Master Thesis

Promoting Nation Building and Nation branding through Western European Integration in the Eurovision Song Contest

Master Program:

Politics and Economics of Contemporary Eastern and Southeastern Europe

Thessaloniki, University of Macedonia

Author:

Theodoros Kitsios

M1318

Supervisor:

Dr. Fotini Tsimpiridou

Declaration in Lieu of Oath

I hereby declare, under oath, that this master thesis has been my independent work and has not been aided with any prohibited means. I declare, to the best of my knowledge and belief, that all passages taken from published and unpublished sources or documents have been reproduced whether as original, slightly changed or in thought, have been mentioned as such at the corresponding places of the thesis, by citation, where the extent of the original quotes is indicated.

The paper has not been submitted for evaluation to another examination authority or has been published in this form or another.

Thessaloniki, 01.10.2013

Theodoros Kitsios

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Fotini Tsimpiridou who supervised, advised and supported me throughout the realization of this thesis. No matter which problems would have come up, she was always open and helpful in her counsel. I am really grateful to her, for giving me the chance to fulfill a dream of my early adolescence, to delve into the Eurovision Song Contest from the perspective I have been enraptured since 1990, when I watched the contest for the first time in my life from the couch of my parents' house. From that time on, I knew there was something more in this show, than what the television programs suggested to be. I really owe my gratitude to her.

Special thanks go to my family who raised me thinking critically and being open to all cultural differences. Without the friendly, peaceful environment and their encouraging words I would be a different person.

I also want to thank my friends who always motivated and elated me; and gave me the power to stay in course.

Contents

Acronyms and abbreviations

CEE – Central and East Europe(an)

CoE - Council of Europe

EBU – European Broadcasting Union

ESC – Eurovision Song Contest

EU- European Union

HTV - Hrvatska radiotelevizija (Croatian Radio & Television)

JRT - Jugoslavenska radiotelevizija (Yugoslavian Radio & Television)

LGBT - Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender

NRK - Norsk rikskringkasting (Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation)

OIRT - Organisation Internationale de Radiodiffusion et de Télévision

Introduction

A series of events and dynamic processes of the last decades - such as the fall of the Berlin Wall and the expansion of the European Union - in the development of the European continent have all brought up the perdurable question about the existence and the development prospects of the shared European identity. Apart from the definition of "identity" and its shaping procedures, the alterations and its reflections which are often discussed nowadays, doubts are getting called in about "whether it can coexist peacefully with the national identities, or whether national identity should be sacrificed for the sake of European integration or perhaps is too strong to be replaced so easily with some vague and ephemeral European one" (Klochun 2011).

Lately the scientific discussions have stated the supposition of compatibility between multiple identities in general, and, particularly, between European and national identities[1]. Provided that the notion of multiple identities competing with each other is rejected, the promotion of European identity is alleged to expand without national identity being sacrificed; on the other hand, assuming that identities are mutually reinforcing, conditions might be created for both identities to be articulated simultaneously, and thus encouraged equally (Bruter 2005). The latter can be expressed best by the famous EU motto, "*United in Diversity*." In this thesis, I will use the case of the Eurovision Song Contest (ESC) to describe a possible arena for such construction, since both viewers and researchers of the ESC accept that the contest has been merely political, and, for some, this may be the basis of its appeal. Voting is the most commonly discussed aspect of politics in the ESC, but the contest's political nature extends far beyond voting. Eurovision has altered countries' national policies[2], has influenced political discourse, and is an immense source of pride and identity in participating countries (Boulos, 2012:38).

Albeit all efforts by the organizers of the show to cast emphasis on the cultural part of the contest, and move away from conflicts between European states, the fact that the ESC is highly politicized appears to be obvious since it is defined as "an

[1] Thomas Risse (2003:79) demonstrates this by means of the "marble-cake" model, where identities are not seen as layered in some ordered way, but rather invoked in a context-dependent way, enmeshed and flowing into each other, and thus there are no clearly defined boundaries between local and European identities. Michael Bruter, for his part, going deeper into the mechanisms of coexisting identities, assumes that multiple identities are incompatible, and may perform different functions and be mutually modifying or reinforcing (Bruter 2005).

[2] particularly in regards to Visas

exercise in Continental intrigues" (Raykoff, 2007:03). In this international arena, the contestants are regarded as the ambassadors of their countries, "behind whom stand not only backing groups and cliché set designs, but also Ministers of Culture, flags, prisons, border guards, and armies" (Coleman, 2008:132). Very rightly, thus, Mueller (2005) expresses the ESC as platform for international relations: "Eurovision is legendary as an arena for settling diplomatic scores, venting ethnic grievance, baiting national rivals and undermining governments". And as a 2012 Telegraph article states, "One night of Eurovision says more about European politics than a year of debates in the Strasbourg parliament" (Nelson, 2012). Taking into consideration the peculiarities of this event, Eurovision has attracted scientific attention from researchers in a variety of fields, including musicology, sociology, international relations, statistics, and gender studies, each finding some particular yet undiscovered area to study, and the interconnection between different types of identities is the area of special interest.

The unique nature of events like the ESC, creates the conditions for the meeting of such types of identities as European, regional, and national. The promotion of a European identity has been an unofficial goal of the contest. While the reason for it may be hidden behind the commonalities in culture, common historical roots, or geographical proximity, the mechanism of block voting encourages the feeling of being a part of a particular region.

A systemic approach would help to examine why the states of the CEE form a distinct region. Although it does not intend on contributing to the scientific debate on what constitutes a 'region', this thesis holds that in the post-Soviet period the CEE region is indeed distinct, because of the processes of hierarchy formation since the fall of Socialism, the disintegration of the USSR and, thus, the withdrawal of Moscow – temporarily though; all of the CEE countries share a common systemic characteristic. The system has varied in tightness, and at times has been disaggregated and highly contested[3]. The post-Soviet region, though, is based on a distinct pattern of hierarchy around Russia and towards Europe. Lake (2009:40) agrees that hierarchies have the tendency to 'cluster' regionally, "with many states possessing relatively similar levels of subordination to the same dominant state".

[3] Buzan (2007) hold that the region of the former Socialist Block represents a regional system of states because the states within it have common security concerns that differentiate the system from other regions. The national securities from each individual country cannot be considered independently from each other. To use Buzan's (2007) term, a "Regional Security Complex" with its distinct security patterns can exist whether or not the regional members acknowledge its existence.

And in this approach what is taken into consideration is the Foucauldian perspective that power is not something acquired, seized, or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to slip away, but is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of nonegalitarian and mobile relations (Foucault 1978:94). In the cultural sphere, the notion of hegemony reveals the interpenetrating contexts generated by Europeanizing phenomena, together with associated mobile, glocal and diasporic communities. Insofar as pluralism is upheld under Europeanization, there is no denying of the fact that CEE countries are both tied into and constructing glocal networks, such that while people might be organizing and acting at local spatial scales, they are consistently framing their identities with reference to larger scale, hence the deliberate conceiving of the idea of a widened European culture. These developments have created serious challenges for research of anthropology of politics, in the sense that they have greatly impacted on knowledge production as well. Hegemony in economic, political and cultural field manifests unequal power relations among social groups, even on a world scale.

In this respect a parallel can be drawn between the Eurovision contest and any other mega event. Certainly in both cases it is a matter of national pride to win the competition, but in the case of Eurovision, inevitably raises the question of "acceptance" by other European nations. From this point of view, it might be reasonable to expect that the contestants would wish to be understandable and closer in their performances to as many countries as possible. Nevertheless, one can observe that this approach is not a priority for all participants. It is a matter of question then what stands behind contestants' need to express their uniqueness, even though including national elements into their performances can in fact imperil their own chance to win (Klochun 2011). Therefore, raises the question whether the frequent use of cultural elements, and thus a stronger representation of national identity, is a danger or a threat to the promotion of European identity. In practice it is not the case, at least on the Eurovision stage, because expressing one's national affiliation does not exclude the will to participate, win, and be accepted by others. One should take also into account other factors, such as the attitude towards the ESC which is claimed to vary across the continent, from the skeptical desire to withdraw to total admiration as a rare golden opportunity to be presented on the global arena, and what is even better, possibly to win. Raykoff (2007:07) directly connects countries' attitudes towards the competition with the historical duration of their participation in the European integration project:

“For many West European nations the long process of political and economic integration … has been largely accomplished—and for these players Eurovision seems a tired concept”. Of the six initial participants in 1956, Italy and Luxembourg already withdrew from the ESC in the early 90s; countries that joined the EU in the 80s and 90s (Greece, Spain, Portugal, Austria, Sweden, and Finland) “still show a fair amount of enthusiasm”, but for the eastern and southeast European nations, emerging from a half-century of political, economic and social isolation, participation is a matter of national pride and assurance that they are an integral part of Europe, even temporarily as a substitute for the fallen system. For social scientists, this pan-European event is an object of study on relations between European states and over European identity.

Relations of power are not in a position of exteriority with respect to other types of relationships (economic processes, knowledge relationships, sexual relations), but are immanent in the latter (Foucault, 1978:94); they are the immediate effects of the divisions, inequalities, and disequilibria which occur in the latter, and conversely they are the internal conditions of these differentiations; thus relations of power have a directly productive role, wherever they come into play. This thesis attempts to address the tenacious structure of hegemonic relations that can be seen in the ESC, a European competitive context that is based on the principle of equal opportunity. Empirical analyses show that a persistent cross year structure exists, albeit the fair organization of this competition, thereby disclosing how prominence of certain nations in this cultural festival is determined by deep and hidden hegemonic relations.

This is an International Relations (IR) examination of the variation in hegemony in the post-Soviet region. The concept of changing hegemony can be used as an aiding point to examine how regional hierarchy over European identity has changed in the post-Soviet period. Hegemony tightens and loosens, depending on factors, such as time, territory and type of power logic being exercised, but also on the fluctuating responses of the other countries of the region to that power. Contingent on the consent and dissent shown by the other CEE countries to the attenuation of their sovereignty, European, or other, regional hegemony either grows or lessens in intensity. This study discloses dissent from those who do not fit within or are unprepared to adapt to the status quo of hegemony, and consent from those who accept diminishing sovereignty. In this context, therefore, hegemonies are characterized by regular and open-ended dialogue on the Eurovision stage between those states which

remain independent enough to negotiate the system through consenting and dissenting to hierarchy.

For this study, gauging the constant push-pull dynamic which lies between Europe and the new states' sovereignty - consenting and dissenting that creates the intra-regional legitimacy process in relation to West European hegemony - and comprehending the balance between different power logics are key to understanding changing relationships.

The core hypothesis and main argument proposed by this thesis is that the countries of the CEE are constantly in a process of negotiating the type of hierarchy that orders the CEE regional system. By '*negotiating*', this thesis means that these countries engage in dialogue with Europe over their European identity. Through performance on the stage that justifies their actions and/or positions, they either consent or dissent to regional hierarchy. In this essay, I argue that CEE countries position themselves in the ESC in a common project to define the meaning, values and norms that attach to Europeanness, by different means of visual and textual context, which is also reflected in the voting patterns of the evaluation system during the ESCs. I will elaborate practices in the frame of anthropology of politics, of the state and EU, looking for state and supra-state cultural identities, hegemonies from above, from outside, old and new practices of imitation and subversion[4].

[4] The main contemporary handbooks enlightening for the analysis are: Lewellen T.C., 2003, *Political Anthropology, an Introduction*, Praeger, Greenwood Publishing, and Vincent, J. ed., 2002, *The Anthropology of Politics: A Reader in Ethnography, Theory, and Critique*, Malden, MA: Blackwell.

1. Nation Building and Branding

Nation-building refers to the process of constructing or structuring a national identity using the power of the state[5]. This process aims at the unification of the people within the state so that it remains politically stable and viable in the long run. Nation-building can involve the use of propaganda or major infrastructure development to foster social harmony and economic growth (Smith, 1986). Brand[6] is a name, term, sign, symbol, or combination of them, intended to identify a product or service or organization (Anholt, 2007:4; Clifton, 2009:15; Szondi,2007:08), of one *seller* (or group of *sellers*) and to differentiate them from those of competition. Other words, brand is this what can distinguish one *product* from group of similar *products*;

Since the fall of Communism, twenty eight countries have emerged out of the eight former communist countries in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), and as newly emerged statehoods, they have engaged in a substantial, yet complex, project: to position themselves on to the geographical and mental map of Europe as democratic, politically stable countries with emerging and promising market economies.

This requires countries to adopt conscious branding, if they are to compete effectively on the global stage (Kotler & Gertner, 2002:251), a view shared earlier by Olins (1999:63), who had asserted that within, a few years, "*identity management would be seen as a perfectly normal manifestation of what is now called joined-up government in that a successful brand would be seen as a key national asset*". Van Ham (2001:13) explicitly claims that the unbranded state finds difficulty in attracting political and economic attention, and that "*image and reputation are becoming essential parts of the state's strategic equity*". From the field of sociology, Bond et al. (2003:374) assume a perspective that has implications for nation branding when they declare their intention to move beyond assumptions that nationalism is essentially cultural and/or narrowly political and that it is primarily past-oriented and defensive.

---

[5] Nation-building includes the creation of national paraphernalia such as flags, anthems, national days, national stadiums, national airlines, national languages, and national myths.

[6] Different views about the term "brand" with the common denominator to be the multi-fold aspect of promoting one's place: "*A brand is not only a symbol that separates one product from others, but it is all the attributes that come to the consumer's mind when he or she thinks about the brand. Such attributes are the tangible, intangible, psychological and sociological features related to the product*" (Kapferer, 1997:21); "*Place branding is the management of place image through strategic innovation and coordinated economic, commercial, social, cultural, and government policy. Competitive identity is the term to describe the synthesis of brand management with public diplomacy and with trade, investments, tourism and export promotion*" (Anholt, 2007:15).

The transitional countries of CEE, with the common burden of socialist past, and similar economic, social and political systems, can provide a rich field for analyzing as well as comparing country branding efforts. Place branding in Eastern Europe has been evolving for more than a decade[7] and the accumulated experiences enable researchers of respective fields to identify in literature some common issues, challenges and patterns of country branding in the region. Moilanen & Rainisto (2009:05) explore how much successful this country brand[8] might be to build. They present Croatia as a *success story*; Croatia's conversion from a theater of war to an interesting tourism destination and area of business.

Mega-events[9], such as beauty pageants or sport events, are frequently used as the initial stage of branding campaigns or promoting countries[10]. Poland hosted Miss World finals in 2006, which was a high-flyer '*image promotion*' for the country (Szondi, 2007:14). Another mega event that has been often used for efficient country promotion is the ESC, where millions across Europe are tuned into every year. In 2005 Ukraine hosted the event and seized the opportunity to communicate the values, hopes and visions of the country to a Europe-wide audience. When, earlier, Estonia, after seven years struggling to be held in high scoring positions (Appendix A,9), had won the song contest in 2001 and hosted Eurovision in 2002, the country used it to start the '*Branding Estonia*' initiative and showed the 166 million viewers how the country had been transformed from a Soviet Republic to an EU and NATO contender[11]. The old

---

[7] Popularity of place branding has increased considerably during this time. A publication called "*the Journal of Place Branding (and Public Diplomacy)*" has been influential since 2004, and it is now a central forum for presenting research results of the place and nation branding

[8] Moilanen & Rainisto (2009:06) find three essential concepts to be related to brands: identity; image; and communication. "*The identity of the brand is defined by the sender itself, whereas a brand image is the real image developed in the receiver's mind. Brand identity means how the owner of the brand wants it to be experienced. On the other hand, brand image refers to how the brand is being experienced in reality. The message is developed by the chosen factors of the identity that need to be communicated to the target audiences as attractive factors*".

[9] Mega event is '*a one-time or infrequently occurring event of limited duration that provides the consumer with a leisure and social opportunity beyond everyday experience. Such events, which attract, or have the potential to attract tourists, are often held to raise the profile, image, or awareness of a region'*. (Brown,et al, 2004:280). Behind the word *mega event* are hiding sport championships, cultural festivals or gigantic music concerts.

[10] In the past the significance of sport as a determinant of country image perceptions was massively underestimated in existing country-of-origin research and it is through the emerging field of nation and place branding that sport's role in country image perceptions is beginning to be acknowledged. The most influential example is the Olympic Games. The beneficial way in which the hosting of the 1992 Olympic Games in Barcelona helped Spain to reintegrate itself into the European community as an outward-looking, modern democracy is thoroughly discussed by Gilmore (2002:285) in an article that explores the scope for repositioning a country in terms of its brand.

[11] Ethel Halliste, first secretary at the Estonian Mission to the EU in Brussels, stated that "*for Estonia it was a "gift from God". After we won, people started to show more interest. I can't remember any big*

European member states may attribute little significance to Eurovision but it has meant a great deal for many CEE nations to express themselves and boost their confidence[12].

According to Anholt (2006:103), the most indispensable component for making any place properly satisfying as a brand is culture. "*Culture can often play a critical role in moving the current brand image of a country towards its desired brand vision*". Bohlman (2007:52) argues that song is far more than a genre of nationalism, far more than "*a symbol system to which ciphers of the nation accrue. Song in the history of the European nation is neither simply an object nor a subject given meaning through collective performance. Song mobilizes nationalism in exceptionally complex forms, enacting the performance of the nation in the ordinary and the extraordinary moments of history"*. Through performance, song not only gives agency to the makers of the nation and the actors constituting the "*dramatis personae"* of nationalism, but also, it transforms symbols into action. It is in this field of symbolic agency that Bohlman believes the Eurovision song acquires its meaning for the "*utopian politics*" of a contemporary and future Europe.

Bolos (2012:217) agrees with the importance of music for nation branding, especially considering internet facilities, and gives current examples of ABBA as representative for Sweden, Eros Ramazzotti for Italy, the Beatles for England, Elvis Presley for USA, and Patricia Kass for France. In this context the ESC, disadvantages though it may have, does promote European cultural approach and understanding.

Therefore, it is not surprising that events, such as the ESC, can have a significant politicizing effect on the community of participants or viewers / observers. This influence becomes even easier to substantiate if the performance invokes a sense of national or ethnic identity and provokes an outward expression of nationalism or '*ethnic pride'*. The Olympic Games, for example, a massively popular, heavily staged and by definition nationalistic performance, have been often understood as '*continuation of politics by other means*' (Sala, et al., 2007: 17).

Similarly, the ESC can be regarded as a valuable stage for conducting everyday politics among European nations, as a form of state identity branding and status signaling. Jones & Subotic (2011:544) find Europeanizing states to have used this

---

newspaper or magazine not visiting Estonia that fall." She points out that the exposure for brand Estonia was priceless since millions of people watched the competition, broadcast from the Estonian capital (Gardner & Standaert, 2003).

[12] According to bibliography, what is the most important positive impact from mega sport event is: A. increase of tourism on the local and national arena; B. increase of country recognition on the international arena; and C. increase visitation economic impact.

festival to project certain images of themselves onto the European stage, and shape how they are perceived both by their European others and by themselves. It is through these cultural practices, such as the ESC, that Europeanizing states construct their sense of self.

2. The Eurovision Song Contest

In many ways, the ESC mirrors the vision of the EU, yet it precedes its political equivalent: its official debut was on May 24, 1956 in Lugano, Switzerland. Inspired by the *San Remo Music Festival*, the ESC was initiated by the EUROVISION network[13]. As an activity of the EBU, the network's aim was to link both culturally and technically the different TV broadcasting services in Western Europe, North Africa and the Middle East (Kressley, 1978:1045). In light of the pioneering ideas for the EU at the same time, the idea was to create a song contest as a "*people-to-people*" program for a future vast audience. The only condition for participating in the contest was the existence of a national television, and a paid membership in the EBU[14]. The accessibility on the individual level was also made easy, as it involved minimal technology – all one needed was a TV. Aiming to eliminate costs imposed by geographical distances of its members, EUROVISION's pioneers thus created a new vision of Europe, one that ignored its geographical and political reality, but employed technology in service of what they saw as a common interest.

Referencing parallel political intentions for uniting Europe, the choice of the network's name included two symbolically representative words, "*Euro*" and

[13] Eurovision Network, not affiliated with the European Union, was founded 1954 in Geneva. Not confined only to Europe, Eurovision currently encompasses 75 television broadcasting organizations located in 56 countries of Europe, North Africa, and the Middle East. Furthermore, there are 61 associated broadcasting organizations in Europe, Africa, America, Asia, and Oceania. The first official Eurovision transmission took place on June 6, 1954. It showed the Narcissus Festival in Montreux, Switzerland. High-profile Eurovision events are the annual Eurovision Song Contest, the Eurovision Dance Contest, the Eastertime papal blessing *'Urbi et Orbi'*, the Vienna New Year's Concert, the Palio in Siena and major European sports events, but routine transmissions of sport and culture amount to over 15,000 transmission hours per year (EBU Dossiers).

[14] Similar rule applies in the next year's ESC, in Copenhagen: "*Television broadcasters from countries where rights remain available may acquire the right to broadcast the Shows on their territory against possible payment of a rights fee. In countries where rights remain available, non-participating EBU Members shall have a first option, to be exercised within a deadline set by the EBU, to purchase the programmes for their territory. Depending on the facilities available, nonparticipating broadcasters from countries where rights remain available may also request the right to send a commentator, and/or a production team, to the ESC*". (EBU Rules).

"*vision*"[15]. While the prefix "*Euro-*" indicated that something was European, Akšamija (2005:02) finds the notion of "*-vision*" to be referred to an open-ended process, while also implying its future ambition. And concludes finding no surprise that the ESC, the EUROVISION's most successful program, "*soon became stripped of its less symbolic name component, and became popularly just referred to as* "*Eurovision*."

Parallel to the difficulties of political European unity, the network's goal of united TV Europe came up with a series of impediments along its history[16]. In lieu of a united Europe, the success of EUROVISION disintegrated the continent and elicited the emergence of a parallel broadcasting service, the INTERVISION network, for the Eastern European Bloc in the 1970s[17]. And while this Communist counterpart reflected the political circumstances of the Cold War era, its *Intervision Song Contest* might have also helped prevent the Eastern TV viewers from curiously sneaking behind "*the other side of the Curtain*"[18].

Thus, as the ESC focused on creating a Western European community of competitors, juries and viewers, it made, though, some attempts to image Europe without Cold War geopolitical divisions, or further, encouraged viewers to "*look away from the division*" that structured international relations even in television broadcasting (Badenoch 2010:70). For a short period from the late 1980s to the early 1990s, the ESC

---

[15] The term "*Eurovision*" first appearedon 5 November 1951 from the pen of George Campey, a British journalist, in an Evening Standard article on the future of television in Europe. Pronounceable in all European languages, the word Eurovision took root and offered the idea of a Europe united by a common vision. So the concept of a programme exchange was baptized even before its creation was decided (EBU Dossiers)

[16] However, when a map was introduced and used in the show, no distinction was made between participating countries and the socialist countries whose broadcasters were not EBU members. Whilst the organisation of the ESC embodied the geopolitical divisions in Europe after the Second World War, the maps picture a unified Europe, with no visible East/West boundary. This was in line with the more general concerns of the EBU, which developed co-operation with OIRT. The ESC was offered through OIRT's Intervision network from 1965 onwards, and for a while in the late 1960s, the contest acknowledged the Intervision audience (Pajala, 2012:05).

[17] *Intervision Song Contest* (ISC) was born in August 1961 - just one week after the appearance the Berlin Wall, under the name "*Sopot International Song Festival*". It took place in the Forest Opera in Sopot, Poland, and in 1981 the ISC/Sopot ISF was cancelled because of the rise of the independent trade union movement, Solidarity, which was judged by other Eastern-bloc countries to be counter-revolutionary. With the division of Europe artists in the East "*shrugged their shoulders and decamped to the shipyards of Gdansk in Poland for a socialist sing-song*". Participation in ISC was not limited to the Soviet Union and its satellite states. In a bid to outdo Eurovision and establish itself as the world's premier music festival, the communist competition was open to artists from all over the world. Cuba was a regular. For Intervision as a propaganda tool, Rosenberg (2012) , which includes various testimonies from participants.

[18] "*Intervision hoped that promoting the differences and similarities in each Communist country would help international relations. It may also have helped distract the viewer from longing for other cultures not so readily approved by the Politburo, on the other side of the Curtain*". (TBS Editors, 2013)

actively promoted Western European integration and began discussing Europe more explicitly than before, using symbols of the EC.

When in the early 1990s the end of the Cold War era opened up the Eurovision stage to the new participants from the East to compete for the first time, the song contest was enriched with further dimensions. The dissolution of the Soviet Union led to the increase of the number of participating countries. In 1989, there were 22 competing countries; in 2014, a maximum of 46 active EBU Members shall be allowed to participate (the "Participating Broadcasters"). Due to the EBU limits of the number of participants that can be in the final[19], two consecutive semi-finals were introduced in 2004[20].

The semi-finals are structured almost like the finals and the ten countries, with the most votes of each show, qualify for the final. Five countries – France, Germany, Spain, Italy, and the UK – automatically qualify because they are the EBU's biggest financial contributors, a sheer implication to the hegemonic statute of the ESC structure. Also, the country, that wins, automatically qualifies for the next year's final and hosts the competition[21].

Since 1956, when seven countries competed[22], public excitement about the ESC, the lively internet forums commenting on the national selection processes during the months preceding the live broadcast, along with other procedural changes, have fueled its capacity to call upon Europe "*as an object of intense desire and identification in a way that the architects of EU cultural policy could only dream about*" (Sieg, 2012:02). The contest has become an annual television tradition and is one of the most widely watched non-sporting events in the world. While Americans remain largely oblivious to the event, the EBU estimates that more than 125 million people in Africa, Asia and Europe watch the contest every year (EBU).

---

[19] "*Active EBU Members from a maximum total of 26 countries shall compete in the Final*" (EBU Rules).

[20] Prior to 2004, when there were too many participants the countries that had received the lowest number of points in the previous year did not qualify for the finals.

[21] "*Subject to a decision by the EBU in consultation with the Reference Group, the number of guaranteed places in the Final may be modified depending on circumstances. Apart from the six broadcasters with guaranteed places, all Participating Broadcasters from a maximum of 40 countries shall compete in one of the Semi-Finals for the 20 remaining places in the Final*". (EBU Rules)

[22] The ESC 1956 was the first edition of the Eurovision Song Contest, held at the Teatro Kursaal in Lugano, Switzerland. The debuting countries were Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Switzerland. Lys Assia won the contest for the host country Switzerland, with the song "*Refrain*".

3. *'Europeanness'* and the political context of ESC

The profound reconstruction of CEE economies and political systems, application for EU membership and eventual joining the EU in two waves of enlargement in 2004 and 2007, paralleled their entrance onto the Eurovision stage and informed their performances (Appendix C): in 1993 Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia, in 1994, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Russia and Slovakia competed for the first time; since then, FYROM (1998), Latvia (2000), Ukraine (2003), Albania, Belarus, Serbia & Montenegro (2004), Bulgaria and Moldova (2005), Armenia (2006), Czech Republic, Georgia, Montenegro, Serbia (as separate states) (2007) and, lastly, Azerbaijan (2008) have joined the ESC. For many post-socialist countries[23], whose relation to *Europeanness* was ideologically, culturally or geographically attenuated, the ESC has become a stage where they can perform their imagined relationship to Europe as a '*return home'* or demonstration of affinity. Their efforts have been extraordinarily successful: Since 2000, seven of the winners have come from CEE countries (Appendix B). Björnberg (2007:23) points out that this return constitutes a '*representational multiculturalism'* that '*celebrates cultural diversity and cultural connections to others'*.

Wolther (2012:166) initially agrees with Scherer & Schultz (2003:17) in defining the show as a '*media-staged pseudo-media event'*, i.e. an event staged by the media only for the purpose of further media coverage[24]. Yet, he analyzes the relative importance and interconnections of various dimensions of meaning of the ESC in different countries. In some countries the continuous effort to find musical expression appreciated by an all-European audience brought about a specific musical style characterized by low originality and a certain repetitiveness between songs. Despite these developments, he claims (2012:167) that, there are many examples showing a desire to present national musical culture and traditions at the contest, especially from Mediterranean and Eastern European countries where regional varieties of popular

[23] The former Yugoslavia had been the only socialist country to compete in the ESC in its western configuration.

[24] Bösch (2012) observes for his analysis that the significance of media in constituting events is not the subject of consensus. He compares the view of many historians, who take no account of the media or even the general framework of communications in developing their accounts of event formation, and the prospect of communications studies scholars, who have developed various typologies of events which view the degree of medial control as a defining characteristic. In doing so, they differentiate between "*genuine events*" and "*media-driven events*," staged, "*pseudo events*" and "*pseudo events driven by the media*".

music with strong folkloristic influences have always played a major role in the national pop music scenes[25].

Kovačič (2011:170) describes an interesting phenomenon which occurred in the ESC 2010. The Slovenians Rok Žlindra Ensemble and Kalamari, a combination of two music genres, won at the national Eurosong contest, known as *Ema*[26]. The song title itself, "*Narodnozabavni rock*" (Folk-Pop Rock), reveals the two music genres involved. The fusion of folk-pop and rock within the Eurosong context can be regarded as a fusion of the national[27] and transnational. At Eurosong these types of formulas, also referred to as the "*folkloristic musical style*" (Björnberg, 2007:21), have been used with partial success mainly by CEE countries after 1989. The majority of Slovenian voters also found this formula appropriate: nearly 16,000 Slovenians voted for this song, whereas the second-place song received only around 3,500 votes[28]. Thus the song was a planned product, which reached a wider circle of the Slovenian voting population by combining the two music genres[29]. Björnberg (2007:23) finds the development of nationally or culturally specific expressions of popular music to be triggered by the impact of Anglo-American musical styles on the various national music cultures; Notwithstanding, he points out that in many cases national audiences perceive them as being representative of their respective cultures. The use of seemingly '*ethnic'* elements does not necessarily reflect historical-cultural roots, but rather

[25] Ukraine is like many other smaller countries, in particular recent accessions to the EU, which '*capitalise on the stereotypes that are usually attached to their homelands'* (LeGuern, 2000) and build performances around '*a folkloristic musical style'* (Björnberg, 2007, 21–22)

[26] "*Evrovizijska Melodija"* is the Slovenian national contest, which has been held since the country's debut in the ESC 1996 and has been held every year since, except for on two occasions (1994 and 2000) when Slovenia did not compete at Eurovision. The contest is organized and broadcast by the Slovene broadcaster Radiotelevizija Slovenija (RTV SLO). The contest was previously known as "*Slovenski izbor za pesem Evrovizije*" (literally "Slovenian selection for the Eurovision Song Contest")

[27] Whether one can even speak of folk-pop as "national" music is a different question because this genre also combines the folk and the popular.

[28] It is also an important fact that for years the national competitions were based exclusively on televoting. According to the composer of the winning song, Leon Oblak, this was also the key to their participation in the preselection. This may have been the reason why next year the national television company changed the voting policy: only invited musicians were allowed to participate, they were assessed by a jury, and televoting was only used to make the final call between the first and second-place songs (Kovačič, 2011:171).

[29] However, it did not "enchant" the Eurosong public at all because it ended up in next-to last place. It is interesting to scan through the ESC Forum (*MyEurovision*) over this song to realize that Slovenians had been consciously aware long before the contest that their song wouldn't appeal to the rest of Europe: (February 27, 2010) *I know we will show what is real Slovenia and what we like. Peoples from other countries can't understand that because they don't know our folk music*; (March 9, 2010) *I can't believe what we've sent to eurosong. Our song hasn't got any connection with eurosong. It's not competition of folklore musicians, but something else and it's understood, that we can't attend eurosong with this kind of music. I'm not surprised, that others countries won't understand the song. How they could understand it? It isn't strange, that they don't give us any 'support'.*

constitutes an '*active construction of the past*'. Gumpert (2007:156) asserts that international popular music scene is so varied, that it can be used to build ethnic distinctions[30]. In some cases, even constructions of national stereotypes can be traced, which were highly controversial in the country of origin but very much appreciated by other participating countries, such as the Oriental clichés used by the Turkish singer Sertab Erener in her winning song '*Every Way That I Can*' in 2003.

Some of these issues appeared to have been addressed by Yugoslavia as early as in the 1980's, by sending songs that conformed to international popular music styles, and this approach contributed to its victory in the ESC 1989[31]. And just as Yugoslavia's distinguishing Cold War character found expression at Eurovision[32], by the cultural and political identities of the multinational federation of Yugoslavia being performed on the stage[33] and, thus, achieving cultural success on the European stage[34], so too was its dismantling in the early 1990s, as citizens and political leaders were questioning the value of common Yugoslav cultural and political identities and emphasizing instead the primacy of Croatian, Serbian, Slovenian, and other national ones.

Vuletic (2007:94) finds fynny historical coincidence that the only East European country in Eurovision won the contest in the year that saw the fall of state

---

[30] The 2004 Ukrainian winner—Ruslana—with her '*Wild Dances*' utilises a 'primeval' or 'tribal' sexuality, which was displayed by the performer's leather attire, wildly floating long hair, foot stomping and the introduction of the trembita, the Hutsul's musical instrument. The 2006 entrant, Tina Karol, in her tiny 'kitschified' folk dress looked as though she had just emerged from a traditional Ukrainian festival. Her dance team wore costumes alluding to Cossack culture and used tambourines—a '*seductive instrument of cultural exoticism*' (Boym, 1994:119)—strengthening this impression. In both cases the conscious self-orientalisation strategy was employed to enable '*easier consumption'* by Western audiences.

[31] The success of this approach was crowned when the group Riva (Broadwalk) from the Croatian Zadar won the ESC 1989 with the song "*Rock me baby*".

[32] A clear East/West division was complicated by Yugoslav television, which was an EBU member and participated in the ESC since 1961, (along with the Finnish television, which was a member of both the EBU and OIRT).Yugoslavia's anomalous position in Eurovision is explained by the unique geopolitical position that Yugoslavia occupied in Europe during the Cold War. Because of these political considerations, Yugoslavia was also able to engage in cultural cooperation with the West through the ESC earlier than other CEE countries.

[33] Even though Yugoslavia's success at Eurovision increased its prestige on the international popular music stage, it did not always transcend its internal divisions, and even served to highlight differences among the republics. Issues like increased autonomy for Croatia within the federation were reflected in patriotic songs of the pop star Vice Vukov, who had represented Yugoslavia twice at the ESC, in 1963 and in 1965. Tito finally forced him to exile and forbade him from performing (Vuletic, 2007:91).

[34] Low rankings in the 1970s forced JRT to withdraw from the ESC for 4 years (1977-1980). It was in the 1980s that Yugoslavia experienced its greater successes at the ESC, after popular entertainment magazines (such as Studio) from all over Yugoslavia made a poll on whether Yugoslavia should take part again in the contest, and of the 107,181 votes that they received, 97.5 per cent were in favor of Yugoslavia returning to Eurovision (Wikipedia).

socialism in Eastern Europe, and the Zagreb contest was the first ESC that was broadcast directly to the other countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. He, also, explores some interesting coincidences of the choice of the date of the ESC 1990: it took place on 5th May, a day after the anniversary of Tito's death and on the birthday of Carl Marx; more meaningful for the time, however, was that it also fell on the CoE's Europe Day.

The culmination of the ESC's Western European 'pro-integration' period, in which the recent events in Eastern Europe had inspired not only the entries, such as the Norwegian "*Brandenburger Tor*", Austrian "*Keine Mauer mehr*", the German "*Frei zu Leben*", but also the hosts, who decided for the introduction film to be accompanied by Beethoven's "*Ode to Joy*" – the EC's designated anthem of Europe – over a montage sequence of varying sights of the Croatian host city. ESC 1990's Italian winning song, "*Insieme: 1992*" is a hymn to European integration, with lyrics reflecting on freedom and shared values and a refrain of "*Insieme* (together), *unite unite Europe*"[35]. The same year (1990) was proclaimed as *European Year of Tourism*[36], which made the organizers to screen before each performance the logo of this, along with the photo showing the bird surrounded by the yellow European stars. The visual backdrop of yellow stars on blue once again brings to mind the EC flag.

But for Yugoslavia the year 1990 presented a challenge, for the ending of the East-West division of Europe meant that the unique geopolitical position, which it had partly invested its reason for existence, was no longer there. Slovenia and Croatia, were calling for economic and political reforms in Yugoslavia that would bring it closer to Western Europe[37]; on the contrary, others – particularly the president of

---

[35] The lyrics are: (in translation from Italian) "*Together, unite, unite, Europe / With you, so far and different / With you, a friend that I thought I'd lost / You and I, having the same dream / Together, unite, unite, Europe. / And for you, a woman without borders / With you,* ***under the same flag*** */ You and I,* ***under the same sky*** */ Together, unite, unite, Europe / We're more and more free / It's no longer a dream and you're no longer alone / We're higher and higher / Give me your hand, so that we can fly /* ***Europe is not far awa****y / This is an Italian song for you / Together, unite, unite, Europe / For us, in heaven a thousand violins / For us, love without borders / You and I, having the same ideals, mmm… /* ***Our stars, one single flag*** */ We're stronger and stronger / Stronger and stronger / Give me your hand and you will see yourself flying / Europe is not far away / This is an Italian song for you / Together, unite, unite, Europe / Europe is not far away / This is an Italian song for you / Together, unite, unite, Europe*"

[36] For "*European Years*", since 1983, in the official site of European Union: http://europa.eu/about-eu/basic-information/european-years/index_en.htm

[37] Around the same time that the ESC was held in Zagreb, the first multiparty elections of the postwar period took place in Croatia and brought Franjo Tudjman's nationalist Hrvatska demokratska zajednica (HDZ, Croatian Democratic Union) to power. Slovenia and Croatia held referenda on their secession from Yugoslavia in December 1990 and May 1991 respectively, with the results in both republics overwhelmingly favouring independence (Ramet, 2002:59).

Serbia, Slobodan Milosevic – were more resistant to such change: political divisions that were pulling Yugoslavia apart were reflected in the Yugoslav preliminary in 1991. The winner was the TV Belgrade candidate Baby Doll who sang "*Brazil*" - a title which suggested that Yugoslavia was not moving with the beat that had been set by the various Europe-themed songs at Eurovision. The selection of Baby Doll prompted a scandal and criticism from television centers in Zagreb, Ljubljiana, Sarajevo and Skopje, which believed that the voting had been politically motivated (Vuletic, 2010:136). They accused the television centers of Serbia and its allies Montenegro, Kosovo and Vojvodina – all of which were now led by governments loyal to Belgrade – of uniting forces behind TV Belgrade's entry in order to prevent a victory by HTV's candidate Daniel Popovic, who was the favorite to win[38].

The following year for the ESC 1992, JRT had invited all of the former Yugoslav republics to participate in the national preliminary, but Croatia and Slovenia did not send entries at all, since their independence had received widespread recognition from the international community by January[39]. Chosen to represent the FR Yugoslavia for the last time in the ESC[40], was a Serbian "*newly-composed folk song*" called "*Ljubim te pesmama*" (I am kissing you with songs), and its national victory reflected the status of different styles of popular music in Serbia at the time[41]. Karan (2005:60) describes vividly the performer of the song, Ekstra Nena, who regarded the 1992 ESC as a politically important event for rump Yugoslavia, since "*it wasn't at all easy for us to appear at this moment in front of the eyes of the world and receive applause*". At her Eurovision press conference she tried to convince journalists "*that the Belgrade government and president were against all forms of violence and armed conflict*", and during the contest she "*took pains to present my country to Europe and*

[38] Reflecting the divisions in the country between the republics whose governments were opposed to Milosevic's politics and those that were pro, at the ESC 1991 in Rome, three commentators were sent from Yugoslavia, Mladen Popović from TVB1 (TV Belgrade, for commentary in Serbia, Montenegro, Kosovo, and Vojvodina) and the others Ksenija Urličić from HTV1 (Croatian TV, broadcast in Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and FYROM), and Miša Molk (SLO1) from Slovenian TV (Wikipedia)

[39] Also, by 1992, the *Jugoslavenska Narodna Armija* (JNA, Yugoslav's People Army) had waged wars against the secessionist republics of Slovenia and Croatia - where it aided Serbian forces that opposed Croatian independence - and attacked both Zagreb and Zadar.

[40] For the rest of the 1990s, rump Yugoslavia did not take part in Eurovision due to the international sanctions imposed upon it for its roles in the wars in Bosnia – Herzegovina and Croatia. Because of this JRT also lost its active status in the EBU, and Serbia and Montenegro would only return to Eurovision in 2004 after rejoining the organization.

[41] Terry Wogan, the British commentator, said "*This is the song from Yugoslavia and it should get some sympathy votes*" because there was a war at the time.
(http://www.esctoday.com/9315/interview_with_extra_nena/)

the world as beautifully as possible – with an expensive, elegant wardrobe proud demeanour and glamorous performance" (Karan 2005:61).

However, the ESC's whole image of Europe was about to change; the Swedish host of the 1992 ESC described the situation sharply: "*The map of Europe is rapidly changing. Old countries disappear and new countries are being born. And when east is no longer east and west is no longer west, Europe has become greater*." Since then, the ESC has indeed concentrated on expanding Europe. The first members of the OIRT joined the EBU in 1993 and gradually entered the ESC. The successor states of Yugoslavia took steps to enter Eurovision immediately after they were internationally recognized as independent. That they were faster to enter the contest than their neighbors in East Central Europe was due to the decades of experience that they had already had in Eurovision[42], as well as a desire to promote themselves as newly independent states on the international stage and to present themselves as enthusiastic participants in manifestations of European cooperation. Thus, in 1993 Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia and Slovenia made their debuts on the Eurovision stage, and Croatia and Bosnia & Herzegovina entered songs with themes that reflected their experiences in the wars that had begun in their countries in 1991 and 1992 respectively, and which only ended in 1995.

The contest itself implies an idea of Europe not limited by membership in the European Union, nor even by location within the traditional geographical borders of the European continent: the ESC 1993 had 25 entries, only half of which were members of the (then) EC; almost 20 years later, still, the 43 participants in 2011 included countries that were not even the EU accession timetable (Russia, Ukraine and Belarus), as well as Middle Eastern countries (Turkey and Israel). The contest, therefore, confronts a large number of television viewers with questions of delimitation of Europe and of the grounds on which a European identity may be claimed. It might

[42] The dissolution of the Eastern bloc and the disintegration of Yugoslavia created many new potential applicants. Seven countries took part in the *Kvalifikacija za Millstreet* (Qualification for Millstreet), which was the pre-selection for the Eurovision Song Contest 1993. Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Estonia, Hungary, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, none of which had participated in the Eurovision Song Contest before, although songs from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Slovenia had represented Yugoslavia in past contests. Bosnia & Herzegovina, Slovenia and Croatia made it through the preliminary heat and made their debut in the song contest as independent nations. Hungary, Slovakia, Romania and Estonia had to wait till the following year to be eligible to perform on the European stage. (MyEurovision). The pre-selection show was held on 3 April 1993 at the RTV SLO Broadcasting Centre in Ljubljana, Slovenia.

be expected that in countries that are newcomers to the ESC, participation would flame debates concerning the newcomer's relationship to Europe, and therefore to other neighbors - debates that are also about the national identity of the new participant (Pavlyshyn, 2006:469).

Many CEE countries have conceived their claims to belonging through organic tropes of romance and family. However, the trope of the multinational family brings along "*literary fantasies of caring settler-parents and infantilized Slavs; the romance of western man and eastern paramour historically enshrined patriarchal and racialized hierarchies*" (Sieg 2012:04). This is the reason why Wolther (2012:168) gives attention to the political dimension of ESC. He distinguishes this dimension into an *external* and an *internal*[43]. The external political dimension is activated when the ESC is used as a tool for representation by political forces or to call public attention to political issues (i.e. when the political system influences the ESC system). A very striking example of this case occurred during the ESC 2005 in Kiev when, for the first time in history, the president of the host country, Victor Yushchenko, came on stage to hand the winner a special prize offered by the national government of Ukraine[44].

On the other hand, the internal political dimension of the ESC comes into play when the show itself influences political agendas (i.e. when the ESC affects the political system). The political dimension of the ESC manifests itself differently in the various countries. A good example of the differing political relevance of the ESC was provided in the 1996 contest, when the Norwegian public broadcaster NRK used short video messages from national politicians to open the respective stage performances of the corresponding entries. While this task was undertaken for countries, such as Poland, Turkey and Bosnia & Herzegovina, by the head of state or the head of government, countries such as Spain and the UK just sent in video messages by subordinate political personnel[45]. The fact that heads of state and heads of government took time to welcome the singers representing their countries with a personal video

[43] He names it '*allative political dimension'*, i.e. direction of action from outside to inside, contrary to '*ablative political dimension*', i.e. direction of action from inside to outside (2012:168).

[44] The special prize was an artistic reproduction of a Skythian pectoral made of 497g of gold and worth more than US$30,000. Handing over the prize is therefore not only to be interpreted as a political gesture, but also as an act of national-cultural representation.

[45] Ten countries sent a video with their Prime Minister (Belgium: *Luc van den Brande*, Croatia: *Zlatko Mateša*, Estonia: *Tiit Vähi*, Iceland: *David Odsson*, Ireland: *John Bruton*, Malta: *Eddie Fenech Adami*, **Norway**: , Portugal: *Antonio Guterres*, Slovakia: *Vladimír Mečiar*, Sweden: *Goran Persson*). Five countries sent a video with their President (Bosnia & Herzegovina: *Alija Izetbegović* , Cyprus: *Glafkos Klerides*, Poland: *Aleksander Kwaśniewski*, Slovenia: *Milan Kučan*, Turkey: *Suleyman Demirel*)

message suggests that the ESC is of great political importance in their countries. This importance depends on the position a country has in the international balance of power and the amount of time it has occupied this position. For the young nations that were part of the former Eastern bloc, especially, the ESC has played an important role in overcoming the political, economic and also cultural isolation from which they have suffered for decades[46].

Yet, one of the fundamental concerns of many broadcasters is the representation of national characteristics in their ESC entry. Wolther (2012:169) espouses Habermas' Gestalt theory and extends it by claiming that apart from the emphasis which is placed on presenting something special that sets the national entry apart from other countries' songs, simultaneous construction of national and cultural identity is monitored at the same time[47]. Contrary to that, Haan, et al. (2005:63), explain that, surprisingly, there are no restrictions on the nationality or citizenship of the performing artists or the composer of a song. Indeed, in the past it has often happened that winners were representing countries different from their own[48]. Yet, countries on the periphery of Europe are most anxious to assert their European identity because it is contested (Tobin, 2007:29). Moreover, with over 125 million viewers, Eurovision entries are, effectively, advertisements for each country. For example, Ukraine's 2012 entry, *Be My Guest* (Appendix A,24), was about hosting the 2012 UEFA Euro Cup and was controversial inside Ukraine because the performer, Gaitana, was half-Congolese[49]. Additionally, the Eurovision spectacle retains a traditional space

---

[46] On the occasion of the ESC 2002 taking place in Tallinn, the (then) Estonian Prime Minister Siim Kallas stated: '*For many Estonians it is symbolic that the Eurovision Song Contest is taking place here in the same year that Estonia will conclude membership talks with the European Union – at a time when aspirations that Estonians have laboured towards for years are reaching fulfilment'*. (Wolther, 2012:169)

[47] Miazhevich (2012:1512) claims that the entry of Ukraine in 2007 by Verka Serduchka seemed to rule a distinct format of excessive aesthetics and sexuality, and by doing so (in a self-ironical way), gave prominence to the elements of the national brand. While many saw this entry either as an extravagant vulgar (camp) performativity or a perceptible indication of "Sovietness" and "post-Sovietness", thereby undermining Ukrainian independent nationhood, the show's role in rethinking sexual freedom after the fall of the USSR and the geopolitical status of contemporary Ukraine should not be underestimated.

[48] There have been restrictions, however, on the number of performers of a song. Starting in 1957, only 2 singers could be on stage, without any further vocal accompaniment. This rule was modified only in 1971, when the maximum was set to six performers. Also, since 1989 there has been an age limit of 16. Since 1962, the time limit for a song has been 3 minutes. The same rules apply also for the ESC 2014 (EBU Rules).

[49] A right-wing party official said of Ukraine's entry, "*Millions of people who will be watching will see that Ukraine is represented by a person who does not belong to our race. The vision of Ukraine as a country located somewhere in remote Africa will take root*" (Karpyak, 2012). The manifest racism is distressing, but the comment illustrates what countries believe of Eurovision being a way to demonstrate their compatibility with Europe. Similarly, last year's ESC Russian entry provoked discrimination on the

for presenting voices of European difference, particularly minorities and national diversity, namely in the so-called "*postcards*" that separate each entry. Borrowed initially from the San Remo Festival in Italy, upon which the ESC was based, the 30 second postcards are *entr'acte* vignettes that explicitly use music and folklore to represent the host nation's cultural diversity. Postcards may present folk music and urban popular music in relatively apolitical contexts, but increasingly they seize the moment to make politics and musical identity explicit. And no other Broadcasting Network made it more successfully than the Ukrainian, which, in 2005, repeatedly joined musical images of rural peasant culture with scenes from the Orange Revolution (Bohlman, 2007:48).

a. Door to Europe

Although public enthusiasm is lower in the old western core countries than along the continent's periphery and in the central and eastern regions, Sieg (2012:02) assumes that the ESC has forged deep and broad junctions and elicited the participation of public broadcasters, national and transnational music industries, artists and audiences in the effort to define what it means to be or become *European*. And Yair (1995:148) finds this endeavor to be indeed serious, although the data are taken from a '*non-serious*' event.

Boulos (2012:07) provides a good overview of how the ESC is deceiving, because while the show appears to be frivolous, the contest itself is undoubtedly a key cultural event in Europe. How countries choose to represent themselves in Eurovision is suggestive of their relationship with Europe (Sandvoss, 2008; Wolther, 2012) and how other countries react to these performances, through televoting, reflects their opinions of that country. This perspective testifies what Moilanen & Rainisto (2009:07) detect, that is, a brand is created and shaped in the consumer's mind, i.e. the ESC viewers. It exists when enough people belonging to the target group (viewers) think the same way about the brand's personality (ESC entry), and, thus, it is not created on the designer's table or in the office of the management group but in the customer's mind.

---

grounds of the origin of the singer, 21-year-old Tartan Dina Garipova ,with the song "*What If*", which intensified the already negative comments that have flooded newly crowned Miss Russia Elmira Abdrazakova's social media sites; the most characteristic to the case is: "*A Gypsy woman cannot be the face of Russia*" (Kurmasheva, 2013).

As a result, many countries on the periphery of traditional European borders use the contest as a platform to assert their "*European-ness*". Smaller countries cannot contest geopolitically with the more powerful European countries, but in the ESC they have even position; thus, Eurovision is considered by these countries as a gateway to Europe (Jones & Subotic, 2011:547). In fact, Latvia and Estonia were the first ones to have used their experience hosting Eurovision as part of their bid for EU membership (Wolther, 2012:169). A Romanian delegate visiting the 1993 contest explained: "*We have always wanted to belong to Europe and the ESC is the only part of Europe that functions without political union. For this reason we want to be a part of this world*" (Feddersen, 2002:274). Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia, Estonia and Lithuania joined the ESC a decade before they were allowed to join the EU, predicting Europe's gradual expansion toward the East[50]. When Estonia won the 2001 ESC[51], the Prime Minister declared: "*We are no longer knocking at Europe's door. We are walking through it singing*" (Culshaw, 2005). Serbia & Montenegro made its first post-Yugoslav appearance in the ESC 2004 (Appendix A,21), finishing in second place, and the following year the EU indicated its willingness to negotiate closer ties with the country as a first step towards possible membership (Wood, 2005). In Turkey, Sertab's victory was popularly regarded not just as a public relations victory for Turkish cultural production, but also as a justification of Turkey's political ambitions in Europe. The banner headline in the newspaper "Hürriyet" the day after the contest read "*Europe will listen to us more*", ostensibly referring to the increased European market space for Turkish pop music that the contest victory would presumably bring. There was, however, an obvious implied subtext: *See, we 've proven we 're Europeans with this – now the EU has to accept our claim to membership*. Front-page headlines in the dailies *Milliyet* and *Yeni Şafak* both said of Sertab, "*She conquered Europe*". Prime

[50] A columnist rightly explains: "*Eurovision has expanded faster because it is easier to compose a mindless ditty and don a lamé costume than to pass the 80,000 pages of law needed to join the EU. But the new Eurovision entrants hope—and many old Europeans fear—that where Eurovision goes, the EU will one day follow" (*Economist);

[51] A specific budget was allocated to a branding program, which included 660 thousand euro devoted to create the concept and strategy of branding Estonia, and 200 thousand euro for launching the program of nation branding connected to the Eurovision song contest in 2002, which became an element promoting Estonia in Europe (Dinnie, 2008:234). The program of nation branding in Estonia was to reveal to the world that Estonia is a culturally rich country, open to new possibilities and pursuing the path of innovativeness and creativity. Tourist and natural values of the country were also promoted. The actions undertaken in 2001 towards changing the image of Estonia had - slowly though - the desired effects: the country climbed higher in the ranking of national brands, according to the Anholt-GfK Roper Nation Brand Index methodology. A similar positive change was presented by the Future Brand - Country Brand Index. (Raftowicz-Filipkiewicz, 2012:54).

Minister himself, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, was very optimistic claiming "*this result will speed up Turkey's EU process*" (Solomon, 2007:143,144).

Akšamija (2005) tries to explain the reasons why the ESC evokes a diametrically-opposed meaning for Eastern Europeans, while Western European representatives "*tend to caricature it*" (2005:07). Many of the countries of the old Soviet bloc have a particular affection for Eurovision, as it was the only such televised entertainment permitted in the old Soviet Union. Moreover, it has allowed the EU newcomers and prospective countries to negotiate not only what they are, but also what they want or could be.

Thus, the participation and the winning in the Eurovision contest represent an opportunity to draw attention to one's position, as well as one's role within the current expansion of the European Union. Belarus, for example, sees Eurovision as a way out of its international isolation, and the entire country was caught up, when they decided to enter for the first time in 2004. The Ministry of Culture spokesman said: "*Participation in Eurovision is an excellent opportunity for a young state to establish a positive image and tell the world about itself*". Conversely, a writer noted, the British tend to view Eurovision as "*an anachronistic joke. …For a country whose language is dominant, and whose pop cultural gets global coverage, it's easy for us to sneer*" (Culshaw, 2005).

Belarus is an interesting case for song changes through political reasons. In 2011, Anastasiya Vinnikova was selected to sing the song "*Born in Byelorussia*"[52] (Appendix A,4). Later on, it was announced that the lyrics of the song would be changed to "*I Am Belarusian*", as the previous song quoted memories from the Soviet Union period. The main theme of the song was shifted to a more contemporary way of describing Belarus. It was then deemed to give off the wrong message and may offend some and it was rewritten and entitled "*I Love Belarus*". 2012 entry was even more disastrous with the entire act being changed after Presidential intervention. Alyona Lanskaya initially won the national final with her song "*All my life*", but 10 days later

[52] The lyrics are: "*Baby, I want you to know / Soon we'll be starting the show / Back in the history we go / Byelorussia / When I was wearing a star / Back in the USSR / I was as good as mama / Feel my passion / Round and round we go / Born in Belorussia, USSR time / Belorussia, crazy and so fine / Time is rushing, everything's crashing / Passing by / Born in Belorussia, USSR time / Belorussia, got you on my mind / You're my passion, do it old-fashioned / You and I / Diamonds and treats of the West / Come - check it out! Be my guest / You're still remaining the best / Byelorussia / When everything will be gone / Your name will shine like the sun / You're still remaining the one / Good old-fashioned / Round and round we go*".

was disqualified by the President himself, after accused vote rigging, and the band Litesound went to Baku instead[53].

Conflicting notions of "democracy" and political transition both nationally and Europe-wide are articulated in the contest. In the Lithuanian context, Ingvoldstad (2007:107) observed in his analysis the paternalistic attitude of those in power "knowing best", and bypassing the electoral will of the people is a remainder from Soviet times, but also utterly apparent in the so-called "democracy gap" within the European Union. This paternalism was manifested by the committee that selected Lithuania's ESC entries in years 1994 and 1999, none of which was remotely successful[54] (Appendix A,14). National organizers, later, promised that 2001 would be different. The national preliminary contest was advertised as an exercise in democracy in which "*your vote counts!*" whether one chose to phone it in or to vote on the official website. Aside from all the talk of democratic empowerment, perhaps the most dispiriting was the fact that the victory for the band, named Scamp, flamed the debate over the band's "*Lithuanian-ness*"[55]. But making an argument for the disassociation of ethnicity from nationality was easier than convincing those Lithuanians who, given previous waves of Polonization[56] and Russification[57], perceive globalization and increased Anglification as the latest threat to the nation[58].

Lithuania did gain accession to both the EU and NATO in 2004. In hindsight, the 2001 ESC served as an important preliminary exercise in "*self-imagining*" for the

---

[53] In The Eurovision Times Forum, it is interesting one's comment, who credits all the changes to politics: "*This is beyond ridiculous. According to EBU rules the selection process has to be transparent. But what else can you expect from a dictatorship*". And further on, another comments: "*I only wonder why people in Belarus still bother to vote (both in their NF and in presidential elections btw) if they perfectly know that their opinion is totally irrelevant*" (The Eurovision Times)

[54] In its debut in the ESC 1994, Lithuania came last with zero points, and in the ESC 1999 it was placed 20th out of 23 entries, with only 13 points.

[55] The band posted the following note on their webpage: "*We are seriously thinking about not participating in the Eurovision contest anymore… (in part) because of the criticism about the fact that two-thirds of SKAMP is not fully Lithuanian. If Lithuanians have a problem with one of their (we emphasize their) best singers being Irish and one of their best producers being half Malian, then that's fine with us. We don't feel insulted or anything like that. We just feel we shouldn't bother representing somebody who doesn't want that*" (Ingvoldstad, 2007:108)

[56] Polonization was the acquisition or imposition of elements of Polish culture, in particular, Polish language, as experienced in some historic periods by non-Polish populations of territories controlled or substantially influenced by Poland, and can be seen as an example of cultural assimilation. Such was the case of the nobility of Ruthenia and Lithuania.

[57] Russification is a form of cultural assimilation process during which non-Russian communities give up (whether voluntarily or not) their culture and language in favor of the Russian one.

[58] Lithuanian and Latvian are the two surviving "Baltic languages". Anatol Lieven notes that "*the elimination of the Old Prussians, one of the Baltic peoples, at the hands of the Germans [in the Middle Ages] … has often been cited in Baltic literature as an awful warning and example of the grim, existential danger facing small nations in the region*" (Ingvoldstad, 2007:106).

nation, highlighting several examples of the contestation of Lithuanian identity and its mapping within both regional and global contexts. It mediated Lithuanian's efforts to transform their own national identity and their place in Europe, prompting both the anxiety of being left behind, if the country did not "*make the grade*", as well as the fear of what it would mean for Lithuania, if and when it did finally enter "*Europe*". The contest was seen by the state television network and participants as a way for Lithuanians to access European markets. Reversely, the 2001 Lithuanian entry brought a totally fresh and innovative image into Eurovision. The lyrics of the song "*You got style*" doesn't concern about fashion only: Although the Lithuanian entry that year was one the most modern songs of the festival (EurovisionLive.com), there is a serious social-critical meaning[59].

"Self-imaging" branding, though, may lead to song changes through external pressures. A video for FYROM's entry for the ESC 2013, Vlato "Lozano" Lozanoski and Esma Redžepova's *"Imperija"* ("Empire", Appendix A,10), was pulled from YouTube 24 hours after the song's launch and a new version of the video was produced after complaints from within the country and abroad[60] – the latter over inclusions of images of the nationalistic "Skopje 2014" project[61]. This lavishly expensive project previously caused offence in Greece and Bulgaria, because it features statues of ancient and modern heroes, that two neighbouring countries seen as

---

[59] The lyrics are: (Partly translated from Lithuanian) "*Hey you, sittin' over there lookin' so fine / And I can't deny, given a while, we could spend some time / And see if there's more to you than meets the eye / 'Cause you sure look fine and you sure got style, yeah yeah / You look so divine that you blow my mind / Think I'll make you mine, yeah/ (You got style, you got style,) yeah / (You got style,) baby / I think I'll make you mine / Hey you, with the smile so sweet / Make all the girlies weak with that sleek physique / But once we meet I'll probably see you're no good to be true / You look so divine that you blow my mind / Think I'll make you mine, yeah / I walk down the street, is it you I see? / Finely designed, indeed / My gaze slides down, down / I watch your every move / You glance at me, my heart starts to beat / You paralyse my thoughts and I feel / A hot night is approaching me / Like this, like that, yeah (Like that) / I'm glad I met ya (All right) / Was geht ab? Alles klar? - Wunderbar (Come on, merci) / Comment ça va? - Comme ci, comme ça*".

[60] "*Macedonian media said that after the song was broadcast, on social networks there was a "real rebellion" because of the quality of the video for the song. In English-language websites, forum comments saw bitter exchanges between people from Greece and Macedonia, respectively, of the kind generally exchanged whenever the emotional and long-standing dispute over the use of the name Macedonia comes up*". (The Sofia Globe Staff). The video now available at: http://wiwibloggs.com/2013/02/28/discuss-esma-lozanos-imperija-is-the-duet-eurofans-craved/22608/#

[61] Skopje 2014 has been a project financed by the Government of FYROM, with the main ideology being based on that of the ruling party VMRO-DPMNE, with the purpose of giving the capital Skopje a more classical appeal by the year 2014. The project, officially announced in 2010, consists mainly of the construction of museums and government buildings, as well as the erection of monuments depicting historical figures from the region of Macedonia. Around 20 buildings and over 40 monuments are planned to be constructed as part of the project. The project has been criticized for constructing nationalistic historicist kitsch. Skopje 2014 has also generated controversy for its cost, for which estimates range from 80 to 500 million euros. (Wikipedia)

their own. Among these statues is one that Skopje calls "warrior on a horse" but which is widely perceived as being of Alexander the Great. Also the refrain of the lyrics to "*Imperija"* included the lines, in translation, "*Empire Empire/ Music reigns on Earth/ Empire Empire/ Most powerful force on the planet*", which in terms of the internal dynamics of the Balkans, the theme of an empire is reminiscent of FYROM's own claims of an imperial past, claims notably disputed by Greece and Bulgaria[62]. Within the overall troubled bilateral relations between Athens and Skopje, Greece saw FYROM's self-imaging creation efforts, as appropriation of Greek history.

Nevertheless, the new Eurovision countries seem to articulate their statements in various ways. For instance, the highly sexualized performance of the Bosnian gay singer Deen, in 2004, and his three female and sparely dressed background dancers, were rather surprising, given the fact that he came from a Muslim background as well as a homophobic society[63]. Whether Deen actually reflected the Bosnian openness towards homosexuality is questionable for Akšamija (2005), but he is certain to have communicated the current hegemonies present in Bosnia. Just as his artistic name implies "*foreignness*", his song "*In the Disco*" reflected the singer's attempts towards self-westernizing, through performance in English and with Versace sun-glasses on. Ultimately, his entry is seen by Akšamija more than just a "*zeal for making a performance outrageous enough to win*," but rather a desire to identify with Europe.

b. Lyrics

Many countries use Eurovision for political purposes. Song lyrics are a prominent way to disseminate a political message. Since 1999, songs may be in any language and most are performed in English. Under the EBU rules, "*The lyrics and/or performance of the songs shall not bring the Shows, the ESC as such or the EBU into disrepute. No lyrics, speeches, gestures of a political or similar nature shall be permitted during the ESC. No swearing or other unacceptable language shall be allowed in the lyrics or in the performances of the songs. No commercial messages of*

[62] The lyrics are: (in English translation) "*I am going, walking on the sky / I am flying through the time / And when I am sleeping / Songs I am dreaming / (You, hey you) / (Beautiful songs of ours) / The life is music / Energy, our empire / Empire, empire / The music reigns with the Earth / Empire, empire / The most powerful force on the planet / When the whole universe is sleeping / I am singing in the nights / The stars I am touching / With the wings of the notes*"

[63] The twenty three year old Fuad Backović (Deen) came from Sarajevo, from a politically prominent Muslim family; this made his homosexual coming out even more controversial.

any kind shall be allowed" (EBU Rules)[64]. Though this rule prohibits political songs, countries in the past have performed politically charged songs or used the contest for political purposes.

The most striking example of the last years is the entry of Georgia in the ESC 2009 (Appendix A,11), on which Stadler (2010:96) draws attention: in spring 2009, the band Stephane & 3G won the Georgian finals with their song "*We Don't Wanna Put in*" and were to participate in that year's ESC, which took place in Moscow. The title has an ambiguous meaning: a rebellion against *putting in* as well as against President Vladimir *Putin*. The written lyrics are about leaving everyday life while dancing in a discotheque[65]. Composer Stephane and the 3G – the three *girls* and musicians N. Badurashvili, T. Gachechiladze and K. Imedadze – show another story on stage. The refrain "*We don't wanna put in the negative move/ It's killing the groove/ I'm trying to shoot in some disco tonight/ Boogie with you*" becomes, intentionally mispronounced, an accusation: *We don't want Putin*. The line "*I'm trying to shoot in*," pronounced like *shoot him*, is underlined through the dancing moves of the singers. The performance leaves the three girls on the floor, apparently shot dead. Georgia initially had planned to boycott the ESC in Moscow, because of the August 2008 war[66]; however, it decided to participate. Then suddenly things turned against Georgians: the Eurovision Jury asked the musicians to change the lyrics of their song, because of its extreme, political content, which was supposedly violating the Eurovision competition rules (Jonze 2009). Stephane & 3G refused, blaming Russia for the jury intervention[67] and their entry was banned for being too political (Kamenev, 2009).

The Georgian entry was not the first time a former Soviet republic has attempted to mock Russia on the Eurovision stage. In the ESC 2007, Ukraine's Andrei Danilko (Appendix A,24), who appeared on stage dressed as an overly busty woman,

---

[64] The same rule applies every year.

[65] The lyrics are: "*Some people tell you the stories* / *To drag you down to their knees,* / *But lemme tell you dont worry,* / *No worries, No worries.* / *Another glass of my moonshine,* / *Will kick the hell out of me,* / *But lemme focus on good stuff,* / *Some good stuff, just good stuff.* / *We Dont Wanna Put In* / *The negative move,* / *Its killin the groove.* / *Im o try to shoot in* / *Some disco tonight / To boogie with you. So many people are whining,* / *They're freakin all day long,* / *Their bitchin will last forever* / *And ever, and ever. . .* / *You better change your perspective,* / *Your life won't be outta luck,* / *A groovy sun will be rising,* / *Be rising, its rising. . .*"

[66] The Russia–Georgia War of 2008 (also known as the *2008 South Ossetia War*, *Five-Day War* or *August War*) was an armed conflict in August 2008 between Georgia on one side, and Russia and the separatist Republic of South Ossetia and Republic of Abkhazia on the other.

[67] In a letter sent to the EBU, the producers of the song said that they had their suspicions that the decision to ask Georgia to revise its entry came about as a result of pressure from Russia, where that year's contest was to be held. Georgia's withdrawal went down well in Russia, where there had been small demonstrations against the song. (**Marcus**, 2009).

under the stage name *Verka Serduchka*, sang "*Lasha Tumbai*", but intentionally slurred the words so that viewers heard *Russia Good-bye!* His performance is constructed within the paradigm of the carnival but, according to Miazhevich (2012:1513), "*it goes beyond appropriation of elements of visual folk kitsch by embracing transgressive and absurd qualities of carnivalesque parody*".

The Ukrainian entry of that year conveys several subversive messages and operates within a number of ironic modalities:

Firstly, the references to the Soviet past become obvious from the first line of the song '*sieben sieben ai lyu-lyu'*, which is a slightly altered phrase representing a mixture of German, echoing a famous sentence from the Soviet film "Diamond Arm"[68]. The ridicule of a failed Soviet utopia unfolding on the stage is crowned by a Silver Star shining from the singer's head[69]. This is combined with an obvious rebellion against Russian dominance through the refrain '*lasha tumbai'* and the prevalence of the Ukrainian and English language in the song. This aspect of the song seems to reflect a particularly tense phase of Russian–Ukrainian diplomatic relations[70]. As the frenzy of the show progresses, fostered by an up-tempo music, the spectator is plunged into an even more absurd space. However, a post Soviet Russian-speaking viewer, for whom the '*Soviet-ness'* constitutes a '*common place'* (Boym 1994:73), can easily find a way to 'translate' numerous references and contextualise meanings.

Secondly, the stage outfit of the dance team resembles either a Soviet Pioneer uniform or a soldier's outfit. The fact that the start of the song is in German language strengthens the reference to World War II ("*The Great Patriotic War*"[71]). Miazhevich (2012:1515), argues that this mocking of political correctness is a post- Soviet phenomenon, which echoes the legacy of a negative attitude toward all things Western (including Western liberal values). The framework of self-irony allows the singer to '*get away*' with ridiculing the sacralized World War II legacy.

---

[68] In the film this phrase is uttered by a Western prostitute luring the main character, an honest Soviet worker on (a party approved) trip abroad, to her 'boudoir'.

[69] This star resembles the one at the clock tower of the Kremlin—the centre of the former Soviet empire.

[70] After the Ukrainian Orange Revolution (2004-2005) several problems resurfaced including a gas dispute, and Ukraine's potential NATO membership. Ukraine's attempts to join the EU and NATO were seen as change of course to only a pro-Western, anti-Russian orientation of Ukraine and thus a sign of hostility and this resulted in a drop of Ukraine's perception in Russia.

[71] *Вели́кая Оте́чественная война́*, the term is used in Russia and some former republics of the Soviet Union to describe the period from the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany with its allies (22 June 1941 to 9 May 1945).

Lastly, the dance and the accordion bring viewers back to the tradition of Soviet village festivals. By the end of the show, Serduchka's celebration of sexual liberation[72] turns into a mockery and an ironic protest against sexual colonization (the camp show inevitably links to pornography and the West, which is 'rotten'[73]). The artist runs around the stage 'pestering' the dance team, slapping support singers on their bottoms[74].

The following year, another song, from Georgia again, took a very critical perspective of Russia and its politics. Diana Gurstaya, a blind singer from the region, chose to perform in order to cast light on the atrocities in Abkhazia[75]. Her song "*Peace will come*"[76] (Appendix A,11) reflected the devastation of war and called for peace[77].

Boulos (2012:38) detects a similar case in the ESC 2010. Armenia's entry, "*Apricot Stone*" (Appendix A,2), was a tribute to the Armenian Genocide, which neither Azerbaijan nor Turkey recognize. Eva Rivas's song raised a wave of protest in Turkey, which claimed that Armenia's song had "*a political context hinting at the*

---

[72] The show's grotesque representation of Eastern European 'exoticism' as an attractive difference (for the Western audience) disrupts a predictable associative chain of fixed sexual identities and exotic sexual availability. At the same time, the show's carnivalesque orientation renders various evoked 'others' less 'frightening' teasing the audience with a glimpse into an 'utterly unknown' with its alterity disarmed (Allatson**,** 2007:94).

[73] '*Zagnivayushchii Zapad*' is an (ironic) USSR cliche´. This is a common phrase, which was used to describe 'all things Western' and is translated as '*rotten West*'.

[74] The incorporation of folk motives and sexual excess in the show is a 'double voiced' act, which can be read at face value and as a self-conscious parody to address both Western assumptions about the sexual availability and/or promiscuity of the East, and Western longings for an East, purified of modern sexual ambiguities and still in touch with primeval male and female archetypes (Baer**,** 2009:14). It thereby challenges reductionist conceptions of East– West cultural geography.

[75] Sporadic acts of violence followed the 2003 Rose Revolution (Georgian: ვარდების რევოლუცია *vardebis revolutsia*) continued and led the path to the Russia–Georgia War of 2008. Despite the peacekeeping status of the Russian peacekeepers in Abkhazia, Georgian officials routinely claimed that Russian peacekeepers were inciting violence by supplying Abkhaz rebels with arms and financial support. Russian support of Abkhazia became pronounced when the Russian ruble became the de facto currency and Russia began issuing passports to the population of Abkhazia. Georgia also accused Russia of violating its airspace by sending helicopters to attack Georgian-controlled towns in the Kodori Gorge. One month before the 2008 ESC, in April 2008, a Russian MiG – prohibited from Georgian airspace, including Abkhazia – shot down a Georgian UAV.

[76] The lyrics are: "*Look, the sky is crying cold bitter tears / Weeping for the people lost in fear / While we fight for nothing, my eyes run dry / Are you still so blind to ask me why? Why? / Say it out loud: peace will come / Everybody, shout: peace will come / When you stop and tame your rage / Something's gotta change / Something's gotta change / Say it out loud: peace will come / Everybody, shout: peace will come / Blow the trumpet, beat the drum / Peace will come / Sometimes words kill faster than bullets do / But the face of war is never true / Kids with guns are always too young to die / Are you still so deaf to ask me why? Why? / My land is still crying, torn in half / My world is slowly dying / My heart is only crying / Peace and love / Oh no, no, no".*

[77] In September 2008 an article was published on Radio Free Europe/ Radio Liberty's website proposing that *Georgian Artists Battle Moscow With Music*. The article introduced that the previous war in August between Tbilisi and Moscow was fought not only on the military front. Songs – intended to encourage the nation and weaken the enemy – were sung at political rallies, posted on websites and shown on Georgian TV. Various artists and singers seemed to have joined the armed forces (Rekhviashvili, 2008).

Armenian Genocide" (Abrahamyan 2010). The Turkish composer Yagoub Mutlu, who was at the Armenian national selection final concert, quoting the lyrics of the song, which included the word "*motherland*" five times, clarified that "*Many, many years ago / when I was a little child, / our world is cruel and wild, / but to make your way / through cold and heat love / is all that you need*" sentence apparently recalls about deportation of Armenians by Ottoman Turkey in 1915 and ways they have passed[78] (Adams 2012). Later in France, Armenian representative gave a speech confirming this claim[79].

A more recent example of Armenian troubled diplomacy playing out on stage is the poor relationship with Azerbaijan, over the Nagorno-Karabakh issue[80]. When Azerbaijan was due to host the competition in 2012, an Armenian MP claimed that the war over Karabakh was "*canceled due to Eurovision*." Armenia later withdrew from the 2012 contest over security concerns[81], which Azerbaijan asserted that was political propaganda, and prompted Ali Ahmedov, a senior member of Azerbaijan's governing party, to claim, "*The Armenian refusal to take part in such a respected contest will cause even further damage to the already damaged image of Armenia*" (Adams 2012).

In 2009, during the semifinals, the Armenian postcard included "*We Are Our Mountains*"—a statue in Nagorno-Karabakh, which is internationally recognized as a part of Azerbaijan. Azeris complained, and the EBU removed the statue from the clip for the grand finale. However, Armenians wouldn't let the issue go. In an act of revenge, the TV presenter of the Armenian votes, Sirusho Harutyunyan, repeatedly flashed a clipboard containing an image of "*We Are Our Mountains*." And she stood before another image of the statue, to assert Armenia's claim over the disputed

---

[78] "*And the word 'homeland' mentioned several times in the chorus, means Turkish territories*," Mutlu says.

[79] *Ermeni soykırımı iddiaları Eurovision Şarkı Yarışması'na sıçradı. Ermenistan adına yarışmaya katılan Eva Rivas'ın "1915'te kaybettiğim büyük anneme adıyorum" dediği şarkı Manga ile aynı sahnede yarışacak. Rivas'ın Ermeni iddialarının kabul edildiği Fransa'da yarışma öncesi, verdiği demeçte gözyaşlarına boğulması güne damgasını vurdu* (CNN Türk).

[80] Although the two nations signed a ceasefire in 1994, they have never brokered a final peace deal. An interesting article for another aspect of the dispute is, "Armenia and Azerbaijan : Nagorno – Karabakh Controversy at Eurovision" (Eurovision News)

[81] Tensions began to escalate in February when Armenia blamed the death of one of its soldiers on Azeri sniper fire. On Feb. 24, a group of 22 prominent Armenian musicians—including three former Eurovision contestants—signed a letter calling on Armenia to boycott the contest. "*We refuse to appear in a country that is well-known for the mass killings and massacres of Armenians, in a country where anti-Armenian sentiments have been elevated to the level of state policy*," it said. The final straw appears to have come in late February, when around 50,000 Azeris gathered in Baku to commemorate an alleged massacre carried out by Armenians 20 years earlier. Shortly afterwards, Azerbaijan President Ilham Aliyev posted the following remarks on his website: "*Our main enemies are Armenians of the world and the hypocritical and corrupt politicians that they control*."(Adams 2012)

territory. After the ESC show had finished, Azeri officials seized the televoting records and interrogated individuals who voted for Armenia[82].

Although political songs are technically prohibited, countries have and will continue to use Eurovision songs to further their political agenda. In 2005, when Ukraine hosted the contest, its song—allegedly an 'anthem' of the Orange Revolution (Kuzio 2005:34)—was performed in both Ukrainian and English, by the hip-hop band GreenJolly, whose name in western Ukrainian dialect means "sledge", attached to the Orange leadership team of President Viktor Yushchenko and Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko. GreenJolly was also among the top rock and pop stars, who joined the protests between Nov. 21 and Dec. 26, 2004, and warmed the crowds on Independence Square with hits of immense symbolic power and patriotism; the band jumped to the front lines with a rap tune "*Razom Nas Bahato!*"[83] (Together we are many), which became the unofficial anthem of the Ukrainian Orange Revolution[84]. The original song was entirely in Ukrainian, and was written specifically to refer to the 2004 presidential election, even going so far as to name Presidential candidate Viktor Yushchenko by name. When it was selected as the Ukrainian entry for the ESC 2005, the lyrics were rewritten to include English lyrics, and omitting references to Yushchenko[85]. The entry also appropriated elements of Western culture of bad taste, and was accompanied by peasant-like dancers freeing themselves from the chains of 'Big Brother'.

Similar cases, which emphasize the countries' current political situation of respective entries, are additionally observed by Boulos (2012:38). He provides a good overview of the impact of the break-up of Yugoslavia on seceding republics: Bosnia's 1992 entry, "*Sva bol svijeta*" ("All the Pain in the World", Appendix A,5*)*, sung by

---

[82] After the 2009 contest, Azerbaijan's National Security Committee reportedly seized tele-voting records and summoned Azeri citizens who had voted for Armenia to police stations. Officials then interrogated them over their loyalty to the nation (Adams, 2012)

[83] In Ukrainian: *Разом нас багато, нас не подолати*, It was Kalyn who "wrote the song in 15 minutes," picking up the lyrics from protesters as they chanted slogans in their native Ivano-Frankivsk. The song came together very fast, because it came from the heart, Kalyn said. (Zhuk, 2011).

[84] This anthem was also used by demonstrators in Belarus, after an election that was alleged to have irregularities (Wikipedia)

[85] The original lyrics of the song are: "*Together we are many / We will not be defeated / Falsifications, no! / Machinations, no! / Understandings, no! no! / No to lies! / Yushchenko, yes! / Is our president, yes! / Yushchenko, yes! yes! yes! / Together we are many / We will not be defeated / We aren't goats (kozly) / We are Ukraine's / Sons and daughters. / It's now or never, / Enough waiting!*". The ESC entry lyrics changed to: *We won't stand this (No), revolution is on / 'Cause lies be the weapon of mass destruction / All together we're one, all together we're strong / God be my witness, we've waited too long / Together we are many / We will not be defeated / What you wanna say to your daughters and sons / You know the battle is not over till the battle is won / Truth be the weapon, we ain't scared of the guns / We stay undefeated, 'cause together we're one.*

Fazla, was about a man who remained in Bosnia during the war and was sending out message to his love who now lived somewhere else. The song claimed, "*All the pain in the world tonight is in Bosnia*"[86] referring to the suffering of the Bosnian War, which had started a month before the ESC and was ongoing at that time. The same year Croatia's song was "*Don't ever cry*"[87] (Appendix A,7), performed by the group *Put* (Way), and it spoke of a young man, Ivan, who had died in the war; the song was a plea for peace, set against the backdrop of the war of aggression which had recently immersed Croatia. The song ended with the dramatic line "*Don't ever cry, my Croatian sky*" – a rare expression of patriotism in the lyrics of a Eurovision song.

In 2003, a year before it became a member of the EU, Poland's song was "*Zadnych granic / Keine Grenzen*" ("No Borders", Appendix A,17), with lyrics in Polish, German, and Russian describing a world with "*no stupid quarrels, no different races, no wars, no states*", and "*unlimited peace without flags*"[88]. Sieg (2012:04) explores whether and how the metaphor of the European family can be adapted to the purpose of signifying post-imperialist relations, and comparing this song and Ukraine's 2010 entry (Alyosha: "*Sweet People*"; Appendix A,24)), she takes a social view for looking at how gender stereotypes register the splitting of neoliberal elites' ambitions for equal participation in transnational economic and political decision-making, on the

[86]The lyrics are: "*No, I cannot feel the stars down here from the sky? I can't find the way to rise us up the road / I can only write and send a song to you / To know I'm still alive, oh my love. / When the cold and darkness sneak into my bones tonight / I will not allow the fear to push me to the lights / I still have the power to fight them all alone / If you were with me, it's easier would be. / The whole world's pain in Bosnia tonight / I stay here to challenge and to fight / And I'm not afraid to stumble and fall / I'll never stop to sing, they cannot take my soul. / When the cold and darkness sneak into my bones tonight / I will not allow the fear to push me to the lights / Who will then be guarding, standing all the pain / So the evil one never comes again? / The whole world's pain in Bosnia tonight / I stay here to challenge and to fight / And I'm not afraid to stumble and fall / I'll never stop to sing, they cannot take my soul. / The whole world's pain in Bosnia tonight / I stay here to challenge and to fight / And I'm not afraid to stumble and fall / I'll never stop to sing, they cannot take my soul*".

[87] The lyrics are: *Tisuœe snova dalekih, ruža u srcima zaspalih / Leptira tisuœe šarenih, k'o duše nevinih / Osamnaest godina, moga Ivana / Moli za njega, pjesmo anðela / Don't ever cry, don't ever cry / Never say goodbye, never say goodbye / Don't ever cry, don't ever cry / Never say goodbye, never say goodbye / Mir daj nam ti, mir daj nam ti / Nebo ljubavi, nebo ljubavi / Mir daj nam ti, mir daj nam ti / Nebo ljubavi, nebo ljubavi*

[88] The lyrics are: (in English translation) "*I wish I were an astronaut / Who looks down to the earth from up there / Because all those, who already were up there / They all say it's wonderful / Here you'll feel time slower passing by / Silence and peace that we miss so much / And here today it could also be this way / We're small, but not necessarily bad / No borders, no flags / From up there, the world is just beautiful / No countries, no nations / No wars can be seen from up there / Everyone should go there at least once / To realise this struggle doesn't make sense / Perhaps it will take our stupid megalomania / And instead of talking, we begin to love / No borders, no flags / No stupid quarrels, no different races / No wars, no states / No wars can be seen from up there / Unlimited (Unlimited) / Peace without flags (Peace without flags) / From the height, borders can't be seen anymore / Unlimited (Unlimited), unusually / Without quarrels, explosions, rage and wars / From up there the world is just beautiful*".

one hand, and consent to national economic dependency, on the other. Under close reading of Alyosha's song[89], Sieg focuses on the refashioning of the discourse of kinship and '*home'*, with references to civic participation, social and environmental sustainability and democratic sovereignty.

Both songs seem to take a critical perspective of the communist past and contemplate possibilities for a better future. In the case of the Polish entry, this future is predicated on overcoming nationalist aggression and, more concretely, a borderless Europe that was within reach: Poland had already joined NATO in 1999 and would soon enjoy EU membership. "*The image of the globe projected onto the Eurovision set underscored this globalist optimism which, however, was not accompanied by English as the lingua franca*". Instead, Ich Troje's use of German, Polish and Russian signaled Poland's newfound self-confidence vis-a-vis the historic imperialist constellation that must be transcended (Sieg, 2013:232). In 2010, by contrast, many in Ukraine were already disillusioned with the country's brief westward turn under the previous government, and its song entry captured a sense of compounded grief over lost worlds and missed opportunities. Sieg (2012:05) finds her choice to sing in English not mistaken as it sidesteps the increasingly nationalist politics of language in Ukraine for the purpose of a post-national vision of sovereignty (Sieg, 2012:05)

Similarly, the 2010 Lithuanian entry song, though very jolly, has some strong social meaning. "*Eastern European Funk*"[90] is a ska-styled song performed by InCulto. It starts with a short history lesson for Westerners about Eastern Europe: "*We survived the Reds and two world wars*." Then it talks about Eastern Europeans' life in Western Europe: "*Yes, sir, we are legal we are, though we are not as legal as you / No, Sir,*

---

[89] The lyrics are: "*Oh, sweet people / What have we done? / Tell me what is happening? / For all that we've built / Tumbles and is gone / Oh, sweet people / Have you no love for mankind? / Must you go on killing / Just to pass the time. / The message is so true / The end is really near / All these feelings take me down / It steals the things so dear / Yes, the message is so real. / Don't turn all the earth to stone / Because, because, because / This is your home / Oh, sweet people / what about our children? / In theaters and video games / They watch what we send to ruin / Oh, sweet people / What senseless game / Have we all been playing? / No one but you to blame? / The message is so true / The end is really near / All these feelings take me down / It steals the things so dear / Yes, the message is so real. / Don't turn all the earth to stone / Because, because, because / This is your home / This is our home*".

[90] The lyrics are: "*You've seen it all before / we ain't got no taste we're all a bore / But you should give us chance / 'cause we're just victims of circumstance / We've had it pretty tough / but that's OK we like it rough / We'll settle the score / we survived the reds and two world wars / Get up and dance to our eastern European kinda… / Get up and dance to our eastern European kinda… / Get up and dance to our eastern European kinda funk! / Yes sir we are legal we are / though we are not as legal as you / No sir we're not equal no / though we are both from the EU / We build your homes and wash your dishes / keep your hands all squeaky clean / But one of these days you'll realize / Eastern Europe is in your genes*"

we're not equal no, though we are both from the EU / We build your homes and wash your dishes, / Keep your hands all soft and clean / But one of these days you'll realize Eastern Europe is in your genes." Although the main part is the refrain: "*Get up and dance to our Eastern European kinda funk*!"[91], a deeper look lead to a new dimension in commentary on Western Europeans, and the fashionable belief that Europe stops at the German border (the Blog)[92].

The 2003 Russian entry (*t.A.T.u.* group; Appendix A,19) goes beyond the Lithuanian history lesson: it mocks the presumed cultural hegemony of the West. Heller (2007:113) takes a Russian advertising executive (named) Shapovalov's response to the BBC video controversy as the social and spiritual health of the countries that sought to sanitize the teen group's image. "*England is sick like America*", he told BBC reporters, "*and the only thing to do is to provide a cure. …We will heal the country with music*". Such oblique comments rhetorically reference the Russian nationalist belief, carried forward from Russian Orthodoxy,that is the unique mission of the Slavic people (and especially the descendants of ancient Holy Rus) to save the world (114). At the same time, his comments reflect the Russian pop-music industry's far more recent sense of liberation from earlier economic, political and social restraints and its beneficent arrival in the world of commercialized global media.

In this media world, Eurovision performances can be treated as a '*double voiced*' acts which self-consciously parody Western imaginings of an exotic, sexually, yet, promiscuous East (in many cases signalled by the inclusion of ethnic burlesque alongside sexual excess). Ukraine quite early realized, like many other smaller countries, the gains to '*capitalise on the stereotypes that are usually attached to their homelands*' (LeGuern, 2000) and build performances around '*a folkloristic musical style*' (Björnberg, 2007, pp. 21–22), which construct the Ukrainian brand not only for the Western public but also for regional audiences. Although in recent years (2008–2013) the artists have moved away from this over-essentialisation of national

[91] Which has been sung with such crazy passion that it has the potential to inspire their female fans to jump on stage and begin dancing with the band, as has happened before, and to totally lose control of themselves (Tracevskis, 2010)

[92] A columnist remarks: "*Didziulis [one of the band members] denies any political messaging: "Our song is very basically about us wanting you to dance to our Eastern European funk". But given the backlash against immigrants throughout Europe during the recent recession--Gordon Brown is running for re-election with the phrase "British jobs for British workers" - it's hard not to indulge an immigration theme. In this light, the song's video plays on the stereotypes attached to migrant workers. Do all six of those men live in that tiny house? Is he pulling vodka out of the fridge (and will he use our tax-payer funded National Health Service for alcohol treatment)?*" wonders the columnist (Adams, 2012).

traditions, they still tend to create a sexual and aesthetic overload (within a traditional gender model) to address a foreign look which idealizes differences, as Ruslana started it in 2004 very successfully.

On May 15, 2004, Ruslana Lyzhychko, won the 49th Eurovision Song Contest. The audience in 2004 was estimated to be 100 million, and almost 4.3 million viewers participated in the televoting (Pavlyshyn, 2006:469). Media commentary and Internet chat speculated at various levels of sophistication on the impact of the *Ruslana phenomenon*, not only on the prospects for Ukraine's integration into Europe, but also on the nature and strength of the forms of national self-identification among residents of Ukraine. Ruslana's "*Wild Dances*" performance alluded musically and visually to the folklore of the Hutsuls, indigenes of the Ukrainian part of the Carpathian Mountains. Much of the global reportage of her Eurovision victory interpreted her act as incorporating elements of this ethno-cultural heritage into "*a contemporary musical and showbiz idiom*" (Pavlyshyn, 2006:470).

For Ukrainian audiences, the alternation between three language codes in "*Wild Dances*" constructs arguments about identity. The diction of the song alternates between two languages and a third kind of linguistic material: the use of both English and Ukrainian functions as a demonstration of the singer's loyalty to her native language, on the one hand, and of global cultural competence, on the other. The song demonstrates its capacity to participate in an international event according to the event's expectations and rules[93]. For the Ukrainophone viewer, repetitions of variations on the incantation "*shydy-rydy dana*", carry associations with the musical culture of the Hutsuls, natives of the Carpathian Mountains who maintained a pre-industrial lifestyle well into the twentieth century. The meaning of these refrains is as obscure to contemporary Ukrainians as it is to the global audience, but the sounds are easily recognized as ethnographic quotations, that introduce into the song an element of the archaic and the pre civilizational, "*underscoring the positive value of "wildness" as an expression of the natural, on the one hand, and the heady, liberating quality of the dance on the other*". All of these connections are emphasized by costume and music (Pavlyshyn, 2006:475).

Some commentators recognized in the *Ruslana phenomenon* a new opportunity for the development of a vigorous national identity for Ukraine. All in all, a number of

[93] Even though Ruslana herself, as distinct from her performer persona, was not a speaker of English.

the persuasive mechanisms in the argumentative system of the *Ruslana phenomenon* were directed toward convincing the audience, both domestic and general, that "*Wild Dances*" was the consequence of a deliberate fusion of modem music and imagery, but also fusion of values and world views, on the one hand, and inspiration from authentic ethnic sources, on the other. The strategy involved the extrication of the ethnographic from the embrace of *sharovarshchyna*[94] and the re-legitimation of cultural distinctiveness as a viable feature of the modern, culturally plural, globalized world. It sought to persuade those viewers of Eurovision who were less than familiar with Ukraine to recognize the country as a vibrant and energetic place at the frontier of Europe, yet within it. Moreover, it sought to postulate Ukraine, not as a grateful recipient of European high culture, but more as a generous giver to a flagging Old Europe of new stimuli and energies. As far as the Ukrainian audience was concerned, on the other hand, the *Ruslana phenomenon* was a challenge to regard as natural the participation of Ukraine in Europe; to re-imagine the national self not as a victim or passive object of the processes driving the continent, but as a positive contributor to an open and manifold contemporary European culture; and to recognize that there is no contradiction between participation in the modem global world and emphatic national self-identification[95]. Ruslana's victory in 2004 added greatly to the persuasive force of these arguments (Pavlyshyn, 2006:475).

In the year following Ruslana's victory, the ESC underwent a process of intense politicization, with varied consequences. Entries from throughout CEE attempted to emulate Ruslana's "*Wild Dances,*" seeking, as is often the case in Eurovision entries, to gain access to the winning formula. Dance and drum ensembles resembled those of Ruslana. Additionally, many of them – Croatia, Hungary, Moldavia, Poland, Serbia & Montenegro, and Ukraine – chose to perform in their own national languages (Appendix A,7,12,15,17,20 respectively), a decision that virtually precluded the possibility of winning at the time. Political themes, too, were more

[94] More explicit than Ruslana's refusal of history was her rejection of the Soviet model of folklore. Ruslana promoted ethnos as a vibrant and productive component of the multi-faceted cultural reality of the present, contradicting Soviet-era identification of ethnicity and its symbols with pre-modernity. *Sharovarshchyna* embodies an attitude toward cultural roots that Ruslana emphatically rejected: "*We turned to ethnos, not to sharovarshchyna [...]. I am a contemporary singer with ethnic interests who has seen [ethnic material] through fresh eyes. There may well be traditional views of Hutsul culture that are dear to some highland officials. But we've done something innovative- something bold and unforeseen*"

[95] One commentator, evidently convinced, discovered in Ruslana's victory nothing less than an antidote to what he called the "*national inferiority complex*" and a pointer toward a "*new Ukrainian dream*" (Pavlyshyn, 2006:482).

evident than they had been in twenty-five years. It follows that the ESC 2005 was the most "ethnic" and most overtly tapped the politics of difference in the history of the contest.

And not much later, in 2007, for the BBC's announcer Terry Wogan, the worst scenario of the ESC came to realization: In the contest finals, the countries that ended to the places 1-16 out of 24 belonged to the CEE countries or previously marginal Eurovision countries (Turkey and Greece)[96]. Serbia itself, with a sheer Serbian song won the contest (Appendix A,20). The CEE nations managed to capture the stance of representing Europe: it was the first time since the removal of the language restriction in 1999 that a song without a word of English had won[97]; the first time a country from the former Yugoslavia had won; the first time a country during its "debut" year had won; the first time Serbia had won. Even ESC's own official website shoved Serbia from the past to the future, finding every possible way to reinvent it as a new nation heralding a new era of European song (Bolhlman, 2007:40). The New Europe had musically supplanted the Old Europe[98].

Serbia's victory in 2007 highlights another aspect studied by Boulos (2012:38), who depicts Eurovision's political nature and its association with the LGBT community[99]. This association has at times been problematic for countries unaccepting

---

[96] 1. Serbia (winner), 2. Ukraine, 3. Russia, 4. Turkey, 5. Bulgaria, 6. Belarus, 7. Greece, 8. Armenia, 9. Hungary, 10. Moldova, 11. Bosnia & Herzegovina, 12. Georgia, 13. Romania, 14. FYROM, 15. Slovenia, 16. Latvia.

[97] Performing in the English language can be interpreted as a competitive aspect. Most countries use the English language because they think it might help them to be more successful in the contest than if they sang in a national language, as Klapheck (2004) suggests. At first glance, ESC entries in English do indeed seem to be much more successful than songs in national languages. This was suggested as well by Schweiger and Brosius (2003:284) and by LeGuern (2000). However, Wolther (2012:170) concludes that the competitive advantage of English compared with other national languages cannot be detected statistically.

[98] Because 14 out of the first 16 songs came from Eastern European countries, a protest was also issued from Germany, namely, why should Western European states contribute most finances to the European Broadcasting Union. When Šerifovic was reconfirmed as the winner after an investigation by the EBU, the proposal emerged to have two separate contests, one for Eastern and one for Western performers. Finally, in November 2007, Austria announced that it would not compete in the 2008 contest, to be held in Belgrade, which, Austria stated, had become nothing short of a 'political kitchen'. Finally, a month later, the European Commission began an inquiry into whether the winning singer, being a supporter of the Serbian radical party candidate Tomislav Nikolic´ in the presidential campaign, was worthy of holding the title of 'the ambassador of intercultural dialogue' given to her on the occasion of the launch of the '*European Year of Intercultural Dialogue'*.

[99] A new research study called LGBT2020 from OutNow - the global gay and lesbian marketing and research company - revealed for the first time the gay impact of Eurovision in 19 diverse countries, spread right across the world. Ian Johnson, CEO of OutNow says: "*There have long been inferences that gays and lesbians share an affinity with the camp pastiche that is the Eurovision Song Contest, now, with the release of this LGBT2020 research we now know to what extent local gay and lesbian communities feel an affinity with Eurovision. Interestingly, some countries not traditionally connected to*

of LGBT individuals, but, at the same time, countries have used their Eurovision acts to signal their acceptance of the LGBT community. In 2007, Serbia chose Marija Šerifović to be its representative. This was a notable victory because Šerifović is Romany and an out lesbian in a strongly Orthodox country; moreover, her song, "*Molitva*" ("*Prayer*") is about lesbian love. More recently, Azerbaijan hosted the ESC 2012, which caused Iran to withdraw its Ambassador because by hosting Eurovision Azerbaijan was committing anti-Islamic behavior and "*insulting religious saints*" (Culshaw, 2012). In this way, participation in Eurovision catalyzes the LGBT movement and, at the very least, brings this issue to the political sphere when it otherwise would not.

In 2002, Slovenia selected a trio of transvestites, a group called "Sestre" (The Sisters) to represent them (Appendix A,23), which created a widespread backlash in the country. A public opinion poll[100] found that 51.4% of Slovenians did not want Sestre to represent them. A portion of the Slovenian public, anti-gay activists took to the streets of Ljubljana, protesting the selection of the song, which they saw as a slight to Slovenia. Furthermore, speeches calling for the group to be withdrawn reached the Slovenian Parliament[101] and, beyond, a member of the European Parliament's committee on Citizens' Freedoms and Rights, Justice, and Home Affairs to question Slovenia's EU accession: "*Now that the results of the Eurovision contest are being debated and the issue of gay rights is coming up, it confronts us with the fact that Slovenia is perhaps not yet ready for EU membership*" (Gaube 2002). Ultimately, Slovenia kept *The Sisters* as its representative.

4. Voting Bias

Political bias means voting that is not driven by song or performance characteristics; it is not just related to international politics or governance, but any voting that is motivated by non-song factors, which includes specifically political

---

Eurovision - such as Japan and Australia - have LGBT communities that are ardent supporters of this event." (OutNow, 2011).

[100] The public opinion poll was realized by the weekly NeDelo Newspaper and the results were published on 3 March 2002.

[101] Franc Kangler, an SLS member of parliament questioned whether judges rigged the contest. However, SDS member of parliament Tone Partljic defended Sestre, saying that the song should be more important than the performer. Speaking to the daily Finance, Jernej Repovš of Studia Marketing said that with Sestre's win, "*With this we are clearly stating that there is no discrimination here*." (Požun, 2002).

votes[102]. The term does not only refer to the political relationships between countries, but also includes social, cultural, and normative ties (Boulos, 2012:05)

The scoring system changed several times. For the first forty years, from 1956 to 1996, only juries awarded points. In 1997, five countries implemented televoting, and from 1998 – 2008 countries exclusively used televoting, although occasionally some countries used juries for technical reasons. Beginning in 2009, individual country votes have been split 50/50 between the jury and televote[103]. The move to the split vote was motivated by claims of political voting. Countries had been upset, because televoters were not voting for songs based on quality, but rather on their own country of origin. National juries are made up of music industry officials; under the EBU rules, national jury members must pursue one of the following professions: radio DJ, artist, composer, lyricist, or music producer (EBU Rules).Tele-voting, though, was initially introduced in 1998, so that every citizen can participate, and according to Haan, et al. (2005), "*in many countries, the number of people calling in to register their vote is in the hundreds of thousands*."

After the performances, countries vote for their favorite songs, but they cannot vote for themselves. Each individual country awards points to ten different countries. The ratings are normalized so that the favorite song gets 12 points, the next one 10, and then 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1. This allows each voting country to give positive ratings to ten other countries[104]. The country with the most points wins.

Geographical and cultural factors seem to play the most important role in voting issues, guiding the attention of national audiences, sometimes despite the supposed aesthetic qualities of a song and its performance.

The collusive voting behavior in the ESC has been studied by an increasing number of scholars with various backgrounds, including computer sciences, economics, sociology, etc. Recent research shows that bilateral votes are strongly affected by conventional measures of cultural proximity, such as linguistic, ethnic, or

[102] For example, many believe the UK's act in 2003 finished the competition with zero points because of the UK's involvement in the Iraq War, with the British commentator Terry Wogan stating that the UK was "*suffering from post-Iraq backlash*" (BBC, 2003).

[103] The split vote addressed the concerns of member countries. Under the split vote, each jury member secretly ranks his/her ten favorite songs. The individual votes are combined to create a total jury vote, where the most preferred song receives 12 points and the tenth ranked song receives one point. For the televote, the song with the most televotes receives 12 points and the song with the tenth most votes receives one point. The jury vote and televote are then combined and the ten countries with the highest combined votes receive points. Twelve points are given to the country with the highest combined score and one point is given to the country with the tenth highest combined score (Boulos 2012:06).

[104] Participating countries cannot vote for their nationals

religious ties (Ginsburgh & Noury, 2008; Clerides & Stengos, 2006). However, in contrast to standard indicators, the ESC scores vary over time and are potentially asymmetric.

Western European countries used to dominate the competition, but with the breakup of the USSR, they have lost their prominence[105]. For countries on the periphery of Europe, voting for 'traditional' European countries may be a sign of wanting to join "Europe" and, likewise, receiving votes from 'traditional' European countries is assumed as a sign of acceptance. Estonia raised this very issue in an analysis of voting patterns included in its 2000 Human Development Report: "*Have generous scores from our geographical and cultural neighbors contributed to an excellent song and appropriate performer, or does the reason for our success lie in our natural affiliation with Europe? Is it that Estonia is part and parcel of modern cultural Europe and possesses the skill to stand up and be noticed even before economic and political integration?*" (EHDR, 2000: 68).

ESC scores are informative about a broader concept of cultural proximity that is close to the definition used by sociologists (Straubhaar, 2002). Felbermayr & Toubal (2010:279) find the cultural proximity to be related with the sharing of a common identity, the feeling of belonging to the same group, and with the degree of affinity between two countries. The sociological concept makes concession of the evolution of bilateral attitudes and moods over time and of asymmetries within pairs of countries. Thus, they assert that a country's citizens can display respect and sympathy for the cultural, societal, and technological achievements of another country without this feeling necessarily being mutual and ever-lasting. Conventional measures of cultural proximity, such as common language, ethnicity, genetic traits, or religion are both time-invariant (pre-determined) and, by construction, symmetric, and can, therefore, not fully capture the broad notion of cultural proximity.

Early enough, before the massive entrance of CEE countries to the ESC, Yair (1995:153) had found three blocks, the Western, the Northern and the Mediterranean. He proved (149) that the appreciation of music has no clear objective criteria, unlike competitive sports, and since the winning song has no special traits (no superior harmonies, tunes or orchestration), and given that songs reflect "*national taste, native*

[105] In Britain, for example, public cries to leave the competition surface every year because the newer countries vote politically amongst themselves; or, in the words of Terry Wogan, the British Eurovision announcer, "We won the Cold War but we lost Eurovision" (Savage, 2007).

rhythm and primordial meanings", he concludes that this subjective factor of cultural evaluation is innate in the contest and raises manifold dimensions of comprehension and appreciation.

Therefore, the evaluation of foreign songs relies on a cultural match between the evaluator and the evaluated, which reveals the underlying structure of cultural evaluation, which implies by its turn, that the ESC folds in the voting matrix the underlying political and cultural structure of Europe (Yair, 1995:150). European unity and solidarity, national rifts and ethnic conflicts are reflected in the results of the contest. Enjoyment of songs is thus a function of the encounter between national and cultural tastes (Yair & Maman, 1996; Gatherer, 2006).

On the other side, there is an extensive amount of research available on the possible voting bias in the ESC. Fenn et al. (2006) study the voting patterns in the ESC during the years 1992–2003 by means of a network approach. Establishing what the authors call '*voting cliques'*, they use cluster analysis to show which countries behave similarly in terms of the average number of points awarded to other countries. The results suggest only some relation between countries' voting patterns based on geographical proximity. The authors conclude that the observed voting similarities are caused by a common historical or cultural background instead of just geographical proximity, but they do not investigate this any further, and, thus, receive the criticism of Ginsburgh & Noury (2008:42) for ignoring "quality", as determined by the juries of the various competitions, even though for the latter it plays the most important role.

Dekker's analysis (2007:54) revealed a set of friendship blocks, and a significant tendency to vote for nearby countries: the Eastern (former USSR, Romania, Hungary, Poland), the Nordic (Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Iceland), the Balkan (former Yugoslavia, Albania), the Eastern Mediterranean (Greece, Cyprus, Malta, Bulgaria, Turkey), the Western (other countries).

Ginsburgh & Noury (2008) provide the most detailed statistical analysis performed so far upon the Eurovision Song contest votes. The authors distinguish '*vote trading*' (where two countries exchange votes) and '*cultural voting'* (where countries prefer songs from those countries which satisfy certain cultural characteristics). For the period 1975–2003, they test the hypothesis that votes have been exchanged in the contest. The authors find hardly any evidence for this hypothesis. By contrast, song quality plays a substantial role in explaining the voting behavior. However, variables such as language and cultural characteristics again, turn out significant in most of their

models. On average, countries prefer songs in the same language and coming from a related culture.

Spierdijk & Vellekoop (2009) have also recently established '*strong evidence for voting bias in the song contest on the basis of geography* '. However, these effects did not generally align with the usual accusations of block voting, i.e. particular countries voting for their neighbours owing to any political reasons. Inversely, they conclude (2009:423) that the influence of cultural, linguistic, religious and ethnical factors on the votes can be explained by human behavior. However, when geographical variables turn out significant even after correction for the former factors, this raises the suspicion that there is 'political' voting.

And Ginsburgh & Noury (2004:41) assert that '*there is no evidence for logrolling. By contrast, cultural and linguistic proximities obviously play a significant role. It may well be that cultural proximities are also at work in international political bodies, and that what appears as being logrolling is due to cultural factors.*' Nevertheless it has to be underlined that accusing certain cultural groups or nations of political voting is, of course, part of the political dimension of the ESC even though the voting itself is not. Yet, the same authors, some years later, test the hypothesis whether players exchange votes (Ginsburgh & Noury, 2008:41) and result in the conclusion that voting agreements are struck, or if countries cast political rather than "artistic" votes, even though here is no political issue at stake[106].

Yet, Bolos (2012:215) emphasizes the evolution of international relations over the image of a country. The European continent is widely known as being full of stories of territorial quarrels, wars, diplomatic conflicts regarding economic or social interest like the Kosovo case, FYROM v. Greece and many others. He finds these elements to have had impact over the neighborhood policies and, sometimes, the same elements go deeper in the citizen's collective mentalities. Maybe this is why at a cultural contest, such as the ESC, geopolitical votes can be observed especially around areas like the former Yugoslavian countries (Serbia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, FYROM), former USSR parts (Baltic countries, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Ukraine, Moldova) and Scandinavian countries.

[106] Accusations of political influence on the voting patterns have been suggested, particularly by BBC-TV commentator, Terry Wogan, after the 2000 contest. See for instance the discussion on http://homepage.ntlworl.com/waterloo/ 2000/politics.htm .

This explains, perhaps, why the most complex factor that may have affected the results since 1990s has been the re-drawing of the political map of Europe and the continued growth of the EU, urging newly emergent attitudes toward ethnic and national cultural expression. Where there had formerly been, for example, one Yugoslav state in the ESC before 1993, there are now six separate nations, each with their own set of points to influence the outcome of the contest. The 3 ex-Yugoslav republics that participated in 2003, gave Turkey 12 points each[107], and this trend in voting may be due, in part, to shared musical and cultural affinities between the Balkans and Turkey, but Solomon suggests (2007:142) that there is also something more complex in play here having to do with the cultural dimensions of ethno-nationalism in Europe.

This trend toward rewarding self-consciously "ethnic" styles has continued in subsequent years as well. 2004 Ukraine's Ruslana won the first place with a performance that included fanciful costumes and choreography, which evoked the ethnic culture of the Carpathian Mountain region of western Ukraine. The second place-winner in 2004 Željko Joksimović from Serbia & Montenegro, performed his song "*Lane moje*" entirely in Serbian, but the onstage ensemble prominently included kaval[108], Turkish saz, violin and west African djembe drums[109]. In 2005 Greece's performer Elena Paparizou took first place with "*My number One*" including a dance interlude, in which the sound of the lyra was prominent. Solomon (2007:143) claims that Greece, in 2005, found the right combination of a solid pop song, English lyrics, and "ethnic" style in its music and performance, comparable in many ways to Sertab's 2003 performance.

But not only that; many new countries have begun to place greater value and emphasis on national culture and their uniquely "ethnic" cultural identity as a sort of compensation for the perceived loss of individual state sovereignty. This interest in

[107] Bosnia & Herzegovina 12, Croatia 12, Slovenia 12; Serbia & Montenegro (then) and FYROM did not participate in 2003.

[108] A wooden rim-blown, ductless vertical flute common throughout the Balkans

[109] Mitrović (2010:173) searches the transitional turning point in Serbia, which she finds to be the year 2000, after the fall of Slobodan Milosevic's regime. She gives credit to the shift of power in Serbia, which by itself motivates the gradual abandonment of the hermetic circle of polarisation and inclusion in differentiating cultural trends. Željko Joksimović, reversely, established the model of success at Eurosong, not only in terms of music and language (since he sang in his native language), but also in terms of self-representation, i.e. representation of nationality. Mitrović, also, detects the outfit of the Serbian performers, since she argues reasonably that visual identity is crucial for the whole construction; She concludes that this identity is almost entirely recycled form the 'memories' of medieval Serbia.

local “national culture” includes holding an approving attitude toward other European countries’ display of their own “national culture”. The Turkish victory in 2003 opened a period during which South-East European music traditions were particularly successful in the ESC. The song that articulated Turkey’s historical moment that year prominently featured Turkish musical style. Voters similarly favored the second place winner, the Belgian neo-Celtic folk group Urban Trad, whose performance of the folksong-like “*Sanomi*” evoked an imagined Belgian Celtic past.

Not to mention that the period leading up to that year’s ESC brought to the fore a number of political and cultural factors that influenced attitudes towards Turkey in Europe and may also have contributed to Turkey’s Eurovision success that year[110]. Solomon (2007:138) distinguishes 4 factors, that seemed to have played a special role:

a. The limiting of Turkey’s support for the United States in the run-up to the second Gulf war[111],

b. improved relations between Turkey and Greek Cyprus,

c. the large number of diasporic Turks in West European countries and

d. the re-drawing of the European political map, with the concomitant emergence of new attitudes towards national culture in Europe more generally.

The ESC 2003, just two months after the invasion of Iraq began, was to a certain extent held in the shadow of this war, and was for many fans and participants a celebration of continental European culture in contrast to American culture. European countries where the general population largely opposed the war, such as Germany, France, Norway, Austria, Belgium, and the Netherlands, interpreted the Turkish parliament’s decision as Turkey’s way of standing up on principle to American bullying tactics (Heller, 2007:115). In all of these countries (except the Netherlands), not only popular opinion but also official government policy opposed the war. And all of these countries gave Turkey 10 or 12 points, the two highest scores possible[112].

---

[110] These factors are alleged to have played a vital role for the turkish song to win instead of the russian entry of that year, which despite provisional internet ratings showing t.A.T.u. in the lead, and most contest devotees’ expectations for Russia to come first, Sertab Erener won the first prize.

[111] On 1 March 2003, during the run-up to the American-led invasion of Iraq on 20 March, the Turkish parliament voted unexpectedly, and against the wishes of the political leadership, not to allow the United States to use its Incirlik military base in southern Turkey as a staging area for a ground offensive in northern Iraq. The parliament took this measure despite Washington’s offer of $6 billion in economic aid to Ankara as a compensation for use of the base.

[112] Scores of Turkey by country in ESC 2003: Austria 12, the Netherlands 12, Belgium 12, Bosnia & Herzegovina 12, Croatia 10, Slovenia 10, Romania 10, Germany 10, France 10, Norway 10, Cyprus 8, Sweden 8, Portugal 8, United Kingdom 7, Israel 7, Greece 7, Malta 4, Iceland 3, Spain 3, Ukraine 2, Poland 2, Russia 0, Latvia 0, Estonia 0, Ireland 0.

Incidentally, the biggest European supporter of the United States in the Iraqi invasion, the United Kingdom, came in last place with zero points[113].

In April of the same year, coincidentally just one month before the contest, Turkish Cypriot authorities eased decades-old travel restrictions between Turkish-occupied northern Cyprus and Greek southern Cyprus. Many attributed this thawing of the Cyprus conflict as a way for Turkey's EU candidacy to move forward[114]. In this atmosphere of rapprochement, Cyprus gave some of its points to Turkey for the first time ever in ESC history. As he announced his country's votes via satellite linkup, the Greek Cypriot announcer made the peace sign with his fingers as he said, "*Europe, peace to Cyprus, Turkey eight points*". It has to be remarked that Turkey's final points in the contest were 167, while the second-place winner Belgium got 165 points, which made this unexpected support from Cyprus a significant contribution to the equally unexpected victory for Turkey[115].

And, while the governments and elites of countries on the periphery of Europe have found in the ESC an opportunity to express their desire to be part of European power structures, more marginal populations, especially within "*Old Europe*", discover, also in Eurovision, a chance to participate in the ideal of Europe. Tobin (2007) focuses his research on Germany, one of the five countries using televoting for the first time in 1997. That year is observed to have been seen a dramatic increase in the number of points Germany gave to Turkey, and started a trend that would last several years. After four consecutive years of awarding Turkey no points at all[116], beginning in 1997 Germany gave Turkey the maximum of 12 points three years in a row (1997-1999). Solomon (2007:140), based on previous surveys (Gambaccini, et al, 1999), claims that the sudden swift of German support for Turkey from 1997 onward was the result of the large Turkish population in that country using televoting to vote for their homeland. The implication was that Germany awarded too much support in

[113] Indeed such speculation was rampant in Britain after the group Jemini set a new record low by receiving zero points. (BBC, 2003; Wells, 2003).

[114] Greek Cyprus was itself scheduled to become a member in May 2005, with or without northern Cyprus.

[115] After the contest, reaction in Cyprus to the voting and to Turkey's victory was mixed. Some Greek Cypriots accused the state-run Cyprus Broadcasting Cooperation of rigging the televote. The newspapers *Fileleftheros* and *Simerini* both conducted polls of the Greek Cypriot population asking their opinions about this, and many people wrote that they opposed Cyprus' giving Turkey any points on the ground of the 30-year Turkish occupation of the northern part of the island. The Turkish newspaper *Hürriyet* reported (28 May 2003) on these polls and quoted many of the respondents under the headline "*Rumlar 8 puana pışman*" (=Cypriot Greeks regret 8 points): (Alkan, 2008)

[116] 1991-1996, not counting 1994 when Turkey did not compete and 1996 when Germany did not compete.

1998 and 1999 to Turkish songs, that everybody else recognized as inferior, and this support must have come from the votes of the Turkish population living in Germany. Additionally, all of the five countries with the highest populations of Turkish residents gave Turkey either 12 or 10 points in the ESC 2003[117]. Feddersen (2002:62) points out that other immigrant groups sway the German vote also toward Bosnia & Herzegovina, Poland, Croatia, and Russia. Immigrant groups in other countries, such as the Portuguese in France, are alleged to have a similar influence on voting. In 2004, many Bosnians thought that their country's Serbian minority had overwhelmed the phone lines and given Serbia 12 points, while many in FYROM believed that its Albanian minority had caused its 12 points to go to Albania (Petruseva, 2004).

This is also justified by a study, undertaken by Spierdijk & Vellekoop (2009), which estimates a model separately for the periods before and after the introduction of televoting in 1997/1998; it becomes clear that Turkish migration plays a significant role both before and after the start of the new voting system. However, the effect in the second period is stronger than in the first. Hence, the substantial effect of Turkish migration in the time-invariant model is mainly due to the televoting period. Further they detect through sample statistics that countries with a substantial Turkish population are strongly biased toward the Turkish contribution to the song contest. They refer to this phenomenon as "*patriotic voting*" (2009:419).

Boulos (2012) goes even further indicating seven countries, of which the televoters were less likely to vote for minority singers: Albania, Belarus, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Turkey, and Ukraine. All of these countries are either from the Balkan or former-Soviet bloc. Interestingly, Ukraine sent a minority singer in the 2012 contest, although this was highly controversial[118], especially among conservative party members. (2012:41)

---

[117] Statistics on the population of Turks living in western Europe vary widely. Figures taken from the EU's *Annual Report on Asylum and Migration* (2001), and OECD's *Database on Immigrants and Expatriates* (2004) show: in Germany 1,947,938 (EU) / 1,189,250 (OECD), in France 173,051 (EU) / 179,382 (OECD), in the Netherlands 100,309 (EU) / 181,865 (OECD), in Austria 98,801 (EU) / 125,026 (OECD), in Belgium 45,866 (EU) / 70,793 (OECD).

[118] Yuriy Syrotyuk, a high-ranking member of the ultranationalist Svoboda (Freedom) Party objected to singer's race. "*Gaitana is not an organic representative of the Ukrainian culture," he told the Kyiv* Post *at the end of February, adding that he preferred Gaydamaky — a Ukrainian group that performs Cossack rock, which draws inspiration from Ukraine's rich musical heritage. "As we want to be accepted to the European Union, it could be our opportunity to show the Europeans that we are also a European nation. We need to show our originality." As part of his xenophobic rant, he also suggested that Gaitana "will provoke an association of Ukraine as a country of a different continent*" (Adams, 2012)

Over a decade after the end of the wars in Bosnia & Herzegovina, and Croatia, all of the Yugoslav successor states are now regular participants in Eurovision, and it appears that the common experiences that they have shared at the contest and in popular music are influencing their vote. At the 2004 ESC Serbia & Montenegro received 12 points from Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, and Slovenia: countries with which they had been at war in the 1990s[119]. Goran Svilanovic, Serbia's former Foreign Minister, optimistically told HTV at the time that Croatia's 12 points for Serbia "*would help improve relations between the countries in the region*". And rightly Bohlman (2007:42) wonders, given the neighbors[120] that awarded to Serbia twelve points, if the memory of an "old" Serbia could disappear so quickly because of the politics and pleasure of song[121].

Conversely, what does it mean when two neighbouring countries don't exchange votes? Ingvoldstad (2007:108) chooses to highlight the case of the Lithuanian votes to Estonia in the ESC 2001, which turned out to be called a "scandal". That year Lithuania gave Estonia ten points, while Estonia had "reciprocated" with zero points for Lithuania. The indignation many Lithuanians felt over this unequal scoring demonstrates another way to understand the ESC in terms of political transition: the way it focuses attention on multinational coalition building – and coalition collapse. Ingvoldstad explains that Lithuanian's perception of the 2001 voting as "*a snub from Estonia*" comes in the context of ongoing frustration with tariff rate increases from Lithuanian Telecom (*Lietuvos ryšiai*, administered by an Estonian) and an Estonian government official's claim that his country was not in fact Baltic but Scandinavian. Thus, as Lithuania was negotiating its identity as a part of Europe, it was also engaged in a struggle with a more complicated relationship to its former 'allies' on

---

[119] Petruseva cites the odd change of votes between Balkan countries as follows: "*Behind the scenes at the May 15 event in Istanbul, Serbia and Montenegro's singer Zeljko Joksimovic rushed to thank his Croatian rival, Ivan Mikuljic, for his country's unexpected gesture. It was not the only shock of the evening, upsetting widespread stereotypes of the former Yugoslav peoples as obsessed by ancient tribal hatreds. Throughout the show, the telephone voting juries of each republic tended to give high scores to neighbours' songs. Croatia, and Slovenia both gave Serbia and Montenegro their top scores of 12 points, though both republics went to war with Belgrade in 1991. In another surprise, Macedonia gave its 12 points to neighbouring Albania, even though ethnic Albanians staged a revolt inside Macedonia in 2001. In spite of a gruelling three-year war pitting Bosnian Muslims and Croats against Bosnian Serbs and their allies in Serbia from 1992 to 1995, Bosnia gave its highest score to Serbia's Zeljko*". (Petruseva, 2004).

[120] Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Hungary, the FYROM, and Slovenia.

[121] "*Are the networks of aesthetics and politics that shape the meaning of Europe today, as they were in the past, implicated in a different set of processes that gather the fragments of the past to shape a transient wholeness in the present?*".

a different playing field. The ESC was an occasion for Lithuania to voice displeasure over their neighbor's pretension – made only worse by the fact that Estonia had actually won the whole thing that year.

As a consequence, it seems that European enlargement in the ESC stopped being '*just about getting bigger*' and became '*a matter of cultural transformation'* (Delanty, 2003:10). This cultural transformation involves struggle. Accordingly, the ESC has been an arena for debate concerning power relations in Europe in recent years, with recurring complaints in old participating countries about the increasing prominence of CEE countries. And it becomes hardly a coincidence that the European map, used on the screen during the show, gained prominence in the ESC at a time when Europe was undergoing great changes with the establishment of new countries and the expansion of the European Union[122]. As the ESC's image of Europe became more inclusive, the maps used also gave increasing room to North Africa and the Middle East, highlighting the fact that Europe has no clear boundaries (Pajala, 2012:07). While earlier maps featured national borders, since 2001 these have been left out, making the ESC ready for a stylized image of Europe with no clear boundaries, which emphasizes unity over national borders[123].

The European map has disappeared from the ESC since the 2009 contest held in Moscow. As the number of participants has grown, there has been a need to streamline the voting process, which probably explains why the graphics have been simplified and the map no longer used. However, it seems significant that the European map was left out just when the ESC was held in Russia for the first time. Fitting all of Russia on the same map with Western Europe would have produced a very different map from the one Eurovision viewers are used to.

[122] The European map became a central visual element of the ESC in the late 1990s, beginning in 1996 when maps were featured in the 'postcard films' that introduce the entries. Different versions of the European map were then used to visualise the voting from 1998 to 2008.

[123] With the development of digital imaging technology, ESC maps have acquired movement, picturing Europe in less stable ways than before. The 2006 map blurs the boundaries of Europe. Instead of the customary outline of Europe, we see carefully drawn countries emerge from a shapeless background. This moving map could be read as an illustration of the difficulties of representing Eurovision's ever-widening Europe (Pajala 2012:08). In the 2007 contest on the other hand we first see a simple map of Europe with no national boundaries.

5. Conclusion

When inspecting the literature, various different definitions of participation in the ESC could be found, which is why a more detailed examination has been necessary. Superficial or visible differences among the ESC entries including race, age, gender and sexuality, and ethnicity are easily detectable and comparable, whereas deeper level disparities depict national or ethnic values, beliefs and attitudes; therefore, they need a more intensive engagement, since several questions are raised: what sort of depictions of national and European identities does the ESC convey through stage performances, the award winners, the selection of songs, melodies and costumes? What patterns of social representation and identity does it reveal? More closely, what are the social principles at work in the shaping of those representations?

In his article '*Visions of Europe'*, Göran Bolin (2006) defines the *Eurovision Song Contest* as a media site for the construction of national identity. In one part of his discussion, Bolin focuses specifically on the "*cultural technologies*" used by post-communist countries in aligning with Western Europe. As can be inferred from the affair and the consequent public reactions, the ESC spectacle has borne the burden to carry the power of symbolically structuring the cultural terrain of the new Europeans and their claim of belonging in the enlarged EU. In social theory, for some time now, European identity has been conceptualized in ambiguous terms of both impossibility and possibility, both as fiction as well as cognitive social reality.

The economic world is altering, which can be seen in an increasing internationalization, technological progress as well as EU enlargements and demographic changes. With the 2012 contest held in Azerbaijan, where conventional geographical definitions place the border between Europe and Asia, the program's relationship to the concept of Europe may be undergoing a change. For Azerbaijan itself, staging the ESC was treated as a valuable chance to represent the country for an international audience, but it becomes debatable whether the ESC there still had symbolic power as a marker of European belonging.

Deducing from the number of different dimensions, some interesting remarks can be made:

- ✓ First, the analysis of Eurovision entries interprets their role as a platform both for national / cultural identification and for the negotiation of a country's individual stance. The debates over participation are constructed within and

around certain spatial and temporal spaces, re-affirming particular ‘cultures’ of taste. The persona of the singer is at the core of the discussions, where it is often reconstructed as the ‘Other’ at the heart of the self. The level of communication of a particular national identity, in relation to its European self-consciousness, is also contingent on the choice of the song, the language of it, and the costume. Albeit the variety of the topics covered, the discussion encircles the nation-branding issues (‘*us*’ compared to ‘*them*’): how they see us and how we want to be perceived by them

- ✓ Second, it has been rightly argued (LeGuern 2000) that the representation of national identities is built from cultural elements, which can be revealed through the ingredients of a song, as well as the competitors’ performances. Indicators of cultural idiosyncrasies are indeed at work, such as the competitors’ costumes or the song melodies. What they seem to imply is a division between those contestants who play on national stereotypes and those who wish to abandon any form of national singularity. It is a fact that "smaller countries" – particularly those of the Mediterranean zone – are more prone than "bigger countries" to capitalize on the stereotypes usually attached to their homelands. Indeed, France, Germany, England, i.e."bigger countries" as well as newcomers (Eastern European countries whose media markets have lately opened to American productions) avoid the use of national clichés, otherwise they use them selectively in the frame of the project to identify themselves within the European territory. In other words, representations of national identities as revealed by the ESC fall into two opposing categories that typify tradition and modernity.

- ✓ Third, by clarifying political functions of cultural symbols in the ESC, the concept of cultural hegemony can aid anthropologists of politics trying to understand how ideas reinforce or undermine existing social structures (Jackson Lears, 1985:572), and social historians seeking to reconcile the obvious contradiction between the power wielded by dominant groups and the relative cultural autonomy of subordinate groups whom they victimize.

- ✓ Fourth, as Berezin (2003:16) remarks, European identity per se is not new: the "old" Europe of territorially bounded nation-states evolved as a political, economic and cultural product. A new European identity is "arguably an afterthought". The material for a European political community in the Weberian sense is flawed on two counts, as revealed in the ESC: first, Europe as a political space is territorially ambiguous; second, Europe as a cultural space lacks affectivity – that is emotional attachment. Europe has no common popular civic space or cultural past from which to forge an identity except for memories of war (Berezin, 2003:22).

- ✓ Fifth, in the post-Socialist context, the distinction between inter-cultural and intra-cultural turns out to be itself problematic. The instruments of sexual and aesthetic excess in show are used to address the (mis)representation of the post-Socialist 'Other' and represent the new version of EU periphery. Former Socialist countries compete with one another to claim the estrada tradition for themselves. This competition becomes, on the temporal level, an intra-cultural struggle and, on the spatial level, an inter-cultural polemic.

- ✓ Sixth, the analysis of the show and the online discussion highlights the intertwining of kitsch with geopolitics. This is a feature of most Eurovision entries. (Self-)irony, kitsch, and (homosexual) eroticism may serve a dual purpose: not only for providing a comforting sense of superiority to domestic fans, who tend to be aware of the ploy with which their 'unsuspecting' Western counterparts are 'fooled', but also for 'impressing' those counterparts with post-communism's newly found 'progressive modernity', and thus for securing votes.

- ✓ Lastly, the identified '*kitschification*' of the show both reinforces national and other stereotypes and, by creating an ironical distance, challenges and renders them ambiguous.

Appendix A: ESC entries of CEE countries

English Language

National Language

Mixed Language

Other (third country's) Language

Winning Song

n.q. = not qualified to the finals

1. **Albania** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
2004	Anjeza Shahini	English	*The Image of You*	7
2005	Ledina Çelo	English	*Tomorrow I Go*	16
2006	Luiz Ejlli	Albanian	*Zjarr e ftohtë*	n.q.
2007	Frederik Ndoci	English - Albanian	*Hear My Plea*	n.q.
2008	Olta Boka	Albanian	*Zemrën e lamë peng*	17
2009	Kejsi Tola	English	*Carry Me in Your Dreams*	17
2010	Juliana Pasha	English	*It's All About You*	16
2011	Aurela Gaçe	English - Albanian	*Feel the Passion*	n.q.
2012	Rona Nishliu	Albanian	*Suus*	5
2013	A. Lulgjuraj & B. Sejko	Albanian	*Identitet*	n.q.

2. **Armenia** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
2006	André	English	*Without Your Love*	8
2007	Hayko	English, Armenian	*Anytime You Need*	8
2008	Sirusho	English, Armenian	*Qélé, Qélé*	4
2009	Inga and Anush	English, Armenian	*Jan Jan*	10
2010	Eva Rivas	English	*Apricot Stone*	7
2011	Emmy	English	*Boom Boom*	n.q.
2013	Dorians	English	*Lonely Planet*	18

3. **Azerbaijan** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
2008	Elnur & Samir	English	*Day After Day*	8
2009	Aysel & Arash	English	*Always*	3
2010	Safura	English	*Drip Drop*	5
2011	Ell & Nikki	English	*Running Scared*	1
2012	Sabina Babayeva	English	*When the Music Dies*	4
2013	Farid Mammadov	English	*Hold Me*	2

4. **Belarus** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
2004	Aleksandra and Konstantin	English	*My Galileo*	n.q.
2005	Angelica Agurbash	English	*Love Me Tonight*	n.q.
2006	Polina Smolova	English	*Mum*	n.q.
2007	Dmitry Koldun	English	*Work Your Magic*	6
2008	Ruslan Alekhno	English, Spanish	*Hasta La Vista*	n.q.
2009	Petr Elfimov	English	*Eyes That Never Lie*	n.q.
2010	3+2	English	*Butterflies*	24
2011	Anastasia Vinnikova	English	*I Love Belarus*	n.q.
2012	Litesound	English	*We Are the Heroes*	n.q.
2013	Alyona Lanskaya	English	*Solayoh*	16

5. **Bosnia and Herzegovina** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
1993	Fazla	Bosnian	*Sva bol svijeta*	16
1994	Alma & Dejan	Bosnian	*Ostani kraj mene*	15
1995	Davorin Popović	Bosnian	*Dvadeset prvi vijek*	19
1996	Amila Glamočak	Bosnian	*Za našu ljubav*	22
1997	Alma Čardžić	Bosnian	*Goodbye*	18
1999	Dino & Beatrice	Bosnian, French	*Putnici*	7
2001	Nino Pršeš	Bosnian, English	*Hano*	14
2002	Maja Tatić	Serbian, English	*На јастуку за двоје*	13
2003	Mija Martina	Croatian, English	*Ne brini*	16
2004	Deen	English	*In The Disco"*	9
2005	Feminnem	English	*Call Me*	14
2006	Hari Mata Hari	Bosnian	*Lejla*	3
2007	Maria	Serbian	*Ријека без имена*	11
2008	Laka	Bosnian	*Pokušaj*	10
2009	Regina	Serbian, Bosnian	*Bistra voda*	9
2010	Vukašin Brajić	English	*Thunder and Lightning*	17
2011	Dino Merlin	Bosnian	*Love in Rewind*	6
2012	Maya Sar	Bosnian	*Korake ti znam*	12

6. **Bulgaria** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
2005	Kaffe	English	*Lorraine*	n.q.
2006	M.Popova	English	*Let my cry*	n.q.
2007	Elitsa & Stoyan	Bulgarian	*Water*	5
2008	Deep Zone & Balthazar	English	*DJ, take me away*	n.q.
2009	Kr. Avramov	English	*Illusion*	n.q.
2010	Miro	Bulgarian, English	*Angel si ti*	n.q.
2011	Poli Genova	Bulgarian	*Na inat*	n.q.
2012	Sofi Marinova	Multi (12)	*Love unlimited*	n.q.

2013	Elitsa & Stoyan	Bulgarian	Samo Shampioni	n.q.

7. **Croatia** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
1993	Put	Croatian - English	*Don't Ever Cry*	15
1994	Tony Cetinski	Croatian	*Nek' ti bude ljubav sva*	16
1995	Magazin & Lidija Horvat-Dunjko	Croatian	*Nostalgija*	6
1996	Maja Blagdan	Croatian	*Sveta ljubav*	4
1997	E.N.I.	Croatian	*Probudi me*	17
1998	Danijela Martinović	Croatian	*Neka mi ne svane*	5
1999	Doris Dragović	Croatian	*Marija Magdalena*	4
2000	Goran Karan	Croatian	*Kad zaspu anđeli*	9
2001	Vanna	English	*Strings of My Heart*	10
2002	Vesna Pisarović	English	*Everything I Want*	11
2003	Claudia Beni	Croatian - English	*Više nisam tvoja*	15
2004	Ivan Mikulić	English	*You Are The Only One*	12
2005	Boris Novković feat. Lado	Croatian	*Vukovi umiru sami*	11
2006	Severina Vučković	Croatian	*Moja štikla*	12
2007	Dragonfly feat. Dado Topić	Croatian - English	*Vjerujem u ljubav*	n.q.
2008	Kraljevi ulice & 75 Cents	Croatian	*Romanca*	21
2009	Igor Cukrov feat. An. Šušnjara	Croatian	*Lijepa Tena*	18
2010	Feminnem	Croatian	*Lako je sve*	n.q.
2011	Daria Kinzer	English	*Celebrate*	n.q.
2012	Nina Badrić	Croatian	*Nebo*	n.q.
2013	Klapa s Mora	Croatian	*Mižerja*	n.q.

8. **Czech Republic** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
2007	Kabát	Czech	Malá dáma	n.q.
2008	Tereza Kerndlová	English	Have Some Fun	n.q.
2009	Gipsy.cz	English, Romani	Aven Romale	n.q.

9. **Estonia** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
1994	Silvi Vrait	Estonian	*Nagu merelaine*	24
1996	Maarja-Liis Ilus & Ivo Linna	Estonian	*Kaelakee hääl*	5
1997	Maarja Liis-Ilus	Estonian	*Keelatud maa*	8
1998	Koit Toome	Estonian	*Mere lapsed*	12
1999	Evelin Samuel & Camille	English	*Diamond of Night*	6
2000	Ines	English	*Once in a Lifetime*	4
2001	Tanel Padar/Dave Benton/2XL	English	*Everybody*	1
2002	Sahlene	English	*Runaway*	3
2003	Ruffus	English	*Eighties Coming Back*	21
2004	Neiokõsõ	Võro language	*Tii*	n.q.
2005	Suntribe	English	*Let's Get Loud*	n.q.
2006	Sandra Oxenryd	English	*Through My Window*	n.q.
2007	Gerli Padar	English	*Partners in Crime*	n.q.
2008	Kreisiraadio	Serbian, German, Finnish	*Leto svet*	n.q.
2009	Urban Symphony	Estonian	*Rändajad*	6
2010	Malcolm Lincoln & Manpower 4	English	*Siren*	n.q.
2011	Getter Jaani	English	*Rockefeller Street*	24
2012	Ott Lepland	Estonian	*Kuula*	6
2013	Birgit Õigemeel	Estonian	*Et uus saaks alguse*	20

10. **FYROM** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
1998	Vlado Janevski	Macedonian	*Не зори, зоро*	19
2000	XXL	Macedonian	100% те љубам	15
2002	Karolina Gočeva	Macedonian	*Од нас зависи*	19
2004	Toše Proeski	English	*Life*	14
2005	Martin Vučić	English	*Make My Day*	17
2006	Elena Risteska	English, Macedonian	*Нинанајна*	12
2007	Karolina Gočeva	Macedonian	*Мојот свет*	14
2008	Tamara, Vrčak and Adrian	English	*Let Me Love You*	n.q.
2009	Next Time	Macedonian	*Нешто што ќе остане*	n.q.
2010	G. Taneski, B. Zver & Pejčin	Macedonian	*Јас ја имам силата*	n.q.
2011	Vlatko Ilievski	Macedonian	*Русинка*	n.q.
2012	Kaliopi	Macedonian	*Црно и бело*	13
2013	Esma & Lozano	Macedonian, Romany	*Пред да се раздени*	n.q.

11. **Georgia** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
2007	Sopho Khalvashi	English	*Visionary Dream*	12
2008	Diana Gurtskaya	English	*Peace Will Come*	11
2010	Sopho Nizharadze	English	*Shine*	9
2011	Eldrine	English	*One More Day*	9
2012	Anri Jokhadze	English, Georgian	*I'm a Joker*	n.q.
2013	Sopho Gelovani & Nodiko Tatishvili	English	*Waterfall*	15

12. **Hungary** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
1994	Friderika Bayer	Hungarian	*Kinek mondjam el vétkeimet?*	4
1995	Csaba Szigeti	Hungarian	*Új név a régi ház falán*	22
1996	Gjon Delhusa	Hungarian	*Fortuna*	n.q.
1997	V.I.P.	Hungarian	*Miért kell, hogy elmenj?*	12
1998	Charlie	Hungarian	*A holnap már nem lesz szomorú*	23
2005	NOX	Hungarian	*Forogj, világ!*	12
2007	Magdi Rúzsa	English	*Unsubstantial Blues*	9
2008	Csézy	English, Hungarian	*Candlelight*	n.q.
2009	Zoli Ádok	English	*Dance with Me*	n.q.
2011	Kati Wolf	English, Hungarian	*What About My Dreams?*	22
2012	Compact Disco	English	*Sound Of Our Hearts*	24
2013	ByeAlex	Hungarian	*Kedvesem (Zoohacker Remix)*	10

13. **Latvia** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
2000	Brainstorm	English	*My Star*	3
2001	Arnis Mednis	English	*Too Much*	18
2002	Marie N	English	*I Wanna*	1
2003	F.L.Y.	English	*Hello From Mars*	24
2004	Fomins and Kleins	English	*Dziesma par laimi*	n.q.
2005	Walters and Kazha	Latvian	*The War Is Not Over*	5
2006	Vocal Group Cosmos	English	*I Hear Your Heart*	16
2007	Bonaparti.lv	Italian	*Questa notte*	16
2008	Pirates of the Sea	English	*Wolves of the Sea*	12
2009	Intars Busulis	Russian	*Пробка*	n.q.
2010	Aisha	English	*What For?*	n.q.
2011	Musiqq	English	*Angel in Disguise*	n.q.
2012	Anmary	English	*Beautiful Song*	n.q.
2013	PeR	English	*Here We Go*	n.q.

14. **Lithuania** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
1994	Ovidijus Vyšniauskas	Lithuanian	*Lopšinė mylimai*	25
1999	Aistė	Samogitian	*Strazdas*	20
2001	SKAMP	English, Lithuanian	*You Got Style*	13
2002	Aivaras	English	*Happy You*	23
2004	Linas and Simona	English	*What's Happened To Your Love?*	n.q.
2005	Laura & The Lovers	English	*Little by Little*	n.q.
2006	LT United	English, French	*We Are the Winners*	6
2007	4Fun	English	*Love or Leave"*	21
2008	Jeronimas Milius	English	*Nomads in the Night*	n.q.
2009	Sasha Son	English	*Love*	23
2010	InCulto	English	*Eastern European Funk*	n.q.
2011	Evelina Sašenko	English, French	*C'est ma vie*	19
2012	Donny Montell	English	*Love Is Blind*	14
2013	Andrius Pojavis	English	*Something*	22

15. **Moldova** in ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
2005	Zdob şi Zdub	Romanian, English	*Bunika Bate Toba*	6
2006	Arsenium feat. N. Gordienko & Connect-R	English, Spanish	*Loca*	20
2007	Natalia Barbu	English	*Fight*	10
2008	Geta Burlacu	English	*A century of love*	n.q.
2009	Nelly Ciobanu	Romanian, English	*Hora din Moldova*	14
2010	SunStroke Project & Ol. Tira	English	*Run away*	22
2011	Zdob şi Zdub	English	*So Lucky*	12
2012	Pasha Parfeny	English	*Lăutar*	11
2013	Aliona Moon	Romanian	*O mie*	11

16. **Montenegro** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
2007	Stevan Faddy	Montenegrin	*Ajde, kroči*	n.q.
2008	Stefan Filipović	Montenegrin	*Zauvijek volim te*	n.q.
2009	Andrea Demirović	English	*Just Get Out of My Life*	n.q.
2012	Rambo Amadeus	English, Serbian, German	*Euro Neuro*	n.q.
2013	Who See	Montenegrin	*Igranka*	n.q.

17. **Poland** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
1994	Edyta Górniak	Polish	To nie ja!	2
1995	Justyna Steczkowska	Polish	Sama	18
1996	Kasia Kowalska	Polish	Chcę znać swój grzech...	15
1997	Anna Maria Jopek	Polish	Ale jestem	11
1998	Sixteen	Polish	To takie proste	17
1999	Mietek Szcześniak	Polish	Przytul mnie mocno	18
2001	Andrzej Piaseczny	English	2 Long	20
2003	Ich Troje	German, Polish, Russian	Keine Grenzen	7
2004	Blue Café	English, Spanish	Love song	17
2005	Ivan & Delfin	Polish, Russian	Czarna dziewczyna	n.q.
2006	Ich Troje feat. Real McCoy	English, Polish, German, Russian, Spanish	Follow my heart	n.q.
2007	The Jet Set	English	Time to party	n.q.
2008	Isis Gee	English	For life	24
2009	Lidia Kopania	English	I don't wanna leave	n.q.
2010	Marcin Mroziński	English, Polish	Legenda	n.q.
2011	Magdalena Tul	Polish	Jestem	n.q.

18. **Romania** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
1993	Dida Dragan	Romanian	*Nu pleca*	n.q.
1994	Dan Bittman	Romanian	*Dincolo de nori*	21
1996	M.Anghel &Sinchron	Romanian	*Ruga pentru pacea lumii*	n.q.
1998	Malina Olinescu	Romanian	*Eu cred*	22
2000	Taxi	English	*The moon*	17
2002	M. Anghel & M.Pavel	English	*Tell me why*	9
2003	Nicola	English	*Don't break my heart*	10
2004	Sanda	English	*I admit*	18
2005	Lum. Anghel & Sistem	English	*Let me try*	3
2006	M. Traistariu	English, Italian	*Tornero*	4
2007	Todomondo	English, Italian, Spanish, Russian,French,Romanian	*Liubi, Liubi, I love you*	13
2008	Nico & Vlad	Romanian, Italian	*Pe-o margine de lume*	20
2009	Elena Gheorghe	English	*The Balkan girls*	19
2010	P. Seling & Ovi	English	*Playing with fire*	3
2011	Hotel FM	English	*Change*	16
2012	Mandinga	Spanish, English	*Zaleilah*	12
2013	Cezar	English	It's my life	13

19. **Russia** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
1994	Youddiph	Russian	*Vechni stranik*	9
1995	Ph.Kirkorov	Russian	*Kolybelnaya dlya vulkana*	17
1996	Andr.Kosinskij	Russian	*Ja eto ja*	n.q.
1997	Alla Pugacheva	Russian	*Primadona*	15
2000	Alsou	English	*Solo*	2
2001	Mumiy Troll	English	*Lady Alpine Blue*	12
2002	Prime Minister	English	*Northern Girl*	10
2003	t.A.T.u.	Russian	*Ne ver', ne boisia*	3
2004	Julia Savicheva	English	*Believe me*	11
2005	Nat. Podolskaya	English	*Nobody hurt no one*	15
2006	Dima Bilan	English	*Never let you go*	2
2007	Serebro	English	*Song #1*	3
2008	**Dima Bilan**	**English**	***Believe***	**1**
2009	An. Prikhodko	Russian, Ukranian	*Mamo*	11
2010	P.Nalitch & Friends	English	*Lost and forgotten*	11
2011	Al.Vorobjov	English, Russian	*Get you*	16
2012	Buranovskiye Babushki	Udmurt, English	*Party for everybody*	2
2013	Dina Garipova	English	*What if*	5

20. **Serbia** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
2007	Marija Šerifović	Serbian	*Молитва*	1
2008	Jelena Tomašević feat. Bora Dugić	Serbian	*Оро*	6
2009	Marko Kon & Milaan	Serbian	*Ципела*	n.q.
2010	Milan Stanković	Serbian	*Ово је Балкан*	13
2011	Nina	Serbian	*Чаробан*	14
2012	Željko Joksimović	Serbian	*Није љубав ствар*	3
2013	Moje 3	Serbian	*Љубав је свуда*	n.q.

21. **Serbia & Montenegro** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
2004	Željko Joksimović	Serbian	*Лане моје*	2
2005	No Name	Montenegrin	*Заувијек моја*	7

22. **Slovakia** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
1994	Tublatanka	Slovak	Nekonečná pieseň	19
1996	Marcel Palonder	Slovak	Kým nás máš	18
1998	Katarína Hasprová	Slovak	Modlitba	21
2009	Kamil Mikulčík & Nela Pocisková	Slovak	Leť tmou	n.q.
2010	Kristina	Slovak	Horehronie	n.q.
2011	TWiiNS	English	I'm Still Alive	n.q.
2012	Max Jason Mai	English	Don't Close Your Eyes	n.q.

23. **Slovenia** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
1993	1X Band	Slovene	*Tih deževen dan*	22
1995	Darja Švajger	Slovene	*Prisluhni mi*	7
1996	Regina	Slovene	*Dan najlepših sanj*	21
1997	Tanja Ribič	Slovene	*Zbudi se*	10
1998	Vili Resnik	Slovene	*Naj bogovi slišijo*	18
1999	Darja Švajger	English	*For a Thousand Years*	11
2001	Nuša Derenda	English	*Energy*	7
2002	Sestre	Slovene	*Samo ljubezen*	13
2003	Karmen Stavec	English	*Nanana*	13
2004	Platin	English	*Stay Forever*	23
2005	Omar Naber	Slovene	*Stop*	n.q.
2006	Anžej Dežan	English	*Mr Nobody*	n.q.
2007	Alenka Gotar	Slovene	*Cvet z juga*	15
2008	Rebeka Dremelj	Slovene	*Vrag naj vzame*	n.q.
2009	Quartissimo feat. M. Majerle	English, Slovene	*Love Symphony*	n.q.
2010	Ans. Žlindra & Kalamari	Slovene	*Narodnozabavni rock*	n.q.
2011	Maja Keuc	English	*No One*	13
2012	Eva Boto	Slovene	*Verjamem*	n.q.
2013	Hannah Mancini	English	*Straight into Love*	n.q.

24. **Ukraine** in the ESC

Year	Artist	Language	Title	Posit.
2003	Ol. Ponomaryov	English	*Hasta la vista*	14
2004	Ruslana	English, Ukranian	*Wild Dances*	1
2005	GreenJolly	English, Ukrainian	*Razom nas bahato*	19
2006	Tina Karol	English	*Show me your love*	
2007	Verka Serduchka	Ukrainian, German, English, Russian	*Dancing Lasha Tumbai*	2
2008	Ani Lorak	English	*Shady Lady*	2
2009	Sv.Loboda	English	*Be my Valentine!(Anti-Crisis Girl)*	12
2010	Alyosha	English	*Sweet People*	10
2011	Mika Newton	English	*Angel*	4
2012	Gaitana	English	*Be my guest*	15
2013	Zlata Ognevich	English	*Gravity*	3

Appendix B: **Winning Countries since 1989**

Year	Host Country, City	Entries	Winning Country
1989	Switzerland, *Lausanne*	22	**Yugoslavia**
1990	Yugoslavia, *Zagreb*	22	**Italy**
1991	Italy, *Rome*	22	**Sweden**
1992	Sweden, *Malmö*	23	**Ireland**
1993	Ireland, *Millstreet*	25	**Ireland**
1994	Ireland, *Dublin*	25	**Ireland**
1995	Ireland, *Dublin*	23	**Norway**
1996	Norway, *Oslo*	23	**Ireland**
1997	Ireland, *Dublin*	25	**United Kingdom**
1998	United Kingdom, *Birmingham*	25	**Israel**
1999	Israel, *Jerusalem*	23	**Sweden**
2000	Sweden, *Stockholm*	24	**Denmark**
2001	Denmark, *Copenhagen*	23	**Estonia**
2002	Estonia, *Tallinn*	24	**Latvia**
2003	Latvia, *Riga*	26	**Turkey**
2004	Turkey, *Istanbul*	36	**Ukraine**
2005	Ukraine, *Kiev*	39	**Greece**
2006	Greece, *Athens*	36	**Finland**
2007	Finland, *Helsinki*	42	**Serbia**
2008	Serbia, *Belgrade*	43	**Russia**
2009	Russia, *Moscow*	42	**Norway**
2010	Norway, *Oslo*	39	**Germany**
2011	Germany, *Düsseldorf*	43	**Azerbaijan**
2012	Azerbaijan, *Baku*	42	**Sweden**
2013	Sweden, *Malmö*	39	**Denmark**

APPENDIX C: **Debuting Countries since 1989**

Year	Host Country, City	Entries	Debuting Country
1989	Switzerland, *Lausanne*	22	---
1990	Yugoslavia, *Zagreb*	22	---
1991	Italy, *Rome*	22	---
1992	Sweden, *Malmö*	23	---
1993	Ireland, *Millstreet*	25	Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia
1994	Ireland, *Dublin*	25	Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovakia
1995	Ireland, *Dublin*	23	---
1996	Norway, *Oslo*	23	---
1997	Ireland, *Dublin*	25	---
1998	UK, *Birmingham*	25	FYROM
1999	Israel, *Jerusalem*	23	---
2000	Sweden, *Stockholm*	24	Latvia
2001	Denmark, *Copenhagen*	23	---
2002	Estonia, *Tallinn*	24	---
2003	Latvia, *Riga*	26	Ukraine
2004	Turkey, *Istanbul*	36	Albania, Belarus, Serbia & Montenegro
2005	Ukraine, *Kiev*	39	Bulgaria, Moldova
2006	Greece, *Athens*	36	Armenia
2007	Finland, *Helsinki*	42	Czech Republic, Georgia, Montenegro, Serbia
2008	Serbia, *Belgrade*	43	Azerbaijan
2009	Russia, *Moscow*	42	---
2010	Norway, *Oslo*	39	---
2011	Germany, *Düsseldorf*	43	---
2012	Azerbaijan, *Baku*	42	---
2013	Sweden, *Malmö*	39	---

Bibliography

Allatson, P., 2007, "*Antes Cursi Que Sencilla*": Eurovision Song Contests and the Kitsch-Drive to Euro-Unity, *Culture, Theory and Critique*, 48 (1), 87–98.

Anholt, S., 2006, Why brand? Some practical considerations for nation branding, *Place Branding*, 2 (2), 97–107.

Anholt S., 2007, *Competitive Identity: The New Brand Management for Nations, Cities and Regions*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Badenoch, A., 2010, Myths of the European Network: Constructions of Cohesion in Infrastructure Maps, pp.47-77. In A. Badenoch & A. Fickers, eds. *Materializing Europe: Transnational Infrastructures and the Project of Europe*, Pelgrave Macmillan.

Baer B. J., 2009, *Other Russias: Homosexuality and the Crisis of Post-Soviet Identity*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Berezin M., 2003, Introduction: Territory, Emotion and Identity: Spacial Recalibtarion in a new Europe, pp. 1-30. In M. Berezin and M. Schain, eds. *Europe Without Borders: Remapping Territory, Citizenship and Identity in a Transnational Age*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Björnberg, A., 2007, Return to ethnicity: The cultural significance of music change in the Eurovision Song Contest, pp.13-23. In I.Raykoff & R.D.Tobin, eds. *A song for Europe: Popular music and politics in the Eurovision Song Contest*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Bohlman, P., 2007, The politics of power, pleasure and prayer in the Eurovision Song Contest. *Musicology*, 7, 39–67.

Bolin, G., 2006, Visions of Europe: Cultural Technologies of Nation-States, *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 9 (2), 189–206.

Bolos, M.D., 2012, *Nation Brand and Intellectual Property in the Context of Globalization*, The 6th International Days of Statistics and Economics, Prague, September 13-15, 2012.

Bond, R., McCrone, D. & Brown, A., 2003, National identity and economic development: reiteration, recapture, reinterpretation and repudiation, *Nations and Nationalism*, 9 (3), 371-391.

Boulos, A., 2012, *Nil Points, Douze Points, and Everything In Between: An Analysis of Political Voting Bias in the Eurovision Song Contest*, Sanford School of Public Policy, Master's of Public Policy Program, Duke University.

Boym, S., 1994, *Common places: Mythologies of Everyday Life in Russia*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Brown, G., Chalip, L., Jago L., & Mules T., 2004, Developing Brand Australia: examining the role of events, pp. 279-305. In Morgan N., Pritchard A. and Pride R., eds. *Destination Branding: creating the unique destination proposition*, 2nd edition, Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann

Buzan, B., 2007, *People states and fear: an agenda for international security studies in the post-cold war era* (2nd ed.). Essex: ECPR Press.

Clerides, S. & Stengos, T., 2006. *Love thy neighbor, love thy kin: voting biases in the Eurovision Song Contest*. Discussion Paper 2006-01, Mimeo, University of Cyprus.

Clifton, R., 2009, *Brands and Branding*, 2nd edition, Canada: Profile Books Ltd.

Coleman, S., 2008, Why is the Eurovision Song Contest Ridiculous? Exploring a Spectacle of Embarrassment, Irony and Identity, *Popular Communication*, 6, 127–140.

Dekker, A., 2007, The Eurovision Song Contest as a 'Friendship' Network, *Connections*, 27 (3), 53-60.

Delanty, G., 2003, The Making of a Post-Western Europe: A Civilizational Analysis, *Thesis Eleven*, 72, 8-25.

Dinnie, K., 2008, *Nation branding, concepts, issues, practice*, Elsevier, Oxford.

Feddersen, J., *Ein Lied kann eine Brucke sein: die deutsche und international Geschichte des Grand Prix Eurovision*, Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 2002.

Felbermayr, G.J. & Toubal, F., 2010, Cultural proximity and trade. *European Economic Review*, 54, 279-293.

Fenn, D., Suleman, O., Efstathiou, J., and Johnson, N.F., 2006, How does Europe make its mind up? Connections, cliques and compatibility between countries in the Eurovision Song Contest, *Physica A*, 360 (2), 576–598.

Foucault, M., 1978, *The History of Sexuality*, Vol. I: An Introduction, New York.

Gambaccini P., Rice J., & Brown T., 1999, *The Complete Eurovision Song Contest Companion 1999*, London: Pavilion.

Gilmore, F., 2002, A country – can it be repositioned? Spain – the success story of country branding, *Journal of Brand Management*, 9 (4-5), 281-293.

Ginsburgh, V.A. & Noury, A., 2008, The Eurovision Song Contest. Is voting political or cultural?, *European Journal of Political Economy*, 24, 41-52.

Gumpert, M., 2007, 'Everyway that I can': Auto-Orientalism at Eurovision 2013, pp.147-158. In I.Raykoff & R.D.Tobin, eds. *A song for Europe: Popular music and politics in the Eurovision Song Contest* , Aldershot: Ashgate.

Haan, M., Dijkstra, G., Dijkstra, P., 2005, Expert judgment versus public opinion. Evidence from the Eurovision Song Contest. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 29, 59–78.

Heller, D., 2007, "Russian body and soul": t.A.t.U. performs at Eurovision 2003, pp.111-121. In I. Raykoff & R.D.Tobin, eds. *A song for Europe: Popular music and politics in the Eurovision Song Contest*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Ingvoldstad, B., 2007, Lithuanian constests and European Dreams, pp.99-110. In I. Raykoff & R.D.Tobin, eds. *A song for Europe: Popular music and politics in the Eurovision Song Contest*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Jackson Lears, T.J., 1985, The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities, *The American Historical Review*, 90 (3), 567-593.

Jones, S. & Subotic, J., 2011, Fantasies of power: Performing Europeanization on the European periphery, *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 14 (5), 542-557.

Kapferer, J.-N., 1997, *Strategic Brand Management: Creating and Sustaining Brand Equity Long Term*, 2nd edn, London: Kogan-Page Ltd.

Karan, M., *Pesma Evrovizije; od Ljiljane Petrović do Željka Joksimovića*, Edicija Posebna izdanja / Svet knjige, Beograd, 2005.

Klapheck, E.-M., 2004, *'Die Sprachenwahl beim Eurovision Song Contest und ihre Auswirkungen und Konsequenzen Untersuchung zum Zeitraum 1999–2004'*, unpublished Master's thesis (Duisburg, Universität Duisburg-Essen).

Kotler, P. & Gertner, D., 2002, Country as brand, product, and beyond: A place marketing and brand management perspective, *Journal of Brand Management*, 9 (4-5), 249-261.

Kovačič, M., 2011, The Accordion in Slovenia Today. V: Jähnichen, Gisa (ur.). *Studia instrumentorum musicae popularis*, 2, 163-177, New series. Münster: Monsenstein und Vannerdar.

Kressley, K.M., 1978, Integrated Television in Europe: A Note on the EUROVISION Network, *International Organization*, 32 (4), 1045-1050.

Kuzio, T., 2005, From Kuchma to Yuschenko: Ukraine's 2004 presidential elections and the orange revolution, *Problems of Post-Communism*, 52 (2), 29-44.

Lake, D., 2009, Regional hierarchy: authority and local international order, *Review of International Studies*, 35, 35 – 58.

Lewellen T.C., 2003, *Political Anthropology, an Introduction*, Praeger, Greenwood Publishing.

Miazhevich, G., 2012, Ukrainian Nation Branding Off-line and Online: Verka Serduchka at the Eurovision Song Contest, *Europe-Asia Studies*, 64 (8), 1505-1523.

Mitrović, M., 2010, 'New face of Serbia' at the Eurovision Song Contest: international media spectacle and national identity, *European Review of History: Revue europeenne d'histoire*, 17 (2), 171-185.

Moilanen, T. & Rainisto, S., *How to Brand Nations, Cities and Destinations, A Planning Book for Place Branding*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Olins, W., *Trading Identities: Why countries and companies are taking each others' roles*, The Foreign Policy Centre, London, 1999.

Pajala, M., 2012, Mapping Europe. Images of Europe in the Eurovision Song Contest. *Journal of European Television History & Culture*, 01 (02), 1-10.

Pavlyshyn, M., 2006, Envisioning Europe: Ruslana's Rhetoric of Identity, *Slavic & Eastern European Journal*, 50 (3), 469-485.

Raftowicz-Filipkiewicz, M., 2012, Nation Branding as an Economic Challenge of the Middle and Eastern Europe on the Example of Estonia, *EQUILIBRIUM Quarterly Journal of Economics and Economic Policy*, 7 (4), 49-59.

Ramet, S.P., 2002, *Balkan Babel: The Disintegration of Yugoslavia from the Death of Tito to The Fall of Milosevic*. 4th ed. Westview Press.

Raykoff, I., 2007, Camping on the borders of Europe, pp. 1–12. In I. Raykoff & R.D.Tobin, eds. *A song for Europe: Popular music and politics in the Eurovision Song Contest*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Risse, T., 2003, European Identity and the Heritage of National Cultures, pp. 74-89. In Shannan-Pecknam, ed. *Rethinking Heritage: Cultures and Politics in Europe*. London/New York: I.B. Tauris.

Sala, B.R., Scott, J.T. & Spriggs, J.F., 2007, The Cold War on ice: Constructivism and the politics of Olympic figure skating judging. *Perspectives on Politics*, 5 (1), 17–29.

Sandvoss, C., 2008, On the Couch with Europe: The Eurovision Song Contest, the European Broadcast Union and Belonging on the Old Continent, *Popular Communication* 6 (3), 190-207.

Scherer, H. & Schultz, D., 2003, *Das inszenierte Medienereignis. Die verschiedenen Wirklichkeiten der Vorausscheidung zum Eurovision Song Contest in Hannover 2001,* 1st edn (Köln, Herbert von Halem Verlag).

Schweiger, W. & Brosius, H.B., 2003, Eurovision Song Contest – Beeinflussen Nachrichtenfaktoren die Punktevergabe durch das Publikum?, *Medien & Kommunikationswissenschaft*, 51 (2), 271–294.

Sieg, K., 2012, Cosmopolitan Empire: Central and Eastern Europeans at the Eurovision Song Contest, *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 0 (0), 1-20.

Sieg, K., 2013, Conundrums of Post-Socialist Belonging at the Eurovision Song Contest, pp. 218-237. In K. Fricker and M. Gluhovic, *Performing the 'New' Europe: Identities, Feelings and Politics in the Eurovision Song Contest*, Studies in International Performance, Palgrave, Macmillan.

Smith, A., State-Making and Nation-Building, in J. Hall, ed. *States in History*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.

Solomon, Th., 2007, Articulating the historical moment:Turkey, Europe, and Eurovision 2003, pp.135-145. In I. Raykoff & R.D.Tobin, eds. *A song for Europe: Popular music and politics in the Eurovision Song Contest*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Spierdijk, L. & Vellekoop, M., 2009, The structure of bias in peer voting systems: lessons from the Eurovision Song Contest, *Empirical Economics*, 36, 403–425.

Stadler, K., 2010, Political Exploitation of Georgian Identity in Contemporary Song, *Caucasus Journal of Social Sciences*, 1 (3), 92-97.

Straubhaar, J., 2002, (Re-)asserting national television and national identity against the global, regional and local levels of world television, pp.181-286. In: Chan, J.M., & McIntyre, B.T., ed. *In Search of Boundaries. Communication Nation-States and Cultural Identities*. Ablex Publishing, Westport, Connecticut.

Szondi, G., 2007, The role and challenges of country branding in transition countries: The Central and Eastern European experience, *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 3 (1), 8–20, Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.

Tobin, R.D., 2007, Eurovision at 50: Post-Wall and Post-Stonewall, pp. 25-36. In I. Raykoff & R.D.Tobin, eds. *A song for Europe: Popular music and politics in the Eurovision Song Contest*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Van Ham, P., 2001, The Rise of the Brand State: The Postmodern Politics of Image and Reputation, *Foreign Affairs*, 80 (5), 2-6.

Vincent, J. ed., 2002, *The Anthropology of Politics: A Reader in Ethnography, Theory, and Critique*, Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Vuletic, D., 2007, The Socialist Star Yugoslavia, Cod War politics and the Eurovision Song Contest, pp. 83-97. In I. Raykoff & R.D.Tobin, eds. *A song for Europe: Popular music and politics in the Eurovision Song Contest*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Vuletic , D., 2010, European Sounds, Yugoslav Visions. Performing Yugoslavia at the Eurovision Song Contest, pp. 121-144. In Br. Luthar & M. Pusnik, eds. *Remembering Utopia: The Culture of Everyday Life in Socialist Yugoslavia*, Washington, DC, New Academia Publishing.

Wolther, Ir., 2012, More than just music: the seven dimensions of the Eurovision Song Contest, *Popular Music*, 31, 165-171.

Yair, G. & Maman, D., 1996, The persistent structure of hegemony in the Eurovision Song Contest, *Acta Sociologica*, 39, 309–325.

Yair, G., 1995, 'Unite Unite Europe', The political and cultural structures of Europe as reflected in the Eurovision Song Contest, *Social Networks*, 17, 147-161.

Internet Sources

Abrahamyan, G., "Conspiracy theory in Eurovision: Turkey claims genocide hint in *Apricot stone"*, *ArmeniaNow.Com*, February 17, 2010. Available at: http://www.armenianow.com/arts/20973/armenia_eurovision_song_apricot_stone_genocide_turkey

Adams, W. L., "How Armenia and Azerbaijan Wage War through Eurovision", *Time*, March 11, 2012. Available at: http://world.time.com/2012/03/11/how-armenia-and-azerbaijan-wage-war-through-eurovision/

Adams, W.L., "Ukraine's Eurovision Selection Marred by Right-Wing Racism". *Time World*, March 05, 2012. Available at: http://world.time.com/2012/03/05/ukraines-eurovision-selection-marred-by-right-wing-racism/

Akšamija, A., "*Eurovision Song Contest: Between Symbolism of European Unity and a Vision of the Wild, Wild East. Europe Lost and Found*", May 2005. Available at: http://www.europelostandfound.net/files/elf/Eurovision.pdf

Alkan, H., "Rumlar 8 puana pışman", *Hürriyet*, May 28, 2003. Available at: http://hurarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/goster/ShowNew.aspx?id=149478

BBC, "UK act hits Eurovision low", *BBC News*, May 25, 2003. Available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/entertainment/2935874.stm

Bösch, Fr., "European Media Events" (Original in German), *EGO | European History Online*, March 12, 2003. Available at: http://www.ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/european-media/european-media-events

Bruter, M. 2005. "European and Sub-European Identity—When are Multiple Identities Compatible?". Centre for the Study of Democratic Government. Available at: http://oxpo.politics.ox.ac.uk/materials/national_identity/Bruter_Paper.pdf.

CNN Türk. "Eurovision'a Ermenistan gözyaşıyla damga vurdu". *CNN Türk*, May 27, 2010. Available at: http://video.cnnturk.com/2010/eglence/5/27/eurovisiona-ermenistan-gozyasiyla-damga-vurdu

Culshaw, P., "Eurovision Sceptic? Nein, non, ni", *The Telegraph*, May 19, 2005. Available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/music/rockandjazzmusic/3642297/Eurovision-sceptic-Nein-non-ni.html

EBU, official site: http://www3.ebu.ch/cms/en/home

EBU Dossiers, "50 years of Eurovision", *EBU Dossiers*, 2004/1. Available at: http://www.ebu.ch/CMSimages/en/dossiers_1_04_eurovision50_ve_tcm6-13890.pdf

EBU Rules, "Rules of the 59th Eurovision Song Contest", *Public Version*, Copenhagen, 6/8/10 May 2014. Available at: http://www3.ebu.ch/files/live/sites/ebu/files/Knowledge/Publication%20Library/EBU_ESC2014_RULES_EN.pdf

Economist, "Euro Visions", *The Economist*, May 12, 2005. Available at: http://www.economist.com/node/3960886

EHDR 2000, "Estonia Human Development Report, 2000*"*, *United Nations Development Programme* (UNDP).

EurovisionLive.com, "*Lithuania 2001"*. Available at: http://www.eurovisionlive.com/index.php/history-eurovision-song-contest/2001-copenhagen/lithuania

Eurovision News. "Armenia and Azerbaijan: Nagorno – Karabakh Controversy at Eurovision". By Wiwi Bloggs, *Eurovision News*, June 9, 2009. Available at: http://wiwibloggs.com/2009/06/09/armenia-and-azerbaijan-nagorno-karabakh-controversy-at-eurovision/1783/#

Future Brand - Country Brand Index, official site: http://www.futurebrand.com/foresight/cbi

Gatherer, D., 2006, Comparison of Eurovision Song Contest simulation with actual results reveals shifting patterns of collusive voting alliances. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation* 9 (2), 1. http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/9/2/1.html

Gardner, S. & Standaert, M., "*Estonia and Belarus: Branding the Old Bloc"*, March 3, 2003. Available at: http://www.brandchannel.com/features_effect.asp?pf_id=146#author

Gaube, A., "The Sisters' Second Act", *Time*, March 22, 2002. Available at: http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,219380,00.html

Gay Ad. "Out Now Global LGBT2020 Study". *Gay Ad Network - UK media report*, August 2012. Available at: http://www.gayadnetwork.com/files/gayadnetworkoutnowreport.pdf

Ginsburgh, V.A. & Noury, A., 2004, Cultural voting the Eurovision Song Contest, CORE Discussion Papers. http://www.core.ucl.ac.be/services/psfiles/dp05/dp2005_6.pdf

Jonze, T., "Eurovision 2009: Georgia Pulls out of Contest over 'Putin Song'." *The Guardian*, March 11, 2009. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/music/2009/mar/11/georgia-eurovision-song-contest-2009

Kamenev, M., (2009), "Eurovision in Russia: Politics and Pop Music". *Time Magazine.* Available at: http://www.time.com/time/arts/article/0,8599,1885138,00.html

Karpyak, O., "Ukraine's Eurovision Entry Gaitana 'Ashamed' by Racism", *BBC*, May 23, 2012. Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-18162443

Klochun, N., 2011, "United in Diversity": the Representation and Promotion of Identities on the Stage of the Eurovision Song Contest. Available at: http://athensdialogues.chs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/WebObjects/athensdialogues.woa/wa/dist?dis=91#n.4

Kurmasheva, A., "A Gypsy Woman Cannot Be the Face of Russia", *the Atlantic*, March 6, 2013. Available at: http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/03/a-gypsy-woman-cannot-be-the-face-of-russia/273762/

LeGuern, P., 2000, "From National Pride to Global Kitsch: The Eurovision Song Contest", *The Web Journal of French Media Studies*, 3 (1), October, available at: http://wjfms.ncl.ac.uk/leguWJ.htm.

Marcus, S., "Georgia pulls out of Eurovision after controversial song is banned", *The Daily Telegraph*, March 12, 2009. Available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/georgia/4974502/Georgia-pulls-out-of-Eurovision-after-controversial-song-is-banned.html

Mueller, A., "The Politics of Pop", *The Guardian*, March 26, 2005. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/music/2005/mar/26/popandrock1

MyEurovision, The Official Eurovision Community, EurovisionFamily.tv. Available at: http://www.eurovisionfamily.tv/

Nation Brands Index, official site: http://www.simonanholt.com/Research/research-introduction.aspx

Nelson, F., "Eurovision Song Contest Is the Real Union of Europe", *The Telegraph*, May 25, 2012.Available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/tvandradio/eurovision/9289950/Eurovision-Song-Contest-is-the-real-union-of-Europe.html

OutNow. "How gay is Eurovision", *OutNow Global*, May 8, 2011. Available at: http://www.outnowconsulting.com/latest-updates/press-centre/how-gay-is-eurovision

Petruseva A., "Old Foes Serenade Serbia in Istanbul", *Institute for War and Peace Reporting*, May 22, 2004. Available at http://iwpr.net/report-news/old-foes-serenade-serbia-istanbul

Požun, B.J., "Eurovision scandal overwhelms Slovenia", *Weekly News Bulletin*, February 23, 2002. Available at:

http://www.webcitation.org/query?url=http://www.geocities.com/ljubljanalife/news/23feb.htm&date=2009-10-26+01:53:58

Rekhviashvili, J., 2008, "Georgian Artists Battle Moscow With Music", *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty*. Available at: http://www.rferl.org/articleprintview.1199848.html.

Rosenberg, S., "*The Cold War rival to Eurovision*", May 13, 2012. Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-18006446

Savage, M., "In the commentary box with Sir Terry", *BBC News*, May 12, 2007. Available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/6647905.stm

TBS Editors, "Intervision", *Transdiffision Broadcasting System*, September 2013. Available at: http://www.transdiffusion.org/tv/intertel/features/intervision

The Eurovision Times, "*Belarus likely to change Song*", January 20, 2013. Available at: http://eurovisiontimes.wordpress.com/2013/01/20/belarus-likely-to-change-song/

The Sofia Globe Staff, "Controversy over Macedonia's 2013 Eurovision song contest entry", *The Sofia Globe*, March 2, 2013. Available at: http://sofiaglobe.com/2013/03/02/controversy-over-macedonias-2013-eurovision-song-contest-entry/

Tracevskis, R.M.,"InCulto goes to Oslo", *The Baltic Times*, March 10, 2010. Available at: http://www.baltictimes.com/news/articles/25069/

Wells, M., "Nul points - UK out of tune with Europe", *The Guardian*, May 28, 2003. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/media/2003/may/26/bbc.arts

Wood N., "Serbia Moves a Step Closer to the European Union", *New York Times*, April 13, 2005. Available at: http://www.nytimes.com/2005/04/13/international/europe/13serbia.html?_r=0

Zhuk, A., "What happened to Orange Revolution band Greenjolly*?*", *Kyiv Post*, November 23, 2011. Available at: http://www.kyivpost.com/guide/music/what-happened-to-orange-revolution-band-greenjolly-117460.html