Saša Nedeljković

Individual Migrations of Montenegrins to Serbian Cities in the Post-Second World War Period[*]

Abstract: The aim of this research is to investigate modes of migrations of Montenegrins into Serbia after the Second World War. Such an aim demands one to investigate how Montenegrins conceptualize living space, the reasons behind migration, their modes and consequences. The first section includes an analysis of modes of individual migrations – namely, the research of individual levels of identification through the analysis of narratives. This was conducted through interviewing a number of persons who were born in Montenegro, but who have during the course of their lives migrated to Serbia. In some cases a biographical method was used, whilst in others interviews were conducted with a set of narrowly formulated questions, supplemented by observation.

Key words: Montenegrins, Serbia, individual migrations, aculturation, identity, narratives.

Ethnic and national conflicts in the territory of the Western Balkans, as well as the growing global internationalization and institutionalization of interethnic relations, have created a need to redefine the factors, subjects and entities that composed the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, as well as their mutual relations. Many of these relations have demanded serious rethinking and systematization in the past few decades. The modern, rational, and civic perspective on interethnic relations has taken the place of an emotional vision that has for long prevailed in the Balkans. The problems of ethnic and national relations between Serbs and Montenegrins is very indicative in that respect. Many people in Montenegro declare themselves to be Serbs, whereas many citizens of Serbia originally come from Montenegro. Connec-

tions and identifications of Montenegrins with Serbs spanning many centuries, alongside constant migration to Serbia and the very specific problem of acculturation has rendered the status of Montenegrins substantially different from the status of other minorities. The question of whether Montenegrins in contemporary Serbia are to be taken as a minority, or even a distinct group, is open for debate. The formal legal standards are in that respect in collision with ethno-anthropological criteria. However, there was no systematic research conducted on the ethnic and/or national identity of Montenegrins in Serbian cities until now. Rather than being based on anthropological research, the knowledge of this issue was primarily based on presumptions and prejudices, thus reflecting institutional developments.

Montenegrins have been settling in Serbia for centuries. They would adapt to the new environment quickly and easily, taking massive and active roles in social and political processes. They were always perceived as Others, yet as almost the same as Serbs: they share the same faith and speak the same (or very similar) language. Over long periods of history they were part of the same political entity as Serbs, and they also frequently perceived themselves as a branch of the Serbian people.[1] Their position was therefore never specifically regulated in Serbia, and they enjoyed the same treatment as Serbs. Today, following the independence of the state of Montenegro, there is a practical need for institutionalization of the status of Montenegrins in Serbia. However, there is resistance on both sides. Among the obstacles is the national declaration of Montenegrins. Some declare themselves as Montenegrins, others as Serbs and even as Serbo-Montenegrins. In some cases these divisions are even cutting through families. This situation has brought to light old divisions within Montenegro, present even in the Pre-Ottoman and Ottoman periods, such as the territorial division between Montenegro and the Highlands, administrative divisions, ethnic divisions between clans and fraternities etc. There is also a tendency in Serbia to differentiate between people from Montenegro who declare themselves as Serb and the ones declaring themselves as Montenegrin.

One important aspect regarding the problem of redefining ethnic and national relations is the kind and the degree of correlation between spatial mobility and the construction of national identity. The aim of my research is therefore to investigate modes of migrations of Montenegrins into Serbia after the Second World War. Such an aim demands an investigation of the conceptualizations of living space by Montenegrins, the causes of migrations, their modes and consequences. The first section covers the analysis of modes of individual migrations, namely research at the individual levels of identification through the analysis of narratives. This was conducted by interviewing a

---

[1] See Nedeljković 2007: 67-118.

number of persons who were born in Montenegro, but who have during the course of their lives migrated to Serbia. In some cases a biographical method was used, in others interviews with narrowly formulated questions, supplemented by observation. In the next phase of research, the focus will shift to institutional levels of identification and towards the second generation of immigrants. After that, the research will concentrate on the parts of the Montenegrin population that came in mass migration movements to rural environments. These will be investigated through participant observation.

It is impossible to determine the exact number of Montenegrins in Serbia. Many declare themselves to be Serbs, and many are not registered, having no formal Serbian citizenship, although they have been living in Serbia for quite some time. The number also fluctuates each year due to the flow of students and seasonal workers. In the last census (2002), 69.049 inhabitants of Serbia claimed to be of Montenegrin nationality. They are concentrated around the cities of Belgrade and Niš, in the region of Bačka and in the districts of Kragujevac and Kraljevo. Among them, there is a certain number of Catholics and Muslims, which points to the problem of classification regarding the Montenegrin nation, as it sometimes shows facets of civil, and sometimes of ethnic types of nation. Until recently, Orthodox Christianity was one of the chief Montenegrin national traits; but now, the relations between ethnical, political, cultural and territorial aspects of Montenegrinhood are very complex. This problem has increased as Montenegrins who declare themselves to be Serbs are growingly becoming territorial Montenegrins, yet they shy away from the ethnic aspect of the term "Montenegrin". Regarding the characteristics of the Montenegrin community in Serbia, it should be pointed out that they are the seventh largest community in Serbia. In percentages, over 16% of Montenegrins in Serbia have higher education, putting them among the highest educated in Serbia, preceded only by the Jewish, German, Russian and Tzintzar communities. Montenegrins encompass a high percentage of people from the strata of lawmakers, managers and executives in Serbia, almost doubling that of Serbs (8,9% of Montenegrins to 4,2% of Serbs, according to the "Ethnic mosaic of Serbia" [Etnički mozaik Srbije] 2004: 202).

Due to the complex situation regarding the declaration of nationality, in this research I interviewed people of Orthodox faith, born in Montenegro, who in any sense (national or territorial) see themselves as Montenegrins. In the period between April and June 2007, 37 people who were born and who lived in Montenegro and had permanently or temporarily settled in Serbia were interviewed. Of course, this is not a representative sample, but members of all social strata, both sexes and all the regions in Montenegro, were covered, with the idea being to discern basic trends. Informants were chosen by

random sampling. Although many were reluctant to converse, they seemed to give frank answers to the questions.

The structure of the sample interviewed was as follows: 25 informants were male (67.5%), 12 female (32.5%). The average age of informants was 33,5. 35% had high or higher education, 35% had completed high school and 30% were studying at the time of the interviews. They originated from different regions of Montenegro (Andrijevica, Bar, Berane, Bijelo Polje, Cetinje, Herceg Novi, Kolašin, Kotor, Mojkovac, Nikšić, Pljevlja, Podgorica, Šavnik, Tivat, Vilusi), and had mainly settled in Belgrade, although some had settled in other, smaller Serbian cities (Kragujevac, Novi Sad, Paraćin, Valjevo, Zrenjanin,). Some of them were from rural areas, whilst others were from urban parts of Montenegro. A smaller portion had been born outside Montenegro (e.g. in Sarajevo, Dubrovnik, Novi Sad), and had moved in the course of childhood with their families to Montenegro, deciding later to settle in Serbia.

Conceptualization of the Montenegrin Living Space

The first problem researched was the conceptualization of living space, that is, the mapping of the ethnic and national space of Montenegrins. This problem was approached through the attempt to discern how the informants understood the term "living space", where the borders of this space were, where the main migrations had started from and towards which directions they were moving; how this living space was organized and how different parts of that space were constructed, described and evaluated. The intention was to investigate the extent to which informants' interests, perspectives and long-term goals remained within or transgressed political and administrative borders.

It can be inferred on the basis of gathered data that the informants considered the living space of Montenegrins after the Second World War to be Montenegro and certain parts of Serbia (above all Belgrade, Vojvodina and Šumadija)[2]. That living space was occasionally and partially enlarged, especially by inhabitants of certain regions or/and members of some minority groups, to encompass parts of Croatia (mainly Zagreb and Dubrovnik sometimes), Slo-

---

[2] One of the informants (aged 50), described his impressions of the living space in the following manner: "I grew up on this Serbian-Montenegrin myth, it was natural for me (to come to Serbia)… In Belgrade, Novi Sad, in Cetinje, Sremski Karlovci (even Gračanica)... There is a spiritual and historical line, regardless of the differences I like to bear witness very much... both environments are different... it was natural to go to study in Belgrade, for Belgrade is the main city of our language and culture. Back then, it was our role-model. In my education I belong to the Serbian culture. And to Montenegrin, that is a part of it..."

venia (Ljubljana and Maribor), Bosnia-Herzegovina (above all Sarajevo and Trebinje), Macedonia (Skoplje), and Kosovo (Peć). The older generations conceptualized living space as wider and more flexible (due to the experience of the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia), while the new generations have had narrower sets of experiences, confined more and more to the official borders of the Montenegrin state. Out of the territories outside the SFRY that stood for desirable and realistic destinations, Italy was often mentioned. Many individual migrations were oriented towards Italy, which in turn has had a great impact on the cultural context of Montenegro (learning of the Italian language, ways of dressing, criminal subcultures etc).

The largest number of informants generally distinguished between the northern part of Montenegro, its central part, and the southern part, which is the seaside. However, there was no general accord on the exact stretch of those regions and their inner division. The criteria used in differentiation were geographical, cultural and commercial-economic. The informants tend to make simple divisions that would include all three criteria. In other words, the informants maintained that these three criteria were intertwined. The northern part(s) was/were divided into one predominantly inhabited by Serbs and Montenegrins (municipalities Berane, Mojkovac, Kolašin, even Nikšić), and the ones in which Bosniaks or Muslims constituted the majority (municipalities Plav, Rožaje, Murino, Pljevlja, Bijelo Polje). It is difficult to distinguish between those parts spatially and geographically, but they are nonetheless clearly ideologically divided in the informants' consciousnesses. The central part, from their viewpoint, consisted of Podgorica and Cetinje, although some considered it to be joined to the southern part. Daily migrations between the central and southern parts are indeed so frequent, especially during the summer, to substantiate this point, Podgorica is also frequently considered to be a special region, a state within the state, which has recently developed, unlike Cetinje. The southern part of Montenegro is the Adriatic coast, within which there are segments like Bar, Budva, Kotor, Herceg Novi and Ulcinj. Most informants considered Ulcinj to be rather different from the rest of the cities, as it is almost completely inhabited by Albanians and has its own dynamics of development, ethnically and economically directed towards Kosovo and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Central and southern parts are considered to be much more developed than the northern part, which is reflected in the budget allocations on the state level, as well as the utter undesirability of the northern part and its steady emigration.

According to the informants, the differences between those regions have a cultural dimension, and the specificities are to be located in mentality, speech, and dress. The most characteristic from that point of view are the dwellers of Cetinje, Podgorica (some of the elderly informants claim different dialects are

spoken in different parts of Podgorica); they are followed by the inhabitants of Nikšić, the Coast, Rožaje, Berane, Budva, Bar etc.

There is a characterization or stereotyping of both of the regions and their inhabitants; it is, of course, not always generally shared, and varies across localities and informants. The northern part of Montenegro is usually associated with a number of stereotypes that go along the lines of underdevelopment, naturalism, locales which haven't been spoilt, unculturedness, courage, a pro-Serbian orientation, and ambitiousness. Some parts of this region, despite their relative underdevelopment, are considered to be potentially significant winter sports centers. In the informants' consciousnesses, this region is still seen as mountainous and inhabited by cattle-herders. The central part of Montenegro cannot be easily described, since it is constituted of entirely different divisions: on the one hand there is Podgorica, which in the recent years has developed into an industrial and university center and hence has attracted the majority of inter-Montenegrin migrations, while on the other hand, Cetinje is declining and losing its significance. The southern part of Montenegro is mostly constituted of summer tourist resorts, very lively in season, but almost completely inactive during the winter months.

The picture that can be deduced form informants' answers and narratives indicates that the Montenegrin territory is seen as very differentiated, and its population as rather culturally heterogeneous. Generalizations referring to Montenegro as a whole are rarely encountered.[3] Generalizations exist principally at the level of region or town. Stereotypes about people from different regions can be divided into those concerning physical characteristics, those concerning character or mentality, and those referring to cultural traits.[4] There are stereotypical representations relating to the inhabitants of smaller towns as

---

[3] "All the stereotypes surrounding us are true. We are lazy... We like to show off, cars, influence, connections... We are very patriarchal..."

[4] "People from the seaside are simply waiting for the summer to grab cash in two to three months"; "People from the North are mainly unspoiled folks who used to raise cattle"; "I can recognize some Northerner from Žabljak, all red in face, with a large head, bulky, dressed simply, and if one meets somebody from Podgorica, for example, he is as if he is from Italy, tidied up, in fancy shows like other Italians"; "Northerners are rather clumsy, tall, one could promptly see where they come from due to the lack of culture. And people from the seaside, say, are much nicer and well-cultured. Cetinje is cultured as well, Podgorica is cultured, Nikšić is not cultured. "; "My highlanders are much tougher, fiercer, consider themselves braver. Those from the seaside are our *Lale* (the regional Serbian nick-name for inhabitants of Vojvodina, who are known for their mild temper*, trans.)*, peaceful by nature" "Northerners are dangerous, much connected. One comes, becomes a manager and then drags his whole family with him and they spread across the town."

well.[5] Podgorica's inhabitants claim that there are not many of them in Serbia, which is mostly inhabited by "northerners", who are spoiling the image of Montenegrins in Serbia, because they are less cultured.[6] As to the capability of discerning differences between inhabitants of different regions, it ranges from extremely great (an informant claims that he can tell any Montenegrin's place of birth in less than a minute; some peoples attempts to guess ones background were just for fun) to minimal (one informant could not ascertain any regional affiliation of his fellow-dwellers). The majority of informants were somewhere in the middle, that is they could recognize the inhabitants of some of the most typical regions: Cetinje, Podgorica, Bar, and the "Northerners". The population of Serbia is also stereotyped in different ways: there are those who think of Montenegrins and Serbs from Serbia as the same people, seeing no difference save the accent and dialect; while there are those who maintain strict divisions and who strive to underpin the major differences (Montenegrins are much lazier etc)

The informants were not at ease with the Serbian tendency to consider all Montenegrins the same (those from Podgorica and the seaside resented being equated with the Northerners). Similarly, many Montenegrins are identifying themselves with the population of the southwestern parts of Serbia (Ibarski Kolašin, Novi Pazar, Tutin, Sjenica), finding no major differences, understanding the propulsive nature and relativity of the cultural border between Montenegro and Serbia. This is confirmed not just by ascription, but also by description, for Serbs from Serbia frequently confused populations from the two different sides of the border (chiefly due to the dialectical differences, and sometimes due to their declared nationality).[7] The border of Montenegro towards Herzegovina was also problematic, leading to a greater degree of identification between the population from the Montenegrin and Bosnian parts of Herzegovina.

Besides this prevailing spatial systematization, one often encounters a systematization derived from the old Turkish division into districts (*nahije*), and even reflecting gens, clan or tribe (*rod*, *bratstvo* and *pleme*) membership. Although those divisions appeared during Ottoman rule, they still have certain functions. In that respect, the elderly informants usually divide Montenegro into districts of Katun, Rijeka, Lješan and Crmnica, or according to clans and fraternities (Rovčani, Moračani, Piperi, Vasojevići, Durmitorci, Crmničani, Bjelopavlići, Kuči). These informants are sometimes not able to define the

---

[5] "People of Cetinje are good folks", or "People of Cetinje changed for the worse", "Citizens of St.Stephen are rich", "People of Berane are good hosts."

[6] "I have not a single friend in the North... when I hear them it gives me shivers..."

[7] "They speak half *ekavica* half *ijekavica*, and by some customs, mentality, and ways of thinking, they resemble Montenegrins more than the Serbs."

space of Montenegro in other but these traditional divisions. Younger informants have heard about this division and are partially aware of it, but are not putting it to use. They perceive space in a more practical and contemporary manner. Quite a few are unaware of the tribal division, and do not even know the name of the clan from which either they or their forefathers are descended. In some cases the informants did not know of their tribal belonging, but could identify themselves with the *nahija* division.

The older informants are well acquainted with Serbian space; they can distinguish narrow specificities of regions, and of particular cities as well. They make clear distinctions between inhabitants of Čačak, Valjevo, Kragujevac, Kraljevo etc. They divide Serbian space into Vojvodina, Beograd, Šumadija and the southeastern region. The southern part of Serbia is defined according to larger cities (Niš, Pirot, Vranje), and sometimes only through the definition of its northern border.[8] Šumadija is perceived as very close and desirable, and Vojvodina is (besides Belgrade) considered to be the most desirable area for immigration (due to the mild mentality of the people and a more peaceful life in comparison to Belgrade). Inhabitants of different regions of Serbia are also stereotyped.[9] The representations of Serbs from Serbia as a whole are not frequent.[10]

Some, and in particular elderly informants, make differences between a choice of place for studying and the choice of place to live. They completed their studies in smaller centers (Sarajevo or Novi Sad, for example), but have chosen Belgrade as their living space. The informants often attempted to translate the geographical references of the informants into a language more understandable to Serbians ("Seaside people are our *Lale*"). Besides the mentioned references (Vojvodina, Šumadija and Belgrade), the Serbian space is defined, albeit rarely, through expressions like "Podrinje" and "Pomoravlje".[11]

Migrations in Montenegro used to flow in different directions in the past, as they were conditioned by the specific historical conditions and by cultural and economic processes. The movements of informants' ancestors had different causes (colonization, flight from blood-feuds etc). Recent migrations, both permanent and seasonal, are mainly directed towards Podgorica and the seaside. The northern part of Montenegro is structurally mainly emigrational, with the seaside and Podgorica being the main destinations. Many seasonal workers come to the seaside from Serbia. Many Montenegrins spend summers at the Montenegrin seaside and winters in Belgrade. Immigrants to Belgrade think, on

---

[8] "Below Kruševac, Aleksinac, is this southern part..."

[9] "People of Novi Sad have a very mild temperament, they are easy-going and relaxed". "I thought it a phrase for people of Pirot, but they are really ready to gauge your eyes out for 10 dinars".

[10] "I mind the coldness of a certain number of people."

[11] They relate to major rivers, Drina and Morava.

the basis of their experience, that the best people from Montenegro moved to Belgrade, whereas less capable and less educated people migrated to other cities of Montenegro ("Mostly people of low qualifications"). This change in perceptions and the evaluation of certain regions of Montenegro is mostly reflected in the notion of the disintegration of the northern part, quite looked-down upon by informants. They also notice the transition of power and cultural institutions from Cetinje (formerly the capital of the Principality of Montenegro) to Podgorica.

The Causes and Handling of Migrations

Six groups of causes of migrations can be distinguished: the first group is of an economic nature,[12] the second is cultural,[13] the third is in connection with individual emancipation,[14] the fourth is political,[15] the fifth is emotional (planning a marriage), whilst the sixth is simply caused by following someone else's example.[16] The majority of informants drew as a motive for migration from a perception of the old environment as unfavorable towards their development and further advancement. Informants perceived the old space as being deprived of proper conditions for studying, improvement and employment. Serbia is perceived as more civic and multicultural.[17] The phrase "better living

---

[12] "Now I am overcome with sorrow when I visit my city in the summer.... All the enterprises in Nikšić collapsed, everything is dead"; "People of Mojkovac migrate, mostly to Podogrica. Many of them are in Serbia. They have nothing to do, factories are closed."

[13] "I repeatedly wanted to move to Belgrade, mostly because I am poet by occupation. I knew that Belgrade is the metropolis that opens itself towards art and people interested in it. "

[14] "Long live the liberty.... For the first time I was separated from the parents – freedom, going out, no burden, no control on your return" "They would slow me when I was with then, everything is so tied up down there, those relations are too entangled, here everything is much more free.".

[15] "I was just giving one lady a lift in Montenegro the other day, and after I told her I was from Serbia, she said 'Is there a house in Serbia, somewhere in the country, for us who declare as Serbs? With the policies of the current government in Montenegro, we can't live here anymore'".

[16] "From the beginning I intended to enroll in School of Law in Podgorica, but one of the sisters had already enrolled in the Faculty of Medicine in Kragujevac. Since a friend of mine decided to go to Kragujevac, and we had many acquaintances there, I also opted for this city."

[17] "I feel completely different in Belgrade, there are a lot of Montenegrins there and people from outside in general, it does not really matter where you come from"

conditions" that denotes Serbia is not necessarily evoking a higher standard, but rather a better context for cultural development, and for achieving independence and individualization.[18] Some of the informants claim that although they would have obtained a better salary had they remained at home, Serbia gives them something they could not find in Montenegro. In this respect there is a significant generational difference. Elderly informants favor stressing economical reasons and possibilities for professional advancement and improvement. The strive for independence and liberation from the constraints of the old environment is more evident in the younger generation. Older generations feel that in terms of career and advancement, they were almost out of choice, as Montenegro was very underdeveloped, had no universities, tourist centers and strong cultural institutions. Younger generations see things differently, as Podgorica and the towns at the seaside are now rather developed, offering a larger job market and better conditions to live and work.

Almost all the informants agreed that, because of migrations to Serbia, Montenegro is losing the most qualified structure of its population, and that "everyone that is worthy" has left. According to the older informants, until the Second World War mostly men were leaving, whereas after the Second World War women joined in the migration. The most frequent cause for migration to Serbia was enrollment into high schools or universities. The political causes of migration are rarely mentioned directly, but are rather present in an indirect manner: Serbs from Montenegro think that they are in some sense endangered and would be better off moving to Serbia. The cases regarding the means of handling of migration are also very specific. In the times of SFRY, when Belgrade was the capital, each republic used to send staff to work in the institutions of federal government. Such individuals frequently did not return to their republic after the end of their term, but remained in Belgrade by obtaining another occupation (becoming, for example, lower executives or managers in companies). Only one of my informants came to Belgrade in such a way, and remained after the expiration of his political engagement. Some of the cases of migrations were inspired by the example of friends or relatives.

Immigrants gathered data on the surroundings in which they were about to settle in various ways; through relatives already living in Serbia, through direct contact during tourist journeys (excursions, weekends or visits to relatives) and so forth. Most of them had heard positive things about Serbia, and particularly about Belgrade, and they had mostly reached a definite decision about permanent settlement even before they arrived in Serbia. The majority

---

[18] "It is roughly clear when one outgrows a given surrounding, it does not satisfy one, can not give you a thing, nothing could have pleased me there." "People are here much more independent, rely on their own abilities, they are allowed to think with their own head."

of the informants started contemplating migration at a relatively early stage, as the university enrolment years were approaching. The older generations started thinking about it during high school. Some of the informants wanted to leave so badly, that they did not give much thought about the conditions in and their expectations of the new environment, and they were avoiding going back and visiting the old surrounding. First contact and accommodation was specific in each case: some stayed with their relatives for some time, whilst others went directly to dormitories or rented apartments. Almost all informants had the support of their families and friends in their decision. Even if the support of one of the parents was not wholehearted, there were no obstructions nor dramatic encounters. In some examples the parents made decisions on behalf of their children. One informant came to Serbia as her parents decided to send her off to Belgrade when she was old enough for high school. The other had to move to Serbia with her parents as her father, who was a military officer, was relocated to Serbia. There are opposite examples, in which the informants delayed their leaving for Belgrade to avoid possible quarrels with their parents.[19] Although the majority denied parental influence on their decision, there can be no doubt about its importance.[20]

Although the first impression conveyed was that the largest part of informants made the decision independently and willingly, one can notice in the background that the process could hardly be seen as completely individual: Montenegro has more or less until recently been characterized by an atmosphere directing and encouraging people to emigrate, and there were many examples of migration to Serbia that migrants were taking as role models. Therefore, I think that those migrations were socially generated, and not a matter of individual decision. We can even say that such mass migrations with individual decision-making have been going on continuously since the end of the Second World War. There were interesting attempts from the researcher to obtain responses from some of the middle-aged informants on how and why the decision to move came about. The inclination towards Belgrade and Serbia as a whole was considered only natural. It was taken for granted by everybody who aimed to "do something with their lives", and had inclinations towards sciences or arts, to the extent that that it is frequently impossible to distinguish how this idea appeared in any given case and how it materialized

---

[19] "I was thinking about it since I was 18. I wanted to come even then, but I was hindered with that emotion, down there is a patriarchal upbringing, I did not want to quarrel with my folks, I was younger then."

[20] "They said: 'Go, son, it will be better for you there'"; "Of course, like everyone else, I asked for the parental approval and got it." "My parents supported me, but it was easer for them when they found out I was not going alone. That I have friends, sister, and that it would be easier for me to find my way.".

itself. One can frequently hear about Montenegrins' inclinations towards Belgrade "in blood" and "in sub-consciousness". The few that contemplated whether to move or not came up with the same outcome as the ones who did not give it much thought. Through the "empirical" research and inductive reasoning they came to the conclusion that Serbia is better and that they should go there.[21]

The important factors that influenced the decision to move to Serbia were modes of declaring national and regional origin. The informants who declare themselves as Serbs and the ones from Pro-Serbian regions (Northern Montenegro, on the first place) were more inclined and directed towards Serbia. However, one cannot establish a rule or infer a correlate: national identity and readiness to migrate do not form a one-dimensional logical connection. People from all parts of Montenegro and of all nationalities were moving to Serbia. There is a prejudice that people from the seaside are not likely to leave their homeland and thus move less frequently to Belgrade.[22] My sample does not support that prejudice. Hoverer, the fact that many evaluate Podgorica highly, due to its closeness to the seaside, attests to the fact that the seaside is a generally desirable environment, influencing the recent perception and evaluation of other parts of Montenegro.

The very act of moving did not have a deeper influence on the consciousness of the informants, and it can be inferred that it went painlessly and without much stress. There was no fear from the new surrounding; the relative proximity and good contact with the homeland, cultural resemblance with the new surrounding and great number of countrymen with whom to associate, all gave migrants a sense of safety and the feeling that they were not abroad. Still, many stressed that it took an amount of courage to do so. Some of the migrants who came quite young in their lives (in high school) have strong and mixed feelings: this ambivalence did not concern the country they were leaving, but the country of destination[23].

---

[21] "When I went to the shop and asked myself where do all those products come from, I saw that out of all the articles - there were only two from Montenegro, and hundreds, thousands were from here (from Serbia, S.N.)."

[22] "Give them double of what they have, they would not take it, they would rather go back down"

[23] "In the beginning, my feelings shifted between fear and exaltation. Fear about how will I fit there now, how will I make my way, will I adjust, will the children mock my accent… Exaltation due to the chance to leave the ugly things aside and start all over in the new environment from the beginning, to make something out of myself. Exaltation, because I knew that the parents would be proud with my success, which I was expecting in the fullest measure."

The Consequences of Migrations

The problem of the integration of Montenegrins in Serbia opens up the question of the applicability and consistency of the present criteria of social classification and stratification. The example of Montenegrins is problematic even if we use criteria called "the level of ethnic incorporation", that relates to the cohesion within the group and integration (*cf*. Handelman 1977, quoted in: Eriksen 1993: 41-...). Furthermore, if we aim to look at this case through the classic division into dominant and subordinated groups, we must consider the position and possibilities of a specific group in a larger social system (*cf*. Schermerhorn 1996: 17-18). In accordance with the first criteria, Montenegrins as a group are to be located along the lines of ethnic categories, – ethnic networks, – ethnic associations and – ethnic communities. In accordance with other criteria, Montenegrins are to be defined with reference to their number and the power they have in society. Firstly, we need to distinguish whether Montenegrins can be considered as a community in Serbia, and secondly if this community has an ethnic character. Only then can we move to the question of whether this is an ethnic/national minority and its specificities.

The pioneer analyses indicate a couple of problems that seek further attention. They include the ways of maintaining inter-group communication, the issue of double belonging and ethnic solidarity.

The first motive to be found in stories told by informants, regarding the reasons for their easy accommodation to the conditions in Serbia, is their self-perception as the inhabitants of both states – meaning that the possibility of return to Montenegro is always open. Psychologically, this has made their situation in Serbia less insecure. Consequently, I observed strong feelings of nostalgia only in one informant; in the others, and particularly the younger, who had not chosen to have, or who had not yet conceived families, ideas about a possible return in a couple of years were appearing, but only sporadically, on the level of fuzzy representations. Among the informants who had been in Belgrade for a significant number of years there was no feeling of nostalgia, partly due to the attractiveness of the new surroundings, and partly due to the possibility of permanent contacts with the old environment. Not a single informant exhibited regret – on the contrary, they mostly considered moving to Serbia the right decision.

Consequences of migrations could be divided into several syndromes, depending on the change of the status and the role of migrants in the old and new environment. From the statements of informants it could be inferred that in their old environment migrants were considered to be the people who had "made it", who represented a positive example and a certain authority. When they returned to visit their old homes, relatives would frequently gather around them to ask about news from Serbia. They are envied or highly revered; in only one case the informant's friends thought it stupid of him to

have wanted to move. In that respect migrants to Serbia bear some resemblance to *Gastarbeiters*. Such a model of behavior is more frequent among the older informants, who moved a couple of decades ago, whereas it's rarer with the younger ones. The other consequence concerns status achievement in the new environment. Contrary to the usual trends when it comes to minorities, Montenegrins in Serbia have a favorable status due to at least two reasons: a high percentage have higher education, which qualifies them to take up highly-appreciated professions, and additionally family and local ties give them a preferential treatment in comparison to their competitors from Serbia. The ways in which immigrants connect and recognize their compatriots is also interesting. Recognition is mostly on the basis of family name and dialect,[24], but the reaction is not always positive; some are ashamed of their compatriots and have no wish at all to socialize with them, while some are proud of them in all contexts and are always trying to establish contact. Solidarity based on regional identity is far stronger than that deriving from national identity. This ethnic, or national, solidarity is reflected in many situations and can even acquire funny overtones, such as when a teacher in a school recognizes a child of his compatriot and tries to help him, to the doctor who offers special services or better treatment to his compatriots.

The level of integration of Montenegrins into Serbian society is so high that there is a lack of interest in creating a national association of Montenegrins; therefore, we can say that there is no single organization that could deal with the issues concerning Montenegrins in Serbia on the institutional level. Great differentiation among the Montenegrin population in Serbia contributes to such a situation. The majority of informants had never visited the social events of Montenegrins in Serbia, nor had ever heard of such occurrences. I only found out from one elderly informant that there is a branch of Matica Crnogorska in Serbia, and that the congregations of the countrymen (from Pljevlje, Durmitor and Podgorica) are still taking place. Only one elderly informant took part in such an event, yet had no idea what it was about. I discovered later that it was the traditional commemoration of December 19th, the Liberation Day in Podgorica. On this occasion people from Podgorica living in Belgrade gathered at the Russian House in Belgrade, marking it with an exhibition of paintings, a concert of some kind and a friendly gathering in which some older, highly educated people participated.

Regarding narrow circles of friends, informants are not turning exclusively to their countrymen or relatives. The Montenegrin background of a spouse was never a condition for marriage, and there is proportionally small number of inter-Montenegrin marriages. Notably, almost all the informants show strong (although allegedly unintentional) resistance to accepting *ekavica*, and

---

[24] "...all of us Montenegrins catch the eye quickly by the way we talk and stand.".

they maintain a strong Montenegrin accent. They know their origin five generations back, and there are examples of thirteen generations or more. Almost all of them come from the clans that have in the past moved from other parts of Montenegro and Herzegovina. The informants' vacation is almost exclusively in Montenegro, partly in the homeland, partly at the Montenegrin seaside. Although they are in constant contact with relatives and countrymen, only rarely do informants show strong tribal or fraternal identity. The ones I visited in their homes mostly had a book on the origin of their fraternity or tribe, although some of them had not read it. Almost all of them possessed some of the works of Petar II Petrović Njegoš, who is in a certain way thought to be the father of the Montenegrin nation. A small number had some of the symbols or insignias of Montenegro: the only such example was the picture of the Sveti Vasilije Ostroški monastery on the wall.

Regarding plans to return to Montenegro, responses were divided. The majority has no intention to go back for good, while a minority felt a great emotional attachment towards the country and the people and were contemplating the return intensively.[25] Only in one case did I encounter the idea of a return to the old environment due to the need to get back to "the roots". This behavior existed alongside the understanding that the return to Montenegro would be a sort of acknowledging defeat. It is considered that the greater opportunities that Serbia offers are accompanied by higher competition, and so the ones who cannot sustain the challenge decide to return to the easier life.[26]

Conclusion

On the basis of the gathered data it is clear that the problem of identity of Montenegrins in Serbia is very complex. The results point out that the immigrants who individually migrated to Serbian cities have a very fuzzy concept of Montenegrin national consciousness. Their solidarity usually revolves around the narrower ethnic and regional identities (that of belonging to the *gens*, fraternity and clan). Group identification is also narrow and directed towards closest relatives. It is difficult to speak about the Montenegrin popu-

---

[25] "I do not know when, but it will fill my heart, I am very attached and like Montenegro very much. It happens to me to go wild with the emotions sometimes, I don't even know what it means, I simply love it – very much. I love the country, the people as well, all of them are down there, you get it?"

[26] "They expected too much. They thought that all of you are simply waiting for them to come and that everything will happen on its own. Mostly they all come back down there because their parents found them an easier job where they can put in less effort and their position will not be so endangered."

lation in Serbian cities as such, because their relations towards Serbhood and Serbia show great variety with respect to the generations and regions of belonging. In that respect there is a problem in determining the Montenegrin minority in terms of its inner group dynamics. If we are to use Handelmans' typology regarding the degree of ethnic cohesion, Montenegrins in Serbian cities are occasionally showing characteristics of the ethnic category, and sometimes show the characteristic of the ethnic network: yet the degree of the ethnic association is almost never reached, apart from the sporadic and culturally determined attempts on the level of narrower regional groups (people from Durmitor, Pljevlja, Podgorica). Montenegrins recognize one another and frequently favor their countrymen on the job market, but that cannot be considered to be a rule. One of the main factors that makes Serbia attractive to Montenegrins is the lack of cultural and economical discrimination. Functionally, Montenegrins show some resemblance with the minorities of middlemen (such as Jews, taken in general), although there are important differences: Montenegrins usually obtain higher social positions, well-qualified jobs than members of other minorities or even members of majority, and can enter high politics.

It is usually regarded that minorities are last in the stratification of the social groups according to number and power. However, Montenegrins are occasionally showing the characteristics of an elite, flirting with the majority and renouncing the possibility of their institutional definition; on the other hand, they developed a certain inner group solidarity coming out of fear, but also from the wish to acquire and maintain the status of the favored group. They use their identity on a situational level: when necessary, large numbers of them equate Serbhood and Montenegrinhood, but they maintain the borders of their groups through inner ethnic solidarity.

Montenegrins who came through individual migrations usually live in cities, which is not a favorable environment for maintaining and manifesting a national identity. Whereas on the institutional level there is neither a desire nor need to manifest national identity, on the individual and on the level of interpersonal relations things are different. A great number of male migrants are proud of their origin in one way or another; they express it, and do not melt with the majority completely.[27] Most of the immigrants maintain their accent and dialect, as well as a

---

[27] An individual who came back from Serbia to Montenegro showed an interesting, but not so rare model of behavior. Father of one of the informants kept his Montenegrinhood as the need to differentiate from the rest of the Serbs, abut came very close to the Serbhood once back in Montenegro when encountering negative aspects of the Montenegrin identity: "While I was in Serbia, I was a great Montenegrin, but when I came to Montenegro, I eased up." His son says that he always declared himself as Montenegrin, but if he were now in Montenegro he would probably declare himself as a Serb.

somewhat specific vocabulary. In their own words, they do it unintentionally. Many are, in spite of the great effort to change, still easily distinguishable by the way they speak. Also, the majority maintain regular contact with friends and relatives, in Serbia as well as in the homeland. The second generation of immigrants showed signs of completely melting into the majority, with the loss of linguistic specificities, and a connection to a homeland growing weaker; feelings of national identity remaining largely beyond definition, so much so that one can hear many of them speaking about Montenegrins in the third person ("they").

This research has shown one other, until now quite unknown, unclear and sidetracked cause of migration of Montenegrins to Serbia. It regards the need for individual emancipation. The important percentage of the informants saw the movement to Serbia as a possibility to free themselves of the old, narrow ethnic patterns and start a free, independent life in a larger setting where relations could be maintained on the basis of interest. It might be that this aspect will be given special attention in further research.

Although incomplete, this research pointed to a number of particular issues to be given special attention in the following period. By that I chiefly mean the identification within the group and community, in which the following levels are identifiable: intergenerational connection and the connection between strata that declare themselves differently in the ethic and national senses. In future research, I will devote special attention to the second generation of informants, and to the problems of ethnic identity within the families in which one or both parents come from Montenegro. The aim of the current research was to reveal the main ideas and discourses, while future research will also encompass statistical analysis. I expect that the picture I will get of Montenegrins settled in rural parts of Serbia will be rather different.

References

Eriksen, T. H. 1993. *Ethnicity and nationalism: anthropological perpectives*. London: Pluto.

Etnički mozaik Srbije – prema podacima popisa stanovništva 2002. 2004. Beograd: Ministarstvo za ljudska i manjinska prava Srbije i Crne Gore.

Nedeljković, S. 2007. *Čast, krv i suze: Ogledi iz antropologije etniciteta i nacionalizma*. Beograd: Zlatni zmaj.

Schermerhorn, R. 1996. Ethnicity and Minority Groups. In: J. Hutchinson and A. D. Smith (eds.) *Ethnicity*. Oxford University Press, 17-18.

Saša Nedeljković

Pojedinačne migracije Crnogoraca u srpske gradove u periodu posle Drugog svetskog rata

Cilj istraživanja je da ispita načine migracija Crbogoraca u Srbiju nakon Drugog svetskog rata. Ovako postavljen cilj zahteva ispitivanje konceptualizacije životnog prostora Crnogoraca, uzroke migracija, njihove načine i posledice. Prva faza obuhvatila je analizu načina individualnih migracija, tačnije individulanog nivoa identifikacije kroz analizu narativa. Ovo je ostvareno vođenjem intervjua s izvesnim brojem osoba koje su se rodile u Croj Gori, ali su se tokom života doselile u Srbiju. U nekim slučajevima je upotrebljen biografski metod, u drugima je vođen intervju s usko formulisanim pitanjima dopunjen opservacijom.

Ključne reči: Crnogorci, Srbija, individualne migracije, akulturacija, identitet, narativi

Saša Nedeljković

Modalités de migrations individuelles des Monténégrins en Serbie après la Deusième guerre mondiale

L'objectif de ce travail est d'examiner les modalités de migrations des Monténégrins en Serbie après la Deuxième Guerre mondiale. L'objectif ainsi formulé exige une étude de la conceptualisation de l'espace de vie des Monténégrins, des causes des migrations, de leurs modalités et de leurs conséquences. Dans un premier temps l'on a procédé à l'analyse des modalités de migrations individuelles, plus précisément du niveau individuel d'identification à travers l'analyse des récits de vie. Cette analyse a été réalisée à partir d'interviews menées avec un certain nombre de personnes nées au Monténégro, mais qui avaient au cours de leur vie migré en Serbie. Dans certains cas est utilisée la méthode biographique, dans d'autres des interviews ont été recueillies, les questions ayant été formulées avec précision et complétées par l'observation.

Mots-clés: Monténégrins, Serbie, migrations individuelles, acculturation, identité, récits