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CHAPTER ONE
MUSIC, BRANDING AND THE HEGEMONIC PROSUMPTION OF VALUES OF AN EVANGELICAL GROWTH CHURCH
TOM WAGNER

The aim of this chapter is to contribute to the ways in which scholars of growth-oriented forms of evangelical Christianity can think about those forms’ relationships to Protestant thought, late-capitalism and neoliberal subjectivity. Specifically, this chapter focuses on prosumption: the hegemonic, co-productive process through which branding informs participants’ meaning-making and self-making activities—and the role of values in this process. The apparent synergy between evangelical Christian growth churches, late-capitalism and neoliberalism has been widely noted. Marion Maddox describes these organizations as “a novel Christian form, attuned to the ethos of late capitalism” (2012: 146). Yet the novelty is not that these organizations reflect their socio-historical moment. Rather, the novelty is found in the moment itself, and the ways that meaning-making and self-making are co-produced among participants therein. Thus, the task of illustrating how growth churches are both reflective of and contribute to late-capitalism’s practices and neoliberal subjectivities is both timely and important.

Two often-interrelated strategies of approaching this are prominent in the literature. The first sees commodification and consumption as important modes of circulation and experience (e.g. Coleman 2000, Einstein 2008). The second draws on Max Weber’s

---

formulation of the relationship between capitalism and the Protestant ethic as a reference point (e.g. Martin 1995, Berger 2010). Birgit Meyer (2010) insists that, while still important, Weber’s model must be updated to account for the variegated forms of evangelical Christianity in late-capitalism. I suggest that this is also true of the former: the “theology of consumption” thesis (Maddox 2013:110; see Himes 2007) that is offered to explain the meaning- and self-making activities of (post)modern subjects, while useful, risks oversimplifying the variegated ways that value and values interact in late-capital exchange. Furthermore, it does not adequately account for the relationships between systemic authority and individual agency that inform Protestantism, late-capitalism and neoliberalism. This is because, although a theology of consumption acknowledges the importance of both structural/productive and individual/consumptive activity, by positing a clear delineation between the two, meaning-making and self-making is reduced to a series of one-offs rather than an on-going cluster of co-productive interactions, in multiple frames, through which hegemony is realized.

In this chapter, I suggest that a productive way to engage with growth-oriented evangelical Christianity and the present socio-historical moment is through branding, and in particular through the “prosumption of values” that it engenders. The emerging paradigm of late-capital exchange and its attendant neoliberal subjectivities thrives not on top-down production or bottom-up consumption, but rather on the ongoing co-productive process of prosumption (Toffler 1980, Xie et al. 2008, Ritzer and Jurgenson 2010). The basic model of prosumption is one in which materials and infrastructure for meaning- and self-making activities are provided by an organization, but assembled as “user-generated content” by participants in local, socio-historically situated contexts. In doing so, the brand values (Andrew 1998: 188-92) of the organization become orientation points that speak to (or against) the values of participants (see Holt 2002, Thompson and Arsel 2004). In both cases,
the brand becomes cultural material with which participants shape, generate, express, and understand “personal” values. This hegemonic branding effect is important to growth churches, especially those transnational organizations that operate in myriad local contexts, because churches within the larger “Body of Christ” – that is, the mediated global Christian community posited by evangelical Christianity – hold a wide range of idiosyncratic and sometimes competing values (see Ingalls 2011).

This chapter is drawn from my doctoral research on Australia’s Hillsong Church, undertaken between 2009 and 2013, at its Hillsong London branch. Combining an ethnomusicological approach with media analysis, I participated in weekly services, served on several volunteer teams, and attended both the church’s introductory Bible College and its small “connect groups” (home-based Bible-study groups) for more than three years. Additionally, I conducted 18 semi-structured interviews with church participants, musicians and staff, read several books by the church leadership, listened to many hours of DVDs, CDs and podcasts, and engaged with media produced by church participants and outsiders in the form of blogs, YouTube posts, and newspaper and magazine publications.

Hillsong Church is one of the best known of the transnational evangelical Christian churches that use popular music alongside sophisticated marketing techniques to spread the gospel.\(^2\) Since 1992, it has produced over 45 albums, sold over 14 million copies worldwide, and amassed over 30 gold and platinum awards. Furthermore, songs penned by its musicians are mainstays on the Christian Copyright Licensing International (CCLI) charts, which track the self-reported use of songs in churches around the world on a quarterly basis.\(^3\) Hillsong’s global popularity stems primarily from its two main worship groups and product streams:

\[^2\] Others include Christian City Church (CCC), Willow Creek, and Vineyard.

\[^3\] http://www.ccli.co.uk
Hillsong United and Hillsong LIVE. Hillsong United regularly tours the world and is arguably the most prominent face of the church. However, Hillsong LIVE albums are promoted as the “congregational expression” of Hillsong’s global network and are more reflective of the evolution of the church’s global branding (Riches and Wagner 2012, Wagner 2014b). Every Sunday, Hillsong’s songs are heard and sung in thousands of evangelical and non-evangelical churches around the world. Its music therefore exerts an outsized influence on both the Australian and global Christian sonic (and theological) landscapes (Evans 2006: 87-109; see also Evans 2014). Indeed, Hillsong’s music has become so influential that some have argued that it has become a “genre” or “style” of worship (Evans 2006, 2014). This is important because style is never neutral – it carries value-laden ethical and, in religious contexts, theological connotations that extend far beyond the sounds themselves (Rommen 2007). Furthermore, some of those that use Hillsong’s music contest its theology.\(^4\) Hillsong’s musical influence on the Christian soundscape therefore raises several important questions in connection to values, prosumption, and the relationship between Protestantism, late-capitalism, and neoliberal subjectivity. Why is it that Hillsong’s music is so popular, even among some who contest its values? What does this tell us about how (religious) branding works? How is the relationship between agency and authority that is found both in Protestant and modern thought revealed through Hillsong’s music and musicians?

\(^4\) A Google search for “Hillsong Theology” is instructive on this point, as it returns posts by groups and individuals opposed to the church’s beliefs and/or practices that range from the balanced to polemical. See, for example “Should Evangelicals Sing Hillsong Songs?” (http://savouringthegospel.wordpres.com/2012/03/11/should-evangelicals-sing-hillsong-songs/).
This chapter explores these questions by analyzing how participants (church musicians, members, and “outsiders”) engage with Hillsong’s music, musicians and branding. In the first section of what follows, I offer branding and prosumption as useful theoretical starting points for studying the relationship between growth churches (and particularly transnational growth churches), late-capitalism, and neoliberalism, and present Hillsong Church’s musical branding as an example of a growth church that uses these methods. Following this, I present two of Hillsong’s “celebritized” worship leaders, former Worship Pastor Darlene Zschech and current Worship Pastor Reuben Morgan, as mediated proxies for the Protestant dilemma of how to live “in but not of the world,” which in modernity is articulated as a dialogue between consumer values and spiritual authority vis-à-vis celebrity culture. Because these mediated musicians and their music are disentangled (Giddens 1990) from a specific “meaning,” they can be used to orient and articulate a broad range of values that extend beyond those purported to be held by Hillsong’s congregation. In part three, I suggest that Hillsong’s “Brand Charisma” is rooted in the evangelical Christian understanding of “anointing,” which is itself a product of a prosumption process that co-brands individual, institutional and spiritual authority. I conclude by suggesting that branding and prosumption afford participants a “pragmatic discursivity” with which they orient meaning- and self-making, vis-à-vis the brand. This occurs in the mutually-implicating socio-historical frames of Protestantism, late-capitalism and neoliberalism, frames in which agency and authority are both co-constituted and co-produced.

Branding, Prosumption, and Neoliberalism

As with most terms that have entered the popular lexicon, there are multiple understandings of the terms “brand” and “branding” (Murphy 1998:1-12). For the purposes of this chapter, both should be understood as the organization and communication of information across a
variety of media. A brand is a condensation of information, meanings and values (Keller 2003) that exists as a web of associations among actors across time and space (Latour 2007). Branding is the process of mediation through which this web is spun. The brand is thus produced through and comprised of media, and it is also media itself. In other words, it is both a mediated and media object (Lury 2004). This multiplicity means that the brand adapts easily to transnational flows, especially in the digital realm, and is therefore an ideal way for growth churches to communicate to both local and transnational audiences.

Branding’s mediated nature offers advantages in communicating to modern subjects in that, as a collection of disassembled signs, the “reassembling” process through which brand meaning emerges is always fluid, multiple and ultimately co-produced. One feature of these co-productive processes that is particularly important for religious brands is the prosumption of values. As the name suggests, prosumption is a process in which actors simultaneously produce and consume content—a way of meaning-making and self-making that has developed as capitalism has moved from production-based Fordism, through consumption-based Post-Fordism, toward what is now often (and often contentiously) referred to as an “information economy” (see Webster 2006).

First coined by Alvin Toffler (1980), the term “prosumption” has recently come to the fore in marketing circles to describe Web 2.0 economics (Ritzer and Jurgenson 2010; see also Xie et al. 2008). For Ritzer and Jurgenson, prosumption in the information age is an asymmetric exchange in which companies encourage consumers to do work for the company.

5 In Latour’s usage, “actors” include both sentient and non-sentient things, including forms of media. For example, both Hillsong’s musicians and CDs are considered actors in the semiotic web from which meaning emerges. I therefore refer to the people who engage with Hillsong’s music and musicians as “participants.”
– for example by crowdsourcing the design of new products or promoting user-generated advertising campaigns – without paying participants for their efforts. For the company, this has myriad benefits. While still providing a framing “brandscape” (Carah 2010, Sherry 1998) – that is, the materials (such as logos) and structures (such as Internet forums in which activities largely take place) – it eliminates costly research-and-design overhead while simultaneously opening up the creative process to a potentially unlimited number of minds anywhere in the world (Howe 2008). Crowdsourcing also has the advantage of emotionally investing prosumers in the company, as the company’s brand becomes a vital part of cultural production, both as the material with which and the site where meaning-making and self-making happen. One can immediately see the parallel in the evangelical Christian context, where reliance on volunteer labor significantly lowers operational overhead, embeds participants in the collective and, in the largest churches, provides a massive pool of creative talent to draw upon in the production of their music and media.

While size does matter, even the smallest church can adopt the branding and prosumption strategies – and thus the neoliberal orientation – of a “growth church” (Maddox 2012). This suggests that, in the study of both secular and religious forms of community, a focus on economic aspects of exchange (something that characterizes both Ritzer’s and Jurgenson’s argument, and I would suggest is also endemic to many accounts of growth churches) glosses other types of value that are actually more valuable to the organization and, perhaps arguably, the participants (the latter being what this chapter questions). In other words, economic value is inextricable from other types of value and values (Moor and Lury 2011) and should be examined with equal rigor. The question then becomes: What is the value of values for participants in growth churches (and by extension, late-capitalistic societies)? In the secular context, for example, the prosumption process is part of the experience of the product. Prosumers not only “personalize” the product in terms of
specifications, but also become emotionally involved in it – and, by extension, the brand community associated with it (McAlexander et al. 2002, Muñiz and O’Guinn 2001, Muñiz and Schau 2005). The organization becomes part of participants’ social lives. We see parallels with religious prosumption, where volunteers’ labor invests them in the church both physically and emotionally, often with positive effects (Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle 1997: 184-207). This is the positive view of prosumption promoted in the marketing literature as the “added value” that branding delivers (see Hart and Murphy 1998, Olins 2003, Schroeder and Salzer-Mörling 2006).

Marxist-influenced sociologists, however, question this view. Speaking from a critical perspective (Arvidsson 2005), they argue that prosumption cannot happen outside of the already established cultural context of the “brandscape” (in other words, the brand is always the frame of reference in which action takes place), and thus the “value” it affords is ultimately hegemonic (See, e.g.: Arvidsson 2006; Carah 2010; Lury 2004; Moor 2007; Thompson and Arsel 2004). Religious parallels can be drawn with this negative view as well, for example when analyzing the social dynamics of cults (see Galanter 1989; O’Reilly and Chatman 1996). While the opposing views from marketing and critical theory ultimately disagree over the value of capitalism and its attendant values systems, the key assumption shared by both is that participants experience their prosumption activities as being personally valuable. Therefore, the multiple, conflicting ways that prosumption can be viewed vis-à-vis the value of values is essential to understanding the relationship between growth churches, Protestantism, late-capitalism, and neoliberalism.

Hillsong’s Musical Brand and Contested Values

The act of evangelizing is itself a form of marketing, and evangelicals have long travelled the world to spread the word, often being most successful when adapting to the local modes of
communication available to them. From this view, church branding is a contemporary manifestation of age-old proselytising practices (Twitchell 2007). Although advertising the Gospel is nothing new, referring to it specifically as “branding” has until recently been avoided (Einstein 2008: 61). The explosion of Christian-oriented branding firms since around the turn of the millennium, though, testifies to it becoming a key part of evangelical Christianity’s culturally relevant communication style. Indeed, one might go so far as to posit the church brand as the “new paradigm” denomination in that the largest – and often most well-branded – evangelical organizations have not only been drawing membership from mainline denominations, but replicating their functions as well (Sargeant 2000). For example, transnational organizations like Chicago’s Willow Creek, the United Kingdom’s Holy Trinity Brompton, and Australia’s Hillsong Church train pastors at their name-brand colleges, disseminate leadership advice and materials to affiliated churches through their integrated networks and conferences, and even create branded musical liturgies from their self-produced worship albums. While it has been argued that denominations have always been brands (the Roman Catholic Church is a favorite example in the media) what differentiates the “new paradigm” branded denomination is the self-referential nature and in-house production of information that localizes meaning around a single church organization and its unique theology, mission and message (Wagner 2014a).

Hillsong’s mission and message is one of global transformation, seeking to “reach and influence the world by building a large Christ-centred, Bible-based church, changing mindsets and empowering people to lead and impact in every sphere of life.” It does this by

---

6 The Rev. Charles Stelzle, for example, published *Principles of Successful Church Advertising* in 1908 (Twitchell 2007: 141).

building a globally networked community of local churches, and by promoting its brand
tagline, “Welcome Home,” which neatly sums up its glocalization strategy (Wagner 2014b).
Because Hillsong strategically locates churches in major international cities around the
world, its transnational congregation is culturally and linguistically diverse. This diversity is
apparent at some of its larger “local” venues, such as Hillsong London, which serves around
10,000 worshipers weekly, translating its services into seven languages. In addition, its music
is distributed in 89 countries and is widely available on the Internet, which greatly increases
its potential audience.

An effective brand communicates an organization’s purpose and values to and among
its stakeholders, and does so by demonstrating fidelity to and being literate in the
idiosyncratic cultural codes of its target markets (Holt 2004: 65). As an evangelical
organization, Hillsong has multiple target markets. For example, it seeks the “unchurched,”
but also ministers to its believing participants. Beyond this, Hillsong’s global mandate means
that it seeks to “resource” multiple cultural markets, including many unaffiliated churches
that make use of its musical materials but do not necessarily subscribe to its theology. This
means that, while myriad cultural differences exist between and among the individuals and
organizations that constitute Hillsong’s markets, what they have in common is that they all
engage with the same mass media – Hillsong’s music and its musicians – that are integral
parts of Hillsong’s branding (Riches and Wagner 2012, Wagner 2014a, 2014b).

Simon Coleman (2000) has argued that engagement with Christian mass media,
particularly with the worship music and videos that circulate in transnational flows of
 evangelical conferences and on the Internet, engenders a kind of “generic” evangelical
Christian subjectivity. Both Hillsong’s music and its branding have been posited as having
homogenizing effects on both Christian music and theology (Evans 2006, 2014). While this
may be true in part, neither music nor brands are the “global language” that they are often
imagined to be (see, e.g., Klein 2010) – they derive their meanings from the ways they are deployed in specific situations, in specific cultural contexts (Holt et al. 2004). Branding is a co-productive process, requiring the participation of multiple actors and the values with which those actors are associated. This can be seen in the different ways within which Hillsong’s music, musicians and brand is engaged, both around the world (e.g. Evans 2014, Hartje-Döll 2013, Wagner 2014b), as well as within more specific “local” contexts. For example, almost a quarter of all songs sung in Australian Christian churches have been written by Hillsong’s artists. Yet, while many churches that use Hillsong’s music align with its teaching, others do not. One former Anglican music director expressed this to me in an email in this way:

I used to attend a mainstream Anglican Church here in Australia, most of whose members would never set foot in Hillsong for theological reasons, yet we sang their music every week. Some [other churches] went hard line and “banned” Hillsong music from their church's repertoire, but you can bet the young people especially were still singing/using it privately or at youth group stuff…. And most congregational members probably don't know where the songs are from in any case. (September 24, 2012)

Another told me:

[Hillsong’s music] slides into [Australian] charismatic churches, but the prosperity doctrine is fought publicly. Many Anglicans don’t even know where the music is from, but associate Hillsong and money. This was true of my time in Malaysia also. (Email exchange with author, June 13, 2013)
Hillsong’s songwriters are also congregation members (with the exception of a few well-known collaborators), and thus their music is intimately connected to the church’s theology and congregational values (Riches and Wagner 2012, Wagner 2014a, 2014b). Other churches re-purpose the music, using those original (or at least originally intended) meanings as orientation points against which they articulate their own values. This confirms the fluidity of meaning in modernity, especially when the digital commodity (in this case music) becomes disembedded from its original context (Benjamin [1936] 2008). It also speaks to the spectrum of attitudes that evangelical Protestants take toward consumer culture (at least part of the reason for the late embrace of church branding noted above), that range from the conspicuous consumption that characterizes the Health and Wealth gospel to a more circumspect view held by other churches.

The Christian Music Celebrity and the Protestant Dilemma

For many evangelical Christians, the sacred/secular dichotomy is most clearly articulated in the biblical mandate to live “in, but not of, the world.” Evangelicals believe that Christians are called upon to engage with society in everyday life (especially for evangelical purposes), but should also maintain a higher moral standard than “secular” society. While this call is embraced in theory, there remains considerable disagreement as to how it should be applied in practice, including musical practice. Since the time of Luther and Calvin, music has been a source of controversy in Protestantism, particularly in relation to authority (Nekola 2009). Today, Christian music’s commodity status means that to live “in, but not of, the world” is not only a negotiation of consumer culture (Romanowski 2000, Ingalls forth.), but also the cultural authority that it affords celebrities. H. Richard Niebuhr ([1951] 2002) postulated that

---

Christians negotiate the tensions between “Christ and Culture” by adopting a range of strategies of relating the sacred to the secular that are differentiated by the degree to which the two are “mixed.” Howard and Streck usefully apply Niebuhr’s typology to Christian contemporary music in their book *Apostles of Rock: The Splintered World of Contemporary Christian Music* (1999). Using rhetoric that articulates the Christ and Culture conundrum, Christian music artists, labels, and fans adopt different and often contradictory views about the nature and purpose of Christian music in order to justify their activities. For example, the “crossover” artist Amy Grant claims that her songs are grounded in her faith, but her lyrics are generally not explicitly Christian. To some listeners, Grant is helping “covertly” spread Christian values by reaching the “unchurched” that otherwise might be turned off by explicitly Christian lyrics. To others, though, the dearth of Christian lyrics amounts to a capitulation to “secular” market demands and an abandonment of her evangelical mandate. Arguments over artists like Grant reveal the plurality of views held by evangelical Christians.

Like many worship musicians, Hillsong’s musicians think of their music as “Christian Worship Music” (CWM), thereby differentiating their activities from the “entertainment” and “profit” motives often attributed to CCM. Elsewhere (2014a), I use the term “Christian Popular Music” (CPM) because it most accurately describes the contentious interplay between ethical and economic value that is at the heart of the development of the Christian lifestyle. Ingalls *et al.* (2013) note that, although CPM songs may be created with specific intentions, they often slip between categories as a result of their commodity status. Because the mechanisms of production and distribution are often the same for different categories of CPM music, and also because commercial profitability and popularity often go hand in hand, CPM is often ground zero for discourses over intention that inflected the “Worship Wars” (Nekola 2009) and the present discussion (cf. Howard and Streck 1999, Mall 2012).
about how to engage with contemporary culture – particularly its consumer elements – and furthermore show how (musical) celebrities become proxies for value disagreements (cf. Beaujon 2006).

One needs look no farther than musical icons such as KISS or Madonna to understand that musical celebrities and brands are created through the same mediated processes (Christian 2011, Blackwell and Stephan 2004). Both are important symbolic elements in the language of consumer culture because they are shorthand for values that participants personally relate to, both positively or negatively (cf. Basil 1996, Lim 2005, Ward 2011). This is also true of Hillsong Church’s internationally known worship leaders such as former Worship Pastor Darlene Zschech and her successor Reuben Morgan. Both Zschech and Morgan are important figures in contemporary Christian music. Zschech’s song “Shout to the Lord” (1993) is one of the staples of the new Christian music canon: it is sung in thousands of churches around the world every Sunday.\(^\text{10}\) Having sold over five million albums worldwide, Zschech is one of the most successful Christian music performers in the world (Connell 2005: 326, Evans 2006: 108). Although she now pastors her own church in New South Wales, she remains very much “the face and sound of HMA [Hillsong Music Australia]” (Evans 2006: 107), often appearing at the church’s conferences. Reuben Morgan also enjoys a global profile. His song “Mighty to Save” (co-written with Ben Fielding) is, like “Shout to the Lord,” a contemporary Christian classic. It and other of his compositions are regulars on the CCLI top 25 charts around the world.

Hillsong’s music is written primarily in English, and most of the songs sung in its churches (with the exception of its Ukrainian church, which translates many of the Australian

church’s songs but also writes some of its own) are sung in the original English. To guard against meaning getting “lost in translation,” Hillsong offers official translations of its songs in several languages on the Internet. Furthermore, it has released four Spanish language albums of its most popular songs, reflecting its high profile in Spanish-speaking markets, and its ninth album *Global Project* (2013) features translations of songs by Zschech, Morgan, and other popular Hillsong artists into Spanish, Portuguese, Russian, French, German, Swedish, Korean, Mandarin, and Indonesian, as well as songs by local songwriters who are part of Hillsong or Hillsong-affiliated churches. While lyrical translation carries important theological implications (Evans 2014), what I am interested in here is how Zschech and Morgan “translate” as value-imbued media objects. As icons of Christian music that are cobranded with Hillsong, Zschech and Morgan are in a sense the language through which the church attempts to reach its disparate audiences. But, as Ward (2011) has noted, fame is not due to the *celebrity* being everywhere but the *celebrity’s image* being everywhere. Celebrity is created through repetition of mediated images that over time coalesce into a set of meanings and associations in the hearts and minds of those who consume them. From this view, it is not Zschech or Morgan who speak to those who engage with their songs, but their “celebritized” mediated images and the values associated with those images.

Indeed, the celebritization of Hillsong’s worship leaders points toward a larger dilemma for transnational evangelical organizations like Hillsong *vis-à-vis* values and consumerism. Because it is a transnational organization, Hillsong must communicate its brand through mass media. This necessitates mediating its worship leaders’ images in ways that allow those images, as vessels imbued with values, to be easily disseminated and recognized. The church has done this to great effect; in a secular context, the recognition that Zschech, Morgan, and other Hillsong musicians receive would qualify them as rock stars (Hartje-Döll 2013: 144). Yet they do not operate in an exclusively secular context, and for
evangelical Christians there is only one rock star: Jesus. Hillsong is thus faced with the challenge of promoting “non-celebrity” celebrities. It is stuck in the dilemma that colors the discourses of Christian music and, more broadly, Protestantism’s engagement with authority in modernity.

By positioning its music and musicians as “resources” for worship, Hillsong attempts to circumvent the suspicions that evangelical Christians hold of famous Christian artists by suggesting a use value that is antithetical to entertainment and economics, and thus the CCM industry. However, it would also be disingenuous for Hillsong’s worship leaders to deny that they are famous. They therefore speak openly and often about the dangers of success, always taking care to acknowledge the true “Famous One.” A typical example of this is seen in an interview with Darlene Zschech for AwsomeCityTV:

I think we’ve got to be really careful, because worship is marketable. God will take his hand off once you turn it into just a product or something to do with dollars. I’m not on the “Darlene trail” at all, *but people can easily turn it over*. So you’ve got to be real careful on why you’re doing it – your agenda. Making sure it’s for the right reasons. Not just for your opportunity to get your songs heard or whatever… but more for that communion with God, to point people towards Christ [my emphasis].

By proactively acknowledging that they are famous, Zschech and Hillsong’s other worship leaders attempt to shape the conversation, an important brand management strategy (Cooke 2008: 88-125; see Holt 2004: 39-62, 155-188). Like all brands, the Hillsong brand is a story,

11 *Darlene Zschech the Heart of Worship Part 1.*

so it is important that the church is the one telling it. Yet stories need listeners, who will always “hear” them in socio-historically situated, idiosyncratic ways through and as part of their personal identity projects. Far from being a detriment, though, this fluidity may be branding’s most advantageous communicative trait.

Worshiping the Worshipper

Celebrities (and brands) represent states of being that might be aspired to, or conversely, avoided – ways of, as Pete Ward puts it, “being human” (2011: 96; see also Basil 1996, Till and Shimp 1998, Thomson 2006). Part of Zschech’s appeal is just this: she presents an image of evangelical Christian femininity that is emulated by many of the church’s participants (Riches 2010: 162-163). Ruben Morgan also presents an appealing image of Christian values, which are mapped onto his music. For example, in a July 6, 2013 response to an interview with Morgan on the Christian blog bradlomenick.com, a reader commented that:

I have always for years been drawn to the heart of the spirit of Hillsong worship music but especially the songs written by Reuben Morgan. Any time I have ever seen or heard an interview with Reuben it reminds me of why this is, in that he comes across as such a humble person and just a genuinely nice guy (Lomenick 2013).

Over the course of their careers, Zschech and Morgan have projected a consistent image that appeals to many Christians’ ideals of a values-oriented lifestyle. However, in the context of the Christian celebrity, this appeal also presents a problem: by being “model” Christians, they may inadvertently contribute to their own idolisation. Hillsong’s brand is partly communicated through the “Godly” lifestyle of its worship leaders. But this, combined with an “anointing” of their talents, may lead others to “worship the worshipper” (Teoh 2005). As
Zschech points out, “One of the great dangers we face at Hillsong is the fact that we have become famous for our worship” (2001: 151).

Hillsong and its musicians are not alone. Indeed, while evangelical Christians often mistrust the intentions of famous pastors and worship leaders, many are equally (perhaps more) mistrustful of themselves, and are vigilant in their efforts to direct their admiration away from the platform and towards God. These Christians acknowledge that fame needs an audience, and thus the responsibility of remaining a disciple of Christ rather than of a celebrity ultimately lies with the worshipper. The following passage, taken from an article entitled “When Jesus Meets TMZ: Why Celebrity Culture is Taking Over Our Pulpits,” in the online Christian magazine Relevant, is a typical expression of this:

When Christians look to pastors for wisdom on how to better love God and love one another, they become better disciples of Jesus and better lights of hope in a dark world. [However], when Christians look to pastors to tell them how to dress, what to eat, what hobbies to have, what systematic theologies to prefer, how to vote and what personality to adopt, they become creepy, unthinking clones of broken people – and big red warning flags to a culture that has grown increasingly suspicious of authority figures (Evans 2012).

What is interesting here is the relationship the author draws between (lifestyle) consumerism and (spiritual) authority. Protestantism, with its history of lay leadership, has historically been defined by a tension between individualism and a call to submit to biblical authority (Nekola 2009). The author of the statement suggests that “Christian” culture’s shift toward a lifestyle focus risks imparting too much authority in “Christian celebrity,” a conflation of cultural and spiritual authority. Yet the author places the onus squarely on individual Christian prosumers:
Like the stars on the covers of tabloid magazines, Christians make celebrity pastors into little more than characters in a detached story played out for their entertainment, characters onto which people project their own hopes, dreams, insecurities, fears and frustrations (Evans 2012).

For the author, the “Christian celebrity” is nothing more than the prosumption of personal values, material in personal identity projects. Where, then, does the “authority” come from?

Anointing and the Prosumption of Brand Charisma

What I want to do in this final section is to use prosumption to frame Max Weber’s concept of charisma, thereby placing it and the Protestant dilemma squarely in the present socio-historical moment. Weber defined Charisma as: A “certain quality of an individual personality, by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader” (1964 needs page number). Weber held that charisma is less about authority than it is about leadership, and that furthermore a charismatic leader is legitimized by his or her followers (Adair-Tottef 2005: 192, 195). In other words, the follower both produces and consumes the “exceptional powers or qualities” that give the leader his or her charisma: charisma is prosumed. This fits with the evangelical Christian concept of the worship leader, whose job it is (as the name suggests) to musically “lead” congregation members into personal dialogues with God.

In evangelical Christian belief, something that is “anointed” is understood to have God’s blessing and is also imbued with the transformative power of the Holy Spirit. This is
both a powerful (Ingalls forth.) and controversial trope (Evans 2006: 100-106), one that is vital to the understanding of Hillsong’s music and brand by its musicians and other participants. For example Zschech, speaking on a Hillsong Conference panel, noted:

Our church [Hillsong]… [has] an anointing for a new song. We have tried other things, but we have an anointing for a new song. We still sing hymns, we sing them often…. We haven’t thrown out the old, but we understand the anointing on our house. Now that is going to be different from the anointing on your house. Once you understand the direction of your leadership [then] operate out of that in strength…. We have so many songwriters coming through, but that is the anointing of our house (Evans 2006: 100).

The spiritual associations that participants ascribe to the church are key to the experience of its music and brand (Wagner 2014a, 2014b). As part of the church, then, it follows that the musical talents of its songwriters are “God-given,” as expressed by Hillsong’s General Manager, George Aghajanian:

Our albums are more of a distillation of many, many songs that are submitted to us through our various songwriters, and those songs are really a reflection of those songwriters’ relationship with the church but also more importantly with God…. The songs really come back to the anointing that God puts on these guys. And out of that anointing, out of the leading of the Holy Spirit, the songs that they bring – which hopefully are fresh, they’re new –[will] help people encounter Christ during a worship service (interview with author, September 28, 2011).
Hillsong wants their songs to be understood as authentic expressions of its musicians’ personal relationships with God, and (because the songwriters are also congregation members) be also reflective of its congregational values. As it has moved toward more “ecumenical” global engagement (particularly with the Anglican Church), Hillsong has stopped referring to its music as “anointed,” at least in public communications (Riches 2010, 2012; Riches and Wagner 2012).\(^{12}\) However, the idea still pervades the church’s culture, and several participants I interviewed used the term to describe its music and musicians. The church, its values, its music, and its musicians are all integrated into the gestalt of the Hillsong brand, and Hillsong’s participants “hear” sacred meanings imbued in Hillsong’s brand through its worship leaders and their songs (Wagner 2014a, 2014b).

This is evident in an email exchange between Vicki, a long-time participant at Hillsong London, and myself, in which she attributes spiritual power to both Hillsong’s music and musicians:

Question: What did you think of the [*A Beautiful Exchange*] album?

V: The “Beautiful Exchange”\(^{13}\) song has a special meaning for me – it is something extraordinary…. It is the blend of music, scriptural truth and the lovely personality of the performers that makes the Spirit of Jesus alive. Having such songs is a powerful and an all-consuming experience for each and every personality that listens to it. I can imagine many unbelievers get to have a first encounter with our God, who I do not think has been

\(^{12}\) Part of this strategy has included courting churches that contest its values, such as the Australian Anglican and Charismatic churches mentioned earlier.

\(^{13}\) “A Beautiful Exchange” is the title track of the album by the same title. Although I asked about the album, Vicki responded by talking about the song.
worshiped in such a scale and with such sources on Earth so far…. (email exchange with author, 13 July 2011; emphasis added)

One way to read Vicki’s statement is through an evangelical Christian worldview that is deeply embedded in the meanings that accrue for Hillsong’s music, musicians, and brand. In particular, it is important to recognize the centrality of the transformative power of the Holy Spirit to the Pentecostal practice that is Hillsong’s lineage. Many Pentecostals believe that every Christian is imbued with the power of the Holy Spirit. This transforms him or her into a mouthpiece for God, a potential evangelizer through which the Spirit speaks to the world and a fusion of individual and spiritual authority. For Hillsong and its participants, its music and musicians are thus imbued, and therefore this anointing is an essential part of the branding process. In other words, Hillsong’s Brand Charisma is anointed, co-produced, and prosumed.

While one might expect participants who share Hillsong’s values to imbue its brand with Charismatic authority, it is the actions of those who do not share those values, such as the Anglican and Charismatic churches described earlier in this chapter, that confirm the hegemonic power of Hillsong’s branding. As we have seen, Hillsong’s musical branding is co-produced, a dialogue between actors in a transnational mediascape. While participants may hold different values and views of how to engage with “the world,” in this case articulated through consumer culture and Christian celebrity, they articulate those differences vis-à-vis shared media: Hillsong’s music and musicians. Although Hillsong takes great care in trying to protect the meaning of its music through public statements and translations, the disembedded nature of commodified media makes this impossible. Far from being a problem, though, this fluidity of meaning actually facilitates the “translation” – through orientation – of a highly personalized Christianity. Values that participants hold as parts of their personal identity projects are articulated in relation to Hillsong’s, and thus (re)embedded in the music.
in the moment of engagement. In other words, through prosumption, Hillsong’s values and those of others are co-produced and thus inextricable from each other. The “loss” of control of musical meaning is ultimately hegemonic because Hillsong’s brand values circumscribe and direct understanding.

Conclusion: Religious Branding, Prosumption, and Hegemony

This chapter has explored the “value of values” in the branding of a transnational evangelical Christian growth church. I have tried to move beyond theoretical models that draw clear distinctions between “producers” and “consumers” toward a prosumption model that focuses on the hegemonic co-productive processes that engender neoliberal subjectivities.

Recognizing that these processes play out differently in every local context, prosumption and branding help reformulate sociological understandings of the synergy between Protestantism, late-capitalism and neoliberalism by viewing individualism and authority not as dichotomous, but as a gestalt of on-going, co-productive processes in which agency and structure are mutually-constitutive, but also fluid and asymmetric.

Brands are hegemonic devices. Drawing from information already “in the world,” a brand anticipates certain kinds of meanings, and thus predetermines certain kinds of actions and attachments through a kind of framing (Arvidsson 2006: 74, Lury 2004). In other words, brands “provide part of the context in which products are used” (Arvidsson 2006: 8; see also Carah 2010). However, this does not mean that a brand imposes meanings on the user in a Taylorist sense. Instead, “brands work by enabling consumers, by empowering them in particular directions…. The brand does not say ‘You Must’, but rather ‘You May!’” (Arvidsson 2006: 8; original emphasis) – much like neoliberalism does. Here, Arvidsson’s use of “enable” is deeply ironic; he is pointing to the hegemonic influence of branding that can be seen in Hillsong participants’ (both “insiders” and “outsiders”) uses of the church’s
music and musicians as materials and orienting frames for meaning-making and self-making activities.

Hillsong’s music and musicians’ celebritized images accrue different meanings in different contexts. For Hillsong’s faithful, its music and musicians are inextricable from – and indeed expressions of – the church’s anointing, theology, and congregational values. For other Christians (such as those who attend some Anglican and Charismatic churches), though, Hillsong’s music is accepted in worship even while its theology is rejected. One could say that, in both cases, personal values are “branded” because they are understood in relation to the Hillsong’s values whether participants “like it or not.” By affording participants a “pragmatic discursivity,” through which they orient their personal values and lifestyles to what they see as “Christian,” both synergetic and opposed values ultimately co-produce and re-inscribe that to which they are oriented. In other words, Hillsong’s branded music and musicians allow the church’s values to be in, if not of, multiple, even contesting, evangelical Christian world views. This is the essence of hegemony in late-capitalism and neoliberalism. Thus prosumption and branding offer scholars powerful ways to understand growth churches in the present socio-historical moment, which includes the crises of late-capitalism, neoliberalism, and evangelical values.
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