfam during a press call organized by The Israel Project, an advocacy group whose raison d’être is connecting journalists—from Wolf Blitzer to Jon Stewart—to pro-Israel talking points. [Deger explains that Oxfam:] In the past they funded the Coalition of Women for Peace, and Israeli-Palestinian feminist organization that oversees the Who Profits from the Israeli Occupation Project. [And elaborating that it was] Who Profits [who] “initiated in response to the Palestinian call for the boycott, divestment and sanction (BDS) movement,” but the organization’s role is not advocacy. They produce reports and have a popular online portal with information about Israeli and international companies that violate international law by setting up shop on occupied territory. With respect to SodaStream, the group drafted a case study that implicated the carbonated device manufacturer with trade fraud. Who Profits discovered that SodaStream products shipped to European market mislabeled as being produced in “Airport City, Ben Gurion Airport,” rather than in a settlement. [Deger further noting that:] Because of Who Profit’s research mislabeled products, or products and services that violate a corporation’s social responsibility policy have lost contracts. Indeed Birnbaum have even stated the BDS movement is a financial “risk factor” for SodaStream. It may be understandable that there was an initial misunderstanding regarding Oxfam’s policy towards BDS, however the charity has repeatedly provided clarification that Birnbaum and through his advisement, Johansson, has chosen to ignore. (471, 473, 474)

The announcement is taken as a perceived threat and blog activists construct drama by strategically using celebrity in multiple ways for generating attention to the campaign. However, how Johansson responds creates a shift on how activists use of editorial journalism and images intensify their pressure and shaming of the celebrity. The turning points reveal how blog activists continue to take advantage of a variety of opportunities in their strategic use of Johansson to problematize her as a means to generate attention to the movement’s claims and grievances. However, blog activists’ editorial rhetoric and use of images change dramatically depending on how the celebrity responded and or reacted to the controversy. Blog activists use these turning points to also politicize her further by making connections to her relationships to the boycotted company and other external issues such as apartheid and the SodaStream factory in occupied territory. Blog activists’ initial labeling of her as The Face of Apartheid and suspicions about her relationship with the boycotted company are perceived to be validated by the last turning point.
CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION

Celebrities are increasingly becoming strategically involved in politics, social activism, and marketing in a variety of ways (Boorstin 2012; Street 2004; King and Soule 2009; Bartley and Child 2007; Wheeler 2013). At the same time celebrity are subject to media spectacle (Kellner 2009) and intense media criticism regarding the authenticity of their reputations particularly those involved in humanitarian work (Dyer 1991; Brockington 2011; Yrjölä 2012; Jerslev 2014). Given that attention is a key resource of social movements (Tufecki 2013) social movements use celebrities in campaign activities as part of their strategic efforts to apply pressure at key targets, but to ultimately generate attention for social action and social change (Gitlin 1980; Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993; Meyer and Gamson 1995; Lahusen 1996; Thrall et al., 2008). Following the anti-apartheid cultural boycotts of South Africa, movements such as BDS are increasingly pressuring entertainers and celebrities to make moral choices and tough decisions.

However, the Palestinian movement and their supporters are often marginalized from mainstream media so they often use alternative media to challenge opposing narratives to pressure Israel and to actively contest and construct an alternative political and social reality. By framing the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as a conflict over conscience and humanity, the strategic use of celebrity and apartheid rhetoric is one opportunity to creatively draw attention and communicate claims. Nonetheless, activists need to be careful not to overdo their lampooned tactics towards a popular celebrity in case of alienating their supporters. This study demonstrates how the claims making and protest activities are part of an agentic and dynamic process which revolves around the strategic use of celebrity in multiple ways to test which kinds of rhetorical/persuasive tactics are effective and successful. Ultimately, the intention is to provoke a response.
from the celebrity in ways that would be perceived as successful for the movement by generating
attention and sustaining interest and mobilization in protest related activities.

**Important findings**

This study addressed how 1. blog activists strategically used celebrity to draw attention to
der wider Palestinian movement’s claims and grievances. Additionally, the study examined how 2.
blog activists maintained enduring interest in campaign activities for mobilizing online and
offline protest activities throughout a protest event. Examining activists claims making and
protest activities through a process-oriented approach is important because we can better
understand how movement messages are presented and how celebrity is manufactured as an
antagonist to a movement and subsequently strategically used as a persuasive tactic for
generating attention and maintaining interest during a protest event. As such, this study provides
insight to how movements and their actors strategically use celebrity in social media platforms.

Although I drew from a variety of social movement perspectives, I essentially
conceptualize social movements as either structural or constructionism. Nonetheless as argued by
Jasper (2004), structure implies relatively fixed entities so scholarship attention is often diverted
away from open-ended strategic interplay. To understand what and why people protest we first
need to understand how they perceive and interpret tier world. Therefore, while not dismissing
dominant social movement theories, I concentrate on symbolic interaction and constructionism to
understand how people perceive their reality and how that shape their interactions and actively
construct meaning to influence social action. A perceived threat opportunity premise allows me
to emphasize how on one hand individuals and groups perceive and interpret these material and
or structural conditions. At the same time, activists themselves create agentic and interactional
opportunities outside of the structure via their perception and tactical strategizing of a threat (Kurzman 1996) by substantiating her connections with SodaStream (both economically and politically) by taking advantage of networks and practices already in place instead of creating new resources (Tilly 1978). In this way, activists are strategically using celebrity to constructing problems and claims without waiting for structural openings for contentious making opportunities.

What I found missing from the literature is an examination of agentic, creative, and process oriented forms of activism—the process involved and how it unfolds. This lead to some precursory questions: what are activists actually doing during a protest event as opposed to structural explanations or outcomes? How are they dramatizing events? How are activists using creative tactics, strategically using humor to bypass hegemonic media structures with online forms of activisms? What I am doing with this study is bringing the human agency back into the focus. So I synthesize these dominant social movement theories and I draw from each of them useful terms and concepts into a strategy paradigm, including mobilization of resources and political processes via cultural and framing approaches. As such, I explore ways in which blog activists strategically use celebrity to generate attention and to communicate claims and grievances on behalf of the wider movement. I employed grounded theory and mixed methods (which includes case study and netnography) to employ a process-oriented approach to analyze three types of data: 1. editorial text; 2. images; and 3. data I created quantitatively from qualitative data. Data was extracted from Mondoweiss blog editorials focused on the SodaStream/ Johansson controversy from January to March 2014.

Throughout the coding process a critical event and three turning points were identified:
Critical Event: reaction to SodaStream’s announcement of Scarlett Johansson as their Global brand Ambassador

Turning Point 1: Johansson’s response (or lack of) to criticism about her SodaStream ambassadorship

Turning Point 2: Johansson quits her role as Oxfam’s celebrity global ambassador

Turning Point 3: Reactions (and ensuing events) to Johansson’s Super Bowl commercial.

Coupled with my memo notes, I was able to summarize the core category: reputation and how that played an implicit but central role throughout the intended and revealed strategic usage of celebrity and key targets along with external issues (apartheid; the BDS campaign against SodaStream; media attention and or the lack thereof; the two state solution; and liberal Jews—common external issues addressed throughout the Mondoweiss blog editorials in general). In the coding process reputation became the implicit idea that something is being protected and potentially damageable. The text and images indicated that and that is how I identified reputation as the implicit point to which activists are strategically using, like the hinge on a pair of pliers, to contest in a variety of ways, to apply pressure to key targets—and in this case, celebrity. Celebrity is an attention grabbing spectacle, but strategically risky so they must contest in ways that does not alienate their advocates or potential supporters. Therefore, blog activists strategically draw from celebrity multiple aspects of Johansson to see what sticks and what is potentially damageable, to validate their overarching apartheid connections and arguments.

In essence, I examined how the SodaStream announcement of Scarlett Johansson as their Global Brand Ambassador was perceived as a threat to BDS and Palestinian movement for being part of a wider Israeli media/ celebrity propaganda for normalizing the occupation. Activists subsequently target celebrity as an opportunity to construct as a media spectacle for dramatizing the announcement. This was to generate attention to the BDS campaign against SodaStream and ultimately communicate the wider Palestinian movement’s claims and grievances by labeling the
celebrity as The Face of Apartheid. Although strategically risky, this label is dramatic enough to generate news and attention to movement claims about the illegal occupation and provocative enough to pressure the celebrity to respond. Despite the dramatic premise The Face of Apartheid label conveys, blog activists do present Johansson an opportunity to redeem her reputation as a long-time dedicated humanitarian fighting world poverty instead of a celebrity with economic and political underlying motives, as with Kristin Davis in the BDS campaign against Ahava. How and/or if a celebrity responds is initially unknown but the activists potentially have ‘won’ the controversy if they are successful enough to generate attention to the wider movement’s claims and grievances through the strategic use of The Face of Apartheid label.

The study shows how movement actors can strategically use celebrity as a perceived threat to create opportunities to communicate claims, but it involves a carefully crafted process testing the various ways to provoke a response and to warrant that the label is not wholly unfounded. This strategic use of the label reflects an on-going process whereby blog activists cast a wide net to examine which aspect of the celebrity’s persona and reputation merits the label. A perceived threat approach (i.e. perceived opportunity) focuses more on the agency of the actors to make contentious claims versus the more constrained view as implied in ‘opportunity’ (structural opportunities). The idea that actors ‘wait’ for a structural opening in order to make contentious claims and protest is more multifaceted and not as rigid in influencing actors’ decisions and behaviors. Kurzman (1995) asserts that political opportunities are much more complex than a structural perspective would suggest.

Therefore, perceiving (and subsequently contending) that the celebrity is a perceived threat allows blog activists to turn it into an opportunity, reflecting entrepreneurial action whether it be successful or unsuccessful. A perceived threat perspective not only illuminated the
proactive nature of blog activists’ agency to construct opportunities for campaign claims making and protest activities but these perceived threats are very much part of culture. This alternative approach is echoed by Goodwin and Jasper’s (1999: 39) critique of dominate social movement paradigms and contend that “opportunities, when they are important, do not result from invariant menu of factors, but from situationally specific combination and sequences of political processes—none of which, in the abstract, has determinate consequences.” Perceived threats are very much part of the culture. And although culture is both enabling and constraining, it is a contested realm where actors can actively construct meanings, situations, and events for claims making and protest.

During the initial coding stage, which I identified as the critical event, I examined how blog activities strategically used Johansson in multiple ways (such as noting the celebrity as a well-known sexy Hollywood actress who claims to be eco-friendly and fights to address poverty, that the celebrity has maternal Jewish ancestry, and presenting her as an anticipated SodaStream product that ultimately did not help bolster the company’s stock prices) to problematize her relationship with the boycotted and controversial company and to provoke a response from the celebrity. Although the Johansson/ SodaStream controversy was facilitated by Mondoweiss blog activists as part of the BDS campaign against SodaStream, a carefully analysis of data collected from 37 articles from the Mondoweiss blog site verified that celebrity and apartheid emerged as a continuous editorial focus throughout the protest event (which I identified based on data collected from January until March 2014).

What is surprising is how celebrity emerged as the central target (particularly to contest her contradictory ambassadorships). Given that the controversy was part of the BDS campaign against SodaStream one would have assumed that a central editorial focus would have been on
SodaStream. Instead, Johansson’s reputation as a celebrity ambassador fighting for poverty and injustices and the issue of apartheid emerged as the central external issue to which blog activists attempted to problematize with the celebrity. This coalesced into blog activists strategically using and validating *The Face of Apartheid* label to specifically communicate claims about the SodaStream factory and more broadly the illegal occupation in Palestine. Reputation emerged as central theme but it is important to clarify that reputation is the implicit theme through which blog activists are using as an opportunity to contest as a means to apply pressure and provoke a response from key targets.

As such, I examined how blog activists strategically used her responses as an opportunity to sustain interest, but to merit the label by providing evidence to politicize her reputation as an Oxfam celebrity humanitarian ambassador. Contesting her reputation has to be validated and the activists do this by using her statements, both past and present, and humanitarian and political actions to support their initial suspicions that she is a threat to the movement. This claims making and protest activities involves a dynamic process which involves the strategic use of celebrity in multiple ways by ‘casting a net’ so to say to validate *The Face of Apartheid* label. This was intended to pressure the celebrity to respond and verify or redeem *The Face of Apartheid* label.

However, unlike Davis’ case, Johansson chose instead to respond in a way that only solidified blog activists initial suspicious about her authentic reputation as someone who cares about human rights and poverty. Turning points based on the celebrity’s reactions and response reflected a shift in blog activists’ use of rhetoric (editorial text and images) about the celebrity to act as evidence to support their label and possible political collusion with the SodaStream media propaganda. This was intended to motivate action as they connected their contestation over her
humanitarian reputation with external issues surrounding the BDS campaign against SodaStream, thus legitimizing their initial suspicious of her relationship with the boycotted company and politics surrounding the occupation in Palestine.

I also examined how creative tactics through the use of editorial rhetoric and images about the celebrity reflected dramatic shifts or ‘turning points’ to how she responded to the controversy. By continuing their strategic use and editorial focus on the celebrity, blog activists politicized her relationship with the controversial factory to wider state, media, and political propaganda arguments frequently addressed within the blog. This was validated (from the perception of the blog activists) through the use of her statements and reactions to the controversy. Blog activists use her past and current statements and behavior as evidence as to why they are contesting Johansson’s reputation as a humanitarian.

The critical event is characterized as an attempt by blog activists to strategically use celebrity in multiple ways to generate attention to the wider Palestinian movement’s claims and grievances about the situation in occupied Palestine. Particularly, they are attempting to problematize how a Hollywood actress is a bad marketing choice for a boycotted company and thus a potential antagonist target for supporters to capitalize and dramatize. The critical event is multi-dimensional that Johansson is used in multiple ways to problematize her relationship with a boycotted company by capitalizing on her status as a: Hollywood actress; her Jewish maternal ancestry; her association with a BDS boycotted factory in occupied Palestinian territory; SodaStream’s falling stock prices since the announcement of her global brand ambassadorship with SodaStream; using creative, lampooned, and hijacked images of the celebrity and her humanitarian ambassadorship with Oxfam; and the (potential lack of) media attention to the controversy. Blog activists center on aspects of Johansson’s reputation (e.g. her celebrity status...
and humanitarian experience) as part of an anti-apartheid and naming and blaming strategy, which are all forms of nonviolent protest and tactical persuasion. Centering on her reputation as a humanitarian is a strategic attempt to launch public debates about the celebrity’s active partnership with the boycotted and controversial factory and to communicate wider movement’s claims about the illegal occupation in Palestine. As demonstrated throughout this study, targeting celebrity is a pathway to challenge the illegal occupation by the Israeli state and avoids direct confrontation with the opposing movement (the Israeli state, SodaStream and their supporters) while ultimately agitating state authority through these online claims making and protest activities.

The first turning point is based on how the celebrity (or more specifically a lack of responding) to initial claims made by the blog activists during the critical event. The activists direct their focus on the celebrity’s perceived contradictory ambassadorship roles between Oxfam and SodaStream. Highlighting this contradiction, they strategically use this as an opportunity to motivate others to participate in creative protest related activities to pressure both Johansson and Oxfam to influence the celebrity to respond to their claims. As ascertain by data, are connections being made to problematize her relationship with the boycotted company, particularly its controversial location.

What can be observed is an amplification of human rights rhetoric, anti-apartheid and a moral critique as a tactical form of non-violence by shaming and blaming the celebrity. As revealed by the images, poking fun at the celebrity strategically exposes the contradictions and ridiculousness of their perceived reality of the situation. Human rights, injustice frames, and a narrative of victimhood and suffering are all drawn to expose the contradictions and hypocriticalness of a celebrity humanitarian working as a global brand ambassador for a
boycotted company. Quotes by the celebrity are employed to foreshadow the contradictions Johansson makes in her statements regarding the controversy.

Maintaining BDS ethos of human rights and anti-apartheid, blog activists use humor and a moral critique as a tactical form of non-violence by shaming and blaming. In their editorials the blog activists use humor and creative practices (e.g. anti-marketing tactics such as culture jamming) in their expose about the celebrity’s reputation as a humanitarian fighting world poverty. By ‘poking fun’ at the contradiction of Johansson’s ambassadorship roles as a celebrity spokesperson for both Oxfam and SodaStream, they expose the underlying hypocrisies and moral indignation of her responses, decision, and of the occupation itself.

In one particular image (image 43) SodaStream’s original ad, which is centered on their spokesperson Scarlett Johansson, is hijacked. The core image (the celebrity is presented as sipping from a SodaStream product) is superimposed against the Apartheid Wall. The original message constructed by SodaStream was intended to convince potential customers to buy their product, which is endorsed by well-known and sexy Hollywood actress Johansson. As in their advertisements and commercials with Johansson, the celebrity is portrayed as an ‘expert’ of the product and long-time personal consumer. The hijacked image on the other hand, engages the audience to rethink their consumption of a product that is illegally produced in occupied territory. In addition to this, underlying the lampooned aspects of the image (because it now is made to appear truth the celebrity is happily sipping a SodaStream beverage without a care to what is going on behind her) the meta-message of the hijacked image informs the audience that this product is not only ‘occupation made,’ but that it is also knowingly sold by a celebrity who appears to be apathetic and vapid to the situation around her. As such, like the corporation she represents, she is selling a product to the consumer under false pretense (i.e. oppositional
propaganda efforts). In this way, the blog activists endeavor to make the normalization of the occupation and utilization of the celebrity by the opposition’s propaganda visible. Additionally, throughout the process, activists are engaging in the use of anti-apartheid and human rights rhetoric to shame and blame targets, in this case Johansson along with SodaStream (and to a certain degree even Oxfam for not pressuring the celebrity sooner) as part of their tactics of persuasion.

As claim makers and moral entrepreneurs (i.e. netizen activist journalists engaging in a moral crusade against the occupation in Palestine) acting on behalf of the victims of occupied Palestine, blog activists take an editorial moral stance and compassionate move via human rights and injustice frames and the Palestine movement narrative of victimhood and suffering to expose her contradictions and hypocrisies as a celebrity humanitarian. Their efforts is based on exposing contradictions and engaging others (whether key targets or their audience) to make a choice on the situation based on ethical and moral choices. They also draw an environmental justice frame to convey how factory practices supported by the celebrity contradict ethical or conscious consumerism. Overall, they contend that despite Johansson’s Hollywood career and popularity, sex appeal, and past humanitarian efforts, the celebrity is ultimately a manufactured commodity by SodaStream, an unwise marketing strategy, as well as an example of the opposition’s strategic use of celebrity as part of the media propaganda by SodaStream and the wider State ‘Israel Branding’ efforts which aims to normalize and or whitewash the occupation. According to Goldberg (online, 2014) Johansson is “openly gunning for former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton for 2016, Johansson would do well to realize that “normalizing” the Israeli occupation is a bad use of her celebrity.”
The second turning point reflects a dramatic shift based on the celebrity’s response to the controversy by ending her almost eight year long relationship with Oxfam. Although Johansson is rebuked for not responding sooner during turning point 1, turning point 2 reflects a dramatic turn of events which centers on politicizing the celebrity as her response is perceived to be a validation of blog activists’ initial suspicions and The Face of Apartheid label during the critical event. The use of editorial rhetoric and images about the celebrity are amplified and Johansson is politicized with external issues such as apartheid, the SodaStream factory in occupation territory (reports claiming human right abuses), the two-state issue, and the lack of support from self-identified progressive and liberal Jews. Images of the celebrity are drawn from movie posters and political ads from the opposing movement are satirized to draw attention to their claims and grievances. These are accompanied with an attempt to politicize the celebrity with controversial political players (i.e. the hijacked TIP image—image 39—displaying Johansson seductively sipping from a shared SodaStream beverage in between Israel Netanyahu and Palestinian leader Abbas—Mondoweiss is poking fun of TIP’s (The Israel Project’s) pubic thanks to Johansson for standing up for “peace and truth”—which Mondoweiss is critical of slowing the peace process) and external issues (BDS campaign against SodaStream and media attention) as blog activists amplify their presentation on the controversial relationship between the celebrity and the boycotted company.

Johansson’s statements and quotes are compared with third party reports and research on human rights violations at the factory to illustrate how she is being used to normalize the occupation in Palestine. To bolster and legitimize The Face of Apartheid label, UN and third party reports are integrated throughout the editorials to reinforce that building factories on occupied land is an act of aggression and not conducive to peace. This is intended to counter
claims made by SodaStream, which are echoed almost verbatim from Johansson herself, that the factory is an example of building peace. The blog activists make a valid point that her claims not to be political engaged is contradicted in her claim to support a company which is playing a role towards building peace. Despite her experience as an Oxfam humanitarian (i.e. traveling to various countries to experience and witness poverty and atrocities), she responds stating that she ‘strongly reaffirms her support for SodaStream’ and that she ‘has no regrets” despite not visiting the SodaStream factory, Israel, or the occupied territories. Because of this, Johansson’s affiliation with the company is presented by the blog activists to be part of another media propaganda effort to ‘normalize’ the occupation in Palestine.

The descriptive data reveals that his tactical shift in the editorials is an attempt to maintain an enduring interest to mobilize supporters to continue protesting online and offline before the upcoming Super Bowl commercial unveiling in February. The use of an apartheid narratives, human rights, injustice, and environmental consumer frames are utilized to support claims made about the celebrity’s involvement and to motive interest in continuing protest activities before the airing of the SodaStream commercial during the Super Bowl. It is also important to note that although Johansson was the key editorial target, Oxfam also came under pressure for failing to pressure or dismiss Johansson earlier in the controversy (as they have consistently demonstrated before in similar cases) from her ambassadorship position. Activists claimed that Johansson’s Oxfam humanitarian position was untenable due to objective contradictions to upholding their principles while also being the spokesperson to the boycotted and controversial company. Additionally, Oxfam has demonstrated before that while they do not publically support BDS the organization has clearly stated that they “believe that business that operate in settlements further the ongoing poverty and denial of rights of the Palestinian
communities that we work to support. Oxfam is opposed to all trade form Israeli statements, which are illegal under international law.”

Turning point three reflected how activists took advantage of lackluster reactions to the Super Bowl commercial and then strategically using Johansson to confirm their claims that she is an unsuccessful marketing strategy for both SodaStream and Israel. Johansson makes public statements defending her position and reasons to end her relationship with Oxfam by claiming it was because she found out that the NGO has a political connection with the BDS movement. The activists use this as an opportunity to verify their suspicions that she is not only employing the rhetoric of perceived SodaStream media propaganda but that she is in collusion with the opposition. The celebrity is further politicized with regards to her perceived political motivations (in addition to economic ones for choosing an ambassadorship with SodaStream over a humanitarian one with Oxfam) and activists strategically use this as an opportunity to amplify their protest to pressure SodaStream. Conversely, Johansson is strategically used as an example of a celebrity part of a wider Israeli state branding propaganda that employs celebrities to normalize and white wash the occupation. Activists present Johansson as ultimately ‘choosing the wrong side of history’ and made herself an antagonist to the Palestinian movement as The Face of Apartheid.

Johansson’s affiliation with the company is perceived as part of media propaganda efforts to ‘normalize’ the Israeli occupation. For the activists, Johansson’s past political activities and statements that “like most actors, my main job is saving the world” and that she is a “supporter of economic cooperation and social interaction between a democratic Israel and Palestine” contradict her claim that she insisted that “she never intended on being the face of any social or political movement, distinction, separation or stance.” She called SodaStream a “model
employer” and stated to Huffington Post that the company “is not only committed to the environment but to building a bridge to peace between Israel and Palestine, supporting neighbors working alongside each other, receiving equal pay, equal benefits and equal rights.”

Therefore, activists point out how Johansson dismisses the fact that the factory pays their Palestinian workers less, regardless of the fact that the Israeli company is illegally operating in occupied territory. As such, Johansson, a SodaStream product and part of Hollywood illusion, is being used by the opposition to purposefully whitewash the lines between its pre-1967 borders and the settlements both economically and physically. Johansson attempts to present herself as supporting a two-state solution, but instead, states in a well-crafted misleading statement that she and Oxfam parted ways because they “have a fundamental difference of opinion in regards to the boycott, divestment and sanctions movement.” Her statements demonstrate, as a tenured ambassador fighting world poverty, that she fails to grasp the fact that poverty and the occupation in Palestine is a fundamentally political phenomena regardless of her attempts to convey that she is taking a ‘neutral stance.’ If anything, the blog activists have demonstrated that despite their efforts to make aware of the facts, she has confirmed that profit comes before people. As such, Johansson has knowingly abandon her reputation as a progressive celebrity, a respected and tendered humanitarian fight world poverty in exchange for profit, thus becoming The Face of Apartheid. According to Barghouti (quoted by the Huffington Post), Johansson “reminds us of the few unprincipled artists who during the struggle against South Africa sold their souls and stood on the wrong side of history.”
Limitations and suggestions for future research

While not wanting to minimize the importance of my findings, it is necessary to recognize and address some of the limitations of my research. The first limitation revolves around my sample selection. Mattoni (2012) and McCurdy (2011) argued that studies often neglect the whole media spectrum with which activities and social movements interact, enabling a “one media bias.” Although this study focused on one blog and specifically on the blogging behaviors of blog activists, a future study could offer a deeper understanding of the event with an inclusion of audience participants, other blog participants in the network (to map dynamic connections), and evaluate the long-term consequences in the movement’s utilization of The Face of Apartheid label in their ongoing campaign against SodaStream.

Despite these limitations my study contributes to theory and social research in general. The strategic use of celebrity in social movement research is lacking and future research would be fruitful to test my findings. As the basic of this study was exploratory in nature, its purpose was to provide a glimpse of understanding into the agentic aspects of claims making and protest activities in order to provide a framework, if anything a methodological framework, for future researchers a better direction of how to continue the study of strategically use of celebrity. Nonetheless, the study provides a novel empirical foundation for future studies examining the strategic use of celebrity in humanitarians, politics, and social media wars.

Afterwards

Despite attempts to rectify Johansson’s and the company’s image (she is lauded by pro-Israeli supporters as their “beautiful and brave” “heroine”) SodaStream stocks continued to fall. On April 21, 2014 (the day before the globally recognized Earth day), the Earth Day Network (which works with more than 22,000 partners in 192 countries to broaden, diversify, and
mobilize the environmental movement) decided to end its partnership with SodaStream after their attempt to launch an awareness-raising campaign the “Secret Continent campaign.” The EDN’s logo was removed from the Secret Continent’ website and EDN no longer lists SodaStream as a sponsor.  

Johansson’s celebrity product becomes stuck with *The Face of Apartheid* label in the majority of memes and images referencing the BDS campaign against SodaStream or the controversy surrounding Johansson and SodaStream among BDS and Palestinian advocates and their activities. *The Face of Apartheid* label is frequently employed during the war against Palestine in the summer of 2014. SodaStream stocks drops at a 52 week low in October 2014 (the lowest in SodaStream history up to that point) and many mainstream and online media directly link it to BDS and the Johansson controversy.

On October 29th, SodaStream announced that it will be moving to a new location in the Lehavim industrial zone just outside of the Bedouin township of Rahat in the Negev desert in southern occupied Palestine (another disputed territory). Sweden officially recognizes the Palestinian state on October 30th, 2014.
Ph.D Dissertation Postscript

This dissertation is based on a revise study from my first defense in the fall of 2014. Since that time, events have shifted regarding the SodaStream/Johansson controversy, and the SodaStream factory and stocks. In September 2015, SodaStream closed its main factory in Mishor Adumim and moved to the Negev—another controversial location being taken up by the BDS movement. In October 2014, SodaStream shares fell 3.3% to 421.20—which is down 42% from 2013. However, the company reported $119.2 million in revenue, a 17.2% increase from the second quarter of 2015—climbing 73% in 2016 alone. According to an updated biography by IMDb, Johansson has starred in: Captain America: The Winter Soldier and Lucy in 2014; and Avengers: Age of Ultron (2015). Johansson married French journalist Romain Dauriac in 2014 and they gave birth to a daughter.

Although earlier aspirations were to conduct a future study concerning long term consequences regarding the strategic use of The face of Apartheid antagonist character/label in future BDS campaigns against SodaStream, obviously two years has since passed and we ‘know’ the outcomes as it pertains to the SodaStream company and Hollywood actress. The face of Apartheid was not intended to convey some magical label that would ultimately play a factor in the company’s or celebrity’s downfall—however, for the blog activists, it was successful at the time because it did what it was intended to do for that protest event which was to generate attention and sustain interest for online and offline protest.

Therefore, it is important to point out that this study specifically looked at the agentic and creative processes that unfolded during a protest event (January to March 2014). The study was intended to look at how such processes unfolded during a protest event which lead to the strategic use of celebrity during that time. Regardless of the outcomes, this could still
nonetheless provide activists elsewhere with insight on how celebrity in particular can be used to amplify progressive causes via popular culture and add to activists’ innovate strategies. If I were to attempt to execute the study today, I would perhaps consider how social movement organizations can use such campaigns to advance their overall social justice goals; and perhaps contextualize the study against other anti-celebrity campaigns.

According to Lionis (2016: 182) “Palestinian cultural output has been always marked by a narration of the Palestinian story. At each critical junction of history, the form of narration shifted alongside changes in identity and political and social contexts. Although humor can be said to be the latest form of narration of the Palestinian story, it is able to achieve something that was closed off to other forms of visual communication. Humor has the unique ability to challenge our understanding of time through its idiosyncratic relationships to temporality.”

Zionism is a nationalist and political movement that emerged in the 19th century (Chomskey 1999). In fact, the movement was originally agnostic. It was not until soon after the creation of the State of Israel that orthodox religious views merged with the political ideologies of Zionism. When ‘given’ the opportunity to establish Jewish territory in Palestine (as a result of the 1917 Balfour Declaration), Zionist were faced with a demographic dilemma and had three main options to achieve their goal: the way of South Africa (a settler minority ruling over an exploited indigenous majority); the way of partition (dividing Palestine into Jewish and Arab parts); and the way of transfer of all the Arabs (Morris 2001). The transfer option was adopted during the 1948 Arab-Israeli war in 1948 and established the declaration of the independent of the state of Israel. For many, elements of Zionism and the Jewish religion shaped the creation and ongoing construction of the state of Israel. Of course this discussion on the complexities of religion and politics is historically and culturally complex (Israel is comprised of a secular and religious diversity, including differing opinions on Israel’s direction). However, as elaborated in the history chapter of this dissertation, this is a source of contention from the Palestinian position.

Protests are non-routinized ways of affecting cultural, political and social processes. In fact, “social movements employ methods of persuasion and coercion which are, more often than not, novel, unorthodox, dramatic, and of questionable legitimacy” (Wilson 1973: 227). Protests are “sites of contestation in which bodies, symbolism, identities, practices, and discourse are used to pursue or prevent changes in institutionalized power relations” (Taylor and van Dyke 2004: 268). As such, movement activists select tactics which are the specific means of implementing strategy (form of collective action taken by movement actors) to employ an effective protest (see repertoires of contention in this chapter).

Defining ‘new’ media is complex and wide-ranging and there is much scholarly discussion on the subject. Because this study examines how blogger activists use anti-marketing and culture jamming strategies as a pathway to challenge oppositional and hegemonic messages, for the sake of brevity and to establish some form of consistency, I will be using the term ‘alternative media’ to refer to the various Internet related technologies and platforms, digital media, and ICT (information communication technologies) as opposed to ‘old’ or ‘traditional’ media such as radio and television. Alternative media is viewed as more personal and social medium that has posed a challenge to conventional media. As such, alternative media is viewed as a potentially important site of resistance to conventional media hegemony (Gitlin 1980) although I am not dismissing the reality that alternative media does have its own biases and challenges. Specifically, I am conceptualizing alternative media, as a tool and as a platform that are part of framing processes, mobilizing and political structures, and which are used to challenge “established, hierarchal systems of politics, economics, and culture” (Fuchs 2010: 174). In this vein, I approach alternative media on how it is being used by citizen journalists/ movement activists, as non-institutional actors to produce and engage in critical forum and content for grassroots media organizations (Fuchs 2010: 178). However, I may refer to a more specific term depending on specific concepts on what is being discussed and or quoted. To clarify some related terms that constitute ‘alternative media’: digital media are media that combine text, graphics, sound and video using computer technology and which are encoded in a computer-readable format, and can reside on a local device (CD, DVD, hard drive), or remote location such as web pages, social media, digital audio, e-books, etc. ICT (information communication technology) is an umbrella term that includes any communication device or application (radio, television, cellular phone, computer and network hardware/ software, satellite systems, among others). Internet or
the ‘web’ (a worldwide discussion system consisting of world wide web sites) is a large database where all types of information and data are transmitted through different computer servers and systems, and provides a pathway for networks to connect.

The phenomena of celebrity is not a ‘new’ status or specifically a ‘modern’ phenomena, celebrity is ever changing and “much more complex, nuanced and extensive” (Van Krieken 2012: x). Arguably, there is a qualitative difference whereas traditionally, celebrity was a charismatic figure possessing ‘heroic’ qualities (such as fame and talent in the ideal Weberian sense) and they would achieve their status through their exceptional talents. Similar to Furedi (2010) and Turner (2010), Rojek (2012) observed that the ‘modern celebrity’ has been historically linked with the rise of media since the beginning of the twentieth century. Celebrity today are based on their ‘knownness’ (Boorstin 2012) or their ability to harness attention (Kurzman et al., 2007).

Examining claims making and protest activities are important because we can learn how celebrity is strategically used in dynamic ways. It is also important to stress that this study is not looking at movement or campaign emergence, outcomes, successes, or how audiences actually reacted to blog activists’ practices. Although not a direct focus of this study, a movement’s outcome cannot be taken for granted or the practices assumed in how it played a role in shaping the outcome. Therefore “the success of campaign efforts is dependent on the ability of campaigners to formulate and compose persuasive communicative messages and practicable protest actions. And this persuasiveness and practicability is related to the repertoires of existing beliefs and values, symbols and myths, arguments and narratives, practices and events. Thus, the impact and resonance of campaigns is determined by prevailing standards of public communication (e.g. the truthfulness of campaign information, the correctness and ability to compel moral reasoning) and activism, (e.g. the suitability and practicality of actions and events), but also by the entertainment value of campaign messaging and activities, products and events. This praxis increases the ‘playful’ and innovative aspect of collective protest” (Lahusen 1996: 153-154).

In order to capture the unfolding events in some temporal sequence I followed a process-oriented or a ‘processual analysis of opportunities’ (Meyer 2004). When marginalized movements are faced with relatively closed or repressive opportunity structures they often adopt confrontation and disruptive strategies orchestrated outside established policy channels (Kitschelt 1986; Kruesi, et al., 1995). E.g. Given the highly restricted and hegemonic media Palestinian movements and their allies encounter, they often face limits to presenting their grievances, messages and narratives. As such, they provoke action when there is a perceived threat rather than waiting for an opening in the political structure (Kurzman 1996).

The scholarship conventionally has focused on: conceptualizing social movements (as collective action, networks, historical differences, etc.), examining the life cycles or stages of social movements (i.e. how they form, develop, solidify, and decline (cf. Blumer 1969, Tilly 1978), identifying types of social movements (cf. Aberle 1966), investigating their outcomes and success (cf. Gamson 1992; Giugni 1998), how to address the free-rider problem (cf. Olson 1965; McCarthy and Zald 1997), focusing on movement tactics and strategies (Turner 1970; Tilly 1978; Ganz 2000; Taylor and Van Dyke 2004; Meyer and Staggenborg 2008), approaching movements from either an agency/ constructionist versus structural approaches (cf. Touraine 1981), examining movement framing activities and processes (Snow and Benford 1988), considering the roles of emotion, performances and or other cultural attributes (cf. Goodwin, Jasper, and Polletta 2001), and attempts to integrate movement theories (cf. Oliver, Cadena-Roa, and Straw 2003).

Structural approaches emphasize on the distribution of material resources, movement organizations and institutions that governed such distributions. This view often dismisses the implicit importance of grievances in explaining the emergence of political contentions and focus instead on the rational actor. Resources mobilization saw movements as depending on human and material resources and a base of supporters for organization and sustained contention (cf. McCarthy and Zald 1973, 1977; Jenkins and Perrow 1977). Likewise, structures of political opportunities and constraints external to organizations enable movements to successful mobilize resources due to the overall social or political conditions that might be conducive for successful and sustained contention. Political process theorists contend that political opportunities combined with the organizational capacity for mobilization allows for the emergence of social movement and their ongoing mobilization (McAdam 1982).

Cultural approaches tend to take into consideration how individuals and groups perceive and interpret these material and structural conditions. Such view provide broad implications for movement research particularly in offering alternative explanations for understanding how contention is sustained in the absence of formal organization networks. Culture is understood as interpretative, multivocal and socially constructed with both constraining and enabling capacities to shape action (Williams 2004). It is important to consider culture in its all-encompassing ways that include agency and their meaning-making activities (Johnston 2009).

Contentious politics refers to those episodic, public, collective interactions in which actors make claims that bear on someone else’s interests, leading to coordinating efforts in which states are targets, the objects of claims, or third
parties; contentious politics brings together three features of social life: 1. contention (where one group makes a claim against another group), 2. collective action (coordinating efforts on behalf of shared interest), and 3. politics (having something to do with states or agents of government) (Tilly and Tarrow 2007: 4, 5).

12 Gamson and Meyer (1996) stressed that an opportunity has a cultural component, in addition to comprising of an institutional side with access challengers have to institutional political system, and a discursive side relating to public visibility, resonance, and political legitimacy of certain actors, identities, and claims (Giugni 2009: 364). On the other hand, opportunity structures could be defined irrespective of the characteristics of specific issue fields and collective actors (Giugni 2009: 364). Perceived opportunities are openings that need to be perceived in order to be seized into action (cf. Kurzman 1996, Giugni 2009). Lastly, McAdam et al., (2001) suggested to diverge the search for the conditions that favor or prevent challengers to mobilize and focus instead on the processes and mechanisms underlying their mobilization, specifically distinguishing between cognitive, relational, and environmental mechanisms.

13 “Like its theatrical counterpart, the term ‘repertoire’ implies that the interaction between movement and its antagonists can be understood as strategic performance...with the purpose of challenging or resisting change in groups, organizations, or societies” (Taylor and van Dyke 2004: 265, 266).

14 According to Meyer and Staggenborg (2007: 3), “strategy refers to choices about claims, issues, allies, frames, identity, and presentation of self, resources, and tactics.” Specifically, strategy is the "overall plan for action, the blueprint of activities with regard to the mobilization of resources and the series of collective actions that movements designate as necessary for bringing about desired social changes" (Jenkins 1981:135).

15 “Cultural theories of tactical choice reveal tactical choice to be a process that involves gathering, interpreting, and evaluating information within contexts that may be changing, uncertain, and even contradictory. They illuminate the symbolic world, the realm of meaning, and focus on the socially constructed cues embodied in rituals, beliefs, identities, scripts, memories, artifacts, and social structures” (Larson 2013: 869-870).


17 As inspired by the Situationist and punk ‘DIY’ (‘do it yourself’) culture in the 1980s and early hacking ethos and billboard artists in the 1990s to the current culture and political jamming techniques aimed at intruding into the mainstream public sphere (Cammaerts 2012).

18 The notion of repertoire has been further developed by McAdam et al. (2001) as a locus around which various protest performances are constructed. In addition to affected outcomes, these ‘cultural performances’ are important because they play a central role in the mobilization of movement support (Taylor and Van Dyke 2004). The decision making on the choice of tactic to employ depends on whether movement actors intend “to play to inside or outside audiences” (Jasper 2004: 10). Tactics are those intentional efforts to create change, which involves contestation with targets and the development of identity within challenging groups (Taylor and Van Dyke 2004).

19 Rhetoric “focuses our attention on the distinctive but conventional ways of speaking and reasoning [...] To speak of the rhetoric...is not to limit our domain to techniques of persuasion. The concept of rhetoric is useful for providing a framework for discerning patterns in phenomena that appear “from the outside” to be incoherent and in a constant state of flux, even as participants assert their claims to be intelligible concerns about conditions. (Ibarra and Kitsuse 2003: 25). Benford (1993) summarizes four particular kinds of rhetoric that protestors fashion to justify their action: 1) the severity of the problem, 2) the urgency of a solution, 3) the efficacy of their own efforts, and 4) taking action.

20 Similarly Meyer identifies four particular audiences to which movements need to consider: 1. activists; 2. authorities; 3. bystanders; and 4. media (Meyer 2007).

21 This is explained and elaborated in the framing segment.

22 E.g. Engel (2001) argued that differences in the strategies of gay and lesbian movements in the U.S. and Britain resulted from reactions to differing cultural opportunities (cf. Engel 2001). Whereas the American movement used a civil rights frame, this frame was not perceived compatible in Britain, and claims were framed in terms of the acceptability of homosexuality as a private, rather than public, behavior (Engel 2001:136). Thus, collective actors are limited by structural features of their cultural and political contexts, and by their perceptions of what strategies are most effective.

23 The U.S. Civil Rights movement utilized a variety of nonviolent tactics (lunch counter sit-ins, boycotts of public transportation and white owned businesses, freedom schools, marches, etc. (McAdam 1996) as tools of political pressure to protest racial segregation and discrimination. At the same time, the movement’s disruptive actions and
repressive actions of local authorities generated dramatic news coverage and increased political support for their cause (McAdam 1996).

24 UN human rights articles are elaborated listed in Appendix A in addition to being discusses throughout the dissertation.

25 Market disruption can be assessed by a company’s stock prices as investors react to a boycott.

26 Mediated disruption can be assessed by how activist use the media to draw public support for their cause.

27 The practice of shaming is a form of reputational damage that weakens an oppositional entity in the international community (Budabin 2015: 4).

28 Likewise, Entman (1993: 52) suggest that frames defines problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgments and suggest solutions. This suggest that certain frames could affect the public’s perception of the Israel-Palestine conflict and what can be done (i.e. mobilization). “Frames call attention to some aspects of reality while obscuring other elements” (Entman 1993: 55). Frames can influence opinions by highlighting certain values, facts or other considerations, endowing them with greater relevance to the issue than they might appear to have under another frame. Therefore this battle for public opinion is affected/ shaped by the way the debate is defined and how attitudes and beliefs, along with information can also push actions and solutions to conflicts.

29 Injustice frames involves some moral indignation against those responsible for the harm and suffering; agency frames describes that something can be done about the problem if acted collectively; and identity distinguishes a “we” and an adversarial “they.” This clarifies the ‘us’ versus ‘them’ distinctions (Snow and Benford 1992) particularly who is responsible for the injustice and how supporters could go about to act. (Gamson 1992).

30 Master frames draw from wider movement narratives, myths, and stories—which define the group’s values, beliefs, and claims. In conjunction with social networks being an important aspect for mobilization, master frames (e.g. injustice, human rights, and environmental justice frames) provide the motivation for people to act and mobilize. These master frames are often coalesced with movement’s narratives, collection of ideas, symbols, and values to vitalize how both important the problem is as well as what the movement can do to address it. The illegal corporate activity by SodaStream in occupied Palestine provides the movement opportunities (as a perceived threat) to publicly oppose the company in addition to the state of Israel. And they communicate this to their audiences by employing master frames (e.g. a combination of injustice, human rights, and environmental injustice) in its framing practices.

31 Diagnostic framing defines the problem and usually defines it as unjust or immoral, thus attributing blame to a cause of the problem or issue. Prognostic framing identifies possible remedies, strategies, tactics and targets. Motivational framing provides some rationale for the activism or call to action.

32 The framing of contention facilitates the behavior/perceptibility of the audience in a direction deemed desirable by the producers of the content. It provides a space to negotiate meanings and which part of the discourse is important. Therefore, an effective frame makes a compelling case for the “injustice and blame placement of a target antagonist, by “distinguishing ‘us’ from ‘them’ and depicting antagonists as human decision makers rather than impersonal forces” (Poletta and Ho 2006: 5-6). Audiences are receptive to contextual cues when they find a motive behind contentious issues, and when these cues resonate in collective action frames (i.e. human rights, injustice, and environmental injustice) and the making of a celebrity antagonist character in the campaign story).

33 Like a ‘bridge’ bridging connects individuals and groups with others who share similar goals and interests to create a similar but stronger movement organization. Amplification expands core ideas to gain a more universal appeal. Through the extension feature, groups promote each other even when they do not share immediate goals, e.g. when the women’s and civil rights movements aligned due to mutual consideration to each other’s respective cause. When frames do not resonate with an audience or seen as aversive to established beliefs, lifestyles, or values then “new values may have to be planted and nurtured, old meanings or understandings jettisoned and erroneous beliefs of ‘misframings’ reframed’ through the transformation feature (Snow et al, 1986: 473).

34 Wolfsfeld elaborates that in the case of the Israel-Palestine, Palestinians often use the ‘injustice frame highlighting their demands for self-determination while the Israelis use the ‘law and order’ frame and focus on how to handle the violence (Cohen and Wolfsfeld 1993: xxiv).

35 Although the paradigm has been criticized for not actually identifying new processes (cf. Bagguley 1992; Rucht 1995), arguably it has brought attention to non-structural factors in movement mobilizing and protest dynamics.

36 This umbrella term is employed in this dissertation to reflect the fusion of art and activism in the fight for social justice and represent those who employ “artistic talents to fight and struggle against injustice and oppression by any medium necessary” (Asante 2008: 203). Creative activism is rooted in ‘artivism’ (coined by Chicana artist Judy Baca) “a hybrid neologism that signifies work created by individuals who see an organize relationship between art and activism” (Sandoval and Latorre 2008: 82).
it was initially created for: “a platform to facilitate information exchange between users” Kapl

Web, 2.0 allows for the production and consumption of user-generated content, making a definitive shift in web-based communities and usage from Web 1.0 (which was primarily in static text format and had passive user engagement). Social media are a group of Internet based applications that are built on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0 and “can be seen as an development back to the Internet’s roots, since it re-transformed the World Wide Web to what it was initially created for: “a platform to facilitate information exchange between users” Kapl

According to Flynn (2016), Bourriaud’s concept of “relational aesthetics” was an attempt to understand the so-called “social turn” in artistic practices in the 1990s. The concept has been expanded to include what has been broadly referred to as “socially engaged” art and focuses on “the realm of human interactions and its social context, rather than the assertion of an independent and private symbolic space” (Bourriaud 2002: 14). Relational aesthetics is about human relations and their social context; specifically, how art and their artists afford audiences access to power and the means to create social change. “Relational aesthetics foregrounds the notion that “viewers” of art works art in fact “active participants,” invited by a wider collective to elaborate tropes of meaning: a work of art in this sense becomes a “social form,” political implication and emancipatory in effect” (Flynn 2016: 65).

38 Contemporary movements such as those demonstrated by the Zapatistas, Genoa G8 Summit protest, Occupy and the Indignados movements have sought to change how politics is conducted, but more importantly, how meaning itself, is created. Meaning refers to the process by which subjective interpretations of phenomena are contested by multiple persons (Flynn 2016: 65).

39 There are two positions in the literature about the utility, democratic or participatory nature, and future with alternative media: those which center on utopian rhetoric (e.g. Rheingold 1993; Kahn and Kellner 2004; Aouragh 2008; Castells 2012); and those which center on a dystopian rhetoric (e.g. Gladwell 2010; Scheufele and Nisbet 2002; Morozov 2009; Van de Donk et al., 2004).

40 Gladwell (2010) and Morozov (2011) on the other hand contend that people are essentially participating in ‘slacktivism’ and argue that it is often difficult to tell if they are clicking ‘like’ or tweeting because they believe they can make a difference (Putnam 2000). They assert that this is giving a false illusion of more access and participation to contentious politics. However, other studies have challenged this view and demonstrated how alternative media could revolutionize civic engagement and strengthen democratic processes (Castells 2012). That is because “protest and knowledge about protests can quickly spread over large distances, protest can intensify itself, making the platform ideally suited as a medium of coordination, communication, and cooperation in global protests” (Fuchs 2006: 279). Elaborating on this, Aitchison and Peters (2011: 60) argue that this non-hierarchical and nebulous nature of networked activism “may be its strength.”

41 Web, 2.0 allows for the production and consumption of user-generated content, marking a definitive shift in web-based communities and usage from Web 1.0 (which was primarily in static text format and had passive user engagement). Social media are a group of Internet based applications that are built on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0 and “can be seen as an development back to the Internet’s roots, since it re-transformed the World Wide Web to what it was initially created for: “a platform to facilitate information exchange between users” Kapl

42 Such platforms would include collaborative projects (e.g. Wikipedia), weblogs [blogs] and microblogs (e.g. Twitter), video content communities (e.g. YouTube), social networking sites [SNS] (e.g. Facebook), virtual game worlds (e.g. World of Warcraft) and virtual social worlds (e.g. Second Life), and picture sharing sites (e.g. Flickr). SNSs enable individuals to: 1. construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, 2. articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and 3. view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the systems (boyd and Ellison 2007: 211).

43 This is a term coined by Hauben in 1992 (Hauben and Hauben 1997) to characterize an active online participant.

44 The flows of capital, information, technology, organizational interaction, images, sounds, symbols, and social relations (Castells 1996) are configured within the ‘space of flows’ which is the dominant space constituted by networks. Castells (1996) maintains that we are living in a networked society where ever-increasing transformations are occurring in the economic, political, and social realms transforming previously held boundaries in those areas. Therefore Castells idea of the ‘networked society’ proposes that we look at contemporary society in terms of disjuncture networks of flows of things, people ideas, and where various capital are transformed and organized through the medium of alternative media. The networked society comprises of global networks and flows which are “the expressions of processes dominating our economic, political, and symbolic life” (Castells 2000: 442).

45 For Debord (1967), the culture of contemporary society is reduced to a domain of the spectacle (similar to Karl Marx’s conceptualization of the commodity), where the spectacle is “a social relation among people [that is] mediated by images” (Debord 1967 #4). As such, Debord contends that “our historical mission of installing truth in the world” requires that we “[emancipate] from the material bases of inverted truth” (Debord 1967 #221 thus illustrating the importance of agency and uses of creative and expressive culture, of resistance and the utilization of ‘subversive’ (i.e. ‘detournement) techniques of texts or images into a new form for partisan propaganda purposes (Debord and Wolman 1956).
40 A critical strategy of social movements is to disseminate new or transform information in order to influence public perceptions of reality, and challenged the so-called rationality and legitimacy of conventional norms and values. And this is frequently taking place in alternative media often in the forms of ‘cyber wars’ (Kellner 2002). Likewise, the Internet enables grassroots to expand their capabilities to access, create and disseminate information to their audience; and to get connected with those that are beyond their social, political, and geographical boundaries. In this way, alternative media has increased social movements’ capacities to reach the public, policy makers and traditional mass media, to build public relationship, and to put their goals and issues on the social, economic, and political agenda.

41 Alternative media has played a major role in episodes of global contentious political action (e.g. the 2008 attacks in Mumbai, 2009 Iran Revolution and various Arab Spring events in 2011). Particularly, SNS platforms such as blogs, Facebook and Twitter afforded protestors the opportunity to communicate during the revolts, establish protest events, and to overcome the governmental attempts to stop the circulation of protest media (cf. Lynch 2007; Harlow 2012) and elsewhere in the Philippines and Spain in 2001 (Shirky 2011). In North Africa and the Middle East (cf. Howard and Parks 2012) alternative have helped propel the momentum of these revolutions (Shirky 2011) as documented through Twitter activity in Iran’s Green Movement (cf. Kidd 2003) and the Arab Spring hashtags (cf. Howard et al., 2011). Assaults on these activists legitimize online activism and proves that governments and states have growing concerns with alternative media disruptive and influential potential (cf. Lim 2012). Additionally, more recent have documented how “re-mobilization” (movements that emerged entirely online) such as MoveOn.org (cf. Eaton 2010, Gaby and Caren 2012) and Indymedia.org (cf. Kidd 2003) spread and flourished online. In such ways, alternative media is increasingly playing a contending role in contentious politics. Previously, governments were able to maintain a relative level of control over the image of their countries. Today, a variety of voices are contesting, re-shaping those images—which mostly rest outside the state. It has become clear that alternative media ‘have become indispensable to activists’ (Youmans and York 2012). Alternative media have allowed movements to communicate in exciting new ways, providing new platforms for networks of all kinds to exist, function and expand. Subsequently, new forms of activism emerged giving greater opportunities for social movements to organize, influence, and infiltrate society. Bennett reiterates this point by describing our recent history as one marked by “impressive levels of global activism, including mass demonstrations, sustained publicity campaigns against corporations and world development agencies, and the rise of innovative public accountability systems for corporate governments to conduct. All of these activities seem to be associated in various ways with the internet” (2003: 6).

Our networked society provides new environment for new forms of activisms, manifesting a technologically connected society.

42 According to Tufekci 2013), attention is a key resource for social movements. An intangible resource, nonetheless “attention is the means through which a social movement can introduce and fight for its preferred framing, convince broader publics of its cause, recruit new members, attempt to neutralize opposition framing, access solidarity, and mobilize its own adherents. Gaining attention may not guarantee desired outcomes, and attention is likely to smother a movement. It is thus not surprising that social movement actors devote a great deal of strategic efforts to obtaining and sustaining attention” (Tufekci 2013: 849). And “media coverage is the path to this resource” (Tufekci 2013: 849).

43 I draw from the concepts of netizens and citizen journalists to reflect those online identities, practices and activities of actors, such as bloggers, but specifically those who take on a ‘journalist’ like persona and role online and actively advocate on behalf of a movement through their blogging or editorial-like activities.

44 Motivations stemming from collective identity on the other hand, emerge from a participant's sense of group belonging and in-group solidarity (Gamson 1992; Melucci 1988). Additionally, a level of trust is needed to support sustained mobilization (Diani 2000). Strong feelings of collective identity make participation a goal in itself (Goodwin, Jasper, and Polletta 2001); subsequently building trust online which could lead to offline mobilization (Nip 2004; Hara 2008; Wojcieszak 2009).

45 Although celebrity is elaborated in a separate section of this chapter, celebrity (as applied to microcelebrity) draws from Goffman’s dramaturgical metaphors: celebrity in this context is considered as an ever-changing performative practice (which requires impression management strategies to maintain the construction of a consumable persona) rather than a set of intrinsic characters or external labels (Marwick and boyd 2011). The success of celebrity practice (as authentic—elaborated in the celebrity section of this chapter) occurs when it provides the illusion of ‘backstage’ access, a presentation on the ‘impression’ of an uncensored look in the ‘everyday’ or private lives of the celebrity (Marwick and boyd 2011). In this case, Mondoweiss blogger activists are considered to acquire a microcelebrity-like status because of to their frequent contributions to the Mondoweiss site and the attention they command because of their reputation and visibility throughout SNSs platforms (pertaining to Middle East issues and politics). They are recognized both as individuals for their personal or distinctive (but often related) activities outside of Mondoweiss,
and as a collectively authentic and trustworthy branded package to their audience on the reporting of the Israel-Palestine conflict.

52 Mobilization is important for movement participants; however, to get their messages and grievances communicated in order to evoke action they need to be covered by media as a means to validate their messages as important and relevant. Subsequently, this will lead to scope enlargement by the public sphere which might bring new recruits for the movement.

53 Moral shocks or ‘emotional motives’ (Van Laer 2010) are essentially cognitive and emotional processes that encourage participation. Since alternative media may enhance the maintenance and mobilization of networks, motives for participation are reinforced out of a sense of moral indignation (Klandermans 2004: 361). People do not participate to enforce political change, but also to express their anger and grievances, their feelings of injustice and other emotions about a certain issue or situation. Jasper and Poulson (1995) suggest that emotional responses or motivations rooted in moral shocks can draw “people into activism by building on their existing beliefs” (1995: 498).

54 We are living in an intrinsically and ubiquitously ‘glocal’ world, a world that is much more pluralistic and multicultural. And communities are now becoming enmeshed into the ‘networked society’ where “boundaries are more permeable, interactions are with diverse others, linkages switch between multiple networks, and hierarchies are flatter and more recursive” (Wellman et al., 2003: 170). In this way, alternative media allow people to be everywhere but situated nowhere, enabling users to participate in a variety of ways even in faraway localities (Wellman et al., 2003) through the maintenance of weak ties as a means for bridging networks in accessing information and resources (Granovetter 1973).

55 The term meme was coined by biologist Richard Dawkins and describes how cultural symbols or social ideas, like a gene (but in the Internet context: a humorous image, video, or piece of text), can replicate and evolve, and bounce contagiously, in bio-hyperlink fashion (spread by Internet users) from one head to another (Dawkins 1989). “It describes how small units of culture spread from person to person by copying or imitating” (Shifman 2014: 2).

Reflecting the characteristics of participatory or convergence culture, in ‘netizen discourse’, “Internet meme is commonly applied to describe the propagation of items such as jokes, rumors, videos, and websites from person to person via the Internet…a central attribute of Internet memes is their sparking of user-created derivatives articulated as parodies, remixes, or mashups” (Shifman 2014: 2).

56 Veil, et al. (2015) examined how a blogger activist took advantage of an online hoax regarding a warning label for Kraft Macaroni and Cheese, which subsequently influenced others to further hijacking Kraft’s Facebook page. While the hoax was quickly exposed, the reputation damage to Kraft was done and within six months the company announced it was changing the ingredients in some of their products. Veil, et al. (2015) research provides an empirical example on the role of bloggers as activists’ utilizing creative strategies and tactics to draw attention to a cause and to motivate action, demonstrating the impact of social media hijacking and or lampooning a company’s product and or well-crafted and heavily invested images.

57 Lasn is known for empirical work on the Adbusters Media Foundation (AMF), a high profiled movement which is considered one of the well-known logos saboteurs utilizing and influencing modern day culture jamming tactics. Founded by Kalle Lasn in 1989, the AMF publish a magazine dedicated to the movement, and it is maintained by the web page Adbusters.org, a virtual headquarters for many culture jammers (Wettergren 2005: 29).

58 For example, sociological empirical work have focused on how processes of celebrity are controlled both inside and outside in the larger world (Gamson 1994; Marshall 2006), as part of mass culture industries or media productions (Giles 2000; Rojek 2001; Adorno 2002; Turner 2014), as a semiotic system (Dyer 1979), a product of individualism and capitalism (Marshall 1997, 2006), the history of celebrity fame as a system of power in contemporary society (Braudy 1986; deCordova 1990; Collins 1998), celebrity fandom (Ang 1991), how politicized celebrities have become as important figures in modern politics (Street 2004), celebrity as text (Reaves 1998), and the politics of celebrity humanitarianism or celebrity diplomats (Cooper 2008; Tsaliki, Frangonikolopoulos, and Huliaras 2011; Richey and Ponte 2011; Choulialiari 2012; Kapoor 2012; Wheeler 2013).

59 An analysis of celebrity in which celebrities are constructed and packaged as ‘consumer products’ reveals that “celebrity is situated at the intersection of numerous discourses…all of which are located within a structure of capitalist production and consumption” (Nayar 2014: 176).

60 This “process of celebritization is widely seen as transformative but with markedly varying political significance; at one end of the spectrum of opinion, it would be described as a form of enfranchisement and empowerment, but at the other end as a mode of exploitation” (Turner 2010: 13).

61 The commodification and use of celebrity in the culture manufacturing industry is a pragmatic decision largely determined by constraints of the media and their ability to generate attention (Bunting 2010, online).

62 A clarification on some terms:
For this study, brand and reputation are employed comparably in the respective contexts when referring to celebrity or corporation. This study is utilizing concepts like ‘brand’, ‘image’, and ‘reputation’ and their respective but similar meanings as it relates to celebrity and corporation. Although these terms may refer to particular things in their respective separate context—this study draws from advertising/marketing studies, celebrity, and sociology to use these terms and their underlying meanings interchangeably given the usage context (e.g., brand to refer to a commercial product whether ‘celebrity’ or a material physical product). According to Shenkar and Yuchman-Yaar (1997), reputation stems from economics and it is conceptually equivalent to prestige (sociology) or image (marketing). Reputation is everything, given that public perception is often more powerful than the reality or severity of the situation. As such:

Brand and reputation are closely related, but they are not identical in meaning. Brands generate desire and differentiation and motivate buyers to pay more for your products then they might otherwise...it is about relevancy and differentiation. Reputation on the other hand, (based on credibility and trust) is the sum total of one’s track record. It is the accumulation of your actions and statements to date; it is about maintaining legitimacy (Di Somma 2015, online).

Celebrity status, their capital and persona (as part of brand making process) coalesce as reputation, which, according to Fine (2007) refers to a socially recognized identity which is linked into a common assessment:

On one level a reputation constitutes a moral gestalt that is linked to a person—an organizing principle for person perception. However, reputations are more than this social psychological claim: they are collective representations, enacted in relationships...Persons are concerned with the repute in which they are held because of the options that reputations open and close, and because reputations permit us to evaluate (Fine 2007, online).

Reputation is formed based on the actions and behaviors of the company or person in question, and in turn, how they are perceived as ‘good’ or ‘bad’ or if they are perceived guilty: “It is not reasonable to form an unfavorable impression of a firm unless the company is believed to be responsible for that act” (Benoit 1997: 178).

Celebrity can also be conceptualized by the “capacity to attract attention” (Furedi 2010). And this attention can be converted into economic or social capital (Rojeck 2001). And given that attention and celebrity has been commodified, they have become resources that are frequently sought after in this highly competitive mediated and consumer society. “If visibility is the oxygen of celebrity, then the opportunities to achieve such visibility are becoming ever more widespread. Conversely, however, visibility alone is not enough and attention, or rather the ability to attract attention, is increasingly becoming the main currency that drives celebrity status” (Huijser and Tay 2011: 108).

According to Weber (1946), status is part of a social hierarchy that is defined by positive or negative social estimation of in-group honor; it is a specific way of life. Others have conceptualized celebrity as part of an occupational status group (Hodge 1962), as part of a power elite (Mills, 1956), embodying various capital (Bourdieu 1984) or as capital in itself, i.e. celebrity capital (Driessens 2013).

Celebrities can be influential and cultural ‘trendsetters’ because of their: public personalities and parasocial relationships (how celebrities embody audiences with an affective connection, a fan-star relationship (Gamson 1994), and their ability to ‘sell’ or promote cultural products (whether movies, commercial brands, fashion, etc.) This creates a field of consumption where they set norms and standards to which their audience (fans) follow and imitate. As such, celebrity can act as a reference group or role model (Ferris 2007).

Mugford and O’Mallery (1991: 11) found that “image management has become a lucrative business and a matter-of-fact necessity in commerce, industry, politics and personal relationships, style has ripened into an intrinsic form of information” and no force goes beyond alternative media’s reach in sending the images by which the audience endeavor to assess with or reality or true.

These ‘authentification strategies’ are similar to marketing or presentation strategies drawn from Goffman’s (1959) ideas about impression management and applied to individuals, groups or corporations.

Thrall et al. (2008) present research that show that a hierarchy of fame is a major component influencing celebrity advocacy. Celebrities are crucial tools to raise unpopular issues; the UN has at least 175 celebrities as goodwill ambassadors for one agency or another (Bunting 2010, online).

Hollywood celebrities such as Harry Belafonte, Ossie Davis, Ruby Dee, Sammy Davis Jr., Dick Gregory, and Sidney Poitier ‘the Leading Six’ have been documented as among the earliest and most influential celebrities for the Civil Rights movement. Lending their fame, money, networks and visibility they are recognized as playing a vital role to the success of the movement (Raymond 2015). As exemplified during the Ferguson protest, Michael Brown, Black Lives Movement, Trayvon Martin, Freddie Gray, and Sandra Bland—representing hashtag activism, and celebrity involvement in alternative media (such as ‘hashtag activism’) was used to rally support and mobilization in
opposition towards police brutality against African Americans and received a considerable amount of media coverage.

For example: celebrity can be converted into economic capital as money (e.g. through merchandising), into social capital as valuable contacts (e.g. through increased access to previously closed networks), into symbolic capital as recognition (e.g. when one’s fame is recognized in a specific social field), or into political capital as political power (e.g. by being an elected official) (Driessens 2013: 14).

Among other characteristics, celebrity capital is based on a celebrity’s persona (how authentic, sincere and trustworthy they are) and status (how liked, visible, and popular they are).

Since the 1980s, gossip columns, fan club newsletters and entertainment related magazine (print and then online) offered personal details about actors (Gamson 1994: 26-39) reflecting a market on the obsessive (to being fetishized) captivation with celebrity that both honors and critiques them for their distinction. This perhaps distinguishes celebrity from earlier high status groups (Kurzman, et al., 2007).

Authentication is the state of being genuine to true to and about oneself, of being truthful and having authority (i.e. witnessing). Sincerity on the other hand is the state of being free from pretense or deceit. The opposite of sincerity is hypocrisy or cynicism—fake emotions or fake gestures (expressing vacant meanings), a break within the link between action and result, it is another spiral of artificiality (Baudrillard 1970/1998: 110). As such, the hypocrite is “an actor, the leading player in a comedy of principle, perfidy, and blood” (Trilling 1972: 69). Hypocrisy is a “character traits [that] has been the single greatest subject of condemnation and loathing by the intellectuals and artists of the past two centuries” (Melzer 1995: 4). As such, hypocrisy plays a significant characterization of the protagonist character, the Face of Apartheid, as manufactured by Mondoweiss blog activists.

The role of celebrity as a spectacle is analyzed in this study to help understand how celebrity affects social movements by how celebrity is promoted, constructed, produced, and mobilized by social movement actors in political spaces. For Debord (1967) the society of the spectacle represents late capitalism when there was a change in our relationships between direct experience and mediated representations: “Everything that was directly lived has moved away into a representation” (Debord #1). The spectacle represents the tragedy of culture and the rule of commodities—the fetishizing of artistic goods for mass consumption, is a substitute (usually through some real or abstract commodity) for direct experience and such commodities rise given an arbitrary, constructed, use-value but dominates most of everyday life. Therefore, the spectacle is “the heart of the unrealism of the real society. In all its specific forms, as information or propaganda, as advertisement or direct entertainment consumption, the spectacle is the present model of socially dominant life” (Debord #6). In this way, I contend that the antagonist character of Johansson (as constructed by Mondoweiss blog activists) the ‘Face of Apartheid’ is a “spectacular representation of a living human being…the object of identification with the shallow seeming life that has to compensate for the fragmented productive specializations which are actually lived” (Debord #60). Using Debord’s ideas about the spectacle to this study provides conceptual weight for understanding how celebrity is manufactured to establish a hold on the public’s imagination, and how both media and celebrity are used to hide reality (i.e. how celebrity is being used to distort reality or hide the truth about the illegal occupation in Palestine) but in turn, the celebrity is remanufactured into a mocked form of a spectacular representation but to expose the truth.

Drawing from Debord’s The Society of the Spectacle, Kellner explains that: spectacles are media constructs that are out of the ordinary and habitual daily routine which become popular media events capturing the attention of the media and the public. They involve an aesthetic dimension and often are dramatic, bound up with competition like the Olympics or the Oscars and they feature compelling images, montage and stories. In particular, media spectacle refers to the technologically mediated events, in which media forms—like broadcasting, print media or the Internet—protest events in spectacular ways, Natural disasters are presented as media spectacle as ‘Breaking News!’ Highly dangerous hurricanes, fires and other natural events dominate the news cycle when they hit, as the Asian Tsunami of 2005 and Hurricane Katrina in 2005…Examples of political events that became media spectacles would include the Clinton sex and impeachment scandal in the late 1990s, the death of Princess Diana, the 9/11 terror attacks, and the meltdown of the U.S. and global financial systems concurrent with the 2008 presidential election and new presidency of Barack Obama. Celebrity spectacles would include the O.J. Simpson trial which dominated corporate media news in the mid-1990s (2009: 716-17).

Additionally, Rosa Parks and lunch sit-ins were strategic spectacles to dramatize the violation of rights, discrimination and segregation within the public sphere and as a strategy to attract sympathy and attention for mobilization and support (Kellner 2012; Cohen 2015). Likewise, in the 1970s gay Liberation activists organized ‘kiss-ins’ at anti-gay businesses as a way of prompting visibility and awareness (Cohen 2015, online). The use of Internet memes and hashtags such as #blacklivesmatter (as calls to action against police brutality) are more
contemporary examples of creative uses and productions of media spectacle (Cohen 2015, online). Media spectacles play an instrumental role in the media shaping the narrative of social or political struggles (Cohen 2015, online).

The process involving the transformation of being famous, well-known and the ability to harness attention, particularly in mediatized society, whereby celebrity capital has become a significant asset (besides cultural, economic, political, and or social capitals) cf. Gamson 1994; Rojek 2001; Driessens 2012. As opposed to the process of ‘celebrification’ or the transformation of an ordinary person into a celebrity (Driessens 2012).

A contradiction resides in the fact that authenticity (‘one’s true self’) is theoretically supposed to be a reflect of essential being, however, since we do not really ‘know’ the ‘true’ essence of a celebrity person, in the end, it is all a manufactured performance no matter how ‘real’ they may come across. Taken together (the celebrity’s public performances and the media coverage of their private life) “ensure that whatever intimacy is permitted between the audience and the star is purely at the discursive level” (Marshall 1997: 90). The signs are so intertwined that is almost impossible to separate the ‘real’ from the ‘constructed’ image (Meyers 2009: 894).

Movement actors challenge authorities and disseminate grievances at the margins of society, one way to do this and to draw attention to their claims (especially at said target) is by using tactics that somehow damage the image of a corporation (whether factual or not) that could result in (potentially long-term) a loss of sales, lower stock prices, losing a consumer base, and declining shareholder values (cf. McAdam 1982; Gamson 1990; Piven and Cloward 1997; King and Soulé 2007).

For public relations agents, celebrity philanthropy has proven to be less risky to celebrity brands than political endorsements, which can ineffably tarnish any support for the wrong candidate or party (O’Brien 2014: 14). A prime example occurred when Romney supporter Clint Eastwood’s berating of an empty chair representing Obama at the 2012 Republican National Convention. The overwhelming negative reaction to this blunder raised awareness that any suspected mistake would be poorly received by many: “It became a defining moment in the campaigns the meme “Eastwooding” went viral along with postings of pictures of empty chairs. In just a few days an ‘Invisible Obama’ Twitter account had over 32,000 followers. Even Obama tweeted an image of himself sitting in a chair in the White House accompanied by the caption ‘This seat's taken’” (O’Brien 2014: 15).

A discussion on authenticity requires a dramaturgical approach (Goffman 1959) to celebrity where metaphors of the stage are applied to the study of soil interactions. As part of impression management strategies, authenticity is linked to performance and kinds of moral credibility. The recent rise in the attention to celebrity authenticity is not surprising considering the cultural context. Erickson (1995) highlighted the shifts in society that encourage attention to authenticity with the rise of commodification of lives, whereby certain identities and persons (such as celebrity) are conferred with values. As a result of the demands and expectations of modern society, this has turned our society to new vigor in examining fundamental issues of identity (Erickson 1995: 131). There is a tension between onstage behaviors though its attention to offstage behavior, and although it is inevitably unknown when the celebrity is not performing (the trick is to make offstage behavior appear sincere or trust, thus authentic), this provides a foundation for the idea of an authentic being. “Though the part may call for different behaviors from one scene to scene as the character is confronted with different people and social contexts, there is a core consistency that carries over from scene to scene” (Buss and Briggs 1984: 1322).

‘Do-gooders’ or ‘does of good’: a moral entrepreneur or instrumental agenda setter (Cooper 2008: 267). Calderisi (2006) utilized the concept as part a critique of Western celebrity humanitarians engaged in third world issues, a neo-racist engaged in a neo-colonial endeavor for more selfish intentions—but as spectacle, they become a protagonist in the sphere of politics and humanitarian aid (Pleios 2011). Distress is package with an emphasis on spectacle and celebrity sacrifice (Driessens et al., 2012). Although “celebrities“ can bridge the gap between Western audiences and faraway tragedies,” Wheeler and Kapoor assert that “celebrities only further divert public attention from the real social and economic causes of inequality. There is now mounting evidence that [celebrity activism, does] more harm than good...as a result of the very-hyped rhetoric” (2012: 30).

“‘Having been there’ confers authority on the celebrity and entitles them to talk about what happened” (Jerslev 2014: 177).

Taking into consideration the role of emotions in movement mobilization coupled with the blurring of entertainment (celebrity), news and politics characterizes what Bennett (2005) calls a celebrity-spectacle culture. According to Weiskel (2005), the celebrity spectacle dominates much of the political rhetoric of candidates and interest groups in contemporary society. As a response to the concerns of freedom of speech and artistic expressions, the celebrity spectacle utilizes popular culture to empower people to make political participation more appealing. Additionally, Street (1997: 48) contends that as a way to legitimize their cause, politicians “associate themselves with popular culture and its icons, in the hope that some of the popularity will rub off.” The celebrity spectacle is increasingly becoming a powerful locus for political mobilization as exemplified by research on the United States presidential 2004 campaign (Payne, Hanlon, and Twomey 2007). Celebrities such as Ben Affleck and P. Diddy
involved themselves, respectively, in the  

Rock the Vote and Vote or Die! campaigns in order to motivate and mobilize voter turn-out (specifically among young people).

84 Fama is a monstrous spreader of the news, using her feathered wings and multiple mouths to all across heaven and Earth. She is described by the poet Virgil as being “evil and no plague is swifter than she” (quoting Berlin 1996: 27 in Ferris 2007: 374).

85 One way to do this is to establish a ‘relationship’ directly with their fan base through ‘performative constructs’ via alternate media (Marwick and boyd 2011: 155). Alternative media has removed the celebrities’ ‘untouchable and mysterious status’ and has thrown them directly to communicating and interacting (while potentially sacrificing their private lives) with their audiences online (O’Brien 2014). While there are some advantages related to online celebrity relationships with their fan base, celebrities are equally faced with skepticism on their motivations for using social networks for self-promoting purposes rather than for altruistic ones.

86 See http://www.globalphilanthropy.com. According to Brockington (2014: 94), the Global Philanthropy Groups is an industry which “seeks to leverage celebrity influence in the political and entertainment fields to encourage philanthropy in the USA.”

87 Alternative media provides platforms where people can engage in a variety of performances facilitated by images and rhetoric which brings a specific kind of aesthetic and narratives to these performances. Performances encase managed impressions of the self, and the Internet provides opportunities for people to perform the ideal self. Alternative media platforms can be conceptualized as the front stage or the performance stage, the back stage “a place, relative to performance, where the impression of the performance is knowingly contradicted” (Goffman 1959: 114). Despite Goffman’s suggestion of a performance free space, the back and front stages are often burred online. Nor can it be assumed that all alternative media platforms are utilized in the same way. Aspling (2011) reveals how the dramaturgy of Facebook is about actively concealing self-performances and the dramaturgy on blogs is about actively revealing information connecting to the back stage. The back stage is often occupied by a performer’s ‘acting team’ and the front stage can be manipulated to mask an individual's identity or ‘true’ self. Nonetheless, this provides a starting point for this study in examining the online interactions as performances, and alternative media as a stage for people to perform many life roles (and subsequently for others to contest them).

88 Corporations are very conscious of their brand and want to be associated with giving to celebrity supported causes and use celebrities as their brand ambassador or spokesperson. “Corporate social responsibility” strategies (Kapoor 2013) use celebrities as a pathway to help them ‘sell’ (often literally through their corporate endorsement contracts) an idea that they contribute to social causes primarily through ‘ethical’ consumption and socially and environmentally sustainable commodities rather than direct political engagement (Carrier 2010).

89 That a celebrity personally used this product and is in position to attest its quality.

90 A celebrity lend their names, image, persona, and or fame to ads for product or service for which they may or may not be the experts.

91 As opposed to personal testimonial.

92 Often in print and TV ads as well as in personal appearances.

93 Much research has demonstrated the importance in finding a celebrity that is congruent with a product, otherwise the company may run the risk of bad publicity if they focus on measuring attention and celebrity and not the personality traits that are acquired by the brand acquired celebrity. Some positive characteristics identified as traits a company aims to transfer over to a product from a celebrity: honorable, trustworthy, positive (sexy, fun), whereas negative characteristics from a celebrity would be: dishonorable, disloyalty, lack of commitment, untrustworthy, ditzy, etc. (Campbell 2012).

94 Ohanian (1990) provided theoretical basis for selection constructs that represent dimensions that comprise source credibility and in playing a fundamental role in shaping consumer’s ideas about the brand a celebrity is promoting: attractiveness (physical beauty, intelligent skills, personality properties, lifestyles, or athletic prowess), expertise (knowledge and authority), and trustworthiness.

95 With the use of characteristics like likability, credibility, similarity, likability and familiarity, McCracken (1989) observed how credibility and attractiveness are the most important characteristics shaping the congruency between celebrity and a product they are representing.

96 Typically a company only employs one celebrity as an endorser for their product; however celebrities can potentially endorse multiple products for several companies. Because millions of dollars are invested in celebrity endorsements, it’s vital for companies to consider the potential impact using a celebrity who already represents other brands. McCracken (1989: 311) states that because a celebrity endorser takes on meanings that carry from ad to ad, the endorser may lose credibility (and thus be less likeable) and the endorsement effect would lose its strength. Notably, research by Redenbach (2000) found that credibility starts to decline when a celebrity endorsing for four different types of products or brands. Consumer may also think that the celebrity is just endorsing for financial
reasons (Belch and Belch 2001). And McCracken (1989) contends that when an endorser does only represent one brand, this is when the match-up congruence and meaning transfer becomes significant.

97 Actress and humanitarian Angelina Jolie is perhaps the most popular and most studied celebrity humanitarian in the scholarship of celebrity humanitarianism. Jolie assumed the role of Goodwill Ambassador for the UNHCR in 2001 (Cooper 2008: 30) and her consistent and systematic commitment to the refugee cause has won her world-wide praise and recognition and soon separated her from those who critique the opportunistic behavior of other humanitarian celebrities. Jolie represents ‘celebrity advocacy at its most effective, most intelligent and most sincere’ (Mark Malloch Brown, Deputy Secretary General of the UN, quoted in Barron 2009: 223). She has been on field missions to more than 20 countries, visiting refugee camps, and poverty reduction centers and meeting activists, journalist and politicians. Her humanitarian activities have exceeded her Goodwill Ambassador role and she has largely acted as a freelance humanitarian ‘unwilling to accept any organizational discipline’ (Cooper 2008: 35). However, even Jolie relies heavily on professionals for her humanitarian initiative (Cooper 2008). Initially, her philanthropic advisor was Trevor Nielson, a former Clinton White House staffer who later worked for the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the former US Assistant Secretary of State, Richard C. Holbrooke—instrumental in promoting Jolie’s humanitarian profile for intertwining her interest in philanthropy with her acting career (Halperin 2009). Her first directorial attempt with the film In the Land of Blood and Honey (2011) was judged positively as ‘an authentic attempt to inform and entertain’ (Thorpe 2011). This illustrates the blurring of entertainment and politics and highlights the need to gauge the motivations of celebrity activism, with their professional activities.

“One cannot rule out that in Jolie’s case the possibility that professional marketing considerations were also at play in the context of an increased interest from the industry for political movies emphasizing human rights” (Huliaras and Tzifakis 2015). Jolie is profiled here because she is often used as a standard or measurement for what is an authentic celebrity humanitarian and yet her story highlights the difficulties surrounding the maintenance and sustainability of that status and authentic reputation.

99 People with extraordinary beauty, talent, and resources could appear to be out of touch with the public so it could be difficult to convince audiences to take the issue seriously—celebrities need to develop an ability to show that they are ‘just like us’ by humanizing themselves by affecting shock and horror without coming across as hypocritical or insincere (Holson 2010). According to Rajagopal (1999), Angelina Jolie and Princess Diana are among the few to achieve this level of reputation, specifically as a result of their ability to mobilize femininity (specifically their ability to evoke emotion and empathy) in their performances of compassion. As exemplified by Angelina Jolie, a celebrity spokesperson is a celebrity who is identified which a charity, a political or humanitarian cause and makes statements on its behalf. Celebrity spokespersons are represented as truth-claims by providing a moral and social worldview. In other words, as a spokesperson, celebrity are engaged in “systems of meaning production [which] are intimately related to practices of power—the power to define and defend ‘reality’” (Shephard 2006: 21). Comedians Billy Crystal, Whoopi Goldberg and Robin Williams staged the annual Comic Relief television program to raise money for the homeless which led to public attention (and subsequent funding) about the cause. However, few celebrities have been able to genuinely achieve this level of ‘celebrity do-gooding’ due to the collapse of trust towards elites and the political classes and their ability to be ‘in touch’ with popular values, audiences are increasingly cautious and demanding for authentic forms of celebrity engagement (cf. Wills 2014).

99 Like convergence, participatory culture is characterized with a new terrain for contentious politics; it is organized around platforms and where content is made more visible or socially networked (Elmer et al., 2012).

100 This was symbolically sparked by Bouazizi, a Tunisian street vendor and activists who set himself on fire on December 17 2010 in protest against the confiscation of his wares and the harassment by government officials he reportedly experienced.

101 Reactive emotions such as anger, confusion, or moral outrage in the face of injustice can be trigger the decision to participate in protest events (Van Laer and Van Aelst 2009; Van Laer 2010).

102 Yang’s empirical study on Chinese movements in 1989 highlights the significance of studying critical events. Analyzing primary and secondary sources on events that occurred in 1989, analysis shows that critical events can transform the dynamics of movements and collective action. The events brought challengers, opponents, and audiences into heightened relationships—specifically, the challengers used ‘dramatic techniques’ and emotional narratives to shame and challenge the opponents and movement audiences (Yang 2005: 93). “The symbolic spaces where these events took place and the latent, underlying emotional schemas in Chines culture added meaning and intensity to the dramatic events. These emotional events decidedly shaped the course of the movement by leading into a higher level of mobilization” (Yang 2005: 93).

103 Since the 1980s, various social movements such as Greenpeace, Amnesty International and others have used celebrities in creative and innovative way to increase the exposure of their grievances and campaign message and objectives. Lahusen examined the function of these celebrity involved protest events and the role of mobilization for
a social movement in general (cf. Lahusen 1996). According to Lahusen, mobilization is comprised of information (informing participants about the movement’s grievances, aims and goals), persuasion (persuading participants to think and act differently) and socialization (bystanders’ can potentially become active agents over time through membership and through their economic/political participation). Attending a concert does not require much political commitment from an individual, but even passive participation through the activities and messages spread throughout the celebrity protest event reveals the complex nature of individual involvement. Lahusen (1996) investigated how SMOs adapted their campaign discourse and activities to targeted audience via the texts, products and events they produce (specifically those channeled through celebrity forums such as ‘rock for a cause’ protest events). As such, these events provided opportunities that direct the public attention to the cause.

Identity is part of dramaturgical and impression management activities which are further elaborated in its own respective sub-segment in this chapter.

In this case, targeting a celebrity with rhetoric and subverted parodied images is risky as it may potentially alienate members in their own group because of her celebrity popularity and well-liked Hollywood crafted persona.

In their research on the counter subversion movements since the 1960s, Bromley and Cutchin (1999) demonstrate how such movements (responding to various episodes of public fears or attacks) created ideologies as a form of social drama, with narrative portraying the struggle of good against evil in their subversive activities. Their research departs from social movement scholarship’s “earlier emphasis on the organizational dimensions of social movements [to how] social movement participants create systems of meaning that orient their individual and collective actions” (Bromley and Cutchin 1999: 196).

Performance spaces, such as blogs, provide a unique environment for the examination for symbolic interactions. People are engaging in the everyday drama played out on the Internet, in the society of the spectacle (a culture filled with mediated messages and where drama is an act of ‘collaborative production’ by actors and a ‘collective reception’ by audiences (Pfister 1977: 11) where people are living out a modified form of Goffman’s dramaturgical sociology. Applying a dramaturgical analysis is the idea that people’s everyday lives can be understood as resembling actors/performers in action on a stage. Reguillo (2015) calls this ‘dramaturgical action of political persuasion’ and it invites us to pay greater attention to the link between the aesthetics and political dimensions. Such an approach enables one the ‘capacity to imagine and the capacity to laugh at power’ (Reguillo 2014, online). In this way, Taylor (2003) contends that performances also provides the analytical lens for scholars to examine events as performances, not just offline (e.g. Gandhi’s sit-ins and Rosa Park’s refusal to comply with segregationist rules) but online as well.

Despite being a long quote, Manheim (2011: 28-29) perfectly describes this study’s focus on a campaign and the conceptual role of the Mondoweiss blog activists as movement entrepreneur fulfilling netizen journalistic roles and the importance in the fashioning of an antagonist target as an effective campaign strategy:

[A] campaign relies on the mass media to legitimize its objectives (or even the protagonist itself), to carry its messages, to generate visibility, or for any other purpose, it must, in effect, recruit and mobilize journalists to serve this function. This is accomplished...by understanding and serving the cultural needs and wants of journalists as a group, and by facilitating the fulfillment of their professional obligations. In this, the strategist is able to take advantage of an exceptionally broad and deep body of scholarship of journalistic norms and behaviors, and on newsroom decision-making. We know for example, that journalists are storytellers, and the effective campaign will provide them with a good story to tell, complete with the good guys (the protagonist), bad guys (the target), a socially beneficial objective, a responsible and public-regarding plan of action, and a morally imperative outcome. Such a story can be irresistible,...and can be rendered even more so if it can be aligned with the known values and predispositions of the journalists themselves. In addition, journalists pride themselves on their inherent skepticism and their widely self-proclaiming independence, both of which they protect as a basis for deserving the respect of newsmakers, including the campaign protagonist or its agents, and the public alike. All of this provides the grounding for a measure of moral certitude on the part of many journalists that can border on hubris. Given this psycho-cultural posture, an effective campaign strategy that relies in any degree on managing media portrayals will incorporate mechanisms for explicitly valuing these same traits on the part of the journalists with which it deals even as it turns them to advantage in shaping, placing, and gaining credibility for its story.... [A] good story—in the full sense of the word—is what makes the news tick. Journalists need that story, and campaign strategists need to provide it, complete with dramatic personage...that is, as a well-tuned tale, complete with clearly drawn heroes and villains, exciting twists and turns, and all the other accoutrements of the storyteller’s art. And the more taut and compelling your narrative, the better.

Corporations and celebrities, who are targeted by humor based activism, usually find it difficult to publically react to the satirical discourse. Because of their ‘professional image’ and reputation, they would appear defensive and thus come across guilty if they were to directly react or respond. As a form of impression management, such
tactics forces them to scramble their public relations team to repair the damage (‘image restoration’) and salvage the damage to their image or reputation (Benoit 1995).

110 Cadena-Roa (2002) explored the emotional dimensions of social protest and observed how the Asamblea de Barrios, a Mexico City social movement, transformed action repertoires by drawing on Mexico’s culture of wrestling by creating the ‘Super barrio’, a masked crusader for justice. He observed how humor and drama was deployed to help the urban poor confront the corruption and mismanagement of the Mexican state.

111 Al-Nakba refers to the events that occurred during 1948 when many Palestinians were displaced from their homeland with the implementation of the colonial state of Israel.

112 This was signed by Britain’s Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour and drafted in part by U.S. President Wilson. This illustrated the spirit of the time which emphasized the ‘self-determination of small nations’ and the British ideology that supporting Zionism was the easiest way for securing lasting British influence of the region east of the Suez Canal.

113 By 1949, about 500 Palestinian villages, towns, and tribes were depopulated and destroyed and approximately 711,000 Palestinian refugees were disposed (Morris 1987: 297-298). Today, there are an estimated 7 million Palestinian refugees. Many are located in 58 registered refugee camps in the West bank, Gaza, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria.

114 In December 1948, the United Nations General Assembly (UVGA) passed Resolution 194 (UNGA 194: Article 11): Resolves that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the Government or authorities responsible. The UNGA further instructs the UN Conciliation Commission on Palestine (consisting of the United States, Turkey, and France): to facilitate the repatriation, resettlement and economic and social rehabilitation of the refugees and the payment of compensation, and to maintain close relations with the Direction of the United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees, and, through him, with the appropriate organs and agencies of the United Nations (Article 11).

115 During this time the Dalet Plan was enacted in March 1948 by Ben-Gurion and his consultancy, this was a strategy which outlined a set of guidelines for the systematic expulsion of indigenous Palestinians.

116 When the state of Israel was formed in 1948, the Israeli government engaged in strategic propaganda efforts in constructing a myth that Palestinians had left their homes voluntarily after waging a courageous, moral and righteous war (cf. Morris 1987; Rogan and Shlaim 2007). Some Israeli scholars are now recognizing that the expulsion was a deliberate and concerted political and military effort at ethnic cleansing (cf. Pappe 2006) which occurred during the al-Nakba resulting in the dispossession of over 750,000 indigenous inhabitants of Palestinians and their descendants. As Israel attempts to expunge the memory of the indigenous Arab Palestinians from their indigenous lands though an exclusionary political system (i.e. home demolitions and destruction of agricultural lands and livelihoods, settlement construction, military occupation, and a fierce seize of the Gaza Strip), Palestinian advocates around the globe mobilize in order to defend the natural rights of Palestinians and thrust Israel into the international spotlight for its dismissive disregard of civilian life and international law. For Palestinian and their advocates, the failure of the Israeli state and international community to acknowledge the events in 1948 (and ensuing human rights violations, apartheid practices, colonial racist practices) is viewed as a form of ethnic cleansing and it is this ideology which continues to be a source of contention underpinning contemporary conflicts. The ‘right to return’ adage derives from the UN General Assembly Resolution 194 passed in December 1948. The UN has reaffirmed this resolution since its adoption.

117 These companies have supplied bulldozers to demolish more than 12,000 Palestinian homes since 1967 and assisted in the construction of the apartheid wall.

118 International and emergency humanitarian aid to the occupied territories has helped to avoid massive hunger and disease.

119 The Seam zone refers to the land area in the West Bank between the 1967 Green Line and West of the Apartheid Wall. This zone revolves around labor-intensive industries such as agricultural crops and manufacturing—of which Palestinians are used as cheap labor and suffer human right violations. Factories built in this area do not have to abide by the State of Israel’s environmental or labor laws.

120 The apartheid wall has subsequently maximized profits for both the state of Israel and foreign companies. The apartheid wall is made of eight-meter tall concrete blocks, electronic fences and trenches representing the biggest Israeli land grab since 1967. It is designed not only to maximize Israel’s illegal territory, but also to steal Palestinian natural resources such as key agricultural lands and water. The construction was also used to exploit Palestinian workers (cf. Yousef 2006; Bahour 2010). In 2004, the International Court of Justice issued an advisory opinion that the wall Israel built on Palestinian territory was illegal.
Whole generations of Palestinians know of no other life other than the occupation and this has unfortunately resulted into various acts of mass civil disobedience. As a result, underlying discontent grew as Palestinians experienced (among other things) the continuing onslaught of racial dissemination, work and travel permits, the destruction of anything considered ‘pro-Palestinian,’ cultural appropriation, among other things which caused underground grassroots movements for liberation (Nasser and Heacock 1990). Although nonviolent forms of civil resistance was practiced in Palestine (e.g. Mubarak Awad established a Center for the Study of Nonviolence in the West Bank in 1983), it was superseded by a faction committed to guerilla warfare. And these forms of civil resistance differed from first Palestinian Intifada, which centered on the use of nonviolence as a tool as practiced during the Civil Rights Movement (Carter 2007).

_Fatah_ founded in 1959 (a secular political party and the largest faction of the confederated multi-party Palestinian Liberation Movement, the _Palestinian Liberation Organization_ (PLO) founded in 1965 (the political party aims to ‘liberate’ Palestine through armed struggles), and _Hamas_ founded in 1987 (a Sunni-fundamentalist organization and the governing authority of Gaza).

Historical background to the Palestinian and BDS movements are provided in the history chapter of this dissertation.

The Palestinian transnational advocacy network is unified around the following goals: to raise awareness in civil society and the media about the situation of the occupation, apartheid, and violation of human rights in Palestine. The utilization of global networks and global ideologies for the purpose of the boycott campaign was first observed in the South Africa model of boycott. In this manner, the anti-apartheid movement marked the emergence of a truly global nature of the boycott form and highlights the importance of transnational forms of collective action and solidarity. Klein notes how, during the struggle against South Africa apartheid, transnational networks utilized a corporate boycott as a method of forcing the South African government to end apartheid (Klein 2007: 198).

Master frames are effective based on the credibility (frame consistency, empirical credibility, and credibility of the frame articulators or claim makers, i.e. movement entrepreneurs) of the given frame and its relative salience (or the congruency) between an SMO’s articulated beliefs, claims, and actions (Benford and Snow 2000: 619-620). A frame’s resonance occurs when it connects collective action to cultural meanings and symbolic systems of the groups (such as narratives) to the movement’s audiences.

Narrative fidelity occurs when frames resonate with stories, myths, and folktales held dearly by members or potential members (Snow and Benford 1988). Although frames serve to inspire and legitimate movement activity, they also do more than identifying some kind of grievances. Frames provide guidance for collective and individual participation action, they also serve to maintain group solidarity, and they act as a persuasive tool for enlisting new participants into action (Snow et al., 1986). Movements seek to recruit outsiders by attempting to align movement frames with the personal experiences, interests, and beliefs of potential participants through the use of a frame alignment processes beyond motivational framing (Snow et al., 1986). Subsequently, frames generate active and emotional responses. In order to do so, it has to achieve cultural resonance. E.g. Martin Luther King, Jr. and his associates focused on acquiring equal rights through nonviolent means as a master frame unifying the original independent frames of the movement’s primary organizing groups (Snow and Benford 1992: 145).

Social movement actors endeavor to anchor their collective action frames in the beliefs and identities that emerge out of public discourse via the way they frame issues, define grievances, and stage collective action to attract attention (among other things). Therefore, frames that resonate create social capital for its participant members and organizations within the movement network (Diani 1997). The concept provides adequate explanatory value to understanding how movement narratives provided the necessary cultural and emotional components to which blog activists drew from in order to evoke emotions intending for support and mobilization when they highlight hypocritical (thus oppositional) characteristics of the celebrity in their identify transformation practices.

Supportive advocacy networks are characterized by a strong transnational solidarity with the Palestinian cause and the Palestinian occupied territories act as the center of gravity (Ben-David 2012: 34). Supportive advocacy networks are brought together by their strong ties to non-diaspora civil society organization in their host societies, which are dedicated to the Palestinian cause and less to issues related to the Palestinian diaspora (Ben-David 2012: 34). In this way, Palestine is no longer a point of orientation, but a point of reference—organized less around a network of familial, social and transnational ties between communities of Palestinians dispersed around the world, but more around global advocacy networks that transcended their immediate social networks. Its members are no longer centered on Palestinian abroad, but also those individuals of the host countries who identify with the Palestine cause (Ben-David 2012: 34). Ben-David (2012) also found that the BDS movement, which was founded in Palestine and then expanded among transnational activists abroad, is very dominant in these advocacy networks. Ben-David contends that the center of gravity within these supportive advocacy networks is the BDS movement.
According to Gamson, the injustice frame is a master frame utilized by most social movements, and it refers to the ‘moral indignation expressed in…political consciousness…one laden with emotion’ (Gamson 1995: 90). Effective injustice frames require the identification of a recognizable other reasonable for the harm or suffering. During the development of the Palestinian movement, movement leaders drew on the injustices imposed by occupation to develop a master frame based on the narrative of Palestinian suffering and victimization. Grievances regarding the Israeli occupation were emotionally fervent and attributed to the state of Israel. In this case, the injustice frame reflected empirical credibility (evidential basis), experiential commensurability (individual proximity), and narrative fidelity (ideational fit) (Snow and Benford 1992, 1988). Because nearly all Palestinians had suffered to the same extent the grievous consequences of the occupation, the injustice frame is a fundamental component of Palestinian narrative and discourse. Subsequently, the emergence of the BDS movement (elaborating on the original Palestinian movement’s narrative when it adopted the South African anti-apartheid movement’s narrative) resonate global mobilizing strength when it also incorporated the following master frame: human rights (as evidential ‘proof’ in the international laws Israeli violates and ‘narrative fidelity’ as it relates to Palestinian Movement claims). As such, the strategic framing of nonviolent tactic was fundamental in drawing international support when it incorporated the human rights frame. The study also examined how the Mondoweiss blog activities draw from another master frame (in addition to the human rights and injustice frames), environmental injustice, as it pertained to SodaStream’s illegal corporate and consumer practices (for similar reasons with the use of the human rights frame).

“The Palestinian diaspora and advocacy groups are linked to each other in weak and strong ways, the point of reference remains historic Palestine and the occupied territories” (Aouragh 2006: 23).

According to the BDS movement (BDS, online), boycotts target products and companies (Israeli and international) that profit from the violation of Palestinian rights, as well as Israeli sporting, cultural, and academic institutions. Divestment means targeting corporations complicit in the violation of Palestinian rights and ensuring that the likes of university investment portfolios and pension funds are not used to finance such companies. Sanctions are an essential part of demonstrating disapproval for a country’s action, Israel’s membership of various diplomatic and economic forums provides both an unmerited veneer of respectability and material support for its crimes. By calling for sanctions against Israel, campaigners educate society about violations of international law and seek to end the complicity of other nations in these violations.

Established during the first Palestinian BDS Conference held in Ramallah in November 2007 with an initial endorsement of over 170 Palestinian organizations and includes many more global organizations and advocates. Omar Barghouti is one of the founding committee members of the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PACBI) founders and co-founder and co-founder and an influential leader of the BDS movement.


A history and background to the Israel-Palestine conflict, illegal occupation in Palestinian territories and the BDS movement is provided in a separate chapter.

“The traditional gatekeeping role of the mainstream media is under threat from participatory [convergence] communication platforms that host grassroots and independently produced content…contemporary networked media is an information geography that affords a multiplicity of site, spaces, and routes of political communications” (Elmer, Langlois, and McKelvey 2012: 6).

According to Lendman (2010), in addition to the occupation and human rights violations, Palestinians are increasingly feeling discriminated, harassed, encounter hatred and racism, called ‘foreigners’, made to feel unwelcomed, and pressured and or forcibly removed. This is related with the escalating sentiments among Israelis. According to a Pew survey based on interviews in 2014 to 2015, “Nearly half of Israeli Jews, 48 percent, say Arabs should be deported or exiled from Israel. Religious people tend to be particularly supportive of such a move: about 71 percent agree that Arabs should be expelled” (Eichner 2016).

This is reflected in Philo and Berry’s examination on the process and content of news production of the Israel-Palestine conflict and their impact on audiences. They found that while audiences had little understanding of the history (or ‘key elements of the conflict’ Philo and Berry 2004: 216), there was evidence that the audience had absorbed many attributes of the media coverage of the conflict (Philo and Berry 2004). Groups such as If Americans Knew, the Electronic Intifada and other scholars advocating the Palestinian cause have demonstrated the pervasive bias in the coverage of the illegal occupation in Palestinian, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in general (cf. Falk and Friel 2007). Arguably, many mainstream Western media (newspapers and television) outlets have participated in the “distortion and content bias” (Entman 2007), specifically with regards to the language used in the U.S. media coverage of the Israel-Palestine conflict since 1967 (Fisk 2001). Drawing from biblical references and rhetoric such
as “David versus Goliath”, such media portrayals present Israel as the underdog and Palestine as the aggressor (cf. Davidson 1996; Peteet 2005). In these ways, mainstream media facilitated in the construction of an unbalanced narrative on the conflict to Western audiences. Philo and Berry (2004) contend that Western media are controlled by ‘Zionist’ and Israeli agencies which work in concerted efforts to provide falsified or misinformed history, contributing in confusing the public’s understanding of the complexities involved in the conflict. Additionally, many view AIPAC (The American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee) as the most powerful foreign lobby in the United States (Bruck 2014) and as part of an influential pro-Israel lobby on U.S. foreign policy (Mearscheimer and Walt 2007). As the conflict in the occupied Palestinian territories intensifies, both sides engage in ‘reputational warfare’ or ‘social media wars’ as an attempt to transmit their ‘side’ of the story.

Alternative media affords Palestinians and their supporters in the diaspora and those in occupied Palestine to negotiate their disrupted lives in a reconstruction of an ‘imagined’ Palestinian nation (Aouragh 2006: 20). It also helped to gain supporters among the international community.

Interwoven in all the texts and images produced on the Internet, are a re-articulation of meanings about Palestinian culture, history, and national identity. The physical and emotional interactions online can be traced back through analyzing content of forums and websites. One immediately notices that Palestinian national identity is a very important subject. Culture, national, religious and or political expressions, frames as messages, symbols, songs and images are locally embedded, reshaped and re-signified in culturally specific ways […] Hence, Internet is ‘superior’ to other media forums because [alternative media] provides a medium in which direct access and participation is allowed (Aouragh 2006: 22-23).

Using rhetorical analysis to investigate the effectiveness and characteristics of alternative media usages by the BDS movement targeting Israel in various SNSs context, Hitchcock (2016) found that their social media usage functions in similar ways as other contemporary movements (by facilitating on-the-ground actions and delivering useful information to supporters). However, Hitchcock contends that BDS social media discourse lack emotional narration to sustain movement interactivity. On the same token, Hitchcock (2016: 1) does acknowledge that “that can be partly explained by the unique political, material, and rhetorical constraints of the situation.”

While some scholars attempt to measure and evaluate ‘who is winning or losing the social media wars’ by counting hashtags, likes or tweets, Der (2014) contends that it is perhaps more important for researchers to examine the participatory nature of these social media activities:

I think it’s difficult to say who’s winning the “war.” In a conventional war you seize the center of gravity which might be a capital city or a strategic battlefield—but in a media war the center of gravity is diffused. Obviously people are fighting for the moral high-ground; they are fighting for public opinion and measuring who’s winning that part of the war is exceptionally difficult (Der 2014, online)

Movements use public channels like the media to disseminate vilifying images of their target, impugning their target's claims conformity to societal norms. By tarnishing a target’s image, a movement’s attack ultimately threatens the organization’s legitimacy and reputation” (McDonnell and King 2013: 388). Corporations are often targeted because movements see them as “highly visible platforms on which to protect their social change agendas...[as such activists] use media to make negative claims about their corporate targets, hoping to gain leverage over them by damaging their reputation” (McDonnell and King 2013: 389). As such, corporations targeted by consumer boycotts strategically react to defend their public image by using prosocial claims (public claims of corporate social actions, i.e. ‘voluntary actions’ that extend beyond the corporate market interest as a public relations attempt to provide some social benefits or to address general social problems) which operate as an impression management tactic intended to weaken the negative media attention attracted by the boycott (i.e. extra-institutional tactics).

According to Johnston, propaganda has always been involved with both traditional and alternative medias. “Propaganda is not the insidious, deceptive, manipulative pattern of negatively influencing behavior that many people consider it to be. While there’s no doubt it has been used for these purposes in the past, and continues to do so in the present, propaganda has always been used for good...[therefor, propaganda is] a piece of information designed to make those who read it think about an issue or behave in a certain way conducive to what we want them to...Branding and advertising has become a major aspect of social media for all businesses [for this study this includes social movements and their actors, corporations, and celebrities], with a far greater personalization to match the needs of consumers. By promoting brands, we are engaging in issuing propaganda on their behalf” (Johnston 2013, online).

During the first intifada, Palestinian and their supporters established new activist organizations in an effort to explain the Palestinian position to the public by using primarily mainstream media relations and public outreach programs, but with little success. During the second intifada, Palestinian organizations took to the Internet themselves. Palestinian activists, especially those in the diaspora who were trying to increase awareness and
understanding of Palestinian concerns among Western publics and media, have become more sensitive to the way messages were being constructed and propagated in the mainstream Western media. Capitalizing on SNSs platforms, the Palestinian movement activists created action alerts to mobilize the community and their empathizers via their transnational network of supporters and advocates, urging them to contact local and national media outlets or political representatives. This interaction between Palestinian activists inside and outside of occupied Palestinian territories has helped increased the overall level of Palestinian public relations to the political realm (Zaharna et al., 2008: 232).

Cutler is currently the Chief of State at the Israeli embassy in Washington DC and a longtime advisor of Netanyahu. Resulting in the increasing silencing of Palestinian and BDS activists and their supporters; some activists have been denied entry into Palestine and even arrested in Israel for the claim that they are inciting violence. For more information:

Facebook hires longtime Netanyahu adviser. By Dorgham Abusalim (Mondoweiss) on June 20, 2016. Can be accessed at: http://mondoweiss.net/2016/06/facebook-longtime-netanyahu/


Israel Targeting Palestinian Protestors on Facebook. By Alex Kane (The Intercept) on July 7, 2016. Can be accessed at: https://theintercept.com/2016/07/07/israel-targeting-palestinian-protesters-on-facebook/


This was revealed by world renowned Israeli writer Yitzhak Laor. Laor uncovered how this contract between the state of Israel and those artists seeking Foreign Ministry funding to showcase their work abroad are required to sign a lengthy document. Putting out a contract on art, Haaretz. Can be accessed at: http://www.haaretz.com/putting-out-a-contract-on-art-1.250388

The struggle to counter opposing hegemonic narratives (especially with mainstream media) and generate support about the illegal occupation in Palestine continues to be something Palestinian movement actors and their supporters work to achieve. Palestinian activists are increasingly using SNSs platforms to counter the mainstream narrative of the conflict—as well as affording tools for activists seeking to replace authoritarian regimes and to promote freedom and democracy (Aday et al., 2010, online). Therefore, alternative media has developed to be an effective means to disseminate information and create alternative discourses, mobilize people to protest, and facilitate solidarity among the wider advocacy network. But more importantly, the Internet and SNSs platforms allow these networks to coordinate their campaigns and joint activities online and offline. As a result the “new technology-based politics democratizes the old, elite-driven arrangements … [and perhaps the] most lasting impact may be that [alternative media] acclimates citizens both to consuming and to producing political content” (Howard 2009, online).

Referred as ‘Operation Cast Lead’ “there was an assault against the Palestinian population and the Gaza Strip’s infrastructure and the livelihoods of its people, with factories, farms and other economic resources systematically targeted” (Al-Haq 2009: 15). In addition to the conflict itself, the Palestinian population was subject to an imposed blockade resulting in a humanitarian crisis and disenfranchised refugee population.

Israel is ranked 101 out of 180 countries in the world according to the “Press Freedom Index” in 2016 because of ‘military censorship’ and abuses of the Israeli’s military’s targeting of Palestinian and foreign journalists in occupied Palestinian territories (World Press Freedom Index 2016).

Ben-Ari’s (2014) analysis of IDF (Israel Defense Forces) and Israeli social media campaigns reproduced an atmosphere of “political misogyny” where ‘expressive women of Israeli culture are forcibly silenced’ about the war in Gaza. Instead, they are exploited to ‘sell’ the conflict and Ben-Ari (2014, online) observed how ‘beloved female Israeli celebrities’ who have spoken out about their humanitarian concern about the conflict “all received a flood of threats [such as] rape, of having their children killed, of losing their jobs. Some did lose their jobs.”

For a more detailed outline on the evidence of Israeli war crimes committed by Israeli forces during this conflict, see Amnesty International (2009) and Human Rights Watch (2009).

The company has a factory in occupied West Bank territories which are in violation to the human rights abuses which against Oxfam’s principles, the issue was taken up by advocates of the BDS and Palestinian movements and is at the center of this study.

Roger Waters, a Pink Floyd musician and one of the few publically outspoken celebrity advocates for Palestine, commented on his Facebook page: “Scarlett’s choice of SodaStream over Oxfam is such an act of intellectual,
political, and civil about face, that we, all those of us who care about the downtrodden, the oppressed, the occupied, the second class, well I find it hard to rationalize…Scarlett, you are undeniably cute, but if you think SodaStream is building bridges towards peace you are also undeniably not paying attention.” Ali Abunimah, February 3, 2014. The Electronic Intifada. Can be accessed at: https://electronicintifada.net/blogs/ali-abunimah/pink-floyds-roger-waters-slams-scarlett-johansson-over-israel

155 There are a few exceptions: In her acceptance speech for Best Supporting Actress at the 50th Academy Awards, Vanessa Redgrave stated her support for Palestine and encouraged others to fight against Zionism, “against fascism and oppression” (OTRC 2016, online). Vanessa Redgrave delivers a controversial speech—Oscar history (Video). ABC&. Can be accessed at: http://abc7.com/archive/8545580/). Celebrities are more likely to engage in, and gain credible attention in issues which they can claim legitimate standing (Meter and Gamson 1996: 190). Said asserts that the power to narrate or block other narratives from forming and emerging has been one of the many mechanisms for controlling cultural encounters (Said 2003: 3). As such, the Hollywood culture and industry has leaned towards more ‘liberal’ causes such as civil rights, environmentalism, and homelessness (Prindle 1993: 105-113).

156 As an attempt to present a more neutral position, Madonna posted an Instagram picture of herself with two shirtless male dancers, one wearing a Star of David painted on his chest and the other with a crescent moon and star. The pictured was captioned: ‘Cease Fire! Insallah!!! Baruch Hashem!! Praise Lord! #ceasefireforever #peaceinthemiddleeast #livingforlove while others like Bill Maher used alternative media to provoke responses by tweeting: “Dealing w/ Hamas is like dealing w/a crazy woman who is trying to kill u –u can only hold her wrists so long before you have to slap her” (Sullivan 2014, online).

157 A trip to Tel Aviv in 2006 during a Pink Floyd European tour of their Dark Side of the Moon transformed Waters’ view of the conflict. He is considered a prominent supporter of the BDS campaign and has been at the forefront of the platform to speak out against Israeli foreign policy—he is also frequently portrayed in Mondoweiss editorials. According to Waters, celebrities who support Palestinian rights and the boycott are terrified to speak out for fear their careers will be destroyed:

“The only response to BDS is that it is anti-Semitic. I know this because I have been accused of being a Nazi and an anti-Semite for the past 10 years. My industry has been particularly recalcitrant in even raising a voice [against Israel]. There’s me and Elvis Costello, Brian Eno, Manic Street Preachers, one or two others, but there’s nobody in the United States where I live. I’ve talked to a lot of them, and they are scared shitless. If they saw something in the public they will no longer have a career. They will be destroyed. I’m hoping to encourage some of them to stop being frightened and to stand up and be counted, because we need them. We need them desperately in this conversation in the same way we needed musicians to join protesters over Vietnam. The way apartheid South Africa treated its black population, pretending they had some kind of autonomy, was a lie. Just as it is a lie now that there is any possibility under the current status quo of Palestinians achieving self-determination and achieving, at least, a rule of law where they can live and raise their children and start their own industries. This is an ancient, brilliant, artistic and very human civilization that is being destroyed in front of our eyes.” Quoting Waters in Gallagher 2016, online. February 20, 2016. Can be accessed at: http://www.independent.co.uk/people/i-have-been-called-a-nazi-and-anti-semite-for-the-past-10-years

158 ‘adding’ is hyperlinked to: The many faces of…Scarlett Johansson by Nostra on January 27, 2012

159 ‘largest Israeli thefts of Palestinian land’ is hyperlinked to: accessed denied to http://www.codepink.org/section.php?

160 ‘the Times of Israel calls her’ is hyperlinked to: Scarlett Johansson bags bubbly ad gig: Actress to star in Super Bowl commercial for SodaStream, the Israeli seltzer machine maker by Stuart Winer on January 12, 2014


164 ‘dismissed is hyperlinked to: Al Jazeera’s puny controversy over Scarlett Johansson and SodaStream: the news that Scarlett Johansson was representing the Israeli firm SodaStream caused Al Jazeera to call it a controversy—based on four tweets by Nina Strochlic on January 15, 2014. Can be accessed at:
Controversy fizzes up around SodaStream over their use of factories in the West Bank just as Scarlett Johansson represents SodaStream has already brought business to the company’s first global ambassador by Meghan Keneally on January 21, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://www.breitbart.com/bigpost/2014/01/21/sodastream-bubbles-are-more-controversial-than-they-appear/
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165 'told' is hyperlinked to: Scarlett Johansson eyes a political career, saying: I never close the door on those kinds of things' by Andrei Harmsworth on 3 September 2013. Can be accessed at: http://metro.co.uk/2013/09/03/scarlett-johansson-eyes-a-political-career-saying-i-never-close-the-door-on-those-kinds-of-things-3947075/

166 'the new face of apartheid' is hyperlinked to: Scarlett Johansson for SodaStream: 'Set the bubbles free’ but keep the Palestinians bottled in Area A by Annie Robbins on January 12, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://mondoweiss.net/2014/01/johansson

167 'represent SodaStream has already brought’ is hyperlinked to: Scarlett Johansson's relationship with SodaStream may hurt her image by Adam Horowitz on January 17, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://mondoweiss.net/2014/01/johansons-representation-sodastream/

168 'represent SodaStream may hurt her image' by Adam Horowitz on January 17, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://mondoweiss.net/2014/01/johansons-representation-sodastream/


174 'PEP’ is hyperlinked to CNN Money PepsiCo Inc. can be accessed at: http://money.cnn.com/quote/quote.html? symb=PEP


176 'Business and Finance’ is hyperlinked to: Scarlett Johansson under fire for supporting Israeli SodaStream: actress will appear in soda pop-making gadget’s Super Bowl commercial, as BDS supporters cry for boycott is muted by product’s unique success by Adi Gold on January 22, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4479689,00.html


178 Scarlett Johansson under fire for supporting Israeli SodaStream: actress will appear in soda pop-making gadget’s Super Bowl commercial, as BDS supporters cry for boycott is muted by product’s unique success by Adi Gold on January 22, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4479689,00.html


181 ‘erupted after the announcement’ is hyperlinked to: Scarlett Johansson for SodaStream: ‘Set the bubbles free’ but keep the Palestinians bottled in Area A by Annie Robbins on January 12, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://mondoweiss.net/2014/01/johanssons-representation-settlement-business-sodastream/

183 ‘lies about the occupation’ is hyperlinked to: SodaStream: building walls, not bridges—Israelis and Palestinians need to co-resist against the structures of injustice, no co-exist within an unjust system by Mike Merryman-Lotze on July 10, 2013. Can be accessed at: http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/07/20137111145016751282.html


188 ‘Oxfam’ is hyperlinked to: Oxfam International’s main webpage. Can be accessed at: https://www.oxfam.org/

189 ‘how soon before Johansson’s ties to SodaStream’ is hyperlinked to: ‘New Yorker’ says Scarlett Johannsson’s relationship with SodaStream may hurt her image by Adam Horowitz on January 17, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://mondoweiss.net/2014/01/johansson-s relationship-sodastream/

190 ‘Stephanie Westbrook’s’ is hyperlinked to: posts to Mondoweiss made by Stephanie Westbrook. Can be accessed at: http://mondoweiss.net/author/stephanie-westbrook/


192 Scarlett Johansson hints at future political career: actress Scarlett Johansson has hinted she may one day embark on a career as a politician, as she claims a female US president with a “maternal instinct” would “only benefit” the world by Hannah Furness on September 3, 2013. Can be accessed at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/celebritynews/10282055/Scarlett-Johansson-hints-at-future-political-career.html

193 Scarlett Johansson: 2009 WebMD Health Hero Scarlett Johansson is on a mission to feed hungry kids for a very personal reason. She used to be one of them by Gina Shaw [no date listed.] Can be accessed at: http://www.webmd.com/children/features/scarlett-johansson-feeds-hungry-children?print=true


198 An Israeli industrial park is a wild West Bank for labor rights: Israeli labor regulations apply in the Mishor Adumim industrial zone, but inspectors don’t cross the Green Line to enter Area C, so there is no one to enforce them by Tali Heruti-Sover on May 11, 2013. Can be accessed at: http://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/an-israeli-industrial-park-is-a-wild-west-bank-for-labor-rights.premium-1.523269
Scarlett Johansson is “ambassador for oppression,” says Oxfam founder’s grandson

Palestinian civil society to Oxfam: “match words with action”, break ties with Scarlett Johansson


199 ‘PR video’ is hyperlinked to: SodaStream “treats us like slaves,” says Palestinian factory worker by Stephanie Westbrook on 9 May, 2013. Can be accessed at: https://electronicintifada.net/content/sodastream-treats-us-slaves-says-palestinian-factory-worker/12441

200 Staff member of the US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation (Director of grassroots organizing). Ramah serves on the board of the Washington Peace Center and is a member of the Muslim American Women’s Policy Forum. She has been an activist with other grassroots organizations including CODEPINK: Women for Peace and the Arab American Action Network. She has a Masters of Arts degree in Conflict Resolution from Georgetown University and a B.S. in Journalism from Northwestern University. Description taken from the US Campaign staff website.

201 Executive Director of Jewish Voice for Peace.
202 Member of Adalah-NY: The New York Campaign for the Boycott of Israel.
203 Staff member of CODEPINK Women for Peace and part of the national staff and the coordinator for the Stolen Beauty Campaign, which boycotts illegal Israeli settlement product Ahava Cosmetics. In addition to working with CODEPINK, Kricorian is a writer and a novelist, and she is a member of PEN USA and on the board of the Armenia Tree Project. Description is taken from the CODEPINK Founders and Staff website.
204 Steering Committee member (US Campaign Co-Chair) of the US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation
205 ‘refused to allow Corporate Watch to visit their factory’ is hyperlinked to: Palestine Feb 2013: ‘They destroyed our lives and then gave a few people a job. It is nothing’. Some unanswered questions for SodaStream by Corporate Watch. Can be accessed at: https://corporatewatch.org/?q=node/4711
207 Editor-in-chief of The Jewish Daily Forward.
208 New York City Comptroller Scott Stringer and New York Democratic politician.
210 “which supports a boycott of settlement goods’ is hyperlinked to: Americans For Peace Now: Call to boycott settlements picks up steam! by Lara Friedman on March 19, 2012. Can be accessed at: http://archive.peacenow.org/entries/call_to_boycott_settlements_picks_upSteam
211 American citizen and direct descendant (grandson) of Professor Gilbert Murray and whose great-uncle Dr. Henry Gillett were both founding members of the Oxford Committee for Famine Relief in the 1940s—which later became Oxfam.
215 ‘use their own Palestinian workers for this purpose’ is hyperlinked to: SodaStream “treats us like slaves,” says Palestinian factory worker by Stephanie Westbrook on May 9, 2013. Can be accessed at: https://electronicintifada.net/content/sodastream-treats-us-slaves-says-palestinian-factory-worker/12441


Tell Oxfam to drop SodaStream Global Ambassador Scarlett Johansson. Occupation isn’t green or “guilt free.” by CODEPINK on January 28, 2014. [Action has been completed.] Can be accessed at: https://www.thunderclap.it/projects/8346-oxfam-say-no-to-occupation

Oxfam accepts resignation of Scarlett Johansson by Oxfam on January 30, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://www.ft.com/cms/s/688f4b34-882a-11e3-a926-00144feab7de.de.html%3fsiteedition%3dIntl&%2f_i_referer=http%3a%2f%2fmondoweiss.net%2F10b2827a7d7a288915a37fadb87e35b6&classification=conditional_standard&lab=barrier-app#axzz4I131aCo


Hyperlinked to: The BDS movement’s main page. Can be accessed at: https://bdsmovement.net/

Independent commenter and human rights activists, founding member of the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PACBI) and the Palestinian Civil Society BDS campaign, and author of Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions: The Global Struggle for Palestinian Rights 2011.

Author of the forthcoming, The Battle for Justice in Palestine (2014) and cofounder of The Electronic Intifada.

Professor at the University of California Hastings College of Law in San Francisco, Senior Fellow at the Institute for Palestine Studies, and former legal consultant to the Palestinian Legislative Council.


Hyperlinked to: SodaStream “treats us like slaves,” says Palestinian factory worker by Stephanie Westbrook on May 9, 2013. Can be accessed at: https://electronicintifada.net/content/sodastream-treats-us-slaves-says-palestinian-factory-worker/12441

Founding executive director of Rabbis for Human Rights-North America and member of the Jewish Voice for Peace Rabbinical Council.


Hyperlinked to: Apartheid on Steroids by Stephen Robert on August 12, 2011. Can be accessed at:

Mairav Zonszein is an independent writer, translator, and editor, originally from New York City. Her publications include The Guardian, The New York Times, Salon, The Daily Beast, National geographic, Al Jazeera America, The Forward, etc.


‘The USA Today ad meter’ is hyperlinked to: a dead link.

‘suggests that SodaStream missed the’ is hyperlinked to: Super Bowl ads get serious by Aaron Smith on February 3, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://money.cnn.com/2014/02/02/news/companies/super-bowl-ads/r

‘Financial Times’ is hyperlinked to: ‘FT’ blast on settlements will strike fear at Hasbara Central (if not among liberal Zionists and ‘glitzy blondes’ by James North and Phil Weiss on February 1, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://mondoweiss.net/2014/02/settlement-liberal-zionists/

In January 2014, President Obama gave the Iranian government a 6 month interim agreement before making a decision on a nuclear deal. The Iran deal are included as part of Palestinian movement discourses because proposed deals include support for Israel which in turn are perceived as not good for the Palestinian people or any peaceful resolution that would include them in their favor.

‘to talk about boycotts’ is hyperlinked to: Netanyahu and ministers lash out at ‘insufferable’ Kerry for mentioning ‘boycotts’ by Philip Weiss on February 2, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://mondoweiss.net/2014/02/netanyahu-insufferable-mentioning/

‘Financial Times to explain’ is hyperlinked to: ‘FT’ blast on settlements will strike fear at Hasbara Central (if not among liberal Zionists and ‘glitzy blondes’ by James North and Phil Weiss on February 1, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://mondoweiss.net/2014/02/settlement-liberal-zionists/

‘lascivious ad with Johansson’ is hyperlinked to: Scarlett Johansson’s new image (gossout alert) by Philip Weiss on February 2, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://mondoweiss.net/2014/02/scarlett-johanssons-gossout/

‘the Israel Project’s!’ is hyperlinked to: The Israel Project’s webpage Thank you Scarlett, Support Scarlett Johansson. Can be accessed at: http://www.thoisraelproject.org/thank-you-scarlett/


Susan Collins is a United States politician who currently serves as the senior Republican Senator from Maine. ‘Susan Collins’ is hyperlinked to: Senator Susan Collins is the Barrier to Transparency, Accountability on Drones by John Nichols on November 25, 2013. Can be accessed at: https://www.thenation.com/article/senator-susan-collins-barrier-transparency-accountability-drones/

‘AOL’s’ is hyperlinked to: SodaStream Debuts at Super Bowl, in Spite of Coke, Pepsi, and Politics by Eamon Murphy on February 3, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://www.aol.com/article/2013/02/03/sodastream-super-bowl-ad-coke-pepsi-palestine/20446986/?gen=1

‘recently affirmed’ is hyperlinked to: page not found.

‘told the Times of Israel’ is hyperlinked to: SodaStream to kick off at Super Bowl: Israeli soft drink company has long been a target of pro-Palestinian activists who promote boycotts of settlement products by The Times of Israel on December 8, 2012. Can be accessed at: http://www.timesofisrael.com/sodastream-to-kick-off-us-campaign-at-the-super-bowl/


‘diverse coalition of Christian, Muslim, and Jewish organizations’ is hyperlinked to: SodaStream Boycott: Interfaith Boycott Coalition. Can be accessed at: http://www.sodastreamboycott.org/

‘2011 filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission’ is hyperlinked to: As filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on April 4, 2011 Registration No.333 SodaStream International LTD. Can be accessed at: http://app.quotemedia.com/data/downloadFiling?webmasterId=101533&ref=7522072&type=HTML&symbol=SODA&companyName=SodaStream+International+Ltd.&formType=F-1&formDescription=Registration+statement+for+certain+foreign+private+issuers&dateFiled=2011-04-04
Walla Sababa,

Talking Tamer Nafar

Lyrics:

published on March 6, 2014. Can be accessed at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6XHZ4OaWbn0
I think we just found the solution for the Middle East
They will have our land
But we have salaries in our bank
And Scarlett Johansson, well she has gas
Capara 3aleki

**Hook**
She’s a pretty pretty blond thing, doing her own thing
She is living in the bubbles of a soda drink
I’m no Timberlake I’m no Sean Penn
When I’m with Scarlett I’m gone with the wind
Gone with the wind (She has gas)
Gone with the wind (She has gas)
Gone with the wind (She has gas)
Gone with the wind (She has gas)

**Verse 1**
You taught me, What’s the point in pointing out my stress
Instead of pointing at them checkpoints am a point at my checks
(Got paid) Tell mama no more olive oil and bread with a boiling egg
Soon as her boy comes home oh boy I’ll spoil her well
Meanwhile I’m at the checkpoint like Android Paranoid as shit
So I play your songs to hear your voice and stop the noise so I rest
Started to imagine that I’m Auditioning for "The Voice" for a sec
The chair is turning could I be Shakira's choice but instead
It was a soldier with a rifle pointed at my head
Hit me in the groin, but nothing will take all them coins that I’ll spend
Ya Scarlett, Roger from Pink Floyd wants to spoil our fest
Trying to end slavery and make house slaves unemployed I guess
(They took your job? THEY TOOK MY JOB)

**Hook**
She’s a pretty pretty blond thing, doing her own thing
She is living in the bubbles of a soda drink
I’m no Timberlake I’m no Sean Penn
When I’m with Scarlett I’m gone with the wind
Gone with the wind (She has gas)
Gone with the wind (She has gas)
Gone with the wind (She has gas)
Gone with the wind (She has gas)

(Scarlett: Like most actors my real job is saving the world)

**Verse 2**
Saving the world from all them boring details
Whatever she sells count me in on pre sales
Even if it’s in a settlement, do we care?
About Reality, my reality
First they moved me here and now they wanna move me there
But they'll never ever move me like you move me Yeah
I can't feel you but I hear you like the movie “HER”
What are you telling me, what are you telling me
Equal? We should stop faking, stop taking
Famous faces just to make this occupation look like a vacation
Who gave her an explanation about this situation?
Lets face it its not the first time she got LOST IN TRANSLATION
What if I hold her as a hostage and force them forces to order pizza
Can we call it equality cuz the both of us had extra sausage
“Hey, sausage no digestible, you should drop that fast”
Nobody cares but me; Scarlett Johansson has gas

Outro
She’s a pretty blond pretty blond – doing her own thing
She’s living in the bubbles of a; of a Soda Drink
I am not Timberlake; I’m not Sean Penn
When I’m with Scarlett; I’m gone gone with the wind

Lyrics to the rap were accessed at: http://damrap.com/node/270
283 'awkward house parties’ is hyperlinked at: SodaStream: Guilt-free Seltzer or Blood Bubbles? by Kat Stoeffel on
January 20, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://nymag.com/thecut/2014/01/sodastream-guilt-free-seltzer-or-blood-
bubbles.html
284 'broader context is hyperlinked to ‘Palestinian Workers in Settlements Who Profits’ Position Paper, can be
accessed at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f_FHU-8ZeUw
285 'long history of politicized Palestinian labor organization’ is hyperlinked to Amazon.com, ‘Comrades and
Enemies: Arab and Jewish Workers in Palestine, 1906-1948' by Zachary Lockman. Can be accessed at:
286 'brutally put down by Israel’ is hyperlinked to: The West Bank Rises Up by Penny Johnson, Lee O’Brien
287 SodaStream “treats us like slaves’ is hyperlinked to: SodaStream “treats us like slaves,” says Palestinian factory
worker by Stephanie Westbrook on May 9, 2013.
288 ‘Palestinian working conditions in Israeli settlements’ is hyperlinked to: A Report on the Employment of
Palestinians in Israel and the Settlements: Restrictive Policies and Abuse of Rights written by Kav LaOved (August
2012) based on the interviews and complaints of 514 Palestinian workers about work permits, collected in
partnership with Machsom Watch (an Israeli NGO). Can be accessed at:
289 Whitewash is a term used to contest those Israeli one-state advocates utilizes various propaganda tactics/ tools to
distract readers by dismissing or undermining Palestinian political culture and the right to exist.
290 ‘Israeli occupation suppresses the Palestinian economy’ is hyperlinked to:
291 ‘a sort of red herring’ is hyperlinked to: Closing SodaStream’s Westbank Factories would hurt Palestinians, but
that’s not the point by Mattheh Yglesias on February 3, 2014. Can be accessed at:
http://www.slate.com/blogs/moneybox/2014/02/03/sodastream_palestinian_workers_closing_the_factory_would_hu
rt_them_but_that.html
292 Weiss noted that she is aged 95, a Peace Now board member and a longtime friend of Hillary Clinton.
293 ‘ceo Debra DeLee’ is hyperlinked to: APN CEO Debra DeLee in The Forward: Love Israel. Oppose BDS. Reject
SodaStream. Can be accessed at: http://peacenow.org/entry.php?id=3042#.V7nGhE0rJph
294 Scarlett Johansson interview: ‘I would way rather not have middle ground’ 16 March, 2014. Can be accessed at:
https://www.theguardian.com/film/2014/mar/16/scarlett-johansson-interview-middle-ground-under-the-skin-
sodastream. I include parts of the interview specifically referring to the controversy [located at the end of the
article]:
In the Guardian interview Cadwalladr stated that ‘it looked like she’d received very poor advice; that
someone who is paid good money to protect her interest hasn’t done the necessary research before she’d
accepted the role and that she’d unwittingly inserted herself into the world’s most intractable geopolitical
conflict. By the time Oxfam raised the issue, she was going to get flak if she didn’t step down, flak if she
didn’t. Was the whole thing just a big mistake? [Cadwalladr continues on Johansson’s response:] But she
shakes her head. “No, I stand behind that decision. I was aware of that particular factory before I signed it.”
‘Really? “Yes, and … it still doesn’t seem like a problem. Until someone has a solution to the closing of
that factory to leaving all those people destitute, that doesn’t seem like the solution or the problem.” But the
international community says that the settlements are illegal and shouldn’t be there. “I think that’s
something that’s very easily debatable. In that case, I was literally plunged into a conversation that’s way
grander and larger than this one particular issue. And there’s no right side or wrong side leaning on this issue […] I’m coming into this as someone who sees the factory as a model for someone sort of movement forward in seemingly impossible situation.” […] Cadwalladr recalling her feelings about Johansson’s statement:] Half of me admires Johansson for sticking to her guns—her mother is Jewish and she obviously has strong opinions about Israel and its policies. Half of me thinks she’s hopelessly naïve. Or, most likely, poorly advised. Of all of the conflicts in all the world to plant yourself in the middle of … [Cadwalladr trails off on her thought leading into the continuation of her conversation with Johansson:] “When I say a mistake,” I say, “I mean partly because people saw you making a choice between Oxfam—a charity that is out to alleviate global poverty—and accepting a lot of money to advertise a product for a commercial company. For a lot of people, that’s like making a choice between charity—good—and lots of money—greed.” [Johansson responding:] “Sure I think that’s the way you can look at it. But I also think for a non-governmental organization to be supporting something that’s supporting a political cause … there’s something that feels not right about that to me. There’s plenty of evidence that Oxfam does support and has funded a BDS [boycott, divest, sanctions] movement in the past. It’s something that can’t really be denied.” [Cadwalladr:] When I contacted Oxfam, it denied this.

296 ‘first and same public accusation in Haaretz’ is hyperlinked to: SodaStream Boss Accuses Oxfam of ‘Hypocrisy’ and Funding BDS Movement: Oxfam denies charges, says it is opposed to trade with Israeli settlements in the West Bank, not Israel in general by Judy Maltz on February 2, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://www.haaretz.com/israel-news.premium-1.571986
297 ‘Again from Haaretz’ is hyperlinked to: SodaStream Boss Accuses Oxfam of ‘Hypocrisy’ and Funding BDS Movement: Oxfam denies charges, says it is opposed to trade with Israeli settlements in the West Bank, not Israel in general by Judy Maltz on February 2, 2014. Can be accessed at: http://www.haaretz.com/israel-news.premium-1.571986
298 ‘whose raison d’être’ is hyperlinked to: Rightwing ‘Israel Project’ finds welcome mat at NYT and ‘Daily Show.’ Can be accessed at: http://mondoweiss.net/2011/12/rightwing-israel-project-finds-welcome-mat-at-nyt-and-daily-show/
299 ‘Coalition of Women for Peace’ is hyperlinked to their main website. Can be accessed at: http://www.coalitionofwomen.org/
300 ‘Who Profits from the Israeli Occupation?’ is hyperlinked to their main website. Can be accessed at: http://www.whoprofits.org/
301 ‘initiated in response to the Palestinian call for the boycott, divestment and sanction (BDS) movement,” is hyperlinked to:
303 According to Wilson Dizard at Mondoweiss on October 28, 2016: “Roger Waters, lead singer behind Pink Floyd, lost a multimillion dollar American Express sponsorship for his 2017 US+Them tour after expressing solidarity this month with Palestinian students trying to end Israel’s apartheid system of military occupation using the same protest tactic that helped dismantle South African Apartheid and, earlier, America’s Jim Crow: Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions, or BDS.” American Express disowns Pink Floyd singer Roger Waters because of pro-Palestinian views. Article can be accessed at: http://mondoweiss.net/2016/10/americian-express-palestinian/


Can be accessed at: http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0424060/bio?ref_=nm_ov_bio_sm
APPENDIX A
A SUMMARY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW VIOLATIONS BY ISRAEL
(adopted from itsisapartheid.org and israllawresourcecenter.org):

Israeli occupation is illegal:
Laws violated: U.N. Charter, Article 2(4) and 51 (1945); Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations, Principle 1 (1970)

Illegal Israeli Settlements on occupied land:
Laws violated: Geneva Convention IV, Article 49(6) (1949). It is illegal to colonize occupied land or transfer non-indigenous population to that land.

Illegal to take land by force and claim sovereignty:

Illegal Israeli practice of ethnic cleansing:
Laws violated: forbidding civilian populations to the right to return to their home following the end of armed conflict is in direct violation of international law and UN resolutions. Geneva Convention IV, Articles 45, 46, and 49 (1949), UN resolutions 194 (III) (General Assembly 1948) and 237 (Security Council 1967)

Israeli apartheid system is illegal:
Laws violated: International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid (1976). Supporting examples: Israel’s society-wide system of discrimination and isolation of the Palestinian people within Israel, and its system of exploitation, oppression and isolation in the occupied territories, fit the official, legal UN definition of apartheid, which is considered to be a crime against humanity. The practice of passing laws which gives special favor throughout Israeli society to the Jewish people over all other people, and especially indigenous Palestinian Arab people, embodies the UN definition of apartheid, which is giving special favor to one group of people above all other groups based on criteria like religious affiliation.

Massive violations of human rights:

Collective punishment is illegal:

Illegal massive transformation of local laws:
Laws violated: Hague Regulations IV, Article 43 (1907).

Violations of U.N. Security Council resolutions:
Laws violated: Israel has violated 28 resolutions of the United Nations Security Council (which were legally binding on member nations U.N. Charter, Article 25 (1945); a few sample resolutions: 54, 111, 233, 234, 236, 248, 250, 252, 256, 262, 267, 270, 280, 285, 298, 313, 316, 468, 476, etc.

Separation Barrier “Apartheid Wall” ruled illegal:
Laws violated: International Court of Justice of 2004, in an advisory opinion, ruled that the Israel “separation barriers” (the ‘Apartheid Wall’) illegal in a 14 to 1 ruling. The Court beings by citing, with reference to Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter and to General Assembly resolutions 2625 (XXV), the principles of the prohibition of the threat or use of force and the illegality of any territorial acquisition by such means, as reflected in customary international law. It notes that significant amounts of land are de facto annexed by the separation barrier. It further cites the principles of self-determination of peoples, as enshrined in the Charter and reaffirmed by resolution 2625 (XXV). As regards international
humanitarian law, the Court refers to the provisions of the Hague Regulation of 1907, which have become part of customary law, as well as the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 1949, applicable to those Palestinian territories, which, before the armed conflict of 1967, lay to the east of the 1949 Armistice demarcation line (or ‘Green Line’) and were occupied by Israel during that conflict. The Court further notes that certain human rights instruments (International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child) are applicable in the Occupied Palestinian Territory. It finds that the construction of the wall and its associated regime are contrary to the relevant provisions of the Hague Regulations of 1907 and of the Fourth Geneva Convention; and that they impede the liberty of movement of the inhabitants of the territory as guaranteed by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; and that they also impeded the exercise by the persons concerned of the right to work, to health, to education and to an adequate standard of living as proclaimed in the International Covenant on economic, Social and Cultural rights and in the Convention on the rights of the Child. Lastly, the Court finds that this construction and its associated regime, coupled with the establishment of settlements, are tending to alter the demographic composition of the Occupied Palestinian Territory and thereby contravene the Fourth Geneva Convention and the relevant Security Council resolutions.

According to a written statement by the fourth session of the Russell Tribunal on Palestine (which took place on 6 and 7 October 2012, www.russekktribunalonpalestine.com), sent to the General Assembly, Human Rights Council (22nd session, agenda item 7: Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories on 11 February 2013), in addition to Israel violating various international laws, another source of contention is the United States complicity in Israel’s violations of international law. Furthermore, “the tribunal finds that Israel’s ongoing colonial settlement expansion, its racial separatist policies, as well as its violent militarism would not be possible without the U.S.’s unequivocal support. Following World War II, especially in the context of the Cold War, and since then, the U.S. has demonstrated a commitment to Israel’s establishment and viability as an exclusionary and militarized Jewish state at the expense of Palestinian human rights. While U.S. Administrations offered moral support, since the Six Day War in 1967, the U.S. has provided unequivocal economic [aid to Israel has averaged about 25% of all U.S. foreign aid], military [Israel received 60% of the U.S. Foreign Military Financing (FMF) funding making it the largest recipient of U.S. military funding], and diplomatic [between 1972 and 2012, the U.S. has been the lone veto of U.N. resolutions critical of Israel 43 times] support to Israel in order to establish and maintain a qualitative military superiority over its Arab neighbors in violation of its own domestic law” (unispal.un.org).
## APPENDIX B

### TABLE 2 COLLECTION OF IMAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editorial #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Blog Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson for SodaStream: ‘Set the bubbles free’ but keep the Palestinians bottled in Area A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Image: SodaStream)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.15.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson watch: SodaStream stock plunges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Hat tip Tax)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.17.14</td>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td>‘New Yorker’ says Scarlett Johansson’s relationship with SodaStream may hurt her image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(No caption provided)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EVENT 1: Announcement (and reaction) to Scarlett Johansson’s Global Ambassadorship with SodaStream

1. **Image number 1**: SodaStream Unveils Scarlett Johansson as its First-Ever Global Brand Ambassador
2. **Image number 2**: Map of the West Bank showing the separation barrier and settlements. (Image: West Bank Wall Map. Copyright: GeoCarta)
3. **Video number 1**: [This video does not exist]
4. **Video number 2**: [This video is private]
5. **Video number 3**: [This video does not exist]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Robbins</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image number 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Scarlett Letter (graphic: Rachele Richard @docrocket)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.22.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>Update: ‘Blood bubbles’-mainstream media turn on SodaStream and Scarlett Johansson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image number 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Scarlett’s mum on SodaStream’s complicity (graphic: Stephanie Westbrook (@stephinrome)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.23.14</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>Oxfam expresses ‘concerns’ over Scarlett Johansson’s support for settlement product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image number 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="“Set the bubbles free!” (graphic by Stephanie Westbrook (@stephinrome)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Palestinians can wait…” (graphic by Stephanie Westbrook (@stephinrome)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image number 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Italian cartoonist.(Graphic: Andrej)" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Oxfam logo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image number 12</td>
<td>Oxfam ambassador Scarlett Johansson visits Dadaab, Kenya, the largest refugee camp in the world (photo: Oxfam)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image number 13</td>
<td>Scarlett and Oxfam chat over Palestinian land loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image number 14</td>
<td>SodaStream stocks, worst day ever (Graphics: YCharts.com)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>1.24.14</th>
<th>Robbins</th>
<th>Scarlett and Oxfam chat over Palestinian land loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

“Sure, Oxfam. Let’s keep the dialogue going. What could happen?”
(Graphic: Stephanie Westbrook @stephinrome)

**EVENT 2: Johansson’s response to criticisms about her SodaStream ambassadorship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>1.25.14</th>
<th>US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation</th>
<th>Calls grow for Oxfam to drop Scarlett Johansson following her defense of Israeli occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Image: Stephanie Westbrook)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image number 16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image16.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[No caption provided]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Image number 18</strong></th>
<th><strong>Image number 19</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image18.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image19.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarlett Johansson in Kenya: “This would make a great SodaStream factory.”</td>
<td>“Say, do you know that SodaStream is hiring?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Image number 20</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image20.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Video number 4</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Video:</strong> Scar-Jo Criticized for Endorsing Israeli Company ‘SodaStream’-Huckabee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Video number 4</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Video:</strong> Scar-Jo Criticized for Endorsing Israeli Company ‘SodaStream’-Huckabee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Video number 4</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Video:</strong> Scar-Jo Criticized for Endorsing Israeli Company ‘SodaStream’-Huckabee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Video number 4</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Video:</strong> Scar-Jo Criticized for Endorsing Israeli Company ‘SodaStream’-Huckabee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Video number 4</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Video:</strong> Scar-Jo Criticized for Endorsing Israeli Company ‘SodaStream’-Huckabee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image number 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are proud of our relationship with Scarlett Johansson who has worked with Oxfam since 2005 to support Oxfam’s mission to end poverty and injustice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image number 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[No caption provided]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image number 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Image via Twitter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image number 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image24.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Sure, Oxfam. Let’s keep the dialogue going. What could happen?” (Graphic: Stephanie Westbrook)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image number 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image25.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activists at Oxfam America’s office in Washington DC. (Photo: US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image number 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image26.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activists in Boston (Photo: US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image number 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image27.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activist outside Scarlett Johansson’s agent in Los Angeles (Photo: US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image number 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image28.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activists in New York (Photo: US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16</th>
<th>128.14</th>
<th>Norr</th>
<th>Vote at the Guardian: Should Oxfam sever ties with Scarlett Johansson?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Image number 24**

**Image number 25**

Human rights advocates meet with Oxfam & Scarlett Johansson reps over concerns with Israeli settlements

**Image number 26**

 Activists at Oxfam America’s office in Washington DC. (Photo: US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image number 29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[No caption provided]

**Table 2: continued**

| 18 | 1.30.14 | Robbins | Palestinians living near West Bank SodaStream factory urge Scarlett Johansson to end role with occupation profiteer |

**EVENT 3: Johansson quits her role as Oxfam’s Global Ambassador**

| 19 | 1.30.14 | Horowitz | ‘Without doubt, the biggest loser in this well publicized BDS campaign was SodaStream’: Reactions to Johansson leaving Oxfam |

**Image number 30**

(Image: Stephanie Westbrook)
Caption: Keep it together and look concerned. Last photo op and I’m outta here.

**Image number 31**

(Image via Corriere.it)

**Image number 32**

(Image: Stephanie Westbrook)
Caption: You were all great backdrops, but I’m not really that into all of this human rights stuff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Robbins &amp; Norr</th>
<th>Lost in Occupation: Scarlett Johansson ends relationship with Oxfam to stick with SodaStream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I know, I’m really proud of my Oxfam work. It’s just…I have this SodaStream gig to get to.” (Graphic: Stephanie Westbrook—photo: Oxfam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lost in Translation (graphic: Stephanie Westbrook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.30.14</td>
<td>Nguyen</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson not only abandons Oxfam but throws it under the bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson hears the story of Uma Mahajan, who was abused by her first and second husbands, 2007 Oxfam tour in India. (Adrian Fisk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson announcing her deal with SodaStream CEO Daniel Birnbaum at the Gramercy Park Hotel Rooftop Club, 10 January 2014: “I am beyond thrilled to share my enthusiasm for SodaStream with the world!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Video number 6**
*Video:* NCAA Chief Legal Officer Donald Remy is World’s Worst in Sports
Table 2: continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image number</th>
<th>2.2.14</th>
<th>Miranda</th>
<th>The real SodaStream commercial they don’t want you to see</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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THE REAL SODASTREAM COMMERCIAL THEY DON’T WANT YOU TO SEE

LIKE MOST ACTORS, MY REAL JOB IS SAVING THE WORLD. I’VE DECIDED TO FOCUS MY EFFORTS AT BUILDING BRIDGES BETWEEN COMMUNITIES.

FOR EXAMPLE, THE SODASTREAM FACTORY IN NAFAL ARMON, ISRAEL, IS A PERFECT EXAMPLE OF COEXISTANCE.

BETWEEN PALESTINIANS AND JEWISH ISRAELIS.

IF YOU DON’T SHUT UP I CAN’T CONTINUE TO BE A VOICE FOR PEOPLE WHO DON’T HAVE A VOICE.

WE ARE TRYING TO FILM A COMMERCIAL FOR AMERICAN AUDIENCES. YOU WOULDN’T WANT SODASTREAM TO LOSE THIS MARKET BECAUSE IT MIGHT MEAN YOU LOSE YOUR JOB.

WE PROVIDE JOBS FOR PALESTINIANS WHO WORK ALONGSIDE ISRAELIS.

WE PALESTINIAN WORKERS IN THIS FACTORY ALWAYS FEEL LIKE WE ARE ENSLAVED.**

IF WE DON’T AGREE TO WORK 12 HOURS A DAY WITH NO OVERTIME, WE GET FIRED. IF WE COMPLAIN, WE GET FIRED.
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2.2.14

Weiss

Scarlett Johansson’s new image (grossout alert)

Image number 39

Johansson and The Israel Project ad
Table 2: continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2.2.14</th>
<th>Weiss</th>
<th>Do SodaStream workers have the right to vote? Roger Waters asks Scarlett Johansson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Image number 40**

Roger Waters

**EVENT 4: Reactions (and ensuing events) to Johansson/ SodaStream Super Bowl ad**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2.3.14</th>
<th>Horowitz &amp; Weiss</th>
<th>After all that build up—SodaStream ad was flat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Image number 41**

[Image: Screenshot from SodaStream’s Super Bowl commercial in which Scarlett Johansson wonders how it all went so wrong.]

26  | 2.3.14 | Weiss | Scarlett Johansson’s new pals: groups that is trying to break Obama’s Iran deal |

**Image number 42**

[Image: The Israel Project is milking Scarlett Johansson’s support for settlement project]

27  | 2.3.14 | Weiss | SodaStream’s Super bowl ad brings spotlight on Palestine and the Occupation |

**Video number 7**

**Video:** Superbowl SodaStream Spoof Ad (Vote Now) “Priceless” by John Dworkin—[the video does not exist]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.6.14</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>The Two-State SodaStream Solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image number 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image43.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.10.14</td>
<td>Deger</td>
<td>Avigdor Lieberman: ‘Our Oscar goes to Scarlett’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image number 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image44.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image number 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image45.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.11.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>France to perform CPR on Scarlett Johansson’s image—award for film career!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image number 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image46.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.20.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson’s ‘scholarship’ and ‘intelligence’ cited Mike Huckabee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image number 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image47.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.3.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson is featured at AIPAC. to applause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image number 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image48.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Johansson as an ambassador for Oxfam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.7.14</td>
<td>Nussbaum</td>
<td>A modal factory for a colonialism in trouble: the SodaStream saga revisited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video number 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video: Tamer Nafar min Dam – Scarlett Johansson Has Gas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graphic by Stephanie Westbrook (@stephinrome)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.15.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Peace Now board member jokes about owning a SodaStream</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SodaStream is built in Ma’aleh Adumim, a settlement in the occupied West Bank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.18.14</td>
<td>Deger</td>
<td>Scarlett Johansson parrots SodaStream CEO in attack on Oxfam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scarlett Johansson, (Photo: Getty Images)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.18.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mislabeled SodaStream mailing label. List origin as ‘Airport City, Ben Gurion Airport’ instead of Mishor Adumim, an Israeli settlement industrial zone in the West Bank, (Photo: Who Profits)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.18.14</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Johansson got career boost from ‘comic farrago’ over SodaStream—‘New Yorker’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Johansson
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