

I.B. TAURIS

ALEKSANDAR PAVKOVIĆ AND
CHRISTOPHER KELEN

ANTHEMS AND THE MAKING OF NATION-STATES

**Identity and Nationalism
in the Balkans**



Aleksandar Pavković is Associate Professor in Politics at Macquarie University, Sydney. He is the author of *Creating New States: Theory and Practice of Secession* (with Peter Radan, 2007), *The Fragmentation of Yugoslavia: Nationalism and War in the Balkans* (2000) and *Slobodan Jovanovic: An Unsentimental Approach to Politics* (1993). He is the editor (with Peter Radan) of the *Ashgate Research Companion to Secession* (2011). He has also published widely in peer-reviewed journals and has edited several collections.

Christopher (Kit) Kelen is an Australian poet, scholar and visual artist, and Professor of English at the University of Macau, where he has taught Creative Writing and Literature. His poetry has been published in Chinese, Portuguese, French, Italian, Swedish, Indonesian and Filipino languages. The most recent of his many poetry books is *Scavenger's Season* (2014). He has published three scholarly volumes about poetry: *Poetry, Consciousness and Community* (2009), *City of Poets: Exploring Macao Poetry Today* (2009) and *Anthem Quality* (2014). He is Literary Editor for *Postcolonial Text*.

ANTHEMS AND THE MAKING OF NATION STATES

Identity and Nationalism in the Balkans

ALEKSANDAR PAVKOVIĆ

and

CHRISTOPHER KELEN

I.B. TAURIS

LONDON · NEW YORK

Published in 2016 by
I.B.Tauris & Co. Ltd
London • New York
www.ibtauris.com

Copyright © 2016 Aleksandar Pavković and Christopher Kelen

The right of Aleksandar Pavković and Christopher Kelen to be identified as the authors of this work has been asserted by the authors in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. Except for brief quotations in a review, this book, or any part thereof, may not be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

References to websites were correct at the time of writing.

International Library of Twentieth Century History 82

ISBN: 978 1 78453 126 3

eISBN: 978 0 85772 642 1

A full CIP record for this book is available from the British Library

A full CIP record is available from the Library of Congress

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: available

Typeset in Garamond Three by OKS Prepress Services, Chennai, India

Printed and bound by CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	vi
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	viii
<i>Guide to Pronunciation</i>	ix
National Anthems, National Identity and Nation States:	
An Introduction	
Part I. National Anthems: Their Themes and Origins	1
Part II. Creating Nation States and National Anthems in Southeast Europe	33
1. 'Live, Live the Spirit of the Slavs' (1834): 'Hey Slavs' from 1942 to 2006	51
2. Loving One's Homeland: Croatia 1835	66
3. A Toast to a Cosmopolitan Nation: Slovenia 1844	88
4. Praying for One's People: Serbia 1872	111
5. A Love of Mountains and Mothers: Montenegro 1863(?)	131
6. A Fight for Rights: Macedonia 1941	155
7. To Sing or not to Sing? Anthems and Anti-anthems: Bosnia and Herzegovina 1995/99	175
8. Wishing to be One with Europe: Kosovo 2008	202
Epilogue: What do these Anthems Tell Us?	210
<i>Notes</i>	221
<i>Bibliography</i>	236
<i>Index</i>	245

PREFACE

This is a book about the lyrics of national anthems. It is specifically about the anthems of the new states in southeast Europe that have arisen from the disintegration of Yugoslavia. The book attempts to analyse the use of the poetic texts sung by national subjects to express their devotion to the (new) state in which they enjoy citizenship. A focus of attention is in the use (for better or worse) of poetic texts for an ideological purpose. We are interested in the use of poetry in shaping devotion to a nation state (or its proxy). We are also interested in the ways in which political movements (ideologies and parties) deploy poetic devices and imagery to evoke and maintain both the national identity and the sense of self of citizen-subjects. The key ideology in question is nationalism and it is essential to note that the resurgence of nationalist ideology in the Balkans over the past three decades has been a key world-development for the study of nations and nationalism.

The idea of this book originated in Christopher (Kit) Kelen's interest in 'anthem quality' – that is to say, the soul-stirring effect that certain combinations of music and lyrics achieve, most typically in the service of national affiliation. This is the subject of Kelen's general study *Anthem Quality* (Kelen 2014) and a number of earlier papers, going back to the 1990s. Aleksandar Pavković's interest lies in the history of national ideologies of the Balkans and their impact on the recent creation of the new states in this area (Pavković 1997/2000, Pavković 1998). As the introduction of new national anthems preceded or followed the creation of new states in the region, our interests proved to be mutually supportive and resulted in a research project of which this book is the

final outcome. To spell out the terms of the synergy more clearly: the Balkans seemed to be an ideal place to study the creation (and recreation) of anthem quality in the world today while the anthem seemed to be the ideal place to make a comparative study of nationalist sentiment in a place where it was being revived and renewed.

Importantly, this interdisciplinary book brings together culture and politics as a single object of scrutiny. Nations, as 'imagined communities', require belief on the part of both their citizens and their neighbours. Nations need images, symbols and narratives in order to create this belief. Anthems are a key symbolic means by which the life of nations is asserted, maintained and sometimes challenged. Of course context of culture is a key to understanding what and how any text means, and so a large part of this book is about the history of the songs and poems from which the anthems concerned originate. It is also about competitor-texts and about the political context within which the anthems were introduced and sometimes re-introduced.

The research project started while both authors were working at the University of Macau, in China, and when Aleksandar left Macau for Sydney in 2010, we continued writing the book together, letting technology (and modern transport) overcome the tyranny of distance. So this then is a book about the national songs of a corner of Europe by authors who live respectively in Asia and in Australia.

Doubtless, the book would have been enriched by a study of the music accompanying the lyrics with which we deal. Certainly we touch on music and its composition along the way. Music has also much to tell us about the general and particular nature of national devotions. As is also the case with anthem lyrics, there are relatively few scholarly studies of anthem music. Among those few, Karen A. Cerulo's (1989, 1995) studies are certainly outstanding. This is a fertile interdisciplinary field for further study of anthems and their role in evoking and maintaining national devotion.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people assisted us in the writing of this book. We would like to thank: Carol Archer, Natalie Chin, Dejan Djokić, Miša Djurković, Merima Dizdarević, Ivan Dodovski, Matthew Gibson, Goran Gretić, John Hines, Dejan Jović, Csaba G. Kiss, Denisa Kostoviceva, Paisley Livingstone, Alexander Maxwell, Christine Meng, Milivoje Pavlović, Slađana Pavković, Ruth Jordana Pison, Sarah Plant, Andrew Sewell, Boško Stankovski, Glenn Timmermans, Andrija Tomašek, Žarko Trajanovski, Annemari Ulamec, Mitja Velikonja, Ivo Žanić. Apart from those whose names we know, we would also like to thank the reviewers – who had to remain anonymous – of our essays on the Yugoslav anthem ‘Hey Slavs’ and the Serbian anthem ‘God of Justice’ (*Nations and Nationalism*, 2010), on the Croatian anthem ‘Our Beautiful Homeland’ (*Nations and Nationalism*, 2012), and on the Slovenian anthem ‘The Toast’ (*Nationalities Papers*, 2014).

Apart from people, a few academic institutions assisted in our research as well. The University of Macau provided research grants, which enabled the authors to travel to the Balkans and to engage research assistants, students of the University of Macau, who proved to be outstanding in their job. Macquarie University in Sydney provided travel funds for Aleksandar and the funds for the copyediting of the manuscript. Clare Hall, Cambridge and the Centre for the study of the Balkans at Goldsmiths, the University of London, provided an encouraging scholarly environment for Aleksandar to undertake the final revision of the manuscript.

GUIDE TO PRONUNCIATION

Č, č and Ć and ć are pronounced as 'ch' in *cheque* or *chew*

Dž, dž and Dj and dj (the latter two are alternatively written as Đ, đ) are pronounced as 'dz' *jazz* or *joy*.

Lj, lj are pronounced as 'lj' in *million*.

Nj, nj is pronounced as nj in *onion*.

Š, š is pronounced as 'sh' in *she*.

Ž, ž is pronounced as 'zh' in *leisure* or *treasure*.

Q, q in Albanian (as in 'Mengjiqi') is pronounced as soft 'ch' in *mature*.

Gj, gj in Albanian (as in 'Mengjiqi') is pronounced as soft 'dz' in *join*.

NATIONAL ANTHEMS, NATIONAL IDENTITY AND NATION STATES: AN INTRODUCTION

PART I NATIONAL ANTHEMS: THEIR THEMES AND ORIGINS

What is so interesting about national anthems?

National anthems are songs that people sing gladly and repeatedly throughout their lives. In fact, such songs are sung even by people who are, in general, not inclined to sing songs at all. Those who would not vocalise in other circumstances, sing 'their' anthem willingly, without much effort and, usually, without much thought. The national anthem may well be the most popular of songs in the country in which it holds anthem status: it is sung by all generations, from children at pre-schools to residents of aged care homes. Anthems are sung with the least effort because they are the best remembered songs. They are popular and effortlessly repetitive: an anthem is the same unchanging song that one gladly sings from childhood to old age. Anthems lack novelty for those who sing them in unison, as 'their own' anthems, and, in the more politically stable states, they are the most permanent fixtures in the musical and poetic lives of the citizenry.

From such unchanging songs, one does not expect entertainment. The state sanction of an anthem need not be accompanied by any intention to bring the pleasure with which music is more generally associated. The

extraordinary worldwide popularity of this particular type of song sits strangely in its repetitiveness and lack of entertainment value.

Anthems, as popular songs, are unparalleled in their popularity and longevity, in their appeal to a wide generational range and in the repetitiveness of the sentiments they express.

Beyond this, anthems are, unlike most popular songs, political: they have a variety of roles to play within the life of a state. In the next section we shall look in some detail those roles. Some occasions – such as the official reception of foreign officials – do not require a population to sing, they do not even require singing at all. There are many other official rituals where anthems are played and not sung. In short, national anthems are political songs that are also performed during state or official rituals. Although national anthems are sung at many non-state occasions – situations not organised by a state bureaucracy – some of those are rituals or form part of a ritual. In that sense, national anthems appear to be primarily political songs that are used, in various ways, in state-organised or state-oriented occasions as well as other rituals. Their use in rituals and their consequent solemnity link them to the songs from which they originate generically and which they most resemble – to the hymns and anthems sung in Christian churches.

It is the political and ritual aspect of anthems that distinguishes them as a genre and invites further study. What is it that allows a successful anthem to perform its ritual and political role in the service of a state?

Why are national anthems performed?

The simple and obvious answer is found in the occasions when they are played or sung: anthems are performed at official state rituals, in schools, at international and national sporting events, and at political or cultural gatherings requiring the display of solidarity and/or mobilisation for a particular cause.

There are three key state rituals that involve the performance of anthems.

1. The most conspicuous state ritual requiring anthem performance is that of reception of foreign state dignitaries, that is official visitors of high rank. These visitors are customarily greeted by the national anthem of their state followed by the national anthem of the host

state. There is also a display of both national flags and commonly an honour guard, usually with its own flag, displaying arms. The anthems and flags signal and assert the sovereignty of the states to which they belong. These visible and audible symbols of state sovereignty are there to identify the states, to assert their sovereignty and in the case of the honour guard to signal protection and hospitality. In short, the anthem of the host state says: this is who we are and you are now under the sovereignty of the state that is welcoming you. The host's anthem, flag and guard of honour invite the visiting dignitary to show respect, to stand to attention and thereby acknowledge the sovereignty of the nation and the state offering welcome and hospitality. It is worth noting that this ritual requires only a musical performance of the anthem. One may find some officials singing along with the music but this is not required.

2. National anthems are sung or played at the inauguration of heads of states – be those elected presidents or unelected monarchs. The role of the anthem here is similar to that of the reception of foreign officials: it recognises or asserts the sovereignty of the state and its highest official. However, unlike the reception of foreign officials, the singing of the anthem on these occasions is also a display of solidarity with the nation. The anthem displays the link between the ruler and the ruled.
3. Anthem singing is often but not always a part of the opening or inaugural session of state parliaments or assemblies. As was the case in the ritual of reception described above, in the ritual of the opening, the function of the anthem is to assert the sovereignty of the people represented and their representatives: the singing in unison expresses the representative legitimacy of the singers. In addition, performance of the anthem displays the loyalty of the representatives and their solidarity with the nation they represent. This demonstrated loyalty conveys legitimacy and sovereignty, and the performance reassures both the singers and the listeners that the represented and the representatives are one and the same nation-singing-in-unison their common song. The singing of the anthem symbolically brings together or unifies the nation. As we shall see in the case of anthems without lyrics the inability of individuals to sing is often deplored as a sign of a lack of unity and solidarity (see Chapter 7).

In addition, the state funerals or funerals of 'national celebrities' also, at times, require the singing of the official anthem. This singing is a display of unity of the deceased with the people who mourn as well as demonstrating the solidarity of the mourners. In this symbolic act of unity, the mourners show respect and also reassure themselves – and notionally the deceased – of the deceased's significance.

Every independent state, that is member of the UN (and likewise those who aspire to such status), needs to have an anthem for the purpose of first two state rituals adumbrated above. These signal the sovereignty of the state or, in case of non-states, an aspiration to sovereignty. For non-states, singing of official anthem-like songs at state rituals signals aspiration: listen to us and see that we are like the internationally recognised states, we have the symbols of sovereignty too.

Apart from the assertion of sovereignty or the aspiration to an assertion of sovereignty, another universal function of anthem is *education*: anthems are used to educate children about who they are. Anthems are played in schools – both private and government – from an early age. Teaching children how to sing an anthem is a means by which they are solemnly and officially brought into their nation. The children are not only taught the words and melodies, but also how to assume the appropriate posture and attitude for unison with their fellow citizens. They are taught the text, melody and body language plus the set of emotions that go with anthem singing. They are taught how to behave as members of their own named nation-singing-in-unison. The singing of an anthem also has a socialising role: those who sing are made members of the nation. These processes are all rolled into one. In singing the anthem an individual asserts membership in a manner appropriate for a citizen while at the same time speaking to oneself and to others listening (who may be citizens singing or others) the words which indicate citizenship.

In some instances, children and/or their parents may resist or try to subvert this process of national identity socialisation because they do not feel they belong to that nation-singing-in-unison – perhaps because they belong to some other, not recognised, nation or 'national minority' – or because they do not identify with the regime that imposes the official anthem. When this happens individuals often teach other 'national' songs at home and through this are able to signal their belonging to a different nation.

Whether it is the singing of national songs, official or unofficial, school-approved or home-based, the outcome of either circumstance is the child's socialisation into a particular nation.

Although the assertion of sovereignty through the singing of anthems is linked to children's socialisation into a nation, a national anthem can also easily assert the sovereignty of a state without such socialisation. Anthems played or even sung at state rituals need not be widely shared among the population. For example, a regime that has just come into power may not yet have been able to impose a new anthem on the population. This was the case in Costa Rica, which had no anthem, and authorities had to produce one *ex nihilo* in order to greet US and UK dignitaries.¹ This arbitrary property of anthems thus shows that some of the state ritual roles of an anthem can be performed regardless of whether the citizens are inclined to sing it or even accept it as their own. As long as there is an official state anthem to be performed when required it does not matter whether the state's citizens participate or even accept that anthem.

Some ritual performances of national anthems are, however, more dependent on the socialisation of its singers-citizens. One of these ritual performances of anthems takes place at sporting events: anthems are played and sung by both spectators and team participants at the start of international competitive team sports events. Anthems are also performed in the same way at the start of competitive team games that are not international, where the teams are purported to belong to the same state or national group. Further, anthems are played and sung at the ceremonies of prize giving at international sports events that do not necessarily involve team competition. The primary function here is not to assert sovereignty as was the case in the state rituals: these rituals are not state-oriented or organised. The primary function of the anthem at the beginning of national or international competitive team sporting events is to display the solidarity of the nation and its representative audience with the team. In addition, anthem singing appears to provide inspiration and motivation for the team.

In the case of international sporting competitions, the playing of the national anthem of the guest team demonstrates respect for the other non-national team as an equal competitor. It recognises the competitor as a national representative on par with the host national team. It also provides an opportunity for the supporters of the guest team in the

audience to show solidarity with their team and to provide the team with inspiration and motivation.

The singing of anthems at sporting events requires the spectators to have learned the song, and to know the words. Although this learning need not have been carried out in schools, audiences at such events will have had to undergo an anthem socialisation process, usually prior to adulthood. They had to learn the anthem and accept it as their own before they were adults.

In addition to national anthems, other songs are used for purposes of providing incentive, inspiration and motivation at sporting events. Indeed many non-anthem team or fan songs may be able to motivate teams even more than national anthems. In terms of providing incentive, inspiration, support or motivation for sporting teams, national anthems in fact face formidable competition – and may even be inferior to other songs crafted or intended for that specific job. Although the study of such songs is beyond the scope of this book it is worth mentioning that such songs are often considered, by analogy to be ‘anthems’. Their function is to express a kind of solidarity akin to that which national anthems inspire. Christopher Kelen’s *Anthem Quality* (Kelen 2014) explores the nature of that kind of identification and solidarity as expressed in songs most typically oriented towards national devotion.

National anthems face similar competition in the political arena. Anthems are sung by participants at a variety of political gatherings. They may be sung in support of, or against a particular ruling regime or even a variety of policies or political and social causes. Despite intense legislative effort, no regime or political movement or cause has ever achieved a monopoly on the use of a national anthem.

In terms of politics, the primary function of anthem singing is the display of solidarity in pursuit of the given cause: we are in it together and we signal that by singing an anthem which binds us together. As was the case with sporting events, the singing is also motivational: the singing of the anthem provides an incentive, motivation or inspiration for the pursuit of the political cause. Likewise, anthems are not the only songs that can perform these functions and political movements often make use of various other songs that aim to support their cause in a more direct way. In terms of evoking or bringing about feelings of political solidarity anthems appear to be well suited. Songs

which survive in this function over long periods of time, and which survive regime changes, are exemplary for the genre.

Wartime – whether on the battlefield itself or at the home front – provides further occasions for anthem singing. Solidarity, loyalty and motivation are the desired outcomes for anthem singing in wartime. The ‘marching’ anthems – in particular the primary model of the French ‘Marseillaise’ or in its original title ‘The War Song of the Army of Rhine’ – are crafted with the intention of getting singers and listeners to fight. In the French revolutionary wars the French military commanders found this particular function of anthems to be of singular tactical value in securing victory. As General Dumorouiez noted in his order of 4 March 1793: ‘If the enemy crosses the Meuse close ranks . . . fix bayonets, strike up the Maserollois [sic] and you will win’ (Eyck 1995: 43).² Two national anthems of the South Slavs, discussed later in this book, had a similar fighting function, although, one of them ‘Hey Slavs’ was not originally written as a war song (see Chapters 1 and 6). Not all anthems are created as marching or fighting songs and yet they may be used to inspire and display solidarity in wartime.

The inspirational role of anthem singing is difficult to disentangle from its role in the display of solidarity by the singers. As mentioned above, there are at least four distinct functions or tasks that anthem singing/playing can perform. The playing and/or singing of a national anthem can be used to:

1. Assert, announce or recognise the sovereignty of a state (reception of foreign officials, other state rituals);
2. Educate and socialise citizens or members of a nation so as to make them into a nation-singing-in-unison, into a self-conscious national collectivity of anthem-singers (pre-school and school, adult education);
3. Display and evoke the sentiments of group or national solidarity (at sporting competitions, political gatherings);
4. Inspire and motivate individuals belonging to a group, movement or organisation to participate enthusiastically in any group action or activity (sporting competition, political gatherings and during wartime).

As we have suggested above, an anthem can perform role (1) without performing roles (2), (3) or (4): an anthem may be used for the

announcement of state sovereignty even if it has not been used to educate children/citizens, to evoke sentiments of group solidarity or even to inspire individuals to act. However, an anthem is not likely to perform roles (3) and (4) unless it has already been used in role (2) to educate and socialise citizens. Using a song to display the solidarity of singers or to motivate them to act in a particular way requires a degree of previous socialisation, habituation in the singing of the song and at least a display of collective solidarity. Thus, while role (1) may be independent from the other roles an anthem may perform, roles (3) and (4) do not seem to be independent of role (2).

Very few, if any, other songs perform so varied a set of roles or tasks. However, anthems also differ from other songs in yet another important aspect: rather than entertaining, their performance brings solemnity to an occasion, a solemnity that few other songs can achieve. Indeed, they are solemnity-producing songs primarily (but not only) because of the social and ritual functions outlined above. Anthems signal that an occasion is of national significance and is thus serious and not frivolous. Any occasion that is significant to a nation – to its mutual solidarity, to its state or, in wartime, to its survival – is a serious and solemn affair. In addition, the lyrics of the anthems are usually not light-hearted although they may express the themes of love and devotion. There are some exceptions of course: one of which is the current anthem of Slovenia (see Chapter 2). Serving as they do as conduits for emotional expression, national anthems thus express serious affect evoking solemnity.

So how do the anthems then perform these distinct social functions/roles? The core instrument of anthem functionality is their perceived expression of national identity: a national anthem serves as signature-tune. It tells us who the singers are as a nation. It tells the listener which nation is singing. For example, remember the case of the foreign dignitary welcome ritual. By playing their anthem the host nation is signalling to the guest and to everyone else:

This is who we are, this is our signature tune known to everyone, and we are identifying ourselves while at the same time welcoming you. And who are you? You are a representative of another nation whose signature tune was played first, before ours, and thus you too are identified by your signature tune.

The signature tune not only signals who is doing the singing or playing, it also brings together the singers, unites them in singing and differentiates them from similar – nominally equal groups – who are also entitled to sing similar identity-expressing songs.

The identity expressed in anthem texts is, as we shall see, established or identified in different ways but mainly through the means of appropriation of landscapes, rulers, myths and other stories of national significance, evoked in a shorthand lyrical form. The identity expressed in anthems is also directly tied to the state sovereignty through legislation or established tradition – once again by means of appropriation.

The anthem singers: Who are they?

Anthems are supposed to represent states and nations both to their own members and to those individuals who are not members but need to know and, more importantly, to recognise the nation. How do anthems perform this representational task? In representing a nation to its own members and to others, anthems need to tell us something about the nation, particularly about the singers-singing-in-unison. Anthems may tell us how good a nation is, how brave and persistent it is, how it has an admirable homeland, and how devoted and loving it is to the homeland, its flag, its symbols and its people. An anthem may also indicate that the nation is praying for the safety of its ruler and even itself and that it will fight for its freedom against anyone who is a threat. Although not all anthems have all of these elements, they do need to squeeze into just a few stanzas a potentially vast amount of important information, while also being emotionally stirring to both the singers and their audience.

And yet, on many occasions, however stirring they may be, anthems are not very informative. Indeed, the information they provide may even fail to single out the singing nation from others providing similar information.

The range of qualities and topics of national anthems is quite limited, and therefore potentially repetitive; the same descriptions occur in one anthem after another. Most anthems, particularly those that do not name specific pieces of landscape or items (such as flags), use a limited vocabulary of description and praise. This suggests that the qualities of the nations and their homelands, lauded in the anthems, do not differ

much from nation to nation. This paradox of 'the uniformity of differences' is also discussed in Kelen's *Anthem Quality* (Kelen 2014). As anthems tend to be written in languages unique to those singing (except, of course, for the anglophone states, all former British colonies plus Britain) the vocabulary used may actually differ in its associative and emotional connotations. However, despite these interpretive differences, the specific identity of each nation is not primarily brought out by the lyrics and the limited vocabulary. The information about the individual nation that each anthem conveys is not sufficient to differentiate one nation from another when considered outside the context of singing or playing the anthem. Of course, this is not particularly surprising when we consider that the purpose of the anthem is not to convey information to those who are not its assigned or appropriating singers. One of the primary aims of anthem-singing is to offer assurance or re-assurance to the singers that they belong the same nation and to inspire them to feel good about themselves and about each other. It is this sentiment of assurance of the group's goodness that binds the singers to each other and to their nation. In this context, it is sufficient to identify the singers as members of the same nation. The singing of the anthem then brings about the sentiment in the singers and the audience that is sufficient to differentiate themselves from others who sing other anthems.

We have already discussed the educative function of anthem singing and the need to educate citizens in the rituals and mysteries of national devotion that surround the anthem as a key symbol of the nation. However, even lifelong knowledge and practice is not always sufficient to produce the self-identifying sentiment in the singers mentioned above. Indeed, many people may just sing their anthem because it is socially expected of them. They may not necessarily feel that the song binds them to others, or even that it has the potential to make them feel good about themselves. They may sing it by rote because it is expected that, as citizens, they will sing their own national anthem.

And yet even if someone sings their national in a routine way, without the sentiment of togetherness or assurance of goodness, they may sing another song with more of the 'anthem-like' sentiment, outlined above. While some singers might be quite detached from the emotions that anthems are supposed to evoke, singing other non-official and non-anthem songs may indeed evoke anthem-like sentiments. For the study

of attitudinal and political effects of national anthems, situations in which anthems change as a result of violent or even non-violent political changes, are of particular interest. When anthems change, it is expected that singers' attitudes to the new and old anthems will change too. In studying this change one could probably find out more about the attitudes that singers have towards anthems and anthem-singing.

The Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY) started to dissolve around 1989 through a process of secession of its federal units. At the beginning of the process of dissolution several of the federal units – future independent states – enacted legislation establishing their national anthems. These anthems thus gained primacy over the federal state anthem. Secession from the federal state involved the legislative separation of the new state's anthem from any previous anthem and the self-proclaimed successor state, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, consisting of Serbia and Montenegro, retained the SFRY anthem. This is a clear example of anthem change as outlined above, which, as we shall, was in some cases (but not all) preceded by violent conflict. We shall examine some of the aspects of this process in chapters that follow later.

These newly introduced anthems, which were in some cases not new national songs at all, led many of the citizens of former Yugoslavia to re-examine and alter their attitude towards both the anthem of the dissolving state and the anthem introduced to replace it. These changes in attitude – some forced and some not – open the door to an interesting and fruitful study of social psychology of national anthems and their performance. Changes in state anthems or national songs do not happen frequently in Europe. The anthem change in the former Yugoslavia thus presents a rare opportunity for this kind of study, particularly in its scale; the introduction of seven anthems to replace one.

Was the disappearance of the old anthem a relief for some citizens? If so, for whom was it a relief? For whom it was not? Why was it a relief for some and not for others? What did those for whom it was not a relief feel and think? What segments of the population accepted the new anthems most easily and why? How do they describe the sentiments that the new anthems produced? How do they compare these sentiments with those experienced when singing or listening to the previous anthem? These are fascinating questions that can be only addressed through a survey-based public opinion type of study.

The present book does not address these questions. Ours is not a study in social psychology of anthems and their singing. We do not know of any such study conducted in the former Yugoslavia or elsewhere. Instead, this book offers a textual analysis of anthems. We analyse the lyrics of the new anthems in the former Yugoslavia in the political and historical context in which they were written and introduced. In our textual and historiographical study of anthem lyrics we aim to address the following two questions:

- What do the lyrics tell us about the nation-singing-in-unison – who the singers/audience are as well as to what they aspire?
- What was political role and the political message(s) of these songs, in particular, once they were proclaimed state anthems.

In exploring these two questions we discuss how poetic images of nations' identity are used in the processes and discourses of nation-building and state-creation. The state anthems carry a peculiar type of political authority: these are the songs selected by the citizens' representatives to render in poetic images all their constituents, all the citizens, both to others and themselves. Anthems open a window into the world of national self-presentation and self-understanding. They can be used to identify how citizens and political leaders like to think of themselves and how they would like to present themselves to others, outside their group. Anthem lyrics thus may well offer a compact and poignant expression of attempts at collective representation on a national scale.

What is national about national anthems?

Mutual belonging – of a nation to its anthem and the anthem to its nation – is a relation framed by the modern national ideology which, as a general political doctrine, known as 'nationalism'. Nationalism is grounded in the idea that human populations are segmented into clusters called 'nations'. These segmented clusters are said to possess bounded territorial habitation (homelands), a common past (even a common descent), common cultural practices, often a common language and a common set of symbols. In possessing these attributes, these clusters have a common political organisation and, according to this

kind of political doctrine, also deserve to have a sovereign territorial political organisation, known as the state (Breully 1982: 340–4). Modern political ideologies separate clusters of population in terms of the series of salient characteristics, which are intended to separate them from other similar clusters, and then claim that these salient characteristics and the separateness of the cluster from others entitles the cluster to sovereignty over its assigned territory. Sovereignty is thus conceived as the final seal of separateness and uniqueness, the seal that gives the right to that cluster of population to use lethal force against those who may potentially threaten its separateness. Apart from its symbolic significance, the resort to violence is definitive: the sovereign state was famously defined by Max Weber as entitled to the monopoly of the use of force over its bounded territory (Weber 1978: 53).

National anthems at present can perform the various social functions we noted above only within the framework of a national ideology of this kind or a general political doctrine of nationalism. Only in the realm of segmented populations, separated one from another in physical and cultural space and historical time, can anthems make sense both as a significant and constituent element of the unique cultural space of each nation and as an instrument of appeal and mobilisation aimed only at that bounded population cluster.

Prior to the advent of modern national ideologies – roughly prior to the French revolution – popular songs that aimed at political mobilisation did not appeal to specific culturally and territorially segmented groups, now known as nations. One can see this best in the example of early songs that later became state anthems: for example the Dutch ‘William of Nassau’ (1582) and the British ‘God Save the King’ (1745). These songs, at the time of their creating, did not address territorially and culturally separate clusters, that is modern nations as they are currently perceived. The focus of the singers’ self-identification in the songs was loyalty to a single person, the monarch. This focus is almost completely absent from later national songs dating to the nineteenth century, which was the golden era of national songs and European nationalism in general. The national indeterminacy of the object of loyalty, that is, the King or Queen, in the British anthem makes it a song that could be appropriated by any other nation. Its widespread imitation throughout the nineteenth century shows how this indeterminacy aids its dissemination among allegedly unique and separate nations.

National anthems, within the framework of nationalism, not only address these segmented clusters, but also become important defining cultural markers of the nation. National ideologies dictate that modern nations are separated by culturally unique markers and national songs are a useful and often powerful cultural marker of this kind. Each population cluster whose members are aware of themselves as forming a nation should have a national song, in addition to a national flag and other national symbols such as a coat of arms. If the nation in question has no state-like or proto-state institutions (that is its own legislature, local government officials or educational curricula), this national song is sung often in defiance – asserting the separate nationhood and its currently unfulfilled political entitlements. The national song, or rather the singing of the national song, thus signals the existence of the political aspirations expected of a nation. Where a nation has achieved its own proto-state institutions, its national song is often recruited for performance in institutional rituals, thus signalling the national ownership of these institutions.

In proto-states (regional or federal units) or states in which there are several recognised nations, the state anthem can become a contested song – primarily because it is most commonly a cultural marker of a single and separate nation. Each self-aware nation, whether a state-owner or stateless, is supposed to have a national song that no other nation can own. One way to avoid the contestation (and the resulting potential refusal of a nation to sing) is to remove the lyrics from official state anthems.

States that have adopted a strategy of evasion by adopting a music-only anthem, include: Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Kosovo and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (1992–2003), as well as the Kingdom of Spain. The European Union, as an organisation of European states rather than a single nation and an entity committed to an ever-closer unity of its peoples (nations), has also selected a lyrics-free ‘official’ song in Beethoven’s ‘Ode to Joy’. The relative national indeterminacy of anthem music can also be seen in the number of national anthems that use or have used the same or similar melodies. The music of an anthem, unlike its language, does not always give away the identity of the nation singing or even which nation has ownership. As per the paradox of the uniformity of differences, the music of an anthem does not appear to carry on its own the weight of cultural or national ownership, or at least

not obviously; it is the anthem lyrics that function as primary national or cultural markers.

The lyrics of anthems mark the nation-singing-in-unison as distinct from other such anthem- or national song-capable nations. In separating one nation from another, the anthem identifies those it addresses as of a nation-in-particular, one that is putatively unique. In this way nations may be considered to resemble individuals and just as each person is considered to have a unique identity so too is it possible for every individual to experience a breakdown or crisis in their own identity. Some nationalism theorists or adherents of national ideologies allow a degree of change of national identity, but argue that a complete change probably requires assimilation into another nation, or dispersal or elimination of the members of the nation. However, both of those options are unacceptable from a nationalist viewpoint: according to modern national ideology no member of a nation willingly assimilates or allows themselves to be 'dispersed' among others.

Of course, some nations do change their principal national songs or anthems without changing their identity – that is without becoming another nation or assimilating into another. Such change is sometimes a result of a national trauma that is then used both to explain and justify the change: for example, a nation is liberated from its oppressor or from an oppressive (but still national) regime. Sometimes the change is not a result of any trauma but instead comes from a desire to change the image that the nation projects to itself and to outsiders. This appears to be the situation with the change of Slovenian anthems in 1989, discussed in Chapter 3.

Why then do national anthems change and what impact does such a change have on the national identity of the singers? This is one of the principal questions we will address in the context of the dissolution of SFRY and the creation of new states in its former territory.

What is national identity: A few theoretical suggestions

The subject of national identity has been approached from various disciplinary points of view. Each discipline, whether it be social psychology, sociology or political science, emphasises a different aspect of national identity. We have decided to start with a rather wide definition of national identity offered by Anthony D. Smith. According to him, the 'fundamental features of national identity' are:

1. an historic territory, or homeland
 2. common myths and historical memories
 3. a common, mass public culture
 4. common legal rights and duties for all members
 5. a common economy with territorial mobility for members.
- (Smith 1991: 14)

These are all features that define the identity of 'a named human population'. This 'working definition' as Smith calls it is then used in his own general sociological explanation of how modern nations evolve or are created from an earlier type of 'human population', called 'ethnic community' or 'ethnie'. Each of the features listed above is linked to similar features of the 'ethnie'. In this type of explanation, the nation's self-awareness of itself, as a nation, is not a variable or factor to be explained, since ethnies already have a degree of self-awareness. Nonetheless, it is curious to note that, according to the above definition, for a nation to have an identity, it does not appear to be necessary for its members to be aware of each other as members of the same nation. Perhaps this aspect of self-awareness is subsumed under feature 3, 'a common, mass public culture'. If there is a common mass culture, then through participating in such a culture, members of a nation become aware of each other as participants or sharers of the same common culture. If anthems are part of the common mass culture, then through joint singing as well as learning of an anthem, members of a nation become aware of their common nationality.

Music and song have been found to be important instruments in the dissemination, particularly in culturally and linguistically diverse populations, of a sense of belonging as well as the concept of a common nation.³ However, participation in a common culture on its own is not enough to foster the sentiment of belonging. For example, although there is participation in the culture of current global or transnational pop music this does not promote any such sentiment or conception. On the contrary, while participants – the listeners and those who sing the 'global' pop hits – do feel part of a common music culture that crosses national borders, they do not appear to view themselves as members of the same nation. Participating in a common culture does not therefore, *by itself*, lead to self-identification as a member of a common nation or even to an awareness of a membership of a nation.