

“Meet the New Boss—Same as the Old Boss”: The Postcolonial Problem of Choosing an Anthem

Christopher (Kit) Kelen
University of Macau

In his essay, “Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History,” Dipesh Chakrabarty discusses the co-achievement of “European imperialism and third-world nationalism” and “the universalization of the nation-state as the most desirable form of political community.” For Chakrabarty, “the universalist propositions of ‘modern’ (European) political philosophy” condemn the third-world historian to knowing Europe as the home of the modern. From this follows “the everyday subalternity of non-Western histories.” Traffic between the dominant and the subaltern narratives results in a collaborative project, that of “provincializing ‘Europe,’ the ‘Europe’ that modern imperialism and third-world nationalism have, by their collaborative venture and violence, made universal” (19).

Nation, in the Modern Sense

Nation, in the modern sense,¹ is a Western idea. Its acceptance as the basis of a world order of *inter*-national relations has guaranteed the imitation of European models by other-than-European peoples. National symbols have naturally been a key mechanism for the competitive mimesis demanded of new polities wishing to enter the fold. Furthermore, national anthems have been an affective lubricant greasing the wheels to make functional what I will call the paradox of the uniformity of differences. Paradoxically, while the anthem appears to be a celebration of distinct national identity, it is participation in a global system of signs—national anthems—that becomes key to state power and its codes. In the serious world of sincere nations and nationalists, uniformity of differences is revealed in the fact that the overwhelming majority of the world’s national anthems are written and arranged according to the rules of Western poetics and musical forms. It is in the reproduction of these forms, and today for many other-than-national purposes, that anthem quality lies. I have coined the term “anthem quality” to refer to the soul-stirring effect which certain combinations of music and lyrics achieve, most typically in the service of national affiliation. Every member of the “nation” series requires a national anthem; as a consequence, though anthems are notionally

intended to express difference, they serve largely to illustrate the consistency of national investments across international borders.

In “Sociopolitical Control and the Structure of National Symbols: An Empirical Analysis of National Anthems,” Karen Cerulo excludes nine anthems from her “world survey,” on the basis that these do not employ the Western 12-tone diatonic scales. The countries excluded are Bangladesh, self-proclaimed Emperor Jean-Bédél Bocassa’s Central African Empire (1976-1979), India, Japan, Senegal, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand and Tibet (96). The remaining 154 anthems surveyed are composed in conformity with the rules of Western tonal music, as these have evolved over the centuries concurrently with Europe’s world imperial domination.

The notion that Western forms dominate today’s anthems must be qualified, however, since what we now accept to be a world hegemonic form in music is more mixed in origin than it first appears. It may be that the diatonic scale is neither intrinsically nor exclusively Western (or say Hindu-Greek or Sumerian) in origin. For example, the 45,000 year-old “Neanderthal Flute” discovered in Slovenia in 1995 (Divje Babe Flute) suggests more complexity to the theories of origin. Perhaps the tuning-by-ear advantages of a diatonic scale have ensured the world spread of such a system prior to the West’s imperial expansion from the sixteenth century. Such cautions aside, just as one cannot imagine philosophy on the world scale today without reference to Socrates and Kant, so it would be difficult to think of the world canonic norms of music today without the norms set up by Bach, Mozart, and Beethoven, by the European conditions which supported them and which their music subsequently fostered. Whether or not a particular scale may be blamed for the imposition of world-norms on anthem music, certainly we can say that particular music event settings, such as those associated with church choral traditions and military bands have imposed a fundamental Western form on the construction of national anthems throughout the world.

Cerulo makes the weak claim that anthems vary musically from nation to nation (79); recognising that nations do not all have the one anthem, one could hardly disagree.² However, the variation she notes is uniform and predictable within a narrow range. As Alex Marshall wrote in a 2008 *Guardian* piece on national anthems played at the Beijing Olympics: “The ... big disappointment with the majority of anthems is that no matter which country they come from, they sound like they were written by a band leader from the Royal Navy. There are no cha-cha-cha rhythms in Cuba’s anthem, no highlife guitars in Ghana’s.”

A second key paradox of “anthem quality” is the automatization of affect. Anthems are texts, the performance of which typically embodies highly predictable feelings on the part of the unisonant. In everyday speech, the repetition of a sentiment or a particular representation leads often to cliché or tautology and is resented as such. Likewise an overplayed pop song wearies the ear, but populations go on being moved,

sometimes over long stretches of history and over vast territories, by the tunes and lyrics of their national songs.

Thus, in surviving anthems we find instances of clichés and tautologies which are typically not resented. In selecting an anthem, a nation chooses to typify itself for purposes of domestic and international consumption. That choice amounts to finding or creating and then promoting what already is or will become a clichéd representation of the nation in question, of its people and customs, and of its collective sense of self. My intention in noting this largely unnoticed fact is not to criticize nations for the particular choices of cliché they make, though certainly such critique would be justified; rather it is to assert that there is something unavoidably kitsch about the making of, and adopting of, anthems. The process of cliché manufacture is often very deliberately undertaken and is most noticeable when government authorities decide, for whatever reason, that they need to switch from a set of clichés or value assertions that have become unacceptable. For instance, Switzerland, recently decided to replace its current anthem from 1841—deeming it too old fashioned, with its references to mountains and sunshine and prayer and God. The Swiss, wishing to dissociate themselves from certain clichés, are holding a competition for 2014 in which they wish entrants to express in a new anthem the values espoused by the constitution of Switzerland (P. Laurence).

It might seem *prima facie* unlikely that a strategy of cliché creation and management would effectively harness national sentiment for state-sanctioned purposes. This is to underestimate the solidarity-building power of collocations readily recognized by a speech community. For Anton C. Zijderveld, in his 1979 study, *On Clichés: The Superseding of Meaning by Function in Modernity*, “clichés are magically convincing, i.e. produce a sort of enchantment which needs an emotional participation in the general cadence of the words and sounds” (66). Kurt Spellmeyer writes of clichés in terms of “substratums” in discourse which “enable participants to recognize what they hold in common” (267). For Ryan J. Sparks, in his essay “Clichés and Composition Theory,” clichés are “culturally convincing places in discourse”; they represent “powerful connective pathos” (454). Sparks is interested in “how discourse builds the sort of connective energy necessary for an ethical sensibility.” Cliché for Stark “does not initiate paradigm shifts; rather the cliché verifies that one belongs to an existing paradigm, an operating discourse” (456).

But what of other people’s clichés? Just as children and non-native speakers of a language will by lack of habit not be apprised of the clichéd nature of many utterances they encounter, so they will tend unintentionally to de-automatize those markers of paradigms in which they are not yet full participants; foreign speakers of a language will unwittingly bring dead metaphors back to life—they will make the tables and chairs dance on their legs. The implications of this embracing of foreign cliché by non-native speakers for their own purposes are intriguing. I think we can say that when other-than-Western states adopt the clichés of Western

nationhood they are making a claim to participate in the appropriated paradigm; they are claiming a stake in sameness, in what appears to be the same cultural capital. However, such appropriations are never simply achieved, and culture and its capital are altered by such efforts, complicating the idea of reproducing sameness. Cliché from one context need not be cliché in another; the meaning of such national symbols shifts, particularly when borrowed clichés are performed. How do national subjects in particular read those much re-iterated texts which appear to demonstrate clichéd sameness when presented in an international series? What accounts for the survival of such apparently derivative texts?

Anthem is phatic communion³ on the grand scale: a people greets itself by means of words it has remembered well enough to forget to understand: a kind of collective “rote” memory. That memory is archetypically of some originary moment or primal scene. Words of the anthem are the words of nation, words to which the breath returns, gives life. Anthem is the breath and so the embodying—in unisonance—that gives a modern nation life. In anthems powerful affect is automatised because the unisonant know how the anthem makes them feel. Emotion remains and is even intensified after the meaning of the words has been forgotten.

Bearing in mind these paradoxes and the power national identification has over speaking/singing subjects worldwide today, we may see anthems as a principal site of betrayal of third-world peoples, a means of endlessly singing selves into an inescapable subalternity. My suggestion is not that these two paradoxes just mentioned lack currency in the West, rather that the differences and distances between the old established colonizer’s anthems (e.g. “God Save the King,” “The Marseillaise,” “The Star-Spangled Banner”) are paradigmatic of a uniqueness, which though perhaps marginal to “nation-ness” *per se*, is yet at the foundation of what we feel in the national way in the modern sense. These three examples just given fit a crude generic division one might wish to assert, suggesting most of the world’s anthems fit the categories of prayer song, marching song or tableau of the national scene.

How Pale was Your Imitation?

In *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*, Eric Hobsbawm recounts how the “civic nationalisms” of the early 1800s gave rise later in the century to “ethno-linguistic nationalisms” in Europe. While the symbolic paraphernalia of the latter were significantly imitative of the former, there were yet many original elements involved in the new compositions which came to serve symbolic purposes for new nations. The pan-European legacy of “classical music” was available to composers across the continent. In addition, the recording and revival of folk music provided a richly varied but ethnically specific raw material for the composers of

anthems (e.g. Poland, Czech Republic, Croatia). With respect to lyrics, the promotion of newly national languages ensured that the words poets set (or had set) to music would have a cultural specificity, pertaining to the nascent polity. In those other-than-European nations which, as a result of decolonization, came into being post 1945, the contradiction has been that though (in comparison with new European nations) culturally more different from each other and from their colonizers, they have for the most part adopted symbolic machinery which is uniformly a pale imitation of European models. Karen Cerulo has listed the few exceptions, but a number of these are not entirely convincing (witness the example of Japan, discussed below).

Despite the avowals one regularly finds in the lyrics of postcolonial anthems, when you sing the song which is an imitation of a European anthem, which mimics the feeling such an anthem inspires, you invest your identity in the mimetic, rather than the unique. But the investment in this lesser sameness is not made merely for today; it is notionally for all time. The point is demonstrated by the observation that many postcolonial anthems might be mistaken for each other, both in terms of lyrics and music. Consider the rote quality of the lyrics in the national anthem of Grenada:

Hail! Grenada, land of ours.
 We pledge ourselves to thee.
 Heads, hearts and hands in unity
 To reach our destiny.
 Ever conscious of God,
 Being proud of our heritage,
 May we with faith and courage
 Aspire, build, advance
 As one people, one family.
 God bless our nation.
 (Bristow⁴ 238-9)

With the possible exception of avowedly atheist states, it is difficult to imagine citizens who would have trouble rendering this unconvincing devotion to their nation. These are portable lyrics and yet one presumes that a great proportion of the population of Grenada feel the distinctiveness of their identity and identification-in-common when they sing these words together. That rote universalist sentiment can inspire particular peoples to feel particularly themselves, is *prima facie* a mystery needing explaining.

A key paradox of subalternity for the subject throwing off the colonial yoke is the degree to which the collective emergence from this state is to be in the image of the colonizer: that is, as a modern state, notionally on a par with the mother/father country. The paleness of the imitation is reflected in many of the bland or hyperbolic lyrics we find in third-world anthems. Blandest of all must be the lyrics of the march, "May Singapore Progress,"⁵ to one of Alex Marshall's Royal Navy band leader's tunes:

Come, fellow Singaporeans,
 Let us progress towards happiness together.
 May our noble aspiration bring
 Singapore success.
 Come, let us unite
 In a new spirit.
 Let our voices soar as one.
 Onward Singapore!
 (Bristow 502)

Can anyone doubt that Singapore has marched on? By almost any economic measure, Singapore has, from its inception as a nation, set standards for its near neighbours and for the Chinese and wider worlds. Progress, happiness, success, unity: the state enlists its citizens in the worship of the usual nation-making abstractions. But what can these lyrics which could be anyone's have to do with the soul of that city or with the real aspirations of its people? The success of Singapore is corporate, state facilitated; it is the competitive ethos and opportunism of the state which has made Singapore one of the world's most successful cities. And Singaporean nationhood is in this mold. The anthem provides a streamlined model of national affect. The idea of moving onward is imagery enough.

There are many anthems that, like Singapore's or Grenada's, could be anyone's, or which conversely could have come from anywhere. The first stanza of "Hail the Name of Ghana," written by a government committee in 1957, has most of the bases covered. One can imagine key points of agreed ethos being ticked off, line by line, as the verses were composed:

God bless our homeland Ghana,
 And make our nation great and strong,
 Bold to defend for ever
 The cause of freedom and of right;
 Fill our hearts with true humility.
 Make us cherish fearless honesty,
 And help us to resist oppressors' rule
 With all our will and might for evermore.
 (repeat previous two lines)
 Hail to thy name, O Ghana,
 To thee we make our solemn vow:
 Steadfast to build together.
 (Bristow 229)

Conformity, Difference, Reconciliation

Anthems are norm-setting texts, texts of conformity. So it should be unsurprising that many of them urge obedience to various forms of established authority. In Mauritania's national anthem:

Be a helper for God and censure what is forbidden,
 And turn with the law which he wants you to follow,

Hold no one to be useful or harmful, except for Him,
And walk the path of the chosen one, and die while you are on it! (Bristow 364)

These lyrics, Koranic in tone, draw together a number of common characteristics: righteousness, the desirability of sacrifice for the national good, fatalism. God is an important interest in anthems, and whether they are addressed to Him, as in prayer, or whether, as in the case of Mauritania, it is God's path which is being laid out prescriptively for the unisonant. Anthems speak of rights to territory as God-given (Chile), of nation as gift from God (Georgia), of destiny as written by the hand of God (Mexico). There is also the idea of God as umpire among nations, the idea of a "God of nations" (Gabon, New Zealand).

Duty of the national kind often points in the direction of death, and in fact the death (or blood) of citizens (and especially citizen soldiers) is a kind of sacrament in the life of the nation. The nation is inherited from the dead, when we who now sing are gone it will be bequeathed to the as-yet-unborn. So anthems may tutor the citizen in nonchalance in the face of death, as in the case of Congo's anthem: "And if we have to die/What does it really matter?" (Bristow 153). In Cuba's anthem, we are presented with the paradox: "to die for the country is to live" (Bristow 163). In Cuba's case, the words "morir por la Patria es vivir" are what the song's author, Perucho Figueredo, is reported to have shouted at his Spanish firing squad after their order to fire had been given; this was only two years after he had composed the song.

Fatalism is common in anthems. In Honduras' anthem, "We shall march, oh fatherland, to our death;/Our death will be honoured" (Bristow 260). Perhaps the most fatalistic (and cosmic) of all anthems is Iceland's, which ends with the lines: "Iceland's thousand years, Iceland's thousand years,/One small flower of eternity, with a quivering tear,/That prays to its God and dies" (Bristow 266).

A sense of suffering as foundational is common in the anthems of postcolonial countries. This has given rise to some of the strangest metaphors we find among anthem lyrics, as in Columbia's anthem, which asks us to imagine good germinating in furrows of pain (Bristow 141). Alongside the many professions of the necessity of violence, there is the problem of peace as discussed in El Salvador's anthem, clearly the hymn of a people tired of being at war with itself. The spirit of reconciliation is powerfully present in multilingual anthems, such as those of Canada and New Zealand, and most recently in the case of South Africa's anthem, a truly innovative anthem-concept, which combines lyrics from the former apartheid era anthem, "Die Stem" or "The Call of South Africa" and the former ANC revolutionary anthem, "Nkosi Sikelel' iAfrika" (originally a Xhosa methodist hymn), sung in four languages (Xhosa, Sesotho, Afrikaans, English) so that the official complete lyrics⁶ are now:

...
Nkosi sikelel' iAfrika,
Maluphakanyisw? Uphondo Iwayo.

Yizwa imithandazo yethu,
Nkosi sikelela, thina lusapho Iwayo.
Morena boloka setjhaba sa heso,
O fedise dintwa la matshwenyeho,
O se boloke, o se boloke? Setjhaba sa heso.
Setjhaba sa Afrika.

...
Uit die blou van onse hemel.
Uit die diepte van ons see.
Oor ons ewige gebergtes.
Waar die kranse antwoord gee.
...

Sounds the call to come together,
And united we shall stand.
Let us live and strive for freedom
In South Africa our land!

...
(Hang 580)

De-historicizing Subalternity

It is worth observing that much of the “scholarly” literature devoted to anthems has been of the “fan” variety, anthems being the sacred texts of entities which in a number of ways replaced the older objects of communal religious devotion⁷. Paul Nettle commences his classic post-war work study, *National Anthems*, with the observation:

Love of country has always been among the strongest of man’s impulses. Nationalism and patriotism are a sort of collective self-confidence. The pride a man takes in his noble descent or in his personal work corresponds in another sphere to the pride he takes in being a member of his nation and the love he feels for his country. (1)

Beyond the truism, this hypostasization of the call of patriotism as eternal and therefore universal is achieved only at the expense of a dehistoricizing move. That retreat from an objective understanding forecloses a question as to the nature of the relationship between pride in one’s noble descent and pride in one’s nation, likewise a question as to the relationship between pride of place (or love of land) and patriotism. Elided in this process of foreclosure is the issue as to the legitimacy of rights. By what rights—and at whose expense—is land or nation or noble lineage claimed?

This particular dehistoricizing move is conveniently answered by Benedict Anderson in his introduction to *Imagined Communities*:

... nationness, as well as nationalism, are cultural artefacts of a particular kind. To understand them properly we need to consider how they have come into historical being, in what way their meanings have changed over time, and why, today, they command such profound emotional legitimacy. (4)

Anderson's argument is that "nation" as we now know it is an artefact of late eighteenth-century provenance, "the spontaneous distillation of a complex 'crossing' of discrete historical forces" which once in existence were able to be transplanted to various political climates. Anthem for Anderson is part of the imagined reality of the nation artifact (81). Although there is a sense in which anthems-as-we-know-them predate nations-as-we-know-them, our sense of what a national anthem is, is governed by our concept of nation.

Describing the psychological character of national styles in music, Nettl contrasts the idealism of the German with the rationalism of the Frenchman, German heaviness with Italian lightness, folk with art music, the influence on rhythm of Slavic as opposed to Germanic languages, religious versus expansionary styles, imperial versus republican styles. Nettl considers the ancient origins of persistent tunes, the means by which these are assimilated to the "musical character" of a particular nation, the role of dance music, the contrast between the hymn and the march (2-33 passim): "People of a more feminine orientation in their cultures dance with short steps and use correspondingly narrower intervals" (31). Until Nettl contrasts "the savage Caribbean melody to the highly civilized *passacaglias* of a Lully and a Gluck" (28), one might have been under the impression that song and music were entirely European inventions and developments.

In the same postwar atmosphere in which Nettl wrote, Theodor Adorno was articulating a strident critique of universalist assumptions in music writing. In his 1948 volume, *Philosophy of Modern Music*, Adorno historicises the development of Western music in a far less whimsical manner:

The critics present their arguments as though the tonal idiom of the last 350 years had been derived from nature whereas these ossified principles themselves are actually the very evidence of social pressure. The idea that the tonal system is exclusively of natural origin is an illusion rooted in history. This 'second nature' owes the dignity of its closed and exclusive system to mercantile society, whose own dynamics stress totality and demand that the elements of tonality correspond to these dynamics on the most basic functional level. (11)

Adorno's comments are in relation to the future of high art music in the immediate post-war period. Certainly his contempt for manufactured popular culture was as great as his disdain for the ossified principles of late classical music. In anthems we find a meeting of the two—the state-orchestrated manufacture of populist music to serve the state's purposes.

Hypostasizing nation and "national characteristics," as unanalysed abstractions in the eternal/universal category, leaves Nettl with a curious contradiction in the apparent similarity of so many "national" tunes. Here's how he approaches the problem:

The fact that the national characteristics of a given melody do not restrict it to its country of origin would seem to be at odds with the idea of specifically national traits discernible in this or that country's national music. Surely, if it is correct that every

nation is possessed of a specific and characteristic brand of music, it cannot but amaze us that precisely the national anthem—obviously destined to express a people's definitive characteristics—should have been borrowed so frequently from abroad...

The very existence of an “objective” anthem, that is, an anthem whose melody can be and has been appropriated by other peoples, would seem to prove that the psychological impact of an anthem is not exclusively determined by the emotional appeal of its music. (Nettl 29-30) Then what determines the psychological impact of an anthem? “The full patriotic appeal of an anthem is determined by both the tune and the lines—or if you will—the association and relationship between the two” (Nettl 30). While truisms are difficult to argue with, it does not quite follow—knowing what we know of nations and their investments in particular and in common—that “every nation is possessed of a specific and characteristic brand of music.” Nettl's use of the word “destined” is instructive. Our attention should be drawn here to all three of Benedict Anderson's key paradoxes of the national.⁸ Modernity and pragmatic response to a need (“we have to have an anthem to be a nation”) are obscured by a pretended eternal right. The fact of nation as posited universal difference belies the “identity of identities” to which Michael Billig draws attention (92). Anthems demonstrate a strong expression of this principle. Lastly, the intellectual weakness of the abstraction is demonstrated in the weakness of Nettl's argument, his failure to resolve the contradiction to which he alerts us.

Universal Appeal

In the reduction of the world's musical choices to a set of Eurocentric folk and pseudo-philosophic clichés, the “de-colonizing phase” of the UN's existence entailed the dispensing of Europe's affective goods to the natives. That was the kind of medicine that went with the territory the ‘natives’ were allegedly *re*-claiming. Becoming a nation—in the sense of experiencing decolonization—entailed all manner of Westernizations, the most obvious of which were in the form of formal attributes able to be presented in series with those of other nations, and especially the older members of the club. A nation needs in this sense the serious things which A.D. Smith has prescribed (12-13), and many mundane items as well, including: a constitution, a coat of arms, an anthem, borders, citizens, passports, border guards, rule of law, citizens' rights, taxes, money, bureaucracy, souvenirs, postcards, postage stamps, teaspoons, snow cones, car stickers. Whether a nation can objectively be claimed to have each of these attributes, it is clear today that “peer group pressure” among nations is such that few states would claim to be getting by without these kinds of things. “Rogue” states are conspicuous for making just such claims to legitimacy: there is a constitution, there were elections. There are stamps

for the collectors but no one sends postcards, there are no teaspoons to collect, and this gives the game away.

There is a kind of world average in nation-ness—a uniformity—a country does well to aspire to, if wishing to avoid recognition as a ‘rogue’ or ‘pariah’ state. It seems incredible that—with some notable exceptions—the music of anthems the world over is so uniform, until one recognises that much of the function of national symbols is in their *not* drawing attention to the particularity of a nationhood. What we witness in the third world’s saluting of its own national symbols is mainly the worship of Western form, this in turn representing the abstractions borrowed for the world stage (as also for self-recognition) in order that the nation show itself in a good light: with good governance, with freedom, with democratic rights. The tragedy unacknowledged is the lack of an alternative. The colonized are never given back the country that was taken from them. They are given something better and worse, less distinctive, something permanently less their own. They are given the idea of nation and the fact of state power. They are given modernity, a commodity, which, while its nature entails mechanical reproduction, can only be sold to the extent that it reveals no place of origin.

In her essay, “Anthropological Perspectives on Music and Emotion,” Judith Becker writes, “if we accept... the uniformity of passions, we condone the silences imposed upon subalterns of all times and places whose feelings were assumed to be isomorphic with those of the persons who controlled the writing of history, and we ignore the developing body of data supporting the cultural inflection of the emotions” (Juslin and Sloboda 139). This is precisely what the good unisonant of anthems does; s/he accepts the silences in favour of an anthem quality, something with universal appeal.

Is the universal appeal of anthem quality something to be scoffed at? Surely everyone deserves democracy and surely human rights should be the universal inheritance of the Enlightenment, of the categorical imperative, of civilization as lived thus far? It is a helpful axiom that languages in their diversity are able to express what people who speak them need to say; or to put it negatively, if one language is expressively deficient then all are. The paradox of the uniformity of differences consists in the imposition of one set (a generally debased version of the Western classical set) of musical choices worldwide as if this were the only set of choices for the making of music through which a people's collective feeling could be produced.

To constitute oneself as a nation for international symbolic purposes is to accept modernity as evolved by (and as historically imposed by) the West. For the most part we can say that music and nation of the kind an anthem presents are pseudo-choices for other-than-Western populations. They are arbitrary impositions presented in the guise of motivated choices. Along the lines Adorno suggests, it makes sense to think of them as one-in-the-same pseudo-choice. If we believe that all of the world's populations have to be divided into bordered national entities and that

these state entities must be represented through means of words and music obeying the one set of rules as handed down through Western tradition, then the spectre of cultural imperialism vanishes. One draws the line in ethics here between acknowledging and accepting a reality. There is a contradiction between the expression of a people's particular feeling and particular sense of identity-in-common (what makes us us) and the use of Western-only means of expressing such feeling. The contradiction is resolved by a simple rhetorical mechanism—that it is through means descended in Western thought and Western affective strategy that particular peoples of the world express the identity-in-common we know as national: national identity as we know it today is a Western construct expressed through Western means.

The rhetoric for the universality of rights suggests accepting the humanity of all members of our species; this suggests an equality-in-principle and in-prospect more fundamental than the economic conditions with which it is at odds. If we can make the playing field level to that extent then there is no need for empires in which the more powerful will rule the less. Does the current basis of international relations in general serve such a goal? Does the paradox of the uniformity of differences raise the weak and hungry to the level of those nations which have had a head start? Or does this paradox rather distract the wronged from their world-bettering mission by giving them the impression all are in the same boat? To put the question bluntly—is the singing of anthems part of the problem or part of the solution?

Arise Ye Prisoners of Starvation!

The strident tone of “The Marseillaise” and “The Internationale” is prevalent among postcolonial anthems, even if the soul-stirring qualities of these Ur-texts have been difficult to live up to. While this present study has no case-by-case evaluative ambitions, it nevertheless has to be admitted that many of the lyrics of the world’s anthems are bad poems. Imagine singing the first stanza of Burkina Faso's “Hymn of Victory”⁹:

Against the humiliating bondage of a thousand years
 Rapacity came from afar to subjugate them for a hundred years.
 Against the cynical malice in the shape
 Of neocolonialism and its petty local servants.
 Many gave in and certain others resisted.
 But the frustrations, the successes, the sweat, the blood
 Have fortified our courageous people
 And fertilized its heroic struggle.

The other-to-be-resisted has a clear ideological shape in this instance; in principle though the national adversity need not be human in form. Various abstractions (neo-colonialism) for instance demand resistance,

and in the case of Niger's anthem, it is the battle with nature which is foregrounded:

We confront ferocious and treacherous animals
Often scarcely armed,
Seeking to live in dignity,
Not slaying with a lust to kill.
In the steppe where all feel thirst,
brilliant. In the burning desert,
Let us march tirelessly forward
As magnanimous and vigilant masters. (Bristow 408)

Here, nation is something to be sung from the wilderness/jungle; nation-building is a collective effort at protection from other-than-human forces. Senegal's anthem likewise celebrates "the tamer of the bush" (Bristow 493).

Still, revolutionary fervour is powerfully present in postcolonial anthems. Consider the "Arise ye prisoners of starvation" opening of "The Internationale": something close to that idea is to the fore in the anthems of Belize, Benin, Chad, Congo, Djibouti, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Mali, Vietnam, Niger, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Tonga, Senegal, Togo. Consider Algeria's anthem, originally the song of the 1950s liberation front; it tells the story of why liberation was necessary—so that the nation might live:

We swear by the lightning that destroys.
By the streams of generous blood being shed.
By the bright flags that wave.
Flying proudly on the high djebels.
That we are in revolt, whether to live or to die.
We are determined that Algeria should live.
So be our witness—be our witness—be our witness!

We are soldiers in revolt for truth
And we have fought for our independence.
When we spoke, nobody listened to us.
So we have taken the noise of gunpowder as our rhythm
And the sound of machine guns as our melody.
We are determined that Algeria should live.
So be our witness—be our witness—be our witness!

From our heroes we shall make an army come to being.
From our dead we shall build up a glory,
Our spirits shall ascend to immortality
And on our shoulders we shall raise the standard.
To the nation's Liberation Front we have sworn an oath,
We are determined that Algeria should live.
So be our witness—be our witness—be our witness!

The cry of the Fatherland sounds from the battlefields.
Listen to it and answer the call!
Let it be written with the blood of martyrs
And be read to future generations

Oh, Glory, we have held out our hand to you.
We are determined that Algeria should live.
So be our witness—be our witness—be our witness! (Bristow 17)

The call to witness is the call to arms. The state is founded on apparently oppositional terms. The anthem recalls the moment of nation. This might as easily be said of China's "March of the Volunteers" (one of the world's shorter anthems), China being a nation which though perhaps not strictly speaking, postcolonial, has (and for sound historical reasons) one of the most strident of anti-imperialist lyrics:

Arise, ye who refuse to be slaves;
With our very flesh and blood
Let us build our new Great Wall!
The peoples of China are in the most critical time.
Everybody must roar their defiance.
Arise! Arise! Arise!
Millions of hearts with one mind,
Brave the enemy's gunfire,
March on!
Brave the enemy's gunfire.
March on! March on!
March on!
On! (Bristow 137)

The Great Wall is perhaps an ironic image to choose to inspire national sacrifice and perhaps a classic example of a Hobsbawmian "invented" tradition. Although barbarian-deflecting walls in the north of China date back to Antiquity, the Great Wall is essentially a Ming Dynasty construction designed to deter the Mongols (who had ruled China for the duration of their own dynasty, the Yuan). It was the Manchus who marched over the wall to rule China in 1644, and whose dynasty, the Ching, continued until the Chinese Republic was established in 1911. Under the Ming dynasty, the Manchu rulers of an empire, which now extended far beyond the Great Wall, did use parts of the structure to control migration movements of the Han Chinese, who from that point of view can be seen as having spent the previous dynasty building themselves a prison. Certainly the Great Wall would provide an apt symbol for the feudal exploitation of the peasant class. Whichever way one considers it, and without reference to Franz Kafka's hyperbolic treatment in his story of that name, The Great Wall of China is a spectacular long-term failure of foreign policy (Waldron 1992, *passim*). But heroic failure has a special role in the evocation of national sentiment.

When Even Resistance is Rote

One reads in the lyrics of "The March of the Volunteers" the fact that Algeria's and China's experiences of foreign domination have a lot in common. Continuities between the pre-and post-"colonial" state of China

become more apparent with time, and with the return of Confucian thinking to the avowed state-sponsored ideology. Algeria's need is to assert the fact of its birth as a nation, and the memory of the sacrifice enabling that birth. The difference in these songs is that China's anthem recalls a permanently dire state of affairs, delivering a 'price of liberty is eternal vigilance' message. Despite (or because of) this, China's permanence as a political entity can be taken for granted. Algeria's anthem, by contrast, is evoking the pre-originary moment of the nation—the conditions and the mindset from which the nation would arise. In Angola's anthem, the moment of the nation's baptismal fire is lauded very specifically:

O fatherland, we shall never forget
The heroes of the Fourth of February.
O fatherland, we salute your sons
Who died for our independence.
We honor the past and our history
As by our work we build the New Man. (Bristow 25)

This anthem offers the unisonant a narrative to explain a holiday. The holiday remembers the sacrifice that enables the nation. It helps the citizen to understand the meanings and expectations which are a part of the national habitus for Angolans. Some of the postcolonial anthems are very direct in their ideological appeal. Consider the lyrics of the first chorus of the “Total Independence,” the national anthem of Sao Tome and Principe:

Total independence,
Glorious song of the people.
Total independence,
Sacred hymn of combat.
Dynamism
In the national struggle,
Eternal oath
To the sovereign country
Of Sao Tome and Principe.

In the last stanza of the song:

Working, struggling, struggling and conquering,
We go ahead with giant steps
In the crusade of the African peoples,
Raising the national flag.
Voice of the people, present and united,
Strong beat in the heart of hope
To be a hero in the hour of peril,
A hero of the Nation's resurgence. (Bristow 480)

Portugal being the former colonizer of Angola and Sao Tome and Principe, for the purposes of comparison, it may be instructive to consider the tone of Portugal's anthem, “A Portuguesa” (“The Portuguese”):

Heroes of the sea, noble race.
Valiant and immortal nation,
Now is the hour to raise up on high once more
Portugal's splendor.
From out of the mists of memory,
Oh Homeland, we hear the voices
Of your great forefathers
That shall lead you on to victory!

To arms, to arms
On land and sea!
To arms, to arms
To fight for our homeland!
To march against the enemy guns! (Bristow 450)

Another lyric of revival lauding the moral value of walking into gunfire, these words were written by Henrique Lopes de Mendonça in 1890. The song was essentially a patriotic march inspired by British bullying of Portugal over the extent of Portugal's African colonies. It became an important symbol of the Republican cause and replaced the monarchist "Charter Anthem" as Portugal's national anthem when the monarchy was deposed in 1911.

Portugal's and Sao Tome and Principe's anthems are both themed around the idea of a national revival. What is Portugal reviving? Presumably, the revival would be of the imperial moment celebrated by the national poet in the national poem, the sixteenth-century *Lusiads* of Camoens. Here the world-conquering exploits of Vasco da Gama are fantasized in epic form, and celebrated as establishing Portuguese greatness on the world stage. This was a glory much lauded in the resistance to de-colonization which, under the aegis of Luso-tropicalism,¹⁰ we witness in the latter stages of the Salazar dictatorship. What Luso-tropicalism suggested was that the Portuguese were nicer imperialists and therefore deserved to retain their empire while the rest of Europe was de-colonizing. The Carnation Revolution of 1974 ended the fantasy-in-practice, but as we see in the Portuguese anthem, nostalgia for the idea remains, though in a form vague enough to not cause much offence.

Then what is it Sao Tome and Principe would be reviving? No doubt, in 1974, this poor Lusophone cocoa-dependent, ethnically African country was overdue for liberation from its colonial master. That liberation—the "total independence"—of the new nation was achieved because the new democratic government in Lisbon decided to decolonize and immediately began treaty negotiations with parties that would form new governments in various possessions to be shed, all around the globe. And what of Sao Tome and Principe prior to the reign of the colonial oppressor? Both islands were uninhabited when the Portuguese first arrived in the fifteenth century and began building a slave plantation society there. It is participation in the pan-African struggle for independence from Europe which makes credible the idea, in Sao Tome and Principe's context, of being a hero of the national "resurgence."

So we see both colonizer and colonized, in defining the national unison, as possessed of unanalysed and unconvincing delusions of grandeur. Amicable and uneventful post-“liberation” political and economic relations between Portugal and Sao Tome and Principe show how unimportant such delusions may be in practical terms.

Ahead, with Spade and Stone-mason's Hammer!

Hyperbolic claims are often present in postcolonial anthem lyrics. Consider the emphatic imagery of what was, until 2009, the first stanza of Peru's national anthem¹¹:

For a long time the Peruvian, oppressed.
Dragged the ominous chain;
Condemned to cruel serfdom.
For a long time, for a long time.
For a long time he moaned in silence.
But as soon as the sacred cry of
Freedom! was heard on his coasts.
He shook off the indolence of the slave.
He raised his humiliated,
his humiliated, his humiliated head,
He raised, he raised his humiliated head (Bristow 439)

In the second stanza we hear the roar of rough chains of three centuries of horror. Perhaps the most strident of anti-aggressor/oppressor lyrics, are in Lybia's Gaddafi-era anthem:

God is greatest!
God is greatest!
He is above the plots of the aggressors,
He is the best helper of the oppressed.
With faith and weapons I shall defend my country,
And the light of truth will shine in mind.

In the last stanza:

And should I be killed,
I would kill him with me.
Sing with me—
Woe to the imperialists!
And God is above the treacherous tyrant.
God is greatest!
Therefore glorify Him, O my country!
And seize the forehead of the tyrant
And destroy him! (Bristow 332)

Fatalism and the sense of history to be re-written are common features of the postcolonial anthem. Take the second stanza of Honduras' anthem:

To guard this sacred emblem

We shall march, oh fatherland, to our death;
Our death will be honored
If we die thinking of your love.
Having defended your holy flag,
And shrouded in its glorious folds,
Many, Honduras, shall die for you,
But all shall fall in honor. (Bristow 260)

Willingness to sacrifice one's life in the patriotic cause need not, however, suggest any overpowering animosity for an oppressor. The first stanza of Honduras' anthem tells the story of national beginnings by painting a very forgiving picture of the colonizer, and indulging his (sic) point of view:

Like an Indian maiden you were sleeping,
Lulled by the resonant song of your seas,
When, set in your golden valleys,
The bold navigator found you;
And on seeing, enraptured, your beauty,
And feeling your enchantment,
He dedicated a kiss of love to the blue hen
Of your splendid mantle. (Bristow 260)

Many postcolonial anthems are reconciliatory. In the second stanza of Guyana's for example:

Green land of Guyana, our heroes of yore,
Both bondsman and free, laid their bones on your shore.
This soil so they hallowed, and from them are we,
All sons of one mother, Guyana the free. (Bristow 251)

One strives not to see a self-parodic comic-book quality in the image of the “heroes of yore” laying “their bones on your shore.”

I have already noted the reconciliatory feat of the South African anthem, in combining the Apartheid era and ANC songs into the one text. The theme of bad old days being behind us is a common one. As we saw in the case of Peru, the memory of slavery is frequently evoked (in the anthems, for instance, of Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti). Many anthems express self-doubt as part of the national unison (for example, those of Burundi, Central Africa, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ethiopia.) The sense of protesting too much is palpable in the Ethiopian anthem:

Respect for citizenship is strong in our Ethiopia;
National pride is seen, shining from one side to another.
For peace, for justice, for the freedom of peoples,
In equality and in love we stand united.
Firm of foundation, we do not dismiss humanness;
We are peoples who live through work.
Wonderful is the stage of tradition, mistress of proud heritage.
Mother of natural virtue, mother of a valorous people.
We shall protect you—we have a duty;
Our Ethiopia, live! And let us be proud of you! (Bristow 210)

This is a text of a people engaged in persuading itself that the national business is all happening. There are a number of other nations (for instance, Vanuatu and Uzbekistan) which place emphasis on the need to get on with the job as a way of telling the populace who to be. Panama seems to address itself, more or less in the boss's voice, with a “get back to work (!)” imperative:

Ahead, with spade and stone-mason's hammer!
To work, without more delay!
In this way we shall be the honour and the glory
Of this fertile land of Columbus. (Bristow 425)

Let's get that canal dug!

The Postcolonial Embarrassment of Anthem-less-ness

Anthem is as we have noted a *sine qua non* of nationhood. Its aversion to music, and so the idea of an anthem, was one of the set of aberrances which made Afghanistan's Taliban regime stand out on the international stage. One of the embarrassments of new nationhood would be being discovered to lack an anthem. This might indeed indicate that the natives were not living up to their newly won *international* task, to present the world with the symbols suggesting worthiness of membership of the club of nations. Paul Nettl tells the story of how, in 1853, Costa Rica, embarrassed to learn that dignitaries visiting from Great Britain and the United States were expecting to be welcomed to the country with the Costa Rican national anthem, set about to get one. The strategy was simple. The country's foremost practising musician, Manuel María Gutiérrez, was detained by the authorities until he came up with an anthem; which he duly did, and which remains to this day the national anthem of Costa Rica. According to Nettl, “[t]he poor devil insisted that he knew nothing about the art of musical composition. But that did him no good. He was thrown into prison and promised that he would not be released until he produced a usable piece of music” (Nettl 185). Nettl admits the tale he tells may well be apocryphal; still one cannot help thinking it may have been in the back of the mind of the lyricist, Jose Maria Zeledon Brenes, when in 1903 he penned these, perhaps ironic, lyrics for the song's last stanza:

Oh, sweet country, our refuge and shelter;
How fertile your life giving soil!
May your people contented and peaceful
Unmolested continue their hard work. (Hang 158)

Yet another anthem born of similar necessity was that of Malaysia. Following Independence in 1957, each of the Malay States had its own anthem, and an international competition was held to choose a national

anthem for the Federation. All entries were found wanting. So an all-star cast of composers was called in (including Benjamin Britten and William Walton) and their efforts were also rejected. What was chosen for the national devotions was the State Anthem of Perak. The story behind this song is that:

The song had been very popular on the island of Mahé in the Seychelles, where the Sultan of Perak had formerly been living in exile. He heard it at a public band concert on the island, a song to a popular French melody, originally composed by the lyricist Pierre-Jean de Béranger (1780–1857), who was born and died in Paris. When Sultan Idris Murshidul'adzam Shah, who was the Ruler of the State of Perak from 1887 to 1916, represented the Malay Rulers of the Federated Malay States at the installation ceremony of King Edward VII in 1901, his protocol officer was asked what his state anthem was. Realizing that his state did not in fact possess an anthem, he, in order not to appear backward in front of his hosts, proceeded to hum the aforementioned tune. Thus was an anthem born. (Negaraku)

By contrast, Indonesia's "Indonesia Raya" ("Great Indonesia"), dating to 1928, has a history concurrent with the independence struggle and is thus unequivocally the song which expresses the soul of the becoming nation. That goal is reflexively present from the first stanza of the song, with the words "bangunlah jiwanya"—the aim of those singing is to "create the soul" / "raise the soul" of the Indonesian nation, to create the nationality for the people by uniting the people (Bristow 275).

The earliest of the postcolonial East Asian anthems is that of the Philippines, thanks to that country's abortive late-nineteenth-century attempts at independent nationhood. The title of the Philippine national anthem, "Lupang Hinirang," has been rendered in English as "The Chosen Land." The (1899) words of the song present a tableau praising the nation; these were penned to accompany an (1898) score for a march. The anthem *in toto* we may describe as a late Romantic artefact. Its original function was to honour a nascent postcolonial nation, that of the first Republic of the Philippines, an entity which came to grief with the American occupation of the country (1898-1946), following the Spanish-American and Philippine-American wars. There are several ways in which "Lupang Hinirang" / "The Chosen Land" is a curious title for the song. It is neither the popular name of the song, nor a translation of the original title. The song's popular name, in Tagalog, derives from its first line, "Bayang magiliw," which may be translated as "Beloved land"; this would appear to be a faithful translation of "tierra adorada," with which the first line of the lyrics in Spanish commences, the song having originally been titled "Filipinas."¹²

The rest of the lyrics I have translated with my research collaborator, Ruth Jordana Pison, as follows:

Beloved Land,
Pearl of the East,
My heart's fervour
Lives in your breast.

Chosen land,
Cradle of heroes,
You will never submit
To invaders.

In seas and on mountains,
In the very air, in blue of sky,
Splendour in the poem
And the song of our loved freedom.

It is victory
That shines in your flag,
Stars and sun
That never dim.

Land of the sun, of joyous love,
Life is heaven with you.
Our greatest joy, be there oppressors
Would be to die for you.

There are certain questions begged by the title of the song; in particular—in what sense can the Philippines be thought a “chosen land”? Might the choice of this title for the song be read as a case of over-identification with the colonizer (the Philippines considered “a chosen land” in the sense that both Spain and the United States chose to occupy them)?

The song emerges from the originary moment of the Philippine national mythology. The lyrics therefore need to be read in the light of key events and icons of that period, in particular the 1896 martyrdom of the national hero, Jose Rizal. The language history of the song is of particular interest, and especially the apparent irony of Filipinos vowing in Spanish (just as the Spaniards are leaving and the Americans arriving) that their land will never be invaded. Although Filipino law now demands that the song only ever be sung in Filipino, the original Spanish lyrics were translated into English before they were translated into Tagalog. The song was banned by the American authorities until 1919.

Considering questions of self-efficacy as reflected in the anthem and its title, one might speculate as to whether the Filipino national consciousness might be founded on a fear of not being chosen; whether “A Chosen Land” might thus be considered an attempt at the creation, for purposes of national identification, of a self-fulfilling (and pseudo-biblical) prophecy—that this place would be a promised land, its people a chosen race. Again, such a reading pre-supposes the song’s identification with the colonizer’s point of view, as perhaps implied by the original Spanish version of the lyrics.

Does the Singing of Anthems Make for Better Worlds?

“Anthem quality” is attained wherever moral certitude and the symbolization of events are made to coalesce—conveyed in abstract

musical form—with quasi- or pseudo-religious authority, of which the tune “The Star-Spangled Banner” is exemplary, as has been much of Hollywood’s production up to the present day. Through means of musical interludes in film, as in the participatory rituals of national life, the noble—like the patriotic—soul takes part in a collective self-hailing, a welcoming home of the self.

Does the singing of anthems make for better worlds? Taken at face value, anthem lyrics would lead us to that conclusion. In so many cases though, the new boss has been as bad as (or worse than) the old. And so one is tempted towards the conclusion that the anaesthetic muzak of the anthem is what makes it possible for peoples to be taken for granted by the states which regulate them. This is not to say that anthems, in varied circumstances, might not provide the unisonant with opportunities for resistance, for alternative readings of reality and for critical challenges to authority. Anthem parodies and anti-anthems provide cogent examples of performative instances which run against the grain of anthem quality, in particular and in general; but these need to be understood as oppositional phenomena.

By means of state power (the sanction of official symbols as such), the nation worships itself. Who and what and why do they worship? The nation *is* the citizenry and, in singing the anthem, it is the individual citizen who must join with others in revered anonymity to worship the state so worthily represented by the individual who stands on the dais to wear a medal at the Olympics, or who rests anonymously in the tomb of the unknown soldier. Anthem singing makes it possible for people not to bother exercising democratic thinking in working out who they are. That is because in revering their own self-symbolization they agree it is decided who they already are. The anonymous figures whom the citizens worship have their corollary and origin in ancestor cults as well as the divinity of Christ. The ancestors and the saviours of the nation are those whom it is the citizenry’s task, however arduous, to emulate. They are the apotheosis of the state and they are its avatars; as is, in substance, each who sings. Everyone who sings borrows the mystery of the deified nation to be the living substance—and anthropomorphic representation—of that abstraction which takes in both those for-the-nation-dead and those unborn for whom the deeds of nation are done. Singapore’s anthem, with its spectacular refusal of mythology, hollows out the whole procedure; as, in a very different way, does The Who’s 1971 anti-anthem “Won’t Get Fooled Again.” Here, Pete Townshend’s fervently cynical lyrics (“Meet the new boss- same as the old boss!”) render the familiar Orwellian *Animal Farm* trope.

If the world’s citizen subjects are to be protected from excesses of national sentiment and equally from bland erosion of a sense of self, then it will be the critical work of devout ironists, case by case, to fashion antidotes.

Notes

1. In his 1976 work *Keywords* (178-180) Raymond Williams tracked the historical overlap of the old (for instance biblical) use of 'nation' as indicating racial affiliation, against the newer 'political' definition, which we take as the norm today when we refer to the Australian nation or the Botswanan or Peruvian nation. One way to make the distinction clear is to acknowledge that there is no such thing as national-*ism* in the biblical sense. Although *nation* was used in the unitary political sense from the seventeenth century onward to indicate a contrast between the people considered as a whole and any particular (for instance racial) sub-grouping, the overlap between the old and the new idea is of continuing significance. Anthony D. Smith (2008) acknowledges that "the Western conception of the *modern* nation has become the measure of our understanding of the concept of nation *per se*, with the result that other conceptions become illegitimate" (14). The orthodoxy thus is that nations as we know them are an invention of modernity; in Benedict Anderson's terms in *Imagined Communities*, nations are phenomena made possible by the advent of print capitalism (37-46).

2. When one considers the worldwide dominance of the Ur-anthem 'God Save the King' for instance around the turn of the last century, the idea of many countries sharing the one anthem seems less fanciful. Words with this tune have at various times provided a national anthem for Prussia (and then Germany), Lichtenstein, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and of course many parts of the British Empire and later Commonwealth. Generally the words have had a monarchist sentiment to them, the great exception being in the case of the United States, where the 1831 words of Samuel Francis Smith, to the hymn, 'America', are conspicuously about country rather than king.

3. *Phatic communion* is a term devised by Bronislaw Malinowski, an anthropologist who, in the early twentieth century, studied the speech and customs of the Trobriand Islanders (cf Jakobson's phatic function, as mentioned earlier). *Phatic communion* refers to communication the purpose of which is to keep the channel of communication open. For Englishmen this classically entails the discussion of the weather by strangers. Malinowski described this kind of communication as a means by which "ties of union are created by the mere exchange of words" (Ogden and Richards 315).

4. Throughout this essay, citations of national anthems, in particular, are from four main sources—from two encyclopedic works—Bristow's and Xing Hang's anthem collections, from Wikipedia, and from official government websites.

5. Interestingly these pedestrian lyrics were inspired, according to their maker, Zubir Said, by a beautiful Malay proverb: '*Di mana bumi dipijak, di situ langit dijunjung*' ("You should hold up the sky of the land where you live") (2007).

6. In English the complete lyrics are as follows:

Lord, bless Africa,
May her spirit rise high up.
Hear thou our prayers,
Lord bless us, your family.

Descend, O Spirit,
Save our nation.
End all wars and strife,
Bless South Africa, South Africa.

Ring out from our blue heavens,
From our deep seas breaking round;
Over everlasting mountains
Where the echoing crags resound.

Sounds the call to come together,
And united we shall stand.
Let us live and strive for freedom
In South Africa our land! (Hang 580)

7. Ernest Gellner writes: "Durkheim taught that in religious worship society adores its own camouflaged image. In a nationalist age, societies worship themselves brazenly and openly, spurning the camouflage"; Gellner's exemplar for the phenomenon is Germany at the Nuremberg rallies (56). The extreme manifestation we see in Nazism perhaps though belies the more commonplace quasi- or pseudo- religiosity of national devotions. In *The Cultural Foundations of Nations*, Anthony Smith writes, "As 'secular religion of the people,' nationalism was able to combine a purely human and terrestrial compact with public worship of the nation" (xv). Smith further contends that, in the West and elsewhere, "it is impossible to grasp the meanings of nation and nationalism without an understanding of the links between religious motifs and rituals and later ethnic and national myths, memories and symbols" (8). This continuity is demonstrated by the use of the generic category "anthem" for the kind of song that allows the subject of state or religion to express devotion through unison.

8. Benedict Anderson has drawn attention to three key paradoxes of the national. The first concerns the contrast between the objective modernity of nations and the subjective claims to unbroken tradition that characterize the sentiments of nationalists. Anderson's second paradox is that nations are particular instances of identity of which all persons are—at least notionally—possessed. That is to say, nation is a kind of universal

difference: everyone's nationality is not the same as someone else's. The presence of refugees in and "between" nations complicates this picture. The third paradox is between the political power and the intellectual weakness of the abstraction. National-ism is—against the world's otherisms—conspicuously lacking in great thinkers (5).

9. In the original, French text:

Centre la ferule humiliante il y a déjà mille ans.
 La rapacité venue de loin les asservir il y a cent ans.
 Centre la cynique malice métamorphosée
 En néocolonialisme et ses petits servants locaux
 Beaucoup flanchèrent et certains résistèrent
 Mais les échecs, les succès, la sueur, le sang
 Ont fortifié notre peuple courageux
 Et fertilisé sa lutte héroïque. (Bristow 101)

10. According to the theory's key proponent, Gilberto Freyre, Lusotropicalism can be explained as follows:

The Portuguese colonizer, basically poor and humble, did not have the exploitive motivations of his counterpart from the more industrialized countries in Europe. Consequently, he immediately entered into cordial relations with non-European populations he met in the tropics. This is clearly demonstrated through Portugal's initial contacts with the Bakongo Kingdom in the latter part of the fifteenth century. The ultimate proof of the absence of racism among the Portuguese, however, is found in Brazil, whose large and socially prominent mestiço population is living testimony to the freedom of social and sexual intercourse between Portuguese and non-Europeans. Portuguese non-racism is also evidenced by the absence in Portuguese law of the racist legislation in South Africa and until recently in the United States barring non-whites from specific occupations, facilities, etc. Finally, any prejudice or discrimination in territories formerly or presently governed by Portugal can be traced to class, but never colour, prejudice. (Bender 3-4)

11. Provenance of this stanza had been in doubt at various points in the past and there had been previous attempts to remove it because of its aggressively anti-Spanish attitude; however it was not officially replaced until 2009, by the relatively inoffensive lyrics of the new first stanza (formerly the seventh):

On its summits may the Andes sustain
 the two-color flag or standard,
 may it announce to the centuries the effort
 that being free, that being free
 that being free gave us forever.
 Under its shadow may we live calmly
 and, at birth of the sun in its summits,
 may we all renew the great oath
 that we rendered, that we rendered
 that we rendered to the God of Jacob,
 that we rendered to the God of Jacob, the God of Jacob... ("National Anthem of Peru")

12. The official Filipino version of the anthem, is as follows:

Bayang magiliw
Perlas ng silanganan
Alab ng puso
Sa dibdib mo'y buhay.

Lupang Hinirang
Duyan ka ng magiting
Sa manlulupig
Di ka pasisiil.

Sa dagat at bundok
Sa simoy at sa langit mong bughaw
May dilag ang tula
At awit sa paglayang minamahal.

Ang kislap ng watawat
Mo'y tagumapay na nagniningning
Ang bituin at araw niya kailan pa ma'y
Di magdidilim.

Lupa ng araw
Ng luwalhati't pagsinta
Buhay ay langit sa piling mo.
Aming ligaya na pag may mang-aapi
Ang mamatay ng dahil sa iyo. (Serbisyo Philippine Government e-services Portal)

Works Cited

- Adorno, Theodor W. *Philosophy of Modern Music*. Trans. Anne G. Mitchell and Wesley V. Blomster. London: Sheed and Ward, 1973.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, 1991.
- Bender, Gerald. *Angola under the Portuguese: The Myth and Reality*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1978.
- Billig, Michael. *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage, 1995.
- Bristow, Michael Jamieson. *National Anthems of the World*. 11th ed. London: Blandford, 2006.
- Cerulo, Karen A. "Sociopolitical Control and the Structure of National Symbols: An Empirical Analysis of National Anthems." *Social Forces* 68.1 (1986): 96
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. "Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for Indian Pasts?" *Representations* 37 (1992): 19.
- "Divje Babe Flute." *Wikipedia*. Web. 28 Aug. 2013.
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Divje_Babe_flute>.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. New York: Cornell, 1983.
- Hang, Xing. *Encyclopedia of National Anthems*. Oxford: Scarecrow, 2003.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

- Hobsbawm, Eric and Terence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- “The Internationale.” *Wikipedia*. Web. 23 June 2012.
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Internationale>.
- Juslin, Patrik N. and John A. Sloboda. *Music and Emotion: Theory and Research*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001.
- Laurence, P. “Swiss to Launch National Anthem Competition in 2014.” *BBC News Europe*. Web. 24 Aug. 2013.
<<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-23550915>>.
- Marshall, Alex. “And the Winning Anthem is...” *The Guardian*. Web. 24 June 2012.
<<http://www.guardian.co.uk/music/2008/aug/11/olympics2008>>.
- “National Anthem of Peru.” *Wikipedia*. Web. 23 June 2012.
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Anthem_of_Peru>.
- “Negaraku.” *Wikipedia*. Web. 24 June 24 2012.
<<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Negaraku>>.
- Nettl, Paul. *National Anthems*, New York: Storm, 1952.
- Ogden, C. K. and I. A. Richards. *The Meaning of Meaning: A Study of the Influence of Language upon Thought and of the Science of Symbolism*. London: Routledge, Kegan Paul, 1949.
- Serbisyo Philippine Government e-services Portal. *Philippine Symbols*. Manila: Philippine Government. Web. 23 June 2012.
<www.eserbisyo.gov.ph/Default.aspx?ssid=84&aid=1870>.
- Smith, Anthony D. *The Cultural Foundations of Nations: Hierarchy, Covenant and Republic*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.
- Spellmeyer, Kurt. *Common Ground: Dialogue, Understanding and the Teaching of Composition*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1993.
- Starks, Ryan J. “Clichés and Composition Theory.” *Journal of Advanced Composition* 19. 3 (1999): 453-464.
- Waldron, Arthur. *The Great Wall of China—From History to Myth*. Cambridge: Canto, 1992.
- The Who. “Won't Get Fooled Again.” *Who's Next*. London: Decca, 1971.
- Zijderveld, Anton C. *On Clichés: The Supersedure of Meaning by Function in Modernity*. London: Routledge and Keegan Paul. 1979.
- Zubir, Said. “Oral History Interview.” *1959—Singapore's State Arms, Flags and National Anthem*. Web. 27 Aug. 2007.
<http://40years.ns.sg/portal/ns/mindef_saf_history_1950s/1959_singapore_s_state_arms_flags_and_national_anthem/>.