

Robert Schuman Centre
for Advanced Studies

Culture and National Identity:
"The East" and European Integration

DAVID D. LAITIN

RSC No. 2000/3

EUI WORKING PAPERS



EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE

© The Author(s). European University Institute.

Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

IP
321
.02094
EUR

European University Institute



3 0001 0038 8091 3




EUI Working Paper RSC No. 2000/3

Laitin: *Culture and National Identity: "The East"
and European Integration*

WP
321.0209
4 EUR





The Robert Schuman Centre was set up by the High Council of the EUI in 1993 to carry out disciplinary and interdisciplinary research in the areas of European integration and public policy in Europe. Research publications take the form of Working Papers, Policy Papers and books. Most of the Working Papers and Policy Papers are also available on the website of the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies: <http://www.iue.it/RSC/PublicationsRSC-Welcome.htm>. In 1999, the Centre merged with the European Forum to become the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies.

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE, FLORENCE

**ROBERT SCHUMAN CENTRE
FOR ADVANCED STUDIES**

**Culture and National Identity:
"The East" and European Integration**

DAVID D. LAITIN*

***University of Chicago**

EUI Working Paper RSC No. 2000/3

BADIA FIESOLANA, SAN DOMENICO (FI)

**All rights reserved.
No part of this paper may be reproduced in any form
without permission of the author.**

**© 2000 David D. Laitin
Printed in Italy in February 2000
European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana
I – 50016 San Domenico (FI)
Italy**

Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies

Programme on Eastern Europe

The Working Paper series

The Robert Schuman Centre's Programme on Eastern Europe promotes the development of interdisciplinary research focusing on Central and Eastern Europe. Challenges, opportunities and dilemmas confronting the European Union in its relations with Central and Eastern Europe are at the centre of attention. The scope and style of papers in the series is varied, however, two areas of research have been prioritized:

- 1/ The EU Enlargement Eastward: Utility, Visibility, Implications
- 2/ Democratic Consolidation in Central and Eastern Europe

Visitors invited to the Institute under the auspices of the Centre's Programme, as well as researchers at the Institute, are eligible to contribute.

This paper was written for a meeting of the Reflection Group on the Long-Term Implications of Eastward Enlargement of the European Union: the Nature of the New Border, set up jointly by the Robert Schuman Centre and the Forward Studies Unit of the European Commission, and chaired by Professor Giuliano Amato. The European University Institute and the Robert Schuman Centre are not responsible for the proposals and opinions expressed by the author. For information on this and other projects on Eastern Europe at the Robert Schuman Centre, please contact Professor Jan Zielonka (zielonka@datacomm.iue.it).

Introduction¹

As political and economic forces are driving the former communist states of Eastern Europe into the web of the European Union, several questions arise as to the cultural challenges that might ensue. Do East and West have different cultural sensibilities that will act as a roadblock to further integration? More particularly, do the Eastern applicant states have political cultures that encourage people to think about the relationship of religion to the individual, the relationship of nation to the state, or the relationship between minorities (ethnic, religious, racial or those based on sexual orientation) in ways incompatible with the political cultures of EU member states? More generally, have the separate paths of west and east over the course of history forged a cultural divide, foreshadowing extraordinary difficulties in political and economic cooperation in the future?

A "great schism" that divides the "Euro-Atlantic Community" from the "Euro-Asian Community" and traced back to the separation of Christianity into its Roman and Byzantine versions is commonly cited as a barrier to the real possibilities of the integration of the Eastern European states into the EU. It is hypothesized that asymmetries between East and West in regard to modernization have deepened the schism, and furthermore, since the end of World War II, "in the Western part of Europe historical values and traditions creating the base of the cultural and moral identity of the continent have been strengthened. In the Eastern regions of the continent, however, the strengthening of these values was hindered by the so-called socialist ideology, originating in the Western part of Europe, but in practice being connected with the Euro-Asian cultural sphere and being represented by the presence and practice of Soviet power".²

From my examination of cross-country data transcending West and East in a few cultural realms — language, religion and popular culture — I shall provide some preliminary answers to the questions posed above.³ The data will show first that there exists a pan-European cosmopolitan culture that is rapidly infusing the applicant countries of the East. Second, the transcendent cosmopolitan European culture exists complementary with national cultures, which remain vibrant in the West and in the East, even in the context of an overarching continental culture. Third, the divergences of national cultures within the member states of the EU are considerable; yet on the cultural dimensions examined in this paper, the national cultures of the applicant states fall well within the extremes set by the member states. In fact, the data present a stunning result, which of course must be taken as preliminary and still at the level of speculation: *viz.*, that the cultural patterns exhibited by respondents from the applicant states are somewhat closer to the patterns shown among the original six

EEC members than is the case for the post-six entrants. To the degree that there is a "catching up" process in the works, the data suggest it is occurring intergenerationally among the populations of the later entrants more so than the applicants, who are already closer to the so-called western European norm. Fourth, the interpretation provided herein for the stunning result that the cultural practices of the applicant states are more proximate to the cultural practices of the original six EEC members than are the cultural practices of the later entrants to those of the original six is that there is often a greater motivation for those on the far periphery to assimilate into the norms of the center than is the case for the populations close to the center. From this point, it is concluded that the incorporation of East European states into the EU, from a cultural point of view, has greater potential for the deepening of European integration than for its erosion.

More concretely, this paper demonstrates that the citizens of the applicant states from the East into the EU are moving towards full membership in what I have called the 2 ± 1 cultural configuration of Europe.⁴ From this I mean that all Europeans who wish to participate fully in a wide range of mobility opportunities need to be conversant with an all-European continental culture. They must also be fully integrated into the national culture of the state in which they are citizens and/or reside, and will thereby maintain the vital differences in the so-called "mentalités" that differentiate intra-European national cultures. Thus all socially mobile Europeans will need to participate in two complementary cultural worlds. Those Europeans whose national cultures are close to the continental norm need only be a member of a single cultural world (2-1); while those Europeans living in "foreign" European states and those who live in regions of states with state-promoted regional cultures may need to be fully acquainted with three cultural worlds (2+1). All socially mobile Europeans will therefore have 2 ± 1 cultural repertoires.

Taking language as the paradigm, in the emerging European quasi-state, all socially mobile Europeans must be fluent in what is becoming the continental language, English. They also must be fluent in the state language in which they live. Thus bilingualism (the "2" of 2 ± 1) is becoming a European standard. Regional cultural groups within states are getting increasing recognition by both their central states and by the EU. To the extent that their regional governments can require the languages associated with those regions as media of instruction, or as necessary tools for regional government service, residents of those regions will be required to have a third language (2+1) in their repertoires. Those who live in the UK, where English is both the European and state language, need only be equipped in one (2-1) language. Immigrants from outside the EU as of now do not get serious education in their home language, and their grandchildren, should

their families remain in the EU, are likely to have language repertoires consistent with the 2 ± 1 scheme just outlined, depending upon where they live. The relationship of language to (quasi)-state in this regard is not one of a particular language to a state, but to a particular *configuration* of languages particular to a state.⁵ My suggestion in this paper is that across cultural domains, complementary 2 ± 1 cultural repertoires are emerging from below, and that East Europe is becoming a part of this cultural configuration.

The purpose of this paper is in fact to explore this 2 ± 1 configuration not only in language, but in religious belief and in two realms of popular culture. To the extent that the Eastern applicants are joining into this cultural configuration, we can project that the cultural barriers to political incorporation into the EU have been reduced.

Standing Against the Tide

There are three intuitions behind my theory of an emergent European 2 ± 1 cultural zone that includes both East and West. First, the embeddedness of Eastern European states into some European institutions is inevitable, even if EU membership is long delayed. It appears that the material benefits for becoming part of Europe and the opportunity costs for governments failing to bring their countries into the framework of Europe are so high that governments of virtually all political persuasions will see the institutional embeddedness within Europe as unavoidable. Politics will concern the request for short-term exceptions from European institutional standards, and these politics will undoubtedly be intense, with socialist parties being the strongest advocates of states of exception. Yet inexorably, at least some East European states will become part of Europe's trans-national institutional nexus.

Second, authoritative institutions set the boundaries for cultural expression within the societies that live within those boundaries. As Susan Watkins has shown with impressive data, in the nineteenth century demographic patterns within Europe began to be explained far more adequately based upon the country of residence (where people lived under the same political institutions) than by the so-called cultural community within which a person identifies. Therefore, Spanish Basques were far closer to the Spanish mean than they were to a Basque mean, one which combined the Basque populations of France and Spain. Eugen Weber's and Abram de Swaan's separate analyses of language patterns in 19th century Europe show the same result. Cultural shift aligns with state institutions. And so the second element of my intuition: the more Eastern European states are embedded in European institutional structures, the more there will be a shift in

cultural norms toward the European standard.⁶

Third, the natural carriers of national cultures ought not be thought of as the dominant members of the core societies around which the nations were historically constructed. In fact, elite members of the core cultures will have an interest in altering cultural norms in order to avoid the demeaning consequences of becoming indistinguishable culturally from upwardly mobile imitators of their culture. Meanwhile, aggressive and ambitious members of peripheral societies, living under the authority of a dominant culture, will have an interest in mimicking that culture in order to secure positions of responsibility within it. To an important degree, then, it is the Eastern Europeans who have a stronger interest in a utopian vision of "Europe" as a well-defined (and easily mimicked) culture than culturally secure Europeans who are citizens of the West European states.⁷

Despite the apparent (to me) cogency of these intuitions, powerful evidence firmly grounded in field and archival research stands against the thesis I am propounding. Consider the perspective on Polish Catholicism provided by Maryjane Osa. She presents rich historical data to undermine the argument that the Church, because it stood on the right side of history in its opposition to communism, will lend support to the economic and political transformation that will bring Poland into the European world. In fact, she argues, the organization of the Polish church makes it all the more likely to become a supporter of a "new authoritarianism" in East Central Europe, where priests — and here she lends support to Jowitt's imagery — will be aligned with demagogues and colonels. She gives two reasons for her perspective. First, the church will be constrained organizationally in its search for social support, and will not easily be able to take political stands in the abstract, and ignore popular demands for social security whatever the constraints. Second, in a postcommunist void of social organizations, the hierarchy and ethos of the Church are (like its Leninist predecessor) against the secular individualism of the West. The Church, she fears, will be on the vanguard of reaction rather than in support of integration into West European culture.⁸

Consider next the argument of Katherine Verdery, whose field research is in Romania, another of the applicant states. Verdery has, to be sure, picked up the utopian vision of Europe articulated in Romania, as would be suggested by my third intuition. References to the former hegemon to the east in post-Ceausescu Romanian discourse, she reports, exhibit fears of a renewed "Slavic imperialism" or getting sucked into "Bolshevist Asiaticism". Meanwhile European utopianists claim that proposed solutions to the problem of national minorities will be "old-fashioned" until Rumanians are able to discuss them "at a European

level". This utopian discourse shows a greater confidence in "Europe" than would be exhibited by most sectors in Europe's core, which are far more subject to "Euro-skepticism" than is the periphery.

But Verdery claims that this utopian vision is an "urban intellectuals' concept", one that is unconnected to village life. In the villages, she writes, a quite different story emerges, with a view of Europe that is infected by Ceauçescu's indigenist ideology that has a near fascist nation-discourse. The real electoral imperative in Romania, Verdery argues, is to win political support among the anti-Hungarians living in Transylvania, who are angered by the Hungarian population's demands for autonomy, and who are uninterested in merely receiving individual rights. Second, to many rural voters, "Europe" implies a disappearing social safety net, and the potential loss of communist-era pensions. Finally, Verdery emphasizes that increasingly that the then leading politicians in Romania, including President Ion Iliescu, were presenting a vision of Europe as filled with "nationalized states", something that Romania must accomplish before joining into a wider Europe. This would naturally involve a form of national cleansing, Verdery fears. And this explains why in 1993, Romania sent a delegation to Strasbourg, personally appointed by the President, for talks on joining the Council of Europe, that was filled with anti-Europeanists. While Europe is moving in a liberal direction, the implication of Verdery's sensitive analysis is that Romania is moving not toward a European utopia, but rather toward a political culture of anti-liberalism and intolerance.⁹

It would be foolhardy indeed to dismiss these two cogent — and thematically similar¹⁰ — treatises. Yet, as I believe the data will show in the subsequent three sections, when compared to the "real" Europe, the "applicant" Europe does not look like it has been submerged in a half century of anti-liberal Leninism. To be sure, the Polish Church and Romanian political parties are examples of illiberal institutions. But from the level of culture taken here, the populations of the East European applicant states look very much to be part of an emerging continental European culture; and the younger generation living in those states is quickly becoming part of it. In fact, the very division of Europe into "East" and "West" seems from the viewpoint of the data that I shall present to be defunct, a product of the Cold War.¹¹ Future research will have to reconcile the findings of Osa¹² and Verdery with those presented here; but I believe that Osa and Verdery might well have idealized western Europe a bit too much, making the illiberal strands they saw so clearly in Eastern Europe look un-European. They may also have missed some of the broader institutional constraints implied in European membership in their focus on within-state political processes.

East Europe and the Emerging European Language Configuration

Although it is not publicly acknowledged, a 2±1 language configuration is consolidating itself in Western Europe. Businessmen, students and Eurocrats — virtually anyone who sees a career in a European context — must know English. Although French is the language of the European Court and it is still a preferred language in several European institutions housed in Brussels and Strasbourg, no language other than English has a claim as an all-European lingua franca. Meanwhile, state bureaucracies and school systems operate through state languages as media of instruction in virtually all public schools: it is not possible to survive economically or to communicate with state officials in any European state without speaking the state language. Finally, regionally based groups (with the Catalans in the lead, but the Basques, the Welsh, and the Oc-speakers following) are making similar demands upon their residents, as educational texts, government memos, and public pronouncements are increasingly written in regional languages. The resulting 2±1 configuration is an equilibrium because no party to it (state governments; regional activists; the European Commission; socially mobile Europeans) has an interest in deviating from it (though the French government is a partial exception). It is a self-enforcing bottom-up solution to a linguistically-posed coordination problem.

Will the East European states become part of this language configuration? The data from the ISSP surveys, with the sample including three members of the original EEC (West Germany, Italy, and Netherlands), six members of the expanded EC (Austria, Ireland, UK, Spain, Sweden and East Germany), and seven applicant countries (Poland, Latvia, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Bulgaria and Hungary) suggest that the answer is "yes".¹³ Respondents in virtually all the countries overwhelmingly report that the titular language of the country (that is, the language after which the state is named) is their home language. In this sense, all member states (with some limited exceptions) and applicants are "nation"-states in the sense of having coordinated on a single language for home life. Exceptions include Latvia where only 63.8 percent speak Latvian as their principal home language (the rest mostly speaking Russian) and Spain, where 80.7 percent claim Spanish as their first language and only 1.3 percent more claim to speak Spanish fluently. My guess is that the 210 respondents who claimed Basque, Galician or Catalan as their first home language but did not report Spanish as a language they knew well were giving surveyors political rather than linguistic knowledge! In any case, in none of the countries in the survey is there any evidence of a less than dominant role of the state language as the principal language of home life.

Second, the role of English as a lingua franca throughout Europe is becoming a fact of life. Concerning fluency in the three contenders for a European lingua franca among the original EEC members: 29.8 percent overall claim fluency in English; 52.7 percent in German; and 11.3 percent in French (but note well, neither French nor Belgium was part of the sample). But the data on second language learning is more telling. Among these same original EEC members, 29.7 percent speak English as a supplementary language, while only 6.8 percent speak German as a supplementary language, and 11.2 percent speak French. This suggests that although German had the most first language speakers of the original EEC, English amongst this set has become the preferred second language of respondents. In the later generations of EU members (in which English as supplementary language is reduced substantially, as the UK and Ireland are two members of the sample), 7.4 percent speak English as a supplementary language, 1.5 percent speak German and 4.4 percent speak French. Among the applicant countries, German (with 8.6 percent) outpaces English (with 5.7 percent), but French has merely 1.0 percent. Among those under 35 years of age in the applicant countries, however, 11.7 percent claim fluency in English as a supplementary language whereas only 10.6 percent claim that for German. Two points are clear. First is that French may have ideological appeal to some; in reality, it is not a language of wider communication outside of a few corridors of power in Brussels and Strasbourg. Second, English has already become or is becoming the widespread second language of choice in all three sets of countries. It is the language of wider communication in all of Europe.

The outlier cases concerning the multilingual repertoires of Europe are not among the applicants, but rather among the additional members after the original six. As can be seen from Table A, the respondents from the later members are far more likely to report being monolingual than respondents from the countries from the other two groups. This isn't just due to the UK and to Ireland, which given the 2±1 configuration, ought to be monolingual. But consider Spain, where nearly 79.2 percent of the population reports being monolingual, and over 99 percent of the multilinguals report speaking another language of Spain (Catalan, Galician, Basque, or Castilian) as their second language. Even taking UK and Ireland out of the sample, later members have 74.6 percent monolinguals, considerably higher than in the original entrants yet slightly lower than the respondents from the applicant states. Therefore, if there is a non-cosmopolitan outlier set for this part of the language configuration, it is the later entrants rather than the applicants who supposedly don't belong "culturally" in the all-European configuration.

East Europe and the Religious Beliefs of its Citizens

In 1991, ISSP sponsored an earlier study, with a somewhat different sample of countries, that focused on religion and religious belief. Among the original six, West Germany, Netherlands and Italy were included. Among the later entrants, samples from Great Britain, Northern Ireland, Ireland, and Austria are included in the data base. Among the applicant countries, there was Hungary, Slovenia, Poland and (with a different coding for 1991 than it received in 1995) East Germany.¹⁴ The data also show what was indicated in the national identity survey about language: *viz.*, that there is a greater level of common cosmopolitanism, multilingualism, and here secularism among the original members and present applicants than there is among the later members. If there is an intergenerational trend, it is towards the later members catching up to the secularism of the original members and the present applicants.

14X17 ⑥
The findings should be no surprise once it is recognized that the Ireland and Northern Ireland samples are extremely religious (on most questions more so than the Poles), while the East Germans and Hungarians are extremely secular. Consider the question (v26) of whether those who do not believe in god are unfit for public office. Of the country samples, the two highest scores are among the later entrants, Ireland and Northern Ireland where 22.7 percent and 29.6 percent respectively either agreed or strongly agreed. Among the two lowest scores are Netherlands (3.6 percent) and East Germany (3.9 percent). On the question of respondents' belief in the Devil (v35) again the highest scores were from Ireland (48.6 percent) and Northern Ireland (68.1 percent), and the lowest both from the applicant states, East Germany (6.5 percent) and Hungary (11.3 percent). On the question of respondents' beliefs about heaven (v36), 90.3 percent of the Northern Ireland respondents and 87.2 percent of those from Ireland answered that there is definitely or probably a heaven. Compare this with the five lowest scores: 20.1 percent in East Germany, 28.2 percent in Hungary, 40 percent in Netherlands, 42.3 percent in Slovakia, and 42.7 percent in West Germany. Meanwhile, all four of the later entrants are among the six countries with the highest percentages — after the two Irelands, Great Britain as 54.3 percent and Austria 45.9 percent.

I then took five questions that examined the degree to which religious criteria should play a role in public authority. The questions are: (1) Whether R agrees that politicians who do not believe in God are unfit for public office (v26); (2) Whether R agrees that religious leaders should have no influence on how people vote in elections (v27); (3) Whether R agrees that there ought to be more people with religious beliefs in public office (v28); (4) Whether R agrees that religious leaders ought to have no influence in government decisions (v29); and (5) Whether R agrees that religious organizations have too little power (v30).

Each of the answers were on a five-point scale, and I recoded them so that a 5 represented views that government ought to be highly influenced by religious values and leaders, and a 1 represented views that government ought not to be so influenced. I divided the sum of the five answers by five, giving an index ranging from one to five. I then weighted the sample such that there were the same percentage of respondents for each country, based on country population.

I then (again with the weighted sample) ran a regression model with the index for religious influence in governmental affairs as the dependent variable. I controlled for age, for whether the mother of the respondent were a Roman Catholic, respondent's sex, level of education, and then dummies for each of the three stages of membership in the EU. The model on Table B shows the results of an equation that enters both the applicant and later dummies, which in effect compares each of them with the original members. The result shows that the average respondent from a later entrant country will have a score on the religious power index that is twice as far (in the more religious sense) from the average respondent from an original member country than the average respondent from an applicant country.

Table C shows these differences as comparative means. Here we see the differences among the three categories of states; and as well for two sub-populations — those under 35 years old and those 35 years or older. The final column shows that from an intergenerational point of view, it is the young populations of the later entrants who are moving more quickly to the religious culture of the original six than the young populations in the applicant states. One might interpret these data as showing that the later entrants adjusted culturally from one generation to the next in light of EU membership; but that such a cultural shift is not as necessary for the populations of the present applicant countries.

I recoded the list of religions — as the ISSP study differentiated among 29 religious denominations — to a list of five: (1) Catholic, (2) National Christian Church, (3) Protestants and those who called themselves Christians with no denomination, (4) Non-Christian and (5) No religion. Tables D and E present data on correlation coefficients among respondents' reports of religious affiliations of themselves (themselves as children) and close family members. No clear trends emerge, but there are two interesting results. First, rather surprisingly on two measures, religious similarity of mother and father, and religious similarity of respondent and spouse, the respondents in the later entrant countries show a far more cosmopolitan bent than either the respondents from the original six or from the applicant countries. Since on other measures, the later entrants were the non-cosmopolitans, this suggests that there isn't a single "cosmopolitan"

factor when it comes to culture. Second, there is a vast difference among respondents from the applicant countries in reporting their religion as a child and their current religious affiliation. Reports on religion as a child suggests that under communist rule, there was little attention to religious membership in family life. Reports on the current religion of the respondent suggests that after the fall of communism, people began to accept their ascribed religious labels as part of their identity, even if they report being atheists, and marry within their ascribed groups. In fact, there is far greater religious endogamy (computed as in Table E rather than the low level as computed in Table D) among the respondent populations of the applicant states than the other two sets.

Several participants in the "Forward Studies Unit" conference pointed out that the same levels of secularization indicated by the data have vastly different meanings in the West and the East, as the East did not experience the history of the Enlightenment, nor was its secularization the cumulative impact of individual agnosticism. Rather the secularization in the East was due to intense religious delegitimization by the agents of Soviet communism. My data do not allow me to reject this interpretation. But I do wonder how the Soviet rulers could have been so successful in achieving secularization from above when they could not instill socialist values from above? My priors are to accept East European secularization as individual and reflective of the same Enlightenment processes that pushed citizens in the original six toward secular, cosmopolitan world views.

Overall, then, the religious surveys point to an Eastern Europe that is quite close to the norms of the original EEC members in regards to beliefs and values concerning the role of religion in public life. And they are closer in fact than respondents from the later entrants, and now members of the EU. It would be difficult, with these data on the table, to argue that there are religious cultures in Eastern Europe that are reinforced by the hierarchical values of Leninism, and which support anti-liberal values.

It would be highly speculative, but I would suggest the data are consistent with my cultural configuration notion of the emergent European quasi-state. There is an emerging secular religious culture throughout Europe, one that sees religion as inconsequential for political life. There is complementary with this secular religious culture a high level of membership in and identification with nationally based churches, within which there is considerable endogamy. Thus two religious cultures are in simultaneous existence within many European respondents. There are of course many minorities who develop separate religious traditions alongside the secularization of Europe and possible connection to the national churches, making for a 2+1 religious culture. By this I mean that most European citizens will be highly influenced both by a universalist secularism as

well as by an identity connected with the church associated with the dominant population (the 2 religion formula). Religious minorities will be affected by both these religious traditions, but will be free to participate in rituals of their own religion (2+1). Of course, there will remain a class of true secular cosmopolitans, with no connection to any national church (2-1). This multiple religious configuration, I would suggest, is in equilibrium, not in tension with itself, and reflective of both West and East.

East Europe and Popular Culture

Popular culture (here film and music) has two profiles. On the one side, its products are industrial commodities pervading markets all over the world, no different from detergents. On the other side, its products help reproduce local, national and/or transnational cultures. The French government seeks to compete with "Titanic" the movie and "Tide" the detergent for an overlapping set of reasons. One reason why they want to respond to the former (and not a reason to respond to the latter) is a fear that a globalized artistic industry would reduce the symbolic space that encompasses "Frenchness". In any event, thinking of its cultural profile, the data on film and music, *faux de mieux*, show Eastern Europe and members of the EU to be part of a common global regime, in film dominated by United States' production and distribution hegemony, and in popular music by a West European/North American duopoly.

Film

In the film industry, hegemony is found in Hollywood. Consider Table F, on the "top ten" films in four recent years reported from four of the original six (Germany, Netherlands, France and Italy), two of the later entrants (UK and Spain) and four applicant states (Hungary, Latvia, Poland, and Slovakia). The first remarkable fact is that in none of these ten countries, and in all four sample years, are fewer than half of the "top ten" US productions. There are a few reasons why all Europeans are attracted to the same internationalist movie culture. First, big-budget U.S. films are better produced and technically superior, for example with respect to special effects and animation, and thereby attract wide audiences throughout the world. Second, the European film industries are poorly funded, save for UK, Spain, Italy and France. In the Eastern European countries, the political and economic turmoil in the past decade vastly reduced the production of films. Thus there has been no serious "European" alternative, though the figures for 1997 suggest a counter-trend. Third, some of the best European directors are being attracted to Hollywood, and help produce American films. Fourth, success at the box office requires control over distributional

networks, from producers to theaters, and this system is now fully dominated by a handful of massive distribution chains, all with close ties to the Hollywood majors. In Spain, for example, ninety-six domestic feature films were produced in 1996, and film attendance is rising. Yet only thirty-eight of the ninety-six domestic films, due to lack of a local distributor, received at least one public showing. The enormous new growth of multiplex theaters in Europe (with 120 in Spain; 40 in Germany; 25 in Netherlands, and 98 in the UK in 1997) plays into the hands of the distributional giants. Despite the enormous growth of screens, by putting the best screens under control of the giants, the result may actually lower the chances for a screening of domestic films.

A second fact illustrated by Table F, perhaps even more astonishing than the first, is that in none of the countries does any film produced outside of the U.S. or Europe make it into the "top ten". This means that Russian, Australian, Hong Kong, and Indian films (with the latter two having extraordinarily large film industries) did not penetrate into the upper levels of box office success among the member countries of the original six, the later entrants, or the applicant states. The cultural influence of films from these countries has been negligible in the realm of European popular culture.

A third important fact that comes out from Table F is the relative weakness of European films outside their home countries. In the data from 1992, 1995 and 1996, not one European film made it to the "top ten" in another European country. The data from 1997 suggest that a pan-European audience for European films is perhaps emerging. The leading film for 1997 in all countries of the sample was "Mr. Bean", based on a BBC TV series that is in the genre of comedic pantomime. This film did not make it into the US "top ten", suggesting at least some autonomy of European movie tastes from Hollywood blockbusters. Overall, the West European film industry, notably in Netherlands and Germany, has achieved somewhat of a renaissance in the late 1990s, as young film directors, often working through film divisions of state owned TV networks, have made more films that speak to issues that affect young people. European joint ventures is a related route toward competition with America. From 1993 to 1996, for example, Latvia had not produced a feature film, and its market is heavily dominated by US productions. The first new film in 1996 is a co-production with a West European consortium.¹⁵ Joint ventures with the US industry is another route to quasi-autonomy. One of the European productions in 1997 that made it to three "top tens" outside of its France, where it was produced, was "La Femme Nikita". This was a joint French/U.S. production in reality (distributed in the US under the name "The Fifth Element") and it starred the American actor Bruce Willis. It was not among the US "top ten" for 1997.

Another (albeit small) spark to the European film industry is “Euroimages” formed under the aegis of the Council of Europe in 1988. Since its creation, with a mean support figure of about 12 percent of budget, Euroimages has co-produced some 460 feature films and documentaries. Presently, all six of the original EEC members are members of Euroimages, eight later members (Austria, Finland, Denmark, Greece, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, and Sweden, with UK recently leaving), and six applicant countries (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Slovakia).¹⁶ It seems clear that to the extent that there is competition vis-à-vis the American film industry in both West and East Europe, it will be films from Europe itself (and virtually nowhere else) that will move into a second position in domestic markets.

A fourth fact that comes out from analysis of Table F is that the applicant states share with the rest of Europe a common movie culture. The dominance of American films has been clear. Until 1997, in fact, there was only one film that was not American in the four applicant states. This was “Priest”, produced in the UK, which *Variety* described as “an absolutely riveting, made-for-BBC slice-of-life drama that’s a controversial look at incest, gay-life and the Catholic Church”. The movie was seen by approximately 430,000 Poles and generated just under a million US dollars in revenue. As with the rest of Europe, the applicant states had only fledgling domestic products. Also, as with the rest of Europe, the popularity of films made in other European countries (outside of “Priest”) appears only in 1997. Most interesting, given the so-called legacy of the socialist past, among applicant states there were no non-American or non-European films to make it on to any “top ten” list.

Thus, one might say there is a European 2 ± 1 film regime in early stages of development: American films dominate throughout Europe; some state film industries are either strong (as in France and Italy) or re-emerging (Germany, UK, Poland) which will represent an alternative film culture. Finally (and this component is different from the language regime), trans-state European films are developing their own markets within the EU and outside their national borders. Outside of American films, only European films seem to have the power to capture a limited share of trans-European markets. All other national film industries (and film industries from the regions within European states) will play only to boutique markets. In this sense, both West and East Europe are part of the same film culture.

Popular Music

In the world of popular music, the applicant states to the EU are part of a global music regime that is commensurate with the film industry. A dominant English-

language internationalist popular music is the dominant seller. Each country has its own national version of international pop that sells well domestically. Finally, European countries sell their top records to consumers in other European countries. The data will show that the applicant states to the EU are very much part of this configuration.

The international music business today is one in which the United States and five EU countries share a duopoly. Three major EU companies (Thorn EMI in the United Kingdom; PolyGram in Netherlands; and BMG in Germany) account for about 40 percent of the world market in sales, on par with sales from U.S. companies. In many respects, West European youth culture has begun to surpass the Americans in setting standards for musical trends. The result is a powerful global pop music culture that pervades Western Europe. In Eastern Europe especially, but in Western Europe as well, there are three musical cultures: first, the global pop music culture that arrives in the Eastern European states with a marked time delay; second, the remnants of national pop music cultures that have not been entirely erased by the global market; and finally, a healthy market of European pop that sells quite well throughout the EU and Eastern Europe. Therefore one could call the European pop culture configuration a 2±1 outcome (as UK's English language pop is both titular and pan-European).

Popular music has become so global in the past generation that the national origin of popular music and the artists who produce it are blurred and difficult to code. In the early post-World War II generation, Americanization was clear.¹⁷ Radio Luxembourg (as well as the US Armed Forces Radio Network) brought American rock and roll to Europe in the 1950s. The 1960s-70s saw the supposed "Americanization of youth culture". In fact, the so-called "British Invasion of America" was really a moment of recognition in the UK that their artists' true market was in the US, and contracts with US recording companies the criterion of success.

But a European disco culture grew from semi-obscurity to world dominance from the 1970s through the 1990s. In the early 1970s, a genre of "Euro Pop" — a combination of Eurovision song contest entries and the disco-dance sound from holiday dance clubs in Ibiza — began to develop on its own, outside of American direct influence. ABBA, a Swedish disco act, went beyond the confines of Europe, and brought this chirpy singalong music to international audiences. As the genre developed, it hit the gay disco scene, and influenced the German/Italian disco sound that was called "Eurobeat" in which high quality technology gave the music a sheen that assured club and radio play. With the American disco scene fading away, British companies began producing not for the Americans, but for the Europeans, where sales growth was far more robust.

The marriage of Britain to Europe made Europe a genuine challenger to the US for the definition of an international youth music.

The “international pop” that constitutes the first part of the 2 ± 1 formula is largely English in language (as would be expected from the data on language use) but multicultural in form. A significant proportion of EU hits originate in UK and Ireland, but even those originating from Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Austria and Denmark (and sometimes Spain as well) feature English titles and texts. While most of the lyrics for these songs are so primitive that it seems generous to call it “language”, the words tend to be English ones. In Table G, we see that in ten selected countries for 1999, only in France (and of course UK) do a majority of titles in the “top twenty” appear in the titular language. For 1999, taking the mean percentage of original six countries (Germany, Netherlands, France and Italy— where only the “top ten”, not “top twenty”, are recorded), later members (only Spain, as in UK the titular language and English are the same), and applicants (Hungary, Latvia, Poland and Slovakia—where only 1998 data are available) reveals an already familiar pattern. The mean figure is 73.75 percent of English language titles for the original six and 70 percent for the later member (here only Spain). Thus the mean figure for the applicant states (at 75 percent) shows closer connection to the original six than does the figure for the later member. As a rule, foreign language titles, other than English, rarely make it into individual country charts, the figure never going over 10 percent. In a data base going back to 1992 (not shown), occasionally a German language title hits the Netherlands' charts, or a Portuguese song the Spanish, or a French and/or Italian song receives general European interest. For example, in 1998, a Russian song appeared successfully in the Latvian charts. But in general, outside of English, foreign language titles do not reach the top of the popular music charts in the European cultural configuration.

The dominance of the English language is attenuated by attempts to cultivate a sexy multicultural image. A good example of this is Sash!, a German disc jockey (Sascha Lappessen) who employs various vocalists to sing in different European languages. He has had five “top five” hits from 1997-98 (“Encore un Fois”, “Ecuador”, “Stay”, “La Primavera” and “Mysterious Times”) with titles in three languages, none of them German. In the February 1999 listing of the “top ten” or “top twenty” from the nine countries for which we have data, there were 170 different titles, but of the twenty-two that appear on the lists of more than one country, only one of these titles was not in English.

The second part of the expression 2 ± 1 refers to music that plays mostly, or primarily, to domestic audiences. For example, the EU Industry Guide of 1995 reports that EU markets typically have 60 percent of sales for “international

pop.” Domestic artists for domestic audiences contribute around 30 percent. Classical recordings account for the final 10 percent. In Greece, Italy and France, the second category — domestic pop — is somewhat stronger, accounting for 40-60 percent of the markets. In regard to language, as we saw on Table G, titular language songs have a grip in virtually all the European markets, with France, Poland, Spain, Hungary and (of course UK) being the strongest. On the charts of “top twenty” for February 1999, there are ten songs with French titles: but in no other country besides France are these songs in the “top twenty”. Although some of these songs are from a French Canadian popular musical then playing in Paris and from French-singing North Africans, it is fair to say that while English language songs play internationally, French language songs play well only in Francophone countries.

Table H paints a complementary picture, and one that helps draw out the pan-European aspect of the 2 ± 1 configuration. It computes the percentage of the “top twenty” for 1999 by country in which the song was produced. Unlike the case of film, every country in the sample (with Italy the major exception) has marked national presence in the top sellers. Also unlike film, EU productions sell widely beyond their national boundaries, and compete successfully with American productions. Taking the means of the three sets of countries in the samples, we see that for the percentage of “top twenty” hits that are of domestic (national) origin, of the original six, the mean figure is 17.5, and for the later members it is also 17.5, with the applicants at 23.75. And showing the greatest pan-European support, the applicants have the highest percentage of other EU at 27.5 percent, with the original six having a mean percentage of 12.5 and the later members a mean percentage of 15. It is clear from these data that the Eastern European applicant states included in this sample are very much part of the 2 ± 1 music configuration that marks the countries already members of the European Union.

Is This All There Is To Culture?

One might object and ask whether language repertoires, beliefs about the political relevance of religion and popular exposure to movies and music are all there is to “culture”, or whether the data I present here are indicators of “culture” at all?

Consider my discussion concerning language repertoires. Two questions about the interpretation of these data speak to the core concerns of this paper. First, is the 2 ± 1 configuration in any way unique to Europe, or is it a function of globalization that is affecting all states? The answer to this is that while there are

elements of globalization that are reflected in the European configuration (e.g. the dominance of English is a global phenomenon), the specificity of the repertoires is distinctly European. Consider the following cases. Germans working in France will expect their children to have a sound education in German (as well as English and French), yet Algerians working in France will regard Arabic as a language of the home, and not a language of instruction in their schools. This is so because German is a language of Europe but not Arabic. The concessions given to Catalan in the EU rather quickly get incorporated into political programs in other minority language regions, on a premise that all European regions have equal rights to full cultural expression. It is the case that 2±1 repertoires may become more common in other regions of the world, and no doubt English will continue to play a larger role; but the elements of these configurations will differ across regions. In this sense the European configuration will be unique.

Second, to what extent do languages used for specific domains represent something “cultural” and not just functional? To address this question, I shall make an analogy between changing one's language repertoire with religious conversion. As demonstrated by Nock, religious converts almost never imbibe the cultural ethos of the religion; rather they take advantage of the instrumental benefits that accrue to “believers” of their adopted religion. It is only in successive generations, when for example the children of converts get educated at the hands of the religious virtuosi, that a cultural shift takes place.¹⁸ This mechanism could well operate with language repertoires. In the present generation of Languedocians born after World War II, reliance on English may be thought of as purely functional, and reliance on Occitan may be purely recreational. But their children may well see this multilingual repertoire as constitutive of their identities (combining the cosmopolitan and the local, in a unique way), and appeal to it with pride. To the extent that a language repertoire becomes constitutive of social identities, it is properly conceived of as cultural. And so, my data cannot demonstrate that the emerging 2±1 European repertoire is a fully developed aspect of culture; but intergenerationally, it is likely to become one.

But even if the three realms I have analyzed are cultural, and even if my interpretation of the long term implications of the data are correct, are there not other, perhaps “deeper” elements of culture that divide East from West? Ralph Dahrendorf raised this issue in a poignant way when an earlier version of this paper was presented to the European Committee of Reflection in September 1998. In particular, he asked, would readership of books and newspapers, as opposed to films and music, show the same global culture? He thought not, as reading is far more national than continental. But more important, he insisted,

there is in the heart of Europe a common element or value, one that respects the rule of law, carries with it a desire for social democracy and reflects "a combination of a desire to be a successful part of the global economy, but to also conduct policies that favor cohesion and justice." This value is not (now) shared in the East, he fears, and he sees this as ominous for the EU should its core values be diluted by too-quick entry of the applicant states into the EU.

On Dahrendorf's first point, it might be noted that what constitutes "real" or "deep" culture cannot so easily be discerned. Worse, looking ever deeper for culture subverts any attempt at the systematic analysis of the effects of culture. This is so because if we have an intuition that X's and Y's are different in a deep way, any evidence that they share cultural traits will be written off as "shallow." Since it is always possible to dig a bit deeper, the intuition cannot be scientifically undermined. All I can claim for the data presented here is that evidence of a cultural divide between members of the EU and applicants from the East is lacking in three domains of culture. Those who wish to examine other realms are welcome to do so; and if they find a cultural divide between East and West, as might have been expected from the research of Verdery and Osa, my findings here would need to be revised. But as yet there are no systematic data, only vague impressions, that stand against my claims herein.

Dahrendorf also claims that in *political* culture, those in the East may not have the same social democratic values and concern for the rule of law as do the populations of nearly all of the present members of the EU. This may well be true, but trivially so. This paper has postulated a range of cultural variables as independent, and asked whether different values on these variables for new members would negatively impact the common political venture of the EU, which is the dependent variable. But if you want to collect data on "respect for the rule of law" or "the value of social democracy", you need to observe political behavior, which is more-or-less the same information that will inform the dependent variable. Dahrendorf's claim therefore verges on tautology. His thesis in caricature is that there would be a clash of political values were the eastern applicant states admitted into the EU because they have different political values. My thesis is that if the applicant states fail to integrate into the European political community, it would not be because of cultural difference.

My suspicion is that the thesis of cultural difference is a canard, upheld by concerned citizens and political leaders who fear, for other reasons, the consequences of joining East to West. It may be the case that for other reasons — economic differentials, noninstitutionalized systems of justice, nonconsolidation of democratic elections — the attempted integration of eastern Europe into the EU would entail heavy costs. But there is no systematic evidence that for *cultural*

differences the costs would be any heavier than the incorporation of Britain, Ireland, Austria and the other later entries. And I have presented here some positive evidence that those costs might be lighter than the incorporation of the already integrated later entrants.

Implications for a Deepening of the EU

In this paper, I have made three claims, and provided data from three cultural realms to give support for these claims, all of which are in some tension with popular understanding of the dynamics of the deepening of the EU and of the implications of Eastern European incorporation into the EU for that deepening.

The first claim is that despite the still and ever-vibrant national cultures that constitute the member states (and associated nationalities) of the EU, there is an emergent cultural configuration in Europe that represents a common cultural (and proto-national) zone. Although there is significant cultural diversity between nations and between states within Europe, that diversity is contained within a coherent cultural system, such that most Europeans have a set of cultural repertoires that enables them to act appropriately (i.e. according to local standards) throughout the EU. For language, there is an emerging lingua franca, a continued vibrancy of state languages, and a subsidized system to protect minority languages. The norms for which languages are to be used in which contexts are well internalized. It is the internalized norms of the cultural system that constitutes the common cultural zone. In religion, there is an EU-wide consensus in support of a secular Christianity, a respect for national churches that do not meddle in political life, and a recognition as well of minority religious groups as long as the religious expression of these groups is contained within that community. In popular culture, Europe participates in an international popular film and music system (the latter in which it is a duopoly producer) that is dominant in each realm, but each has a small but viable national production of film and music that is made for domestic audiences and for other Europeans. Europeans therefore have a common matrix for the production and consumption of popular culture.

The second claim is that the applicant states from Eastern Europe are far closer to the European cultural system than is popularly understood, or even recognized by leading social scientists who have observed the cultural life of these states with great perspicacity. In fact, the preliminary data show — much to my amazement — that in the cultural realms of language and religion, the applicant states are somewhat closer to the original six in a common cosmopolitanism (multilingualism in language; secularization in religion) than

are the later entering states into the EU. In aspects of popular culture as well, the applicant states appear on some dimensions to be nearly as international as the sample from the original six, and more internationalist than the sample from the later EU entrants. These findings are so counter-intuitive that they demand future analysis. Indeed, several members of the "Forward Studies Unit" were so incredulous that they discounted the cultural realms that were specified in this paper and sought to define other realms (such as sense of rule of law and respect for social democratic values) where the divide between East and West would come out more strongly. Of course I cannot rule out that in other cultural realms the East/West divide might be a deep one. But there is no evidence in the wide ranging sets of data that went into this paper's analysis that the cultural configurations of Eastern Europe pose a threat to the emerging cultural system of the current member states.¹⁹

The third claim is more of an interpretation than a finding. It is that in dynamic national projects (as I believe Europe has become), there is greater interest in promoting a national culture in the periphery than in the center. A particularly good example of this is to think of middle class Jewish culture in post-emancipation Europe:²⁰

The Jews who took the Enlightenment on its word and identified emancipation with refinement of manners and, more generally, with self-cultivation, had become cultural fanatics. In every Western nation they were the ones who treated national cultural heritage most seriously...Trying to excel in the complex and often elusive task ahead, they sung the praises of national monuments and masterpieces of national art and literature, only to find that the audience comprised mostly people similar to themselves. They read avidly and voraciously, only to find they could discuss what they read only with other *aspiring* Germans or Frenchmen like themselves. Far from bringing them closer to assimilation, conspicuous cultural enthusiasm and obsessive display of cultural nobility set them aside from the native middle class and, if anything, supplied further evidence of their ineradicable *foreignness*...The self-destructive tendency of assimilation also effected occupations[;] legal or medical careers...offered particular attractions to assimilating Jews...The unplanned outcome...was...an overrepresentation of Jews in the professions, and a new set of arguments to prove the Jews' permanent distinctiveness. The abandoning of traditional Jewish occupations, which from the assimilants' viewpoint meant *Entjudung* (de-judaization of 'men as such') appeared to the baffled native public more like the process of *Verjudung* (judaization of heretofore gentile areas)". [This was a 'Catch 22' plight [for which] there was no guaranteed escape.

The Eastern Europeans today, in significant numbers, seek to become part of a European national culture that is clearer to them than it is to everyday West Europeans. To be sure, it might be argued, along lines suggested by Bourdieu, that peripheral peoples are "pretenders" with a negative (even cynical) view of the center. They could well be emulating the center purely for instrumental gain, while in fact they are more nationalistic in their apparent cosmopolitanism.²¹ This would be more in line with the data presented earlier from Verdery and Osa. The fact, however, is that the emulation, in seeking to learn English, in wanting secular rule, in listening to "top ten" songs and watching "top ten" films, is not a result of an effete class of social climbers (as was perhaps the case with German Jews). Rather it is a mass phenomenon, belying a notion of cynical adaptation.

There is yet another important difference. Unlike the situation of post-Enlightenment Jewry, however, West Europeans are not seeking to escape from a European mold to keep a distance from those seeking to assimilate, so the "Catch-22" of the Eastern Europeans becoming "Europeans" while the actual EU members becoming something else is not likely. The more likely outcome is that the pressures of peripheralization will induce East Europeans to self-consciously promote a deepening of a European culture that West Europeans themselves have less motivation to foster. Rather than eroding a common EU culture, the data in this paper suggest that East European entry into the EU will contribute to its deepening.

David D. Laitin
University of Chicago
Dept. of Political Science
Pick Hall 522A
5828 South University Ave.
Chicago, IL 60637

dlaitin@midway.uchicago.edu

Table A
Language Repertoires by Type of Country (all countries in sample)

Language Situation Country Type	Monolinguals	Fluent in English	Fluent in Russian	Has an EU Language other than English as 2nd	Has an EE Language as 2nd
Original EEC	62.6	29.8	.6	35.5	1.7
Later Member	79.1	51.1	1.0	20.0	1.2
Applicant	76.0	5.7	9.8	13.6	5.6

Table B
Regression Model with Appropriate Level of Power for Religion in Government as Dependent Variable, Comparing Original EEC Members, Later Entrants and Present Applicants, with Controls

Variable

Dummy for Later Entrant	.224098 (12.351)
Dummy for Present Applicant	.105763 (5.903)
Education	5.26170E-04 (1.149)
Age	.006985 (12.351)
Dummy for Mother Roman Catholic	.080282 (5.139)
Sex	.105775 (7.524)
Constant	1.617763 (46.984)
R squared	.04901

Bold indicates $p < .01$. T-ratios are in parentheses.

Table C

Mean Levels of Power for Religious Beliefs and Institutions as Appropriate for Government (1=low levels of religious influence are appropriate; 5=high levels of religious influence are appropriate) and change over generations

Mean Level of Religious Power Appropriate in Society	All Respondents	Old (> 35 years)	Young (≤ 35 years)	Change in mean
Original EEC	2.1438	2.1959	2.0567	.1392
Later Member	2.3309	2.3722	2.2583	.1139
Applicant	2.2424	2.2660	2.2029	.0531

Table D

Correlations between Religious Identification among Family Members (weighted)

Relationship Country Type	R (as child) and Mother	R (as child) and Father	R (as child) and Spouse	Mother and Father
Original EEC	.8322	.6885	.6187	.7301
Later Member	.6327	.2159	.1954	.2538
Applicant	.3062	.2636	.4010	.7784

Note: These are correlation coefficients based upon v50-v53 in ISSP religion survey.

Table E

Correlations between Religious Identification among Family Members

Relationship Country Type	Respondent and Mother	Respondent and Father	Respondent and Spouse	Mother and Father	Respondent now and Respondent as a child
Original EEC	.6264	.6120	.6244	.7836	.6698
Later Member	.4486	.4514	.3855	.6780	.2336
Applicant	.7953	.7802	.8292	.8545	.0362

Note: These are correlation coefficients based upon my recoded and compressed values based upon v50-v53, and v106.

Table F

The "Top Ten" Films: Selected Countries, Selected Years
 [Figures Represent the Percentage in the Country, for each Year]

[Percentages: Domestic, Other European, and US Films]

Country	Year	1992	1995	1996	1997
ORIGINAL SIX EEC MEMBERS					
Germany		10, 0, 90	10, 0, 90	20, 0, 80	30, 20, 50
Netherlands		10, 0, 90	20, 0, 80	0, 0, 100	0, 10, 90
France		40, 0, 60	30, 0, 70	40, 0, 60	40, 10, 50
Italy		10, 0, 90	30, 0, 70	20, 0, 80	30, 20, 50
LATER EC ENTRANTS					
Spain		0, 0, 100	0, 0, 100	0, 0, 100	10, 20, 70
United Kingdom		0, 0, 100	0, 0, 100	10, 0, 90	20, 0, 80
APPLICANT STATES					
Hungary		0, 0, 100	0, 0, 100	NA	20, 20, 60
Latvia		NA	NA	0, 0, 100	10, 10, 80
Poland		NA	0, 10, 90	0, 0, 100	30, 10, 60
Slovakia		0, 0, 100	0, 0, 100	0, 0, 100	0, 30, 70

Sources: Derek Elley (1996) *Variety Movie Guide '97*, London, Hamlyn; European Commission (1995) *Panorama of EU Industry 95/96*, Brussels, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, pp. 27-1 to 27-22; *International Motion Picture Almanac* for years, 1991, 1992, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998; *Screen International Euroguide* (1996); and *Variety International Film Guide for 1994* [for data on 1992] and 1998 [for data on 1996].

Table G

Language of Song Titles in the "Top Twenty" Pop Music Charts in 1999 by Country

Country	Language	English	Titular	Other
ORIGINAL SIX EEC MEMBERS				
Germany		80	15	5
Netherlands		80	10	10
France		35	55	10
Italy		100	0	0
LATER EC ENTRANTS				
Spain		70	30	0
United Kingdom		100	(100)	0
APPLICANT STATES				
Hungary		70	30	0
Latvia		85	15	0
Poland		70	30	0
Slovakia (1998)		75	15	10

Sources: The 1997 data are from *Variety Film Guide International* (1999), London, Faber and Faber, 64-74. The 1999 raw music data were downloaded from:

Germany = <http://www-info6.informatik.uni-wuerzburg.de/~topsi/deu_040299.html>;

Hungary = <<http://www.externet.hu/mahasz/slagerkis.htm>>;

Latvia = <<http://www.lanet.lv/news/airplay/1999/990214lv.html>>;

Holland = <<http://www.radio538.nl/charts/top40.html>>;

Poland = <<http://www.radom.top.pl/radio/listaprz.htm>>;

Spain = <<http://www.Cadena40.es/scripts/40w3/1st.asp>>;

UK = <http://www.dotmusic.com/charts/top20singlesyr_print.asp>;

Italy = <<http://www.televsual.net/telemusic/sp.html>>;

France = <<http://www.ifop.fr/actualit/top50/top50.htm>>.

Table H

Percentage of "Top Twenty" Pop Songs by National Origin by Country and Year

Country	Origin	Domestic	EU-other	US/Canada	Other	Unknown
ORIGINAL SIX EEC MEMBERS						
Germany		25	10	25	0	40
Netherlands		10	15	45	0	30
France		35	5	35	5	20
Italy		0	20	40	0	40
LATER EC ENTRANTS						
Spain		25	30	35	10	0
United Kingdom		10	0	55	0	35
APPLICANT STATES						
Hungary		35	25	30	0	10
Latvia		15	25	45	0	15
Poland		35	30	35	0	0
Slovakia (1998)		20	30	40	0	10

Sources: See Table G.

NOTES

¹ Research assistance by Brett Klopp is gratefully acknowledged. Peter Katzenstein and Gary Herrigel provided useful comments on an earlier draft. Comments provided by members of the Forward Studies Unit at the European University Institute in September 1998 are gratefully acknowledged.

² Here (with italics omitted and other small changes made in the quoted texts) is Kálmán Kulcsár's characterization of a position that he argues must be overcome to achieve the goal of building upon what he considers "the growing awareness of the common elements of European culture." See his "East Central Europe and the European Integration" in Máté Szabó (ed.) (1996) "The Challenge of Europeanization in the Region: East Central Europe", *European Studies*. 2 (Budapest, Hungarian Political Science Association), quotes from pp. 12-16.

³ The cross country data for language and religion are calculated from surveys conducted by the International Social Survey Program (ISSP), and the data are supplied by the Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung, in Köln, Germany, and distributed by the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA. While sampling procedures differed in each of the countries, the overall attempt was to get country-wide stratified samples, with total number of respondents ranging from about 1000 respondents in Italy to 2700 in Russia. Full details of the surveys are available from ICPSR at <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu>.

⁴ David D. Laitin (1997) "The Cultural Identities of a European State" *Politics & Society*, 25, 3 (September), pp. 277-302. As I discuss later, the cultural configuration for popular music is 1+1.

⁵ On language configurations, see Abram de Swaan (1993) "The Evolving European Language System: A Theory of Communication Potential and Language Competition", *International Political Science Review*, 14, 3: 241-55.

⁶ Susan Watkins (1991) *From Provinces into Nations*, Princeton, Princeton University Press; Eugen Weber (1976) *Peasants into Frenchmen*, Stanford, Stanford University Press; and Abram de Swaan (1988) *In Care of the State*, New York, Oxford University Press.

⁷ This is a central argument in Peter Sahlins (1989) *Boundaries*, Berkeley, University of California Press. I develop this theme in Laitin (1997).

⁸ Maryjane Osa (1992) "Pastoral Mobilization and Symbolic Politics: The Catholic Church in Poland, 1918-1966" Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago. The speculations about the future are on pp. 1-5. Her reference is to Ken Jowitt (1992) *New World Disorder: The Leninist Extinction*, Berkeley: University of California Press. For a similar analysis, see Wodek Anio et al. "Returning to Europe: Central Europe between Internationalization and Institutionalization" in Peter J. Katzenstein (ed.) (1997) *Taming Power: Germany in Europe*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 200-204. They make the excellent point that post-Franco, the Spanish Catholic Church (unlike the Polish Church after communism) reconciled itself to Spain's "European vocation". Thus the challenge for Poland to become part of Europe will be more difficult than it was for Spain.

⁹ Katherine Verdery (1996) "Civil Society or Nation? 'Europe' in the Symbolism of Postsocialist Politics", chapter 5 of her *What was Socialism, and What Comes Next?*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.

¹⁰ Verdery, as with Osa, relies upon and has been influenced by Jowitt (1992).

¹¹ For a refusal to put the Visegrad states in the "East", yet an unwillingness of most elites of

those states to become part of a "Central European" alternative. see Anio et al. (1997), esp. fn. 1 on p. 195. and pp. 196, 250.

¹² In an article consistent with both Osa and the position taken herein. Ewa Morawska (1995) "The Polish Roman Catholic Church Unbound: Change of Face or Change of Context?" in Stephen E. Hanson and Willfried Spohn (eds.) *Can Europe Work? Germany and the Reconstruction of Postcommunist Societies*. Seattle, University of Washington Press, pp. 47-77 argues that the Polish Catholic Church is indeed a bastion of reaction. However, she argues that its position in regard to both public and private spheres is one "that the majority of Polish society perceives today as detrimental to the satisfactory functioning of the democratic nation-state" (p. 48). She concludes that when Poles observe the "naked requirements for a concrete Christian ethos . . . the negative perceptions of the church as 'meddling' and encroaching upon people's lives are enhanced" (p. 68). This is very much in line with west European orientations toward national churches.

¹³ As with the religion data, when I report percentages for all cases, or for the set of cases of either the original EEC members, the later entrants, or the applicants, I assign a weight to each respondent, the same for all respondents in each country, such that there is an equal percentage of respondents as a function of the population of the country.

¹⁴ The reasoning on Germany is as follows. It would be too early to consider a poll done in 1991 to reflect East Germany anything but an applicant to the EU. But by 1995, it is fully part of a country that was an original member.

¹⁵ Data on the film industries of Europe come from the sources cited at the bottom of Table F.

¹⁶ Information on Euroimages has been downloaded from the world wide web. See: <http://culture.coe.fr/Eurimages>.

¹⁷ The following discussion is based upon the analysis of Simon Frith (1989) "Euro pop" *Cultural Studies*, 3, 2, 166-72.

¹⁸ A. D. Nock (1933) *Conversion*. London, Oxford University Press.

¹⁹ Perhaps there is a not-so-East set of countries close to the EU norm (the Visegrad and Baltic states) and a "real" East that is far from that norm (e.g. Romania, Bulgaria). My data do not allow me to address this possibility, but I am skeptical that new data would demonstrate such a cultural boundary.

²⁰ Zygmunt Bauman (1988) "Entry Tickets and Exit Visas: Paradoxes of Jewish Identity", *Telos*, 77:52-55.

²¹ Pierre Bourdieu (1984) *Distinction : a social critique of the judgement of taste*, trans. Richard Nice. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, chap. 6.



EUI WORKING PAPERS

EUI Working Papers are published and distributed by the
European University Institute, Florence

Copies can be obtained free of charge
– depending on the availability of stocks – from:

The Publications Officer
European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)
Italy

Please use order form overleaf

Publications of the European University Institute

To The Publications Officer
 European University Institute
 Badia Fiesolana
 I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI) – Italy
 Telefax No: +39/055/4685 636
 e-mail: publish@datacomm.iue.it
 <http://www.iue.it>

From Name

 Address

- Please send me a list of EUI Working Papers
- Please send me a list of EUI book publications
- Please send me the EUI brochure Academic Year 2000/01

Please send me the following EUI Working Paper(s):

No, Author

Title:

No, Author

Title:

No, Author

Title:

No, Author

Title:

Date

Signature

**Working Papers of the
Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies**

Published since 1999

RSC No. 99/1

Giorgia GIOVANNETTI
EMU and the Mediterranean Area

RSC No. 99/2

Carol HARLOW
Citizen Access to Political Power in the
European Union

RSC No. 99/3

Francesca BIGNAMI
Accountability and Interest Group
Participation in Comitology

RSC No. 99/4

Mette ZØLNER
Re-Imagining the Nation

RSC No. 99/5

Walter MATTLI
Fora of International Commercial Dispute
Resolution for Private Parties

RSC No. 99/6

Christoph U. SCHMID
Ways Out of the Maquis Communautaire –
On Simplification and Consolidation and the
Need for a Restatement of European Primary
Law

RSC No. 99/7

Salvatore PITRUZZELLO
Political Business Cycles and Independent
Central Banks. German Governments and
the Bundesbank (1960-1989)

RSC No. 99/8

Veronika TACKE
Organisational Constructions of the BSE
Problem. A Systems Theoretical Case Study
on the Globalisation of Risk

RSC No. 99/9

Robert SPRINGBORG
Political Structural Adjustment in Egypt: A
Precondition for Rapid Economic Growth?

RSC No. 99/10

Rebecca Jean EMIGH/Eva FODOR/Iván
SZELÉNYI
The Racialization and Feminization of
Poverty During the Market Transition in the
Central and Southern Europe

RSC 99/11

John GOULD
Winners, Losers and the Institutional Effects
of Privatization in the Czech and Slovak
Republics

RSC 99/12

Heather GRABBE
A Partnership for Accession? The
Implications of EU Conditionality for the
Central and East European Applicants

RSC 99/13

Tibor PAPP
Who is In, Who is Out? Citizenship,
Nationhood, Democracy, and European
Integration in the Czech Republic and
Slovakia

RSC 99/14

Karin FIERKE/Antje WIENER
Constructing Institutional Interests: EU and
NATO Enlargement

RSC 99/15

Jarko FIDRMUC
The Political Economy of Restructuring of
East-West Trade: Economic Winners and
Losers in the CEECs and EU

RSC 99/16

Tanja A. BÖRZEL
Why there is No Southern Problem. On
Environmental Leaders and Laggards in the
European Union

RSC 99/17

Markus HAVERLAND
National Adaptation to European Integration:
The Importance of Institutional Veto Points



RSC 99/18
Sabrina TESOKA
The Differential Impact of Judicial Politics in the Field of Gender Equality. Three National Cases under Scrutiny

RSC 99/19
Marina MARCUSSEN
The Power of EMU-Ideas: Reforming Central Banks in Great Britain, France, and Sweden

RSC 99/20
Yannis PAPADOPOULOS
Gouvernance, coordination et légitimité dans les politiques publiques

RSC 99/21
Anne BAZIN
Germany and the Enlargement of the European Union to the Czech Republic

RSC 99/22
Mark THATCHER
The Europeanisation of Regulation. The Case of Telecommunications

RSC 99/23
Daniel C. THOMAS
Boomerangs and Superpowers: The "Helsinki Network" and Human Rights in U.S. Foreign Policy

RSC 99/24
Giuseppe BERTOLA
Labor Markets in the European Union

RSC 99/25
Grigori V. GOLOSOV/Edward PONARIN
Regional Bases of Party Politics: A Measure and Its Implications for the Study of Party System Consolidation in New Democracies

RSC 99/26
Fritz BREUSS/Andrea WEBER
Economic Policy Coordination in the EMU: Implications for the Stability and Growth Pact?

RSC 99/27
Thomas MAYER
The ECB's Policy: The View from the Market

RSC 99/28
Arnold J. HEIDENHEIMER
Political Parties and Political Corruption in Comparative Historical Perspective

RSC 99/29
Luís Manuel MACEDO PINTO DE SOUSA
Corruption and Parties in Portugal

RSC 99/30
Jean CARTIER-BRESSON
Corruption et partis politiques en France sous la V^e République: une première réflexion sur la relation entre les financements occultes et l'enrichissement

RSC 99/31
Giovanna ZINCONE
Citizenship: Between State and Society

RSC 99/32
Adrian FAVELL/Andrew GEDDES
European Integration, Immigration and the Nation State: Institutionalising Transnational Political Action?

RSC 99/33
Jonathan ZEITLIN
Americanization and Its Limits: Reworking US Technology and Management in Postwar Europe and Japan

RSC 99/34
Gerda FALKNER
Interest Groups in a Multi-level Polity: The Impact of European Integration on National Systems

RSC 99/35
David R. CAMERON
Unemployment in the New Europe: The Contours of the Problem

* * *

RSC 2000/1
Gunnar TRUMBULL
Contested Ideas of the Consumer: National Strategies of Product Market Regulation in France and Germany

RSC 2000/2
Jacques MÉLITZ/Frédéric ZUMER
Interregional and International Risk Sharing and Lessons for EMU

RSC 2000/3
David D. LAITIN
Culture and National Identity: "The East" and European Integration

